No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
Below are comments directed to the Environmental Planning Commission (EPC), received prior to the 21 March 2017 comment submittal date.						
1	Kent, Jason	Denish Consulting	12/30/16	We appreciate having been able to meet with City staff to become better educated about the impact of the proposed consolidated and updated IDO on properties currently undergoing development by the Garcia Family, as well as on other properties owned and occupied by them within the City. Based on our current (better) understanding of the updated IDO, the Garcia Family should be in a position to support the IDO as it progresses through City processes, subject to further review of various details.	Staff appreciates the public's engagement with the various drafts of the IDO.	
2	Kent, Jason	Denish Consulting	12/30/16	A general suggestion we have at this time is that the IDO could be improved with more specific language in the adopting ordinance which would accomplish 2 things:	See Lines 3 and 4.	
3	Kent, Jason	Denish Consulting	12/30/16	(1) Allow owners with properties now in the development process to retain current zoning for applications first submitted during a 6 to 12 month transition period after adoption of the IDO, so that investments in planning which have been made based on existing zoning (but which were not submitted or finalized by the adoption date) will not have to start over from scratch under new zoning concepts.	Any complete application submitted to the City's review and approval process prior to the effective date of the IDO will be allowed to proceed through the process under existing zoning rules. Decision-makers will need to decide whether there will be a transition period after adoption and before the effective date of the IDO where projects may be submitted under the current zoning code or under the IDO. City Council will need to determine the length of the transition period and what procedures staff will follow during that period with input from the project team, City Legal, and stakeholders.	Staff intends to build transition period language and procedures into the enacting ordinance for the IDO, based on City Council discussion.

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
4	Kent, Jason	Denish Consulting	12/30/16	(2) Allow a similar 6 to 12 month transition period after adoption within which owners may submit minor zoning correction and rationalization suggestions to the Planning Department for contiguous parcels which wind up with inconsistent internal spot-zones (for example - or other anomalies), so that they can be administratively corrected by the Planning Department without formal rezoning, as long as such corrections are not materially detrimental to or otherwise inconsistent with the IDO as adopted.	The conversion map has been available on the project webpage for public review and comment since April 2016 and will continue to be available throughout the adoption process. Planning staff encourage property owners to review the proposed conversion for their properties and submit comments if the proposed zoning is inconsistent with existing entitlements. See also Line 3.	Staff intendes to build in "errors and corrections" language in the enactment ordinance that allows corrections to be made by Council before the effective date for mistakes to the zoning map or text.
5	Mexal, Catherine		1/2/17	Where is it defined exactly who can reside in those 18-person facilities that are proposed to be permitted in Wells Park? We've already got sex offenders 2 blocks away on 3rd and 6 blocks away on 4th.	See Page 391-2 for a definition of "Community Residential Facility." In contrast to "Group Homes," These facilities are for "protected classes," individuals whose right to housing is protected by the federal Fair Housing Act.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
6	Mexal, Catherine		1/2/17	Somewhat like the “bail bond” issue*, if it probably can't ever happen in Wells Park, why permit it in the first place? We were told at a WPNA meeting that our homes and lots are too small to actually accommodate such a facility, so why is it even permitted? (* As nearly as I can tell, it looks like bail bond offices are no longer an issue for Wells Park. Thank you!)	See Line 5. Because of the federal Fair Housing Act, we are required to allow for these types of facilities throughout the city; they cannot be eliminated completely from any area that allows residential uses. This is why they are tied to zone districts that apply citywide, with a broader range of locations and property sizes that would accommodate different sized facilities. Regarding bail bonds, the commenter is speaking about land currently zoned SU-2/S-R, which is proposed to be converted to R-T. The R-T zone does not allow "personal and business services," which is the IDO use that includes bail bond offices.	On page 106, remove the "P" for Community residential facility, medium from the R-T zone column. Current practice for permitting Community Residential Programs does not allow facilities for 10 or more residents in R-T or R-LT zones. On page 123, in the USS for Community Residential Facility, consider incorporating distance separation requirements from current Community Residential Programs Handbook. On page 392, in the definition for Community Residential Facility, small consider changing the maximum number of residents 10 to match current practice.

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
7	Mexal, Catherine		1/2/17	Or better yet, why is Wells Park being proposed as R-T? Is it because we've been bundled with Sawmill which has the space available for such facilities? Maybe it's time to de-couple Sawmill from Wells Park? We are consistently small- and medium-sized homes, just like much of Downtown which is R-1A and -1B.	The IDO aims to most closely match the permissive uses allowed by existing zoning. The Sawmill/Wells Park SU-2/S-R zone allows both R-1 uses and limited R-T townhouse development, as well as limited R-C, C-1, and C-2 uses, which is why this area is proposed to be converted to R-T. We are aware that the permissive uses allowed by existing zoning do not always match the way that development has occurred on the ground, and a process to address those mismatches and propose discretionary zone changes is intended to be part of the CPA assessment process after IDO adoption. If we do change the community residential facility uses to only allow small facilities in R-T, then for the purposes of that part of the discussion, the change in zone categories would not change what is allowed in terms of community residential facilities, since small community residential facilities are allowed in the R-1 zone districts.	
8	Fisher, Jim		1/4/17	The term "..single family detached" should be reconsidered to allow for the now popular duplex style of residence where just two families occupy one dwelling. They are basically two separate attached dwellings and differentiated from multi-family. This allows for slightly higher density in residential zones and better use of traditional services. It also addresses the aging population who don't want to move to higher density areas. This concept is being used in other states and communities for that exact reason.	Duplexes (referred to in the IDO as "Dwelling, two-family detached") are permitted uses in all R-T, R-ML, and MX-T zone districts (see Table 3-2-1). Accessory Dwelling Units ("Dwelling unit, accessory") are permissive or conditional uses in those mapped areas where SDPs currently allow such uses (see Section 14-16-3-3.6.E).	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
9	Schroeder, Carl		1/5/17	Regarding the use and value of my property at Lyons and Paradise Blvd, I am not shocked that the Planning Department continues to align with corporate and special interests to consciously create those previously discussed "unintended consequences" in a plan to disrupt the life long plans of everyday Albuquerque land owners and tax payers. I do not approve of removing my property from SU-1 designation and demand that you respect small landowners in your grand IDO plan, leaving Special Use-1 (SU-1) the designation for my property, as it has been for at least the past 30 years.	Approved site plans (which SU-1 zones are based on) will continue to remain valid after the adoption of the IDO until the site plan expires or is amended by the owner. More information is needed about what property the commenter is referring to and what aspects of the proposed zoning for this property are not consistent/compatible with the current entitilements associated with the existing SU-1 zoning.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
9 (cont'd)	Schroeder, Carl		1/5/17	(cont'd)	ABC-Z is proposing to replace the City's existing system of over 700 individual zones to a set of 20 zones. The project team used existing zoning maps to identify where today's zones are and replace them with the closest match to the proposed zones in terms of allowable uses and intended densities/intensities. The project team converted SU-1 zones based on information available within the GIS data for permissive land uses and matched these as closely as possible to one of the proposed zone categories, described in the draft Integrated Development Ordinance (see chapter 14-16-2 Zone Districts). Note that in the IDO, Special Use zoning (NR-SU) will be more strictly applied to highly specialized uses that have impacts on surrounding property and need additional levels of review. See Section 14-16-2-5.5 for a description of the NR-SU zone in the IDO. For general commercial uses, the proposed conversions are more appropriate.	
10	Anderson, Bonnie	Huning Highlands Historic District Association (HHHDA)	1/7/17	We applaud your efforts on this vast and important undertaking. We have reviewed the current EPC Draft of the ABQ IDO, and at our recent Huning Highlands Historic District Association Board meeting, with the assistance and advice of C. David Day, we voted to request the following changes and additions:	Staff appreciates HHHDA'a engagement with and input on the various drafts of the IDO.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
11	Anderson, Bonnie	HHHDA	1/7/17	1. HPO-4 Standards & Guidelines, Huning Highland Overlay Zone Development Guidelines, page 31 Map: Huning Highland Historic District: Significant, Contributing, Non-contributing buildings, 1982. CONTEXT: This map is 35 years old, and needs to be updated to preserve the fabric of the HHHDA district. During the intervening years, many buildings originally deemed Noncontributing have gained age and importance in the area. In addition, some styles, such as Moderne and Mid-Century modern, have since become respected architectural contributors. Until a Map update can occur, Non-Contributing structures should be included with Significant and Contributing buildings procedure for review in cases of demolition. This will allow a case-by-case update of buildings (threatened by demolition) by L.U.C.C. Please update page 31 map with asterisk or a note: ADDITION "Update 2017: Buildings marked 'Non-contributing' on this map which are 50 years of age or older as of the year 2017 (age as determined by historic maps such as the Sanborn Insurance Maps) might now contribute value to the district. Such structures shall require a Certificate of Appropriateness for demolition, following the review procedure for Contributing buildings."	This comment refers to a map on Page 31 of the Huning Highland Historic Overlay Zone Guidelines. Modifying existing Historic Overlay Guidelines is not part of the scope of the ABC-Z project. Updates to these guidelines would need to be handled as a separate process reviewed by the LUCC (Landmarks Commission) and approved by City Council. Within all designated HPOs, Staff has review authority for all demolition of existing structures, which is described on page 333, Certificate of Appropriateness – Minor. Within all designated HPOs, the LC has review authority for demolition of a landmark or a contributing structure, which is described on page 342, Certificate of Appropriateness – Major. These comments are more appropriately addressed in the Procedure section of the IDO. See LIne 13.	On page 344, Section 5-5.2C.1.c, add a new map of the EDO CPO-1 as an area that is covered by the "Demolition of Non-Designated Structure Outside of HPO" to retain Staff and/or LUCC review of structures over 50 years old.

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
12	Anderson, Bonnie	HHHDA	1/7/17	2.HPO-4 Standards & Guidelines, Huning Highland Overlay Zone Development Guidelines, page 86 Demolition, please add to the current language: ADDITION "Appropriateness - Major, for Demolition (Significant, Contributing, and Non-Contributing Building of 50 yrs. age or older) Timeliness: from the day of filing the application of Certificate of Appropriateness for demolition with the City, a minimum of 120 day demolition delay will occur to allow due diligence of Landmarks Commissions in determining preservation and economic viability of the property / structure. Subsequent Landmarks hearings may extend the time period if conditions warrant it. A demolition delay is best practice for active historic districts and preservation institutions in the U.S.”	This comment refers to page 85 of the Huning Highland Historic Overlay Zone Guidelines. See Line 11.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
13	Anderson, Bonnie	HHHDA	1/7/17	3. HPO Demolition 14-16-5.5-5.2.a.3.g Certificate of Appropriateness - Major, for Demolition (Significant, Contributing), please add to current language: ADDITION "Appropriateness - Major, for Demolition (Significant, Contributing, and Non-Contributing Building of 50 yrs. age or older Timeliness: from the day of filing the application of Certificate of Appropriateness for demolition with the City, a minimum of 120 day demolition delay will occur to allow due diligence of Landmarks Commissions in determining preservation and economic viability of the property / structure. Subsequent Landmarks hearings may extend the time period if conditions warrant it. A demolition delay is best practice for historic districts and preservation institutions in the U.S."	See Line 11. Current practice is that all demolition permits within an Historic Overlay Zone are required to have a Certificate of Appropriateness. Demolition review for Non-Contributing Buildings is conducted by the City Historic Preservation Planner and is approved through what is referred to in the IDO as a Certificate of Appropriateness - Minor. See Section 14-16-5-5.1.A. There is no required review period for a Certificate of Appropriateness - Minor. Demolition permits for landmark or contributing structure require a Certificate of Appropriateness - Major. See Section 14-16-5-5.2.A. LUCC (referred to in the IDO as LC) reviews these applications and may take up to 90 days for review and public hearings, but there is no provision for an additional demolition delay beyond the LUCC process. Staff would need direction from decision makers to change the current IDO requirements for demolition review.	On page 333, Section 5-5.1A.1.a.ii, revise text to read "All construction of new structures and new accessory structures." On page 333, Section 5-5.1A.1.a.iii, revise text to read "All demolition of existing structures and non-contributing accessory structures."
14	McKinley, Banu	ULI NM	1/9/17	Comments in Lines 15-52 are from a report created in Fall 2016 after an IDO Testing Session led by ULI NM on September 13, 2016. The entire report, including a description of the process, can be found within the public comments attachment of the EPC Staff Report.	The project team attended this testing session and was provided copies of the report when it was released prior to submission of the EPC Draft IDO. In revising the Draft IDO for EPC submission, staff addressed many of the concerns raised in this process.	On page 344, Section 5-5.2C.1.c, add a new map of the EDO CPO-1 as an area that is covered by the "Demolition of Non-Designated Structure Outside of HPO" to retain Staff and/or LUCC review of structures over 50 years old.
15	McKinley, Banu	ULI NM	1/9/17	The IDO is an improvement over the existing code both in regulation and in clarity.	Noted.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
16	McKinley, Banu	ULI NM	1/9/17	Groups almost all agreed that it was a lot easier to find what they needed in the new IDO.	Noted.	
17	McKinley, Banu	ULI NM	1/9/17	Users may have a learning curve in trying to understand the new organization and structure. The development standard summary tables are a great start to use in conjunction with the narrative sections, but it is hard to determine where you need to look for other standards and requirements that are not listed in the summary tables.	The new oganization will take some getting used to for stakeholders. However, staff feels that this draft document is organized in an intuitive way and and contains cross-references to guide the user. The Table of Contents indicates where various standards can be found in the IDO. In the digital version of the IDO, the table of contents and internal cross-references are hyperlinked to allow for more ease of use. More information is needed about how the document could be made easier to navigate.	
18	McKinley, Banu	ULI NM	1/9/17	One participant asked for more cross-references among sections that relate.	See Line 17. Staff has added additional cross-references in the EPC draft. More information is needed about where there should be more cross-references.	
19	McKinley, Banu	ULI NM	1/9/17	The code needs to specify which regulations apply when a corner site has dual corridor designations.	The allowances that come with being in an Urban Center, on a Main Street, within a Premium Transit station area, or in proximity to transit are related to the boundaries of the Center, Corridor, or station area, not to the building orientation or frontage. Staff believes that this comment relates primarily to parking reductions. See Section 14-16-4-5.3.D for an explanation of when parking reductions may apply. For the proximity to transit reduction, and parcel that is within the designated distance of a transit stop or station would be eligible for a parking reduction, regardless of the building's orientation.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
20	McKinley, Banu	ULI NM	1/9/17	Groups could not find solar requirements.	Solar Access regulations are indicated in the Table of Contents.	
21	McKinley, Banu	ULI NM	1/9/17	Groups could not find the setback chart.	In the current code, setbacks and other dimensional standards are listed separately in each zone district. In the IDO, these standards are consolidated in the Dimensional Standards section. See Section 14-16-4-1 Dimensional Standards.	
22	McKinley, Banu	ULI NM	1/9/17	Several participants asked for clarification on basic definitions; ie. adjacent, abut.	Definitions were added for the terms "adjacent" and "abut" for the EPC draft IDO to address this concern.	
23	McKinley, Banu	ULI NM	1/9/17	One group requested credit for elevated planters and rooftop gardens as usable open space and landscaping.	The definition of "Open Space, Usable" describes what elements may be included in the calculation of usable open space, which may include gardens and plantings. Section 14-16-4-6.3 describes the amount of coverage; types of plantings; soil condition; location, size, and spacing of plant material; etc. for something to be considered landscaped area. Areas that meet this requirement for landscaped area may be counted toward the open space requirement if they meet the requirements for usable open space as well.	On page 405, clarify the definition of "Landscape Area." On page 412, in the definition of "Open space, usable," add a reference that rooftop decks may be included in usable open space. On page 232, revise 14-16-4-6.3.B.1, revise second sentence to read "In these areas, landscaping required…" On pages 232-247, review and revise
24	McKinley, Banu	ULI NM	1/9/17	Landscaping requirements and standards need to be more clear and precise.	Staff has made some revisions to these requirements for clarity and consistency since the Consolidated Draft. More information is needed about where the standards are still unclear.	See Line 23.

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
25	McKinley, Banu	ULI NM	1/9/17	It was difficult to understand the differences between open space, landscaping, and drainage, and if they could double count among the different requirements.	Staff feels that the EPC draft of the IDO is appropriately clear on these definitions and where these elements can be counted toward different requirements. The definition of "Open Space, Usable" was revised for the EPC Draft to clarify that required drainage facilities and utility easements cannot be counted toward required usable open space. However, stormwater management features added to the site that meet landscaping requirements count toward landscape area requirements (see Section 14-16-4-6.3.M). See Lines 23 and 24.	See Line 23.
26	McKinley, Banu	ULI NM	1/9/17	The landscaping section was challenging and had large sections that were more philosophical and conceptual with the actual standards buried near the end.	See Lines 23-25.	See Line 23.
27	McKinley, Banu	ULI NM	1/9/17	Parking requirements are difficult to calculate (please add a parking worksheet/calculator).	Noted. A parking worksheet may be created after adoption of the IDO as an administrative form that is available to users who need it.	
28	McKinley, Banu	ULI NM	1/9/17	It is difficult to determine which parking reductions apply.	Section 14-16-4-5.3.D explains that any combination of parking adjustments and credits may be applied to a site depending on the criteria in this section that the site satisfies, as long as the total reduction does not exceed 50%. This has been revised for the EPC Draft IDO. More information is needed about how these regualtions could be made more clear.	
29	McKinley, Banu	ULI NM	1/9/17	Parking terms need to be better defined, e.g. ‘frontage,' 'directly in front’.	Staff feels that the language describing on-street parking adjustments and credits is clear (see Section 14-16-4-5.3.D.6). More information is needed about how this language could be improved.	On page 216, revise Section 14-16-4-5.3.D.6 and 6.b to refer to on-street parking abutting any lot line instead of on-street parking in front of the subject property.

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
30	McKinley, Banu	ULI NM	1/9/17	Parking is restrictive.	Minimum parking requirements have been slightly reduced from the current requirements for most types of development and the IDO updates existing parking reductions. The modifications made to parking requirements and parking reductions are based on national best practices for cities of a similar size. Staff would need direction from decision makers to further reduce parking requirements.	
31	McKinley, Banu	ULI NM	1/9/17	Parking isn't consistent with market demand in auto-oriented areas of the City.	The IDO uses parking *minimums* to allow development to increase the amount of parking on a site to respond to market demand. Staff would need direction from decision makers to increase parking requirements.	
32	McKinley, Banu	ULI NM	1/9/17	Lenders will not finance projects with too little parking.	See Line 31.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
33	McKinley, Banu	ULI NM	1/9/17	Shared use parking is unwieldy and old-fashioned. Consider APA's version.	The Shared Parking Table (Table 4-5-1) is a proxy for hours of operation and complementarity based on general land use categories – and that is the direction many cities are going in to simplify administration. We think the matrix in the draft should be kept. The APA matrix, and other shared parking matrices that depend on comparison of hours of operation, are sometimes useful at the initial development stage, but an increasing number of cities don't want to go to that level of detail. Hours of operation for shared uses could be complementary on Day 1, and then down the road tenants change and the city is faced with the choice of (1) re-running the calculator when hours of operation or tenants change (and potentially saying "no, you can't do that because your hours are no longer complementary so there's not enough parking") or (2) ignoring future changes that make the calculation no longer applicable. Many cities are moving to a version of (2) – namely, they run the calculator when the development/ redevelopment is approved, but don't rerun it when tenants or hours change – relying on the tenant/market to sort that out. So if the city is not going to make the OK/not OK decision based on hours of operation in the future, an increasing number of cities decide they don't need to do that at the beginning.	
34	McKinley, Banu	ULI NM	1/9/17	Further reductions should be allowed for projects receiving tax credits for below market rate housing; this population is shown to have fewer cars.	Staff feels that the reductions provided in the IDO are sufficient. Staff would need direction from decision makers to further reduce parking requirements. See Line 30.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
35	McKinley, Banu	ULI NM	1/9/17	One group requested greater specificity regarding incentives available along specific corridors. For example, would new apartments on the corner of Montgomery and Wyoming qualify for the density bonuses and parking reductions available to the Montgomery corridor if they face Wyoming?	See Line 19.	Add a section at the beginning of the IDO, with the List of Area-Specific Maps, that indicates where there are special regulations for UC-MS-PT. Include in this section cross-references to the definitions and measurements for these areas.
36	McKinley, Banu	ULI NM	1/9/17	Neighborhood representatives were concerned that the new IDO will be challenging to learn and review.	See Line 17. The Planning Department intends to provide training opportunities for staff, decision-makers, and the public to help stakeholders understand the IDO after adoption.	
37	McKinley, Banu	ULI NM	1/9/17	There were questions about whether the zoning is by right or if there is a still a neighborhood process and what delays / obstructions that could present.	Table 5-1-1 (begins on page 298 of the EPC draft) describes the notification and meeting requirements, as well as the type of review and decision-making authority for various types of development decisions. The table also refers the user to the sections with more detail, including thresholds for when a development proposal requires a public hearing.	
38	McKinley, Banu	ULI NM	1/9/17	In general, groups felt that the IDO allowed for greater density than the current zoning code. This had some exceptions:	See Lines 39-52.	
39	McKinley, Banu	ULI NM	1/9/17	The 4-story MX-M height is not sufficient. It may not allow as much density as current C-2 with angle planes on a large lot and inhibits development and financial potential. A project on a large suburban lot (Montgomery and Wyoming) fared worse under the IDO than current zoning.	The 26' base height in the the existing C-2 zone has been increased to 45' in the MX-M zone. This comment refers to an IDO draft from August 2016. For the EPC draft, staff replaced the angle plane rule, which is confusing for many users, with a rule that height limits do not apply to portions of a building located more than 100 ft. from any lot line in the R-ML, R-MH, MX-M, and MX-H zones to make development standards clearer.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
40	McKinley, Banu	ULI NM	1/9/17	Existing SU-1 Form-Based Zoning allowed for greater density than the IDO on a site on Tennessee and Central. 55 ft. building height is not sufficient; 60 ft. is better.	Under the current zoning, this site is zoned C-1 and allows 26 ft. in base height plus height allowed within angle planes. This comment is based on the assumption that a zone change to an SU-1 Form-based zone would be approved and allow for higher building heights. Under the proposed IDO, there is not an option to change zoning to a form-based zone on a site-by-site basis. However, for areas in Centers and along Corridors, where development is desired, building heights vary from the current base height limits. Building height limits have been revised for the EPC Draft IDO. For this particular property, the proposed zoning conversion is MX-M on a Main Street and the maximum height would be 65 ft.	
41	McKinley, Banu	ULI NM	1/9/17	It was hard to go high enough with the IDO. Would prefer 5 stories on top of podium (San Mateo and Montgomery).	See Lines 39 and 40.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
42	McKinley, Banu	ULI NM	1/9/17	One participant expressed concern that the IDO promotes too much retail and multi-family, and this is not appropriate everywhere. This type of development should be targeted only in areas where the market supports it.	The focus of the IDO testing session was to determine whether or not the provisions in the IDO will make development in certain areas possible. Sites for this exercise were chosen to reflect parts of the city where more dense mixed-use development is desirable, and on many of the sites, possible with today's zoning. While the IDO does make this type of development possible in more parts of the city, development will continue to be driven by the market. There is no requirement for first-floor retail or multi-story development in the IDO. See also See Lines 87, 89, 90 108, 186, 189 for comments that indicate the IDO limits retail activity too much.	
43	McKinley, Banu	ULI NM	1/9/17	The IDO does not disallow building signage which is good; however, do all illuminated signs require a permit?	See Section 14-16-4-11.6.B. New illuminated signs will require a sign permit. This is consistent with the provisions of the current zoning code.	
44	McKinley, Banu	ULI NM	1/9/17	Groups appreciated that the IDO makes it explicitly clear how to increase density without resulting in adverse impacts, e.g. rules for development adjacent to single-family residences or Areas of Consistency.	Noted. See Section 14-16-4-8 Neighborhood Edges.	
45	McKinley, Banu	ULI NM	1/9/17	Neighborhood representatives expressed concern that straight zones will not offer as much protection as the existing code, SU-2 and overlay zones.	The intent of the IDO is to carry over the existing, adopted protections in the existing, SU-2, and overlay zones. More information is needed about what protections are missing in the current draft.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
46	McKinley, Banu	ULI NM	1/9/17	Neighborhoods believe SU-1 is successful to preserve natural features, Bosque, and ecological systems.	Additional regualtions were added to the IDO based on public comment for development abutting Major Public Open Space, sensitive lands, arroyos, and acequias. See Sections 4-2.3 (Avoidance of Sensitive Lands), 4-2.5 (Arroyo Standards), 4-2.6 (Acequia Standards), and 4-2.8 (Properties Along Major Public Open Space). The approach in the IDO is to establish regulations that provide adequate protections for natural features, the Bosque, and other ecologically important areas up front, rather than needing to be negotiated on a case-by-case basis. Most cities do not impose extra review and approval procedures in these cases. Upfront requirements implement protections and context-sensitive site design needed in these areas without an additional review and approval process. If additional controls on these development sites is desired, they should be implemented through substantive changes to Chapter 14-16-4 (Development Standards) or – if they related to uses of land – to Chapter 14-16-3 (Use Regulations) rather than through additional/different review procedures.Direction is needed from decision-makers if rezoning to NR-SU zones, which would require EPC review and decision, would provide better protection on these properties.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
47	McKinley, Banu	ULI NM	1/9/17	Neighborhood representatives explained that residents are concerned with density because they fear parking spill-over impacts in areas that don't have transit access or if they don't get the expected ridership. Therefore, parking expectations need to be realistic or they won't work.	See Line 31 for market demands for on-site parking. Businesses and developers may provide additional parking to serve their market. Staff feels that IDO parking requirements are sufficient. Parking requirements have generally been reduced in order to provide an incentive for development within Centers and Corridors, where development is desired.	
48	McKinley, Banu	ULI NM	1/9/17	Lot sizes are problematic. In particular, large lots were difficult to do a financially feasible concept due to a perceived lack of market demand and inability to achieve market rents in specific areas.	The IDO regulates site design and building and does not require minimum lot coverage, floor-area ratios, or building height. Phasing development on large sites is often appropriate on large sites. The IDO cannot create market demand for development. The IDO does not create or change parcel boundaries. Since the testing session, minimum lot sizes in many of the zones have been removed.	
49	McKinley, Banu	ULI NM	1/9/17	Height allowances and dwelling unit setbacks allowed projects to be more viable under the IDO.	Noted.	
50	McKinley, Banu	ULI NM	1/9/17	The new IDO does not require stepbacks, which removes a clear barrier to project design.	Noted. See Lines 39 and 44.	
51	McKinley, Banu	ULI NM	1/9/17	Higher transit bonuses are beneficial in the IDO.	Noted. See Section 14-16-4-1 for Dimensional Standards, where Premium Transit station area building height standards are found.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
52	McKinley, Banu	ULI NM	1/9/17	Some groups did not find the parking requirements or reductions to be an improvement over the existing code and reported that they were still too high. This compromises the potential feasibility of projects, given that more density is allowed under the IDO but the parking requirements were almost the same.	See Lines 30 and 34.	
53	Contreras, Mike		1/11/17	It was a pleasure meeting with all of you yesterday in your office. This site located at 7226 Central Ave. SW, it being on a high traffic corridor, and with the adjacent parcels being zoned MX-H, I believe this parcel needs to have the same designation as well. Any other designation will not work for any of the developers I am currently working with.	The subject site, which is currently SU-1, has been converted to PD and retains site plan control. The SU-1 approval allows uses permissive in O-1, C-1, and C-2. A straight conversion of these uses would go to NR-C West of the River. Regarding the surrounding properties, staff reviewed the zoning conversion and found a mapping error in the IDO Conversion Map. Based on policies to address the jobs-housing balance, C-2 zoning on the West Side is proposed to convert to NR-C unless it is within 660 ft. of a Premium Transit station. Those properties that are within 660 ft. of a PT station would be converted to MX-M. The subject property is more than 660 ft. from the proposed PT station areas on Central, which supports a conversion to NR-C.	Revise the IDO Conversion Map based on decision rules for C-1, C-2, and C-3 to address any possible inconsistencies.
54	Krause, Carol		1/12/17	First I would like to thank members of the planning department for the tolerance and patience with all of us community members who are trying to work our way through these drafts. Their help and guidance has been immeasurable when it comes to understanding and locating the information in the Drafts that address our areas of concern.	Staff appreciates the public's engagement in the various drafts of the IDO.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
55	Krause, Carol		1/12/17	One area of concern that has yet to be fully diminished is the lack of notification when it comes to variances. According to page 253 of the IDO (#3) table 1-16-5 Administration and Enforcement no notice of variance needs to be sent at all to neighbors or NA regarding variances. In a community such as ours (SBMT), which is notorious for its mismatched use vs zoning, one of the few protections we have is the building code itself when it comes to buildings, setbacks and allowances. For someone else to decide if a variance is ok, which may seem harmless at the desk level, but on site with our close neighbors and narrow streets it becomes detrimental. I find it alarming that no notice needs to be given.	This comment refers to a formatting issue in Table 5-1-1 on page 298 of the EPC Draft. There are two types of variance in this table - Development Standards and Public R-O-W Sidewalk. The "Variance" line contains no information about review procedures because the procedures are listed for the two types of variance. A Variance for Development Standards includes requirements for public notice.	In Table 5-1-1, for "Fence, Wall, or Sign Permit," "Subdivision of Land - Major," and "Variance," remove the lines separating the different columns in the rows to clarify that these are header rows and the relevant content is in the rows below.
56	Krause, Carol		1/12/17	We already have instances of paved lots draining directly onto neighbors property and tall buildings blocking the Right to Sunlight.	This comment refers to an enforcement issue. Staff believed the standards in 14-16-4-4.8 (Stormwater Management) and 4-9 (Solar Access) are sufficient. More information is needed to improve these standards.	
57	Krause, Carol		1/12/17	While the new Areas of Consistency is going to help with this, it is not a guarantee and to be certain I would very much like to see notification to the neighbors and NA's of Variances.	See Line 55.	See Line 55.

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
58	Houde, Kristi	Citizens Information Committee of Martinez-town (CICM)	1/17/17	Chapter 14-16-5: Administration and Enforcement, we request you consider expanding the Electronic Mail notification requirement to Recognized Neighborhood Associations (RNAs) to include all Application Types unless Application Type requires a Mailed Notice to the RNA. This expanded notification allows more transparency of proposed development to residents.	Under today's system, notice is not provided for development that does not go to a public meeting or hearing. The vast majority of development does not require public notice or go before a body that takes public comment. Under the IDO, e*mail* notice is a new requirement and is required for some administrative decisions, including Site Plans. All development decisions that require a public meeting or hearing require email notification to RNAs that include the subject site. Administrative and Policy Decisions that impact a specific geography also require notification to impacted RNAs. Direction will be needed from decision makers to expand notice requirements.	
59	Houde, Kristi	CICM	1/17/17	Regarding required Section 5-4.3.A Neighborhood Meeting: we request that you require the applicant have at least one meeting with a Recognized Neighborhood Association located partially or completely within one-quarter (1/4) mile of the proposed project or facility. This request is to allow neighborhoods in "areas of consistency" near proposed new development in "areas of change" an opportunity to uphold good planning, protect the environment, and promote community welfare. Neighborhood residents need information about proposed development close to the RNA boundary to be informed residents.	See Section 14-16-5-4.3.A. For projects that require a neighborhood meeting and are within the boundaries of an RNA, that RNA is the most appropriate to discuss potential impacts and opportunities. Language was added to the EPC Draft IDO that applies to projects that are not within the boundaries of an RNA. For these projects, the applicant will be required to have a meeting with an RNA within 1/4 mile of the property. See Section 14-16-5-4.3.A.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
60	Houde, Kristi	CICM	1/17/17	Current zoning code violations: how will the IDO treat these. Will enforcement or remedies be strengthened in the IDO? Or could violations be grandfathered as permitted use?	Violation of the existing code that also violate the IDO standards will continue to be violations and can be enforced. If the IDO changes a development standard that makes the previous violation legal, then it ceases to be a violation. The IDO provides clearer, more consistent regulations, which allows for better enforcement. If a penalty of the violation has been assessed, it continues. The penalties for violations of the IDO are enumerated in Section 1-1-99 of the City Code. Modifying these penalties is outside of the scope of the ABC-Z project.	In the enacting ordinance fo the IDO, specify that any violation that is cured by this IDO is no longer considered a violation. Any fees or penalties assessed under the pre-existing code may still be assessed.

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
61	Houde, Kristi	CICM	1/17/17	Additional site specific concerns (related to the Lovelace facility on Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd are: -Unscreened HVAC equipment and generators on the Lovelace Medical Campus -Open standing water storm drainage catch basin installed by Lovelace on City property at the east end of Martineztown Park -Unscreened vents installed on Medical Office building -Globe lighting recently activated on top of rehabbed parking lot adjacent to the Medical Office building. -Another concern is the drainage issue from the east end of Martineztown Park and from the Fruit/High St comer: In 2006 and on 1 August 2014 heavy rainstorms resulted in flooding one of the Villa de San Martin townhouse units (517 Roma NE.) How does the proposed IDO address these issues? Is there a process to address these concerns?	These are concerns related to an approved site plan. Site plans remain valid after the adoption of the IDO. See Section 14-16-1-10.3. See also Lines 100-103. Some of these concerns may be violations of the approved site plan, and some may need to be addressed at a future date when the site plan is amended or when a new site plan is submitted for the site. Any site features that become nonconformities under the new IDO regulations will need to be addressed when the site plan is amended for expansions of at least 25% of the net square footage or 2,500 square feet, whichever is less. See Section 14-16-5-6 for nonconformities. Violations of an approved site plan will continue to be considered violations. See Section 14-16-1-10.5. See also Section 14-16-5-7 for general code violations.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
62	Houde, Kristi	CICM	1/17/17	Buffers and setbacks - Identify location of the buffers and set-backs between areas of consistency, areas of change; transit corridors; open space city park; and our elementary school. Specifically: -Lomas and adjacent single family residences on cui-de-sacs within South Martineztown; -Broadway and adjacent low density public housing on Arno; -Martin Luther King and adjacent single family homes on Marquette and low-density public housing units on Arno; and -The residential townhomes on High St. adjacent to the Lovelace Medical Campus.	Staff is developing an interactive map that shows Areas of Change and Consistency. See Section 14-16-4-8 for neighborhood edge provisions that protect single-family neighborhoods. Building heights are found in Section 14-16-4-1, which includes taller building heights for properties within 660 ft. of a Premium Transit Station. There are provisions for screening and fences and walls adjacent to parks and/or Major Public Open Space. See Section 14-16-4-6.8 and 14-16-4-6.9. The IDO does not include and additional buffers or setbacks from City parks. The IDO carries over existing separation requirements between schools and adult uses and alcohol sales. See 14-16-3-3.4.F, G, and DD.	
63	Houde, Kristi	CICM	1/17/17	Allowances - Our experience with Administrative Amendments issued to the Lovelace Medical Campus causes concern that a generic city-wide up to 25% expansion of usage may be detrimental to adjacent residential neighborhoods. Additional lighting, signage, unscreened HVAC, and unscreened venting equipment have negatively affected our residential quality of life. The less than 25% allowance is too generous to avoid public hearings on expanded development city-wide. We request you consider reducing the maximum from less than 25% expansion to 5% expansion for "large" projects to 10% for "smaller" projects. City planning staff should define "huge" and "small" according to accepted standards.	What are currently referred to as "Administrative Amendments" are handled in the IDO under Section 14-16-5-4.24.B. This text will be revised to explain that Minor Amendments to approved Site Plans can be approved for up to 25% or 2,500 S.F., whichever is less, increase in gross floor area as long as the increase does not expand the building beyond the Dimensional Standards for the base zone (see Section 14-16-4-1) or the Administrative Deviations found in Table 4-3-1.	Revise Section 14-16-1-10 for clarity and consistency. Revise Section 14-16-5-4.24 for clarity and consistency.

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
64	Houde, Kristi	CICM	1/17/17	Hospital expansion: On January 12, 2016, the Albuquerque Journal reported that Lovelace Health System and UNM Medical Group are forming a new venture to deliver rehabilitation services at the Lovelace Medical Campus and plan to launch a new residency program in physical medicine and rehabilitation on the Lovelace Medical campus. -Is this an example of the less than 25% expansion that would avoid the need for public hearings and Required Neighborhood Meetings? -Does the current St Joseph/Civic Auditorium Sector Plan allow this development/expansion? -Is there enough parking for the additional outpatient services and for additional student parking? -Is City Planning staff involved in this proposed development/expansion? -Neighborhood residents were alerted by the newspaper article to the proposed development/expansion. Did the recent addition of the CVS Pharmacy to the Medical Office Building increase the parking requirements on the site?	Staff believes that this expansion of services involved the rehabilitation of existing buildings on the site, not an expansion of the building itself. If there is no change of the site itself, such projects are handled through a building permit for tenant improvements, not an amendment to the site plan. In these situations, neighborhood notice and hearings are not required and only the Building Permit Office of the Planning Deparment would be involved. In this case, a parking review would only be triggered if the property owner were requesting a change of use - i.e. from commercial to residential or vice versa. Providing additional medical-related services within a hospital facility is not considered a change of use. The same is true for the addition of a pharmacy within the existing building.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
65	Houde, Kristi	CICM	1/17/17	Administrative Amendments permitting additional uses on St Joseph/Civic Auditorium SDP have had a deleterious effect on our neighborhood quality of life. Permitting additional ambulatory services, a retail pharmacy and a helipad increased noise, air pollution, traffic access and congestion. These now permitted uses increase visual pollution of light at night emitting from enlarged windows, and visual pollution from unscreened venting on the Medical Office Building. As an aside, what's being vented into the neighborhood? Lovelace Hospital still has not complied with their 1998 agreement to vacate Walter St (see attached). Continued noncompliance and additional ambulatory services with retail pharmacy usage worsen traffic access and congestion issues with Longfellow Elementary School on Walter St that spill over into the residential neighborhood.	Noted. See Lines 60-62.	
66	Houde, Kristi	CICM	1/17/17	The current St Joseph/Civic Auditorium SDP as amended is now a patchwork of permitted uses. Will a Facility/ Redevelopment Plan address this SU-1 area to review and upgrade standards to ensure minimal impact on our residential quality? Or would a Community Planning Area Assessment address this large site in the proposed IDO?	The Site Plan for the St. Joseph site determines what development and uses can take place on the site. The approved Site Plan will remain valid after the IDO is adopted. See Line 61. The Community Planning Area assessment may provide an opportunity for residents, Planning staff, and property owners to address issues like this in the future.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
67	Houde, Kristi	CICM	1/17/17	Martineztown Park- -What is the buffer or a set-back allowance from the SU-1 boundary to the adjacent Martineztown Park? -Will the IDO permit high-rise development to be built along the park without a set-back or buffer? -Does the IDO require visual screening between the Lovelace Medical campus valet parking lot and the east end of Martineztown Park? -Currently, no screening exists; the fencing is open iron work with no landscaping. Is the absence of screening/buffering a current zoning code violation?	See Lines 61 and 62. Under the IDO conversion map as of December 2016, the Lovelace Campus parcels are shown as MX-M. After further review, staff realized the existing C-2 zone (of which MX-M is the straight conversion) does not allow hospitals. Staff will be revising the conversion for existing hospital sites to MX-H, the conversion of C-3 zones, which would allow for buildings up to 55 ft. For future development, Edge Buffer Landscaping is required adjacent to the Park and the abutting R-T properties, see page 244, Section4-6.5E. For future development, Parking Lot Edges provisions require screening of parking areas, see page 246, Section4-6.6A. For future development, Neighborhood Edges protections are required for portions of the site that abut the R-T properties, see page 261, Section 14-16-4-8. These provisions would apply with a building expansion of 2,500 SF.	Revise conversion map to zone existing hospital sites (predominantly SU-1 for hospital) as MX-H.
68	Houde, Kristi	CICM	1/17/17	Ugly Billboards -Billboards should be eliminated along Lomas from Railroad tracks to top of hill just east of I-25 northbound frontage road and along the I-25 Frontage roads to protect historic downtown views.	We are generally carrying over existing standards for signs rather than changing entitlements. Minor changes to temporary signs have been made to comply with a recent Supreme Court decision Reed v. Gilbert. Prohibiting off-premises signs in new areas is outside the scope of the ABC-Z project.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
69	Griffee, Jim	Nor Este NA (NENA)	1/17/17	The Nor Este Neighborhood Association (NENA) would like to express our thanks for meeting with us on 1/13/2017 to go over the IDO and Zone Conversion Map issues we had identified within the Association's boundaries. The meeting was very informative and professional and did indeed address our most important concerns. The following are a few remaining comments/concerns that we wanted to pass along for your consideration.	Staff appreciates the public's engagement in the various drafts of the IDO.	
70	Griffee, Jim	NENA	1/17/17	The current conversion map shows all parcels in Nor Este Estates (Wyoming to Barstow, Modesto to Alameda) zoned R-1B. We believe most of the parcels along both sides of the La Cueva Channel and then North to Modesto are at or more than the 7000 sqft minimum size for R-1C but not all satisfy the 10' minimum side lot setback requirements for R1-C. Since the Nor Este Estates if fully developed and there is no distinction in terms of land uses between R-1B and R-1C there is no real concern but it does tend to distort the housing density and housing density gradient "picture" in the area.	As the commenter notes, uses for R-1 are the same. Contextual standards in Section 4-1.3.B are intended to ensure consistency at the street edge for redevelopment in the future. Staff will review the R-1 conversions in this area to verify that the correct sub-types were used.	
71	Griffee, Jim	NENA	1/17/17	There is a zoning error in the existing zoning map for the parcels at the South East corner of Barstow and Modesto. The density in this development is probably 5DU/A, not 3DU/A as shown on the existing zoning map and therefore probably should be R-1C rather than R-1D as shown on the IDO map.	The flavors of R-1 are based on lot size, not density. The IDO zone conversions are based on existing zoning and entitlements. While this area may have developed as higher density than it was zoned for, the conversion is based on the zoning, not the current development. See Line 70.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
72	Griffee, Jim	NENA	1/17/17	Assuming the zone conversion map is adopted at the same time as the IDO, it would seem advisable to have a streamlined process (something other than the normal zone change request process) for correcting conversion errors for some period of time after the adoption.	See Line 4.	
73	Griffee, Jim	NENA	1/17/17	We also hope the pre-adoption zoning/land use data in maintained in ABQ Maps (AGIS) for a period time (possibly years) after the new zoning map is adopted.	The current zoning will be maintained by AGIS during the transition period to the IDO zoning. After that, a record of the current zoning will be kept in the City's records.	
74	Griffee, Jim	NENA	1/17/17	We recommend that the records that document the transition from the current zoning ordinance to the IDO are retained and kept available to the public for quite some time, possibly even as recorded public records. Examples include the final draft of the IDO with all of its foot notes, staff responses to public comments, and policy tracking matrices.	Staff intends to maintain all drafts of the IDO as public record and will be available for the public to review in the future.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
75	Griffee, Jim	NENA	1/17/17	The residential development unit densities identified in the La Cueva SDP that are explicitly identified in the current zoning (i.e. R-D xDU/A) are being replaced by the minimum lot area requirement of R-1A through D in the IDO. Our calculations (see following) find that this approach does not yield an exact match and seems to move toward slightly higher densities. We believe the IDO should explicitly address this aspect of the conversion. R-1B 5,000sqft min = .11 net acre or 9DU/net acre (~8DU/gross acre) The Conversion Map is using R-1B for 7DU/A R-1C 7,000sqft min = .16 net acre or 6DU/net acre (~5DU/gross acre) The Conversion Map is using R-1C for 5DU/A R-1D 10,000sqft min =.23 net acre or 4DU/net acre (~3DU/gross acre) The Conversion Map is using R-1D for 3 and 4DU/A	See Lines 70 and 71.	
76	Griffee, Jim	NENA	1/17/17	14-6-3-3.6.J Accessory Uses: Home Occupation has expanded the scope of what is considered “Home Occupation” from that of the current code with a potential residential neighborhood impacts. Of particular note is the number of Non Resident Family Employees. In the current code, only Resident Family members can be employees while the IDO permits up to 2 non-family member employees. This would seem to muddy the distinction between Home Occupation and Live-Work.	The IDO adds a provision for home occupation that limits the number of individuals that can simultaneously be attracted to the residence, which does not exist in the current Zoning Code, and which serves to limit the amount of traffic - including both employees and patrons - created by the home occupation.	On page 156, Section 14-16-3-3.6.J.2, revert the language to the current code "Only members of the residing family may be employed." On page 157, Section 14-16-3-3.6.J.8, reduce the number of individuals that can be regularly attracted to the premises to two instead of four.

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
77	Griffee, Jim	NENA	1/17/17	There are numerous references to 14-16-4-11 Operation and Maintenance in the current draft that are incorrect. 14-16-4-12 is the current section number for Operation and Maintenance.		Search entire document for references to Operation and Maintenance and fix incorrect cross-references.
78	Massey, John P.		1/17/17	I commend the work of the City Council and the City Planning Department. I am hopeful that their efforts, and yours, will significantly advance the turnaround of the economic difficulties in Albuquerque.	Noted.	
79	Massey, John P.		1/17/17	Because I have lived and worked in the Nob Hill area over a course of decades, I have closely followed and on multiple occasions provided written and verbal comments to City officials on the ABC-Z zoning code recompilation. My significant research on professional articles dealing with zoning and bus rapid transit systems convinces me that the City's work on this zoning matter will provide a great public benefit consistent with the guiding public policies of improving mobility, economic vitality, equity in housing and transportation, all in a sustainable and economically feasible manner.	Noted	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
80	Massey, John P.		1/17/17	The interplay between zoning changes and the construction of the Albuquerque Rapid Transit (ART) is quite heartening. ART is designed to be more than a transportation upgrade. ART will be a much needed economic boon due to the multipliers that will directly accompany this public construction project and those that will accompany the associated increased private construction and commercial activities. (The DOT and Fed Reserve studies of other such systems referenced in ART literature are appropriately encouraging on this public-private economic relationship.)	Noted	
81	Massey, John P.		1/17/17	To facilitate economic, transportation and environmental component success, the ABC-Z Consolidated Plan of December 2016 largely encourages the private developments that must accompany ART The increased uses allowed in the MX- zones will set the stage for additional commercial, business and multi-residential construction. The realization of these opportunities, however, requires density. If you don't have the population to support the businesses, the businesses won't come. If the businesses don't come you won't have the much desired "walkability" of our affected neighborhood.	Staff believes that the "Consolidated Plan" refers to the EPC draft IDO. Agreed. The market is an important driver in determining what development will take place. While the IDO allows some additional building height, density, and uses in Mixed-use zone districts, a market for these things is necessary for the development to happen.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
82	Massey, John P.		1/17/17	This brings me to my current suggestion on how to improve the Consolidated Plan with respect to Nob Hill's potential density increase. The area east of Carlisle to Washington has much open or delapidated existing spaces. This area appears ideal for greater residential and commercial density. The Nob Hill Character Protection Overlay unnecessarily inhibits that density opportunity in that area. Accordingly, I recommend the application of the CPO be limited to the area between Girard and Carlisle. If the CPO boundaries cannot be reduced then please allow the height bonuses available elsewhere in Main Street and Premium Transit corridor designations to be applied throughout the Nob Hill area, from Girard to Washington. If that is too extensive then allow the bonuses to be applied at least to the developments between Carlisle and Washington.	Staff believes that the "Consolidated Plan" refers to the EPC draft IDO. Staff has attempted to balance the regulations in the current Nob Hill Highland SDP with a desire to support development in Centers and along Corridors. Despite the importance of the Nob Hill area as a Main Street as well as its Premium Transit stations, there has been neighborhood opposition to increasing building heights in the area between Girard and Aliso (just East of Carlisle). East of Aliso to Graceland, Premium Transit station area height standards do apply - as does the Workforce Housing incentive - allowing for additional building heights in this area. Staff feels that the proposed zoning regulations and the provisions of the Nob Hill Highland - CPO-5 strike a balance between the Centers & Corridors vision and the desires of the surrounding residents. Staff would need guidance from decision-makers to allow higher building heights in the Nob Hill Highland CPO-5. See Lines 95-97, 140, 142, 152, 232, 276, 309, 311-315, 327-331, and 337-340 for discussion of building heights in Nob Hill.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
83	Massey, John P.		1/17/17	There is a practical and legitimate need to permit developers a reasonable return on their capital and their experience. My concern is that without the associated bonuses available elsewhere under the new plan, the private construction activity in the Nob Hill area will be restricted. Contributing projects may not be undertaken. That would imperil the realistic vision and potential success of both ART and this much needed zoning overhaul.	See Lines 82, 95-97, 140, 142, 152, 232, 276, 309, 311-315, 327-331, and 337-340 for discussion of building heights in Nob Hill.	
84	Jaramillo, Jaime	Consensus Planning	1/17/17	First and foremost, thank you for such a strong December draft! We believe that most of the issues we raised throughout this process were addressed in the December draft.	Staff appreciates the public input that has led to this EPC Draft of the IDO.	
85	Jaramillo, Jaime	Consensus Planning	1/17/17	With that said, there are several items we still believe should be addressed. Now that the IDO draft is under EPC consideration, we understand that each comment we submit will be addressed and if not addressed in the draft with a change, an explanation will be provided as to why it is not recommended for a change. The following list addresses the issues we have identified in the December draft:	See Lines 86-90.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
86	Jaramillo, Jaime	Consensus Planning	1/17/17	Master Development Plans (e.g. Balloon Fiesta Master Development Plan) – Section 14-16-1-10.3 states that Master Plans are listed in Section 14-16-2-5.2, which they are not. Section 14-16-1-10.3 also states that Master Plans are subject to Section 14-16-5-4.23 (Expiration of Approvals), which Master Plans are not found in the table of approvals and expirations.	Staff determined that it is not appropriate to list approved Master Plans within the IDO as this list is likely to change over time. The new reference in Section 14-16-2-5.2.C.2 states that a list of approved Master Plans is available from the Planning Department. This practice will allow interested parties to receive an up-to-date list of approved Master Plans at any time.	On page 4, Section 14-16-1-10.3, remove the reference to the list of Master Plans in Section 14-16-2-5.2.
87	Jaramillo, Jaime	Consensus Planning	1/17/17	Restaurants are currently an accessory use in the O-1 zone. This use was this not carried over into the MX-T (O-1 conversion) zone, please revise.	The MX-T zone is intended to create a buffer between residential neighborhoods and more intense commercial areas and is not intended to include auto-oriented commercial uses. Restaurants tend to attract more traffic than other small-scale offices, which may spillover into nearby residential neighborhoods. Additionally, the IDO does not distinguish between restaurants that serve liquor and those that do not; therefore, staff believes that opening up this zone to include liquor sales would be inappropriate. For these reasons, staff has determined that it is not appropriate to include restaurants as permissive uses in the MX-T zone district. Staff would need direction from decision-makers to change this use. See Line 186.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
88	Jaramillo, Jaime	Consensus Planning	1/17/17	"Storage of household goods, office records, equipment or material reasonable to neighborhood function" is a current conditional use classification in the C-1 zone. The IDO renamed this use "Self-storage" and it is no longer allowed at all (not even conditionally) in the MX-L (C-1 conversion). With the existing popularity and market potential in Albuquerque for storage, this use should be added back to the MX-L zone as a conditional use. Additionally, the proposed use specific standard for self-storage (3-3.4.X.1.) severely restricts storage in the MX-M and MX-H zones, which is a large change from the existing C-2/C-3 storage use standards and should be removed.	See line 187.	On page 111, in Table 3-2-1, add a C in the MX-L Column for "Self-Storage." On page 136, in Section 14-16-3-3.4.X.1, add "MX-L" before "MX-M"
89	Jaramillo, Jaime	Consensus Planning	1/17/17	Retail uses allowed in the C-2 and C-3 conversions to MX-M and MX-H were changed significantly. This is a significant taking of the existing C-2 and C-3 property rights. We continue to request removal of this arbitrary restriction. As a compromise, we suggest modifying the threshold from 50,000 to 75,000 SF to match the current Large Retail Facility definition and making over 75,000 SF retail a conditional use.	The IDO is a legislative action to completely replace the City's zones with new ones. In this process, individual uses may be gained or lost in particular zones, but the project team is proposing zone conversions that match as closely as possible the bundle of permissive uses in the existing zones. In the IDO, MX-H is envisioned to be a more urban, mixed-use zone, which prioritizes pedestrian mobility and walkable environments. See Lines 110-112 for more discussion of changes to retail uses. The IDO proposes zones with a range of intensities and uses that are compatible in each. Direction would be needed from decision-makers to adjust the thresholds for small, medium, and large retail and in which zones each is appropriate.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
90	Jaramillo, Jaime	Consensus Planning	1/17/17	Also in the C-3 conversion to MX-H, the provision of a drive through facility changed from permissive in C-3 to conditional if vacant for five or more years in MX-H. This is an issue which should be resolved for all C-3 to MX-H conversions city-wide.	In the IDO, MX-H is envisioned to be a more urban, mixed-use zone, which prioritizes pedestrian mobility and walkable environments. The C-3 zone is being converted to NR-C outside of Center and Corridor areas. Drive-throughs are permitted as Accessory uses in the NR-C zone district. See also Lines 90 and 191.	
91	Davis, Kalvin	Geltmore, LLC.	1/17/17	We support the City's extensive effort in updating the zoning code through the Integrated Development Ordinance (IDO) and their combined effort with the County in completing the revised Comprehensive Plan.	Noted.	
92	Davis, Kalvin	Geltmore, LLC.	1/17/17	The City has taken great measures to simplify the rules and regulations that protect existing neighborhoods, while also accommodating much needed new development and redevelopment. The move from a convoluted system of overlapping and confusing Sector Plans to an integrated model, in which all the rules and regulations are contained within a single document, will allow the Planning Department to administer their duties more fairly and perform more efficiently when reviewing proposed new development projects.	Noted.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
93	Davis, Kalvin	Geltmore, LLC.	1/17/17	In addition to increased fairness and efficiency, the new integration of the IDO zoning with the goals and policies outlined in the Comprehensive Plan related to land use regulations, transportation, housing, and jobs will connect them in a thoughtful manner, with an eye towards accommodating future growth. The combination of mixed-use zoning categories with height bonuses made available to properties in appropriate locations, like near Premium Transit, Urban Centers, Main Streets, and Downtown, represents the best in current techniques of land use, transportation, and housing planning. The most thoughtful bonus criteria, which best aligns the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan with the zoning and supports the future growth of the City, is the Premium Transit bonus.	Noted.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
94	Davis, Kalvin	Geltmore, LLC.	1/17/17	New mixed-use residential/commercial projects in the applicable bonus areas will create much needed housing near to jobs and transportation. Those individuals that live, work, and play in these new mixed-use development areas will be able to reduce their vehicle miles traveled and help to not only normalize the City's jobs/housing balance but to keep our skies blue and our air clean. We believe that mixed-use projects that create new housing and commercial space near Premium Transit, Urban Centers, Main Streets, and Downtown will be of a great benefit to the City as noted in the study done by the Center for Neighborhood Technologies. We support the City's effort to encourage these types of projects and we believe that the more quality housing that can be added to these areas the better.	Noted.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
95	Davis, Kalvin	Geltmore, LLC.	1/17/17	We recognize the benefit of development height bonuses, and having recognized that, we do not believe that development height bonuses should be limited in any mixed-use zoned areas. We noticed that the Nob Hill CPO section on building standards and building heights [section 2-7.2(5)(d)(i)(b)] has limited the ability of properties to qualify for development height bonuses. We believe that limiting development height bonuses in areas where they should be applicable is contrary to goals and policies outlined in the Comp Plan. The Planning Department, the EPC Commissioners, and the City Councilors should act to modify this section of the Nob Hill CPO. *The Premium Transit bonus should be applied normally within the Nob Hill CPO (i.e. within 660 feet of a station) instead of the vague "within one block" as it is currently written.* At the minimum, the Premium Transit bonus should be applied normally between Carlisle and Washington while retaining the "within one block" language for the area between Girard and Carlisle. Also, note that no other area along a Premium Transit corridor will experience a restriction of the Premium Transit bonus.	Noted. It is important to note that the Nob Hill SDP currently limits building height to 39 feet between Girard and Aliso and 59 feet between Aliso and Graceland. The IDO does not change the existing height entitlements signficantly up or down. The additional height associated with supporting transit-oriented development is proposed to only apply to the blocks immediately adjacent to the station areas in order to protect the historic character of lower Nob Hill. The draft represents an intent to balance existing entitlements with new policies to support transit-oriented development. Staff would need direction from decision-makers to adjust the Nob Hill Highland CPO-5. See Lines 82, 96-97, 140, 142, 152, 232, 276, 309, 311-315, 327-331, and 337-340 for discussion of building heights in Nob Hill.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
96	Davis, Kalvin	Geltmore, LLC.	1/17/17	This map [*see comment letter for graphic]* was created using the boundary outlined in the Nob Hill CPO. It shows those properties between Carlisle and Washington impacted by the restriction of the Premium Transit bonus. The thick red outline shows properties that are located within the Nob Hill CPO and within 660 feet of a new Premium Transit station. The thinner red outline filled with red hatch marks shows properties that are located "within one block" of a new Premium Transit station.	See Lines 95-97, 140, 142, 152, 232, 276, 309, 311-315, 327-331, and 337-340 for discussion of building heights in Nob Hill.	
97	Davis, Kalvin	Geltmore, LLC.	1/17/17	There is a net negative impact to transit oriented development in the City by restricting the Premium Transit bonus. The negative impact is significant as it impacts eight city blocks that have frontage on Central which are within short walking distance of a Premium Transit station. This restriction has the potential to redirect several hundred million dollars in new mixed-use investments into other areas and halt the creation of new multifamily units in those blocks that are within 660 feet of a Premium Transit station but not "within one block." Also, this area is covered by a Metropolitan Redevelopment Area, so new investment should be encouraged here and not restricted more than other areas along the Premium Transit corridor. Restricting the Premium Transit bonus in this area does not represent good land use, transportation, or housing planning and is contrary to many goals and policies outlined in the Comp Plan.	See Lines 95-96, 140, 142, 152, 232, 276, 309, 311-315, 327-331, and 337-340 for discussion of building heights in Nob Hill. The Central/Highland/Upper Nob Hill MR area extends along Central Ave. between San Mateo and Carlisle. MR Plans are standalone documents that do not contain zoning. The redevelopent tools contained in the MR Plan for this area will continue to be available after the IDO is adopted to encourage development proposals that support the intent of that plan. Staff would need direction from decision-makers to adjust the Nob Hill Highland CPO-5.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
98	Murphy, Kim		1/17/17	Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the latest draft of the Integrated Development Ordinance (IDO). Many of my earlier comments on the previous draft (November 14, 2016 Memo) have been addressed, for which I am very appreciative. I continue to be very supportive of the IDO project overall, but have some additional questions and comments set forth in this memo.	Staff appreciates the public input that has led to this EPC Draft of the IDO.	
99	Murphy, Kim		1/17/17	Section 1-10.1 (page 4) First sentence deals with timing of applications prior to the Effective Date of the IDO. The second sentence is confusing in that it addresses amendments and changes to applications, but references Subsection 5-4.24 which deals with minor and major amendments to "permits, approvals or plans." Obviously, these are two different things.	Noted.	See Line 63.
100	Murphy, Kim		1/17/17	Section 1-10.3 (page 4) This subsection states (in part): "Any permit or development.. prior to the Effective Date.. shall remain valid." What is meant by "valid" should be clarified. I'm assuming that with respect to use, "valid" means either conditional or nonconforming, if not permitted.	Correct. With respect to uses, any approved use based on current zoning would be allowed to continue after the adoption of the IDO. If there is a use that is currently permitted by the zoning code, but becomes conditional in the IDO, then that use will be considered an approved conditional use and will not need additional conditional approvals. See Section 14-16-3-1.4. A use that is permitted by the current zoning code but not permitted under the IDO would become a nonconforming use and would be regulated by Section 14-16-5-6. See also Line 116 for period of validity.	See Line 63.

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
101	Murphy, Kim		1/17/17	Section 1-10.3 (page 4) However, the meaning of "valid" with respect to development standards for permits and development approvals prior to IDO is less clear. Is the intent that they become nonconforming and therefore subject to Section 5-6 and Subsection 5-5.2D? Please clarify.	A permit or development approval may identify uses and/or site design elements, and will be considered valid if approved prior to the effective date if the IDO. "Valid" means that the uses and buildings on the site are considered legal as long as they do not change to something that was not approved (i.e. a different use or expansion of the building or site features). Just as in today's zoning system, if the property owner wants to change the site, they can request an amendment to the site plan. Minor Amendments can be approved administratively based on the criteria in Section 14-16-5-4.24.B, to be revised for clarity based on public comment. Changes to the site that go beyond the criteria in Section 5-4.24.B would be considered Major Amendments and would be handled by the decision-making body that issued the permit or approval, as described in Section 14-16-5-4.24.C). See also Line 63.	See Line 63. The revised language in Section 1-10 will clarify how approvals will be handled. Clerical: On Page 346, fix Section refrences in Section 14-16-5-5.2.D.1 (Nonconformities and Definitions references are incorrect).
102	Murphy, Kim		1/17/17	Section 1-10.3 (page 4) Are there any instances when an inconsistency of prior approved development standards with IDO development standards would become an Approved Variance (new term used herein)?	If there is an approved site plan for the site, it remains valid. See Lines 63 and 101. Minor amendments can be made to the approved site plan per Section 14-16-5-4.24.B. For the purposes of future amendments, approved buildings or developments that do not meet the Development Standards in the IDO would be considered nonconforming after the adoption of the IDO. See Section 5-6 for Nonconformities.	See Line 63. The revised language in Section 1-10 will clarify how approvals will be handled.

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
103	Murphy, Kim		1/17/17	Section 1-10.3 (page 4) Also, with respect to amendments to prior development approvals, does this subsection mean that minor amendments to development approvals prior to IDO are processed in compliance with the requirements of the original approval? And major amendments are processed in compliance with the IDO?	Minor and major amendments will need to comply with the IDO. For site plans with elements that become nonconforming once the IDO is adopted, see the Nonconformities Section 5-6 for how amendments will be handled and limits on expansions. See also Line 102.	See Line 63. The revised language in Sections 1-10.1 and 1-10.3 will clarify how approvals will be handled.
104	Murphy, Kim		1/17/17	Section 1-10.3 (page 4) Also, if a use was previously permitted, but now conditional under the IDO, then use would be "Approved Conditional" pursuant to Section 3-1.4 (page 103). Correct?	This is correct. See Line 100.	
105	Murphy, Kim		1/17/17	Section 1-10.3 (page 4) What's the rationale for the specific reference to Master Plans listed in NR-BP? Is there linkage to the Comp Plan, which refers to City Master Plans (Table A-3, Appendix C and Master Development Plans (Appendix H). Should not this provision apply to all approved "Master Plans", including Site Plans for Subdivision aka Master Development Plans?	See Line 86. See the Definition for Master Plan in Section 14-16-6-1. What the IDO considers a "Master Plan" could include what are currently referred to as "Site Development Plans for Subdivision" or "Master Development Plans." Some Site Development Plans for Subdivisions may be considered Site Plans under the IDO. This language has been simplified to reduce confusion created by the use of a variety of terms in the past. In either case, approvals in place before the effective date of the IDO remain valid. See Lines 9, 61, 100-102, and 107.	See Line 86. AGIS currently uses the term "Master Development Plan" to refer to what the IDO currently calls "Master Plans" in the EPC draft. The IDO will be revised throughout to refer to Master Development Plans for private development vs. Master Plans for City-owned facilities.
106	Murphy, Kim		1/17/17	Section 2-5.2 (page 44) Can Planning Department provide a current list of approved Master Plans?	The list that is current as of December 2016 can be found in Table A-3 in Appendix C of the December Council Greenline Draft of the Comp Plan.	Clerical: On page 44, Section 14-16-2-5.2.C.2, replace the ":" at the end of the sentence with a "."

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
107	Murphy, Kim		1/17/17	Section 3-1.4 (page 103) This subsection deals primarily with use and secondarily, by implication, with development standards related to "continue(d) operation." as well as expansion of use. -Is it correct to assume that Approved Conditional encompasses both use and development standards? The statement "continue operations in structures" seems to suggest so. If not, do they become nonconforming with respect to development standards? Or alternatively, should they become Approved Variances (new term used herein)? -How does this situation dovetail with Subsection 1-10.3 (page 4)? Seems like there is overlap.	If a site is deemed to have a Conditional Use Approval per Section 14-16-3-1.4, the use may continue witin the structures and land areas where it was conducted prior to the effective date of the IDO. Part (b) of this section says that the use can be expanded, which means that other uses that are allowed in the zone could be added to the site, provided that they conform to and Use Specific Standards. This means that the structure is legal under the IDO. However, future expansions will need to comply with the development standards of the IDO for the zone district. If there is an approved site plan for the property, then the site plan would remain valid based on section 14-16-1-10.3. See Lines 86 and 101-103 and 110-112.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
108	Murphy, Kim		1/17/17	Table 3-2-1 (Permitted Use Table) MX-L Zone: Seems reasonable to include Personal and business services, large (page 111) and General retail, medium (page 113) as "conditional" uses.	The size distinctions for Personal and business service and General retail uses were added in the IDO to ensure that the scale of development is consistent with the context and purpose of the zone district. Using the size of establishments as a proxy for the intensity of off-site impacts is a more modern and effective way to regulate uses than our current system of regulating the type of products or services provided. The MX-L zone district is intended to provide for neighborhood-scale retail and services. Within this zone, General retail and Personal and business services are limited to small establishments under 10,000 sq. ft. to achieve this purpose. Staff would need direction from decision-makers to allow for larger General retail or Personal and business services in the MX-L zone.	
109	Murphy, Kim		1/17/17	Table 3-2-1 (Permitted Use Table) MX-M Zone: Seems reasonable to include Hospital (page 107) as a "conditional" use.	The MX-M zone district is based on the current C-2 zone, which does not allow hospitals. Direction would be needed from decision-makers to add hospitals as a Conditional use in MX-M.	See Line 67.

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
110	Murphy, Kim		1/17/17	Table 3-2-1 (Permitted Use Table) MX-M Zone: General retail, large is a "conditional" use. Many of the existing large format retail properties (Costco, Wal-Mart, & Target) are programed to be zoned MX-M under the IDO (based on NE ABQ only), and would continue as Approved Conditional under Section 3-1.4. Would they however become "nonconforming" as to structures, signs and site features under Section 5-6?	See Lines 101 and 107. For future changes to the site, if the structure or site features do not meet the standards of the IDO, then the structure and/or site features become nonconforming and would need to follow Section 14-16-5-6. A zone change would be required if the use were to expand or other site development features need to change.	
111	Murphy, Kim		1/17/17	Table 3-2-1 (Permitted Use Table) All MX & NR Zones: With respect to General retail (page 113), I would suggest increasing the square foot parameters somewhat to better align with market realities as follows: -General retail, small <15,000 sf (allows drug & hardware anchors) -General retail, medium 15,000-65,000 sf (Allows hobby, sports, home, and fashion anchors) -80,000 sf (Grocery) -General retail, large >65,000 sf >80,000 sf (Grocery)	See Line 89. Ranges provided in the IDO were based on Clarion recommendations. Direction would be needed from decision-makers to adjust the ranges in the IDO.	
112	Murphy, Kim		1/17/17	Table 3-2-1 (Permitted Use Table) All MX Zones: Building and home improvement, large (>50,000 sf) is neither a permitted or conditional use. Several existing Home Depot and Lowes properties will be zoned MX under the IDO. I assume that they would become Approved Conditional under Section 3-1.4, but perhaps "nonconforming" as to structures, signs and site features. Please clarify?	See Lines 101, 107, and 110.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
113	Murphy, Kim		1/17/17	Section 3-3.1 (page 120) Subsection C states that prior approved uses and plans "remain valid." See comments on Subsection 1-10.3 above.	See Lines 100-103.	
114	Murphy, Kim		1/17/17	Table 4-5.1 (Off-street Parking Requirements) General retail (page 209) establishes a maximum 4 spaces per 1,000 GFA for structures larger than 100,000 GFA. I believe that many large format retailers commonly use 4.5 space per 1,000 GFA.	The maximum is intended to result in less parking than a typical retailer might provide in order to reflect the non-auto dominant policy for UC-MS-PT environments.	On pages 209 and 210, revise the standards for maximum parking for office and retail to only apply to UC-MS-PT areas.
115	Murphy, Kim		1/17/17	Section 4-8 (Neighborhood Edges) It would appear that 4-8.3 relating to building "stepdowns" would apply to properties that are "adjacent" as defined on page 382, which includes properties separated by a public street. While 4-8.5 dealing with buffering applies only to properties that "abut", also defined on page 382, which means having a contiguous boundary. Is this the intent?	Yes. Building height provisions for neighborhood edges were extended to include adjacent buildings - which would impact buildings across the street from low-density residential zones. This decision was in response to public concerns that allowing very tall buildings across the street from low-density residential uses can impact neighborhood character and privacy on residents. Buffering, on the other hand, addresses noise and circulation concerns that have less impact when there is a street between the two properties, so these regulations are only for abutting properties.	
116	Murphy, Kim		1/17/17	Section 5-4.23 (Expiration of Approvals) In Subsection B.2 the phrase "whichever date occurs sooner" should be changed to "whichever date occurs later", because a) the prior approved expiration date should prevail and b) the current regulation at 14-16-3-11 provides "grandfathering" period for approved Site Development Plans prior to the effective date of 14-16-3-11 which may not have yet expired.	Table 5-4-2 lists expirations for the different approval processes and specifies that once a project has been developed for more than 50% of the gross square footage, there is no expiration. The suggested change to "whichever date occus later" would result in all existing approvals being extended to the period of validity listed in the IDO. Staff would need direction from decision-makers to make this change.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
117	Murphy, Kim		1/17/17	Section 5-4.23 (Expiration of Approvals) Subsection C: Cite referenced in footnote 1255 (page 326) should be "current 14-16-3-11". Correct?		On Page 329, Section 14-16-5-4.23.C, update Footnote 1255 to refer to Section 14-16-3-11.
118	Murphy, Kim		1/17/17	Section 5-4.23 (Expiration of Approvals) Subsection C.2.c refers to "Major Site Plan." Should this be "Site Plan"?		On page 330, revise Section 14-16-5-4.23.C.2.c to read "...(TIS) prepared for that Site Plan if the prior..."
119	Murphy, Kim		1/17/17	Section 5-4.24 (Amendments of Existing Approvals) While this Subsection 5-4.24 deals with "approval(s) under this IDO", Subsection 1-10.3 regarding amendments to prior development approvals references Subsection 1-10.1 which in turn references this subsection as applying to major amendments to prior development approvals. Perhaps a cross-reference back to Subsection 1-10.3 would be useful.		See Line 63. Staff will consider this comment when revising Section 14-16-1-10 and 14-16-5-4.24.
120	Murphy, Kim		1/17/17	Section 5-4.24 (Amendments of Existing Approvals) Considerable additional coordination between the provisions of Subsection 1-10.3, Subsection 3-1.4, Subsection 5-5.2.D, Section 5-6 and this Subsection 5-4.24 regarding amendments to prior development approvals is in order with respect to: Minor and major amendments, Decisions requiring public meetings verses public hearings, Amendments dealing with use verses those involving development standards, Amendments concerning approved conditional uses and nonconforming uses	Noted. See Lines 63, 101-103, and 119. Section 14-16-1-10 clarifies how the IDO treats projects that have been submitted or approved prior to the effective date of the IDO. The other sections of the IDO are written primarily to address projects that will be approved after the effective date of the IDO. Property owners who have approved Site Plans or who submit projects before the effective date of the IDO should use Section 14-16-1-10 to determine how their property is treated and where to look for the appropriate regulations. Adding extensive cross-references back to Section 14-16-1-10 may be confusing for property owners and developers submitting projects after the effective date of the IDO.	See Lines 63 and 119.

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
121	Murphy, Kim		1/17/17	Section 5-4.24 (Amendments of Existing Approvals) Subsection A.2: Reference to Facility Plans, Master Plans and Metropolitan Redevelopment Plans is odd. These have been adopted by the City as policy documents. However, Master Plans can also mean City-approved plans that guide and regulate development of private land, e.g. Master Development Plans. Can be confusing. In Subsection A.2 add "Master Plans" to the last phrase so it reads: "or by the procedures specified in the relevant Facility Plan, Master Plan, or Metropolitan Redevelopment Area."	See Lines 86 and 105.	See Line 63. Staff will consider this comment when revising 14-16-5-4.24. In Section 6.1, add a definition for "Resource Management Plan" and revise terminology throughout the IDO for consistency.
122	Murphy, Kim		1/17/17	Section 5-4.24 (Amendments of Existing Approvals) Subsection B Reference in provision #3 should be Table 4-1-1 (page 165), I believe.	Table 5-4-1, referenced in 14-16-5-4.24-B.3 is the Allowable Administrative Deviations table and is correctly referenced. Section 14-16-5-4.24-B.3 indicates that Minor Amendments may be approved to increase the height of a building beyond what is allowed by the Development Standards, but not beyond the possible Administrative Deviation(s).	See Line 63. Staff will consider this comment when revising Section 14-16-5-4.24.
123	Murphy, Kim		1/17/17	Section 5-4.24 (Amendments of Existing Approvals) Subsection C Add "plans" to line 1 of the first sentence.		See Line 63. Staff will consider this comment when revising Section 14-16-5-4.24.
124	Murphy, Kim		1/17/17	Section 5-5.2 (Decisions Requiring a Public Meeting and/or Hearing) Subsection B (Conditional Use Approval) -The reference should be 14-16-5-5.2.B not 14-16-5-5.2A.		On page 342, Section 14-16-5-5.2.B, revise to read "…provisions of this Section 14-16-5-5.2.B"

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
125	Murphy, Kim		1/17/17	-There's a conflict regarding the decision maker for conditional uses. Table 5-1-1 says the decision maker is the ZEO. Subsection B.2.b (page 343) says the decision maker is the ZHE. And footnote 1285 (page 342) says the decision maker is EPC.	Both Table 5-1-1 and and Section 14-16-5-5.2.B.2.b indicate that the Zoning Hearing Examiner is the decision maker for Conditional Use Approvals.	On page 342, revise Footnote 1285 to remove reference to Clarion's recommendation of EPC as decision-maker to reflect current practice that the ZHE is the decision-maker for Conditional Use Approvals.
126	Murphy, Kim		1/17/17	Section 5-5.2 (Decisions Requiring a Public Meeting and/or Hearing) Subsection D (Expansion of a Nonconforming Use or Structure) Statement in Subsection that "Nonconforming site features may not be expanded." may conflict with Section 5-6.6 (page 376). What would happen in the instance where the primary structure is expanded less than 2,500 sf and, as a consequence, nonconforming site features require modification also?	The Review and Decision Criteria for Expansion of Nonconforming Uses or Structures (Section 14-16-5-5.2.D.3) includes provision e., which states that expanding the use or structure up to 25% or 2,500 sq. ft. can be approved if the expansion "will not increase an existing nonconformity or create a new nonconformity." If the expansion of a structure created a situation where parking or landscaping were removed and doing so expanded or created a nonconformity, then the ZHE would not be able to approve the expansion.	On page 377, Section 14-16-5-6.3.E, revise provision to read: "A nonconforming strucuture may be expanded in size by an amount not to exceed 25 percent, provided that the expansion will not increase an exisiting nonconformity or create a new nonconformity, if approved by the Zoning Hearing Examiner pursuant to Section 14-16-5-5.2.D." On page, 346, fix cross-references to Nonconformities and Definitions in Section 14-16-5-5.2.D.1.
127	Murphy, Kim		1/17/17	Section 5-5.2 (Decisions Requiring a Public Meeting and/or Hearing) Subsection D (Expansion of a Nonconforming Use or Structure) Criteria "a" (page 346) is very subjective.	Staff believes this comment is in reference to Section 14-16-5-5.2.D.3.a. Staff is considering this comment for subsequent recommendations.	Remove D.3.b and revise language for Section 14-16-5-5.2.D.3.a.

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
128	Murphy, Kim		1/17/17	Section 5-5.2 (Decisions Requiring a Public Meeting and/or Hearing) Subsection D (Expansion of a Nonconforming Use or Structure) Criteria "c" was 25% but now is 25% or 2,500 sf or less. This appears excessively limiting.	14-16-3-4 in today's Zoning Code allows up to 25% expansion allowed for nonconforming uses. The intent is to provide a balance between allowing some expansion of non-conforming buildings, while requiring compliance at a reasonable threshold. Providing a square footage threshold, in addition to the 25% threshold, is meant to address very large buildings, which would otherwise be allowed to add significant square footage if only a percentage requirement were in place. Staff would need direction from decision-makers to adjust or remove the square footage threshold.	On page 346, Section 14-16-5-5.2.D.3.c, remove the "s" on "gross floor areas." On page 376, Section 14-16-5-6.2.B, delete "by an amount not to exceed 25 percent" so as to defer to provision in the referenced Section 14-16-5.6.2.D. On the same page and section, fix Typo: should be "nonconforming use of land or structure"
129	Murphy, Kim		1/17/17	Also, the 2,500 sf limitation appears to apply to both building floor area and site area equally.	Sections 5-5.2.D.3.c and d use the phrase "gross square footage of the structure" or "area occupied by the non-conforming use." This language does not include the site area. More information is needed about what is unclear and how to provide additional clarity.	
130	Murphy, Kim		1/17/17	Section 5-5.2 (Decisions Requiring a Public Meeting and/or Hearing) Subsection D (Expansion of a Nonconforming Use or Structure) Criteria "d" (page 343) seems to be a re-statement of "c", unless "c" is intended to address uses and "d" structures. In which case, some clarification is needed.	Staff believes the language is clear and needs more information about how to clarify further. Subsection c is intended for nonconforming uses, and d is intended for nonconforming structure.	Editorial: On page 346, Section 5-5.2.D.3, revise the articles used for "the expansion" to "an expansion" and from "a nonconforming" use/structure to "the nonconforming" use/structure to clarify what is intended in sections c and d.

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
131	Murphy, Kim		1/17/17	Section 5-5.2 (Decisions Requiring a Public Meeting and/or Hearing) Subsection D (Expansion of a Nonconforming Use or Structure) Criteria "e" would be largely unavoidable, would it not?	This provision is similar to a provision in today's Zoning Code Section 14-16-3-4. While the structure may be expanded, Criteria e. refers to the expansion of a *different* nonconformity or the creation of a *new* nonconformity. As long as the expansion does not violate any Dimensional Standards (see Chapter 14-16-4) for the zone district, then the expansion may be approved.	
132	Murphy, Kim		1/17/17	Section 5-6 (Nonconformities) Many of the questions, comments and concern expressed in my November 14, 2016 memo remain. Perhaps a meeting with City staff will clarify, particularly in light of the items present above.	Noted. Staff is happy to meet with any individuals or groups who are interested in discussing their questions in more detail upon request.	
133	Murphy, Kim		1/17/17	Section 6-1 (Definitions) As noted above "Abut" is defined differently from "Adjacent". I assume this is intentional, and that the particular use of these terms in the IDO document have been carefully chosen.	See Lines 115 and 134.	
134	Murphy, Kim		1/17/17	Section 6-1 (Definitions) Note that "Contiguous" is very similar to "Abut". Definitions appear to overlap.	The IDO needs to distinguish between "abut" and "adjacent." "Contiguous" appears to be a carryover from the existing Zoning Code but is not used in the IDO. The definition for "Contiguous" references the definition for abutting but adds that it may be separated by an alley. The definition for "Adjacent" adds that it may be separated by a street.	On page 386, Section 6-1, change the definition for "Abut" to delete "contiguous" and "or border." On page 386, Section 6-1, change the definition for "Adjacent" to read: "Those properties that are abutting or separated only…". On page 392, delete the definition for "Contiguous."

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
135	Murphy, Kim		1/17/17	Section 6-1 (Definitions) "Amendment" deals with policy and regulations; while minor and major amendment is document related to permits and development approvals. Can be confusing.		On page 387, Section 6-1, add to the definition of "Amendment" to include revisions to approved site plans.
136	Murphy, Kim		1/17/17	Section 6-1 (Definitions) "Area of Change" uses the term "master planned areas" which I believe is a reference to "master development plans" and not City-adopted Master Plans.		On page 388, Section 6-1, revise the definition of "Area of Change" to reference "Master Development Plans". Revise terminology throughout the IDO to distinguish the term from City facilities with Master Plans vs. private Master Development Plans. On page 44, Section 2-5.2.C, change "Master Plan" to "Master Development Plan."
137	Murphy, Kim		1/17/17	Section 6-1 (Definitions) "Dwelling, Multifamily" refers to "townhome" which I believe should be "townhouse".		On page 397, in Section 14-16-6-1, revise the definition of "Dwelling, Multifamily" to read "…and that does not meet the definition of a <u>townhouse</u> dwelling."
138	Murphy, Kim		1/17/17	Section 6-1 (Definitions) "Master Plan" seems to refer to City-adopted policy documents. The Comp Plan refers to Master Development Plans as City-approved plan governing private development. Confusing.	Noted.	See Line 136.
139	Murphy, Kim		1/17/17	NOTE: Additional review and comment may be forthcoming on the following subsections: Section 4-6 (Landscaping, Buffering & Screening), Section 4-7 (Outdoor Lighting), Section 4-9 (Solar Access), Section 4-10 (Building Design), Section 4-11 (Signs), Section 4-12 (Operation and Maintenance)	Noted.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
140	Haines, Govinda		1/17/17	Nob Hill Highland CPO-5 (page 78): Please limit building heights (page 79) from Girard to Aliso to 39 feet and do not allow any bonuses for premium transit locations. This is consistent with the current sector plan and essential to the historic character and walkability of Nob Hill.	See Lines 82, 95-97, 142, 152, 232, 276, 309, 311-315, 327-331, and 337-340 for discussion of building heights in Nob Hill. CPO-5 refers to the height limits for the zone. This area is largely zoned MX-M, which allows 45 feet as a base height. The IDO allows additional building height along Main Street Corridors and within 660 ft. of transit stations on PT Corridors to encourage density and transit-oriented development within walking distance of transit stations. In order to respect the character of Nob Hill and the intent of the adopted Sector Plan, the CPO-5 eliminates the MS provision and restricts the PT height allowance of 65 ft to properties within 1 block of a PT station.	Add story limits to building heights in Dimensional Tables and Zone summaries.
140 (cont'd)	Haines, Govinda		1/17/17	(cont'd)	Using the base height allowance for MX-M provides consistency across the city. The Sector Plan has a height limit of 39 feet or three stories. The MX-M base height of 45 feet is also expected to result in 3-story buildings.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
141	Haines, Govinda		1/17/17	Also, we do not want 39 feet uninterrupted walls along Central, which would block off the residential neighborhood from the commercial zone and damage the historic commercial streetscape. It is imperative that the requirement to vary massing is preserved. Please use the language (or closely equivalent) from amendment 7 to the 2007 Nob Hill Highland Sector Development Plan, "If 75% or more of the block frontage along Central is being developed or redeveloped, one third of the new development is limited to 2 stories (26 feet) in height." The seamless integration of the commercial and residential zones is fundamental to the historic character and walkability of Nob Hill.	Direction would be needed from decision-makers to further limit building height within CPO-5 or to remove the PT building height provision.	
142	Haines, Govinda		1/17/17	Please prohibit premium transit bonuses all the way to Graceland to provide an appropriate transition to the very tall building heights from Aliso to Graceland. The premium transit bonuses up to 65 ft are not consistent with the current Nob Hill-Highland SDP.	See Lines 82, 95-97, 142, 152, 232, 276, 309, 311-315, 327-331, and 337-340 for discussion of building heights in Nob Hill. Dimensional Standards that are applied differently for UC-MS-PT areas are designed to encourage development in Centers and along Corridors. Allowing development between Aliso and Graceland within the CPO-5 to use the PT Development standards will allow for a more gradual transition between the lower heights west of Aliso and the higher heights east of Graceland. The Neighborhood Edge provisions in Section 14-16-4-8 require transitions between denser development along Central Ave and single-family residential neighborhoods.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
143	Haines, Govinda		1/17/17	Nob Hill Highland CPO-5 (page 78): Please limit MX-T zones to 26 feet to be consistent with our current sector plan and provide an appropriate transition to historic residential properties that are typically 12 feet high.	R-1 allows building heights of 26 feet. MX-T allows both residential and commercial uses that are appropriate transitions between single-family residential neighborhoods and more intense zones. The 30-foot base height allowance is intended to be generally consistent with 26 feet building height limit of R-1 but accommodate non-residential uses, which often need 30 feet even for a single story building. Staff would need direction from decision-makers to limit the MX-T building heights to match the R-1 zone.	
144	Haines, Govinda		1/17/17	Part C, Exception to Maximum Height (page 252): Please eliminate condition (a); this condition is true for almost all properties in Nob Hill (residential standard front yard setback is 20 feet). We do not want to see any non-transparent walls greater than 3 feet in the front yard setback in Nob Hill since they damage streetscape, walkability, and community safety. Transparent fences are acceptable up to 5 feet as well as living fences (i.e. landscaping). If this change is not possible for the entire city, please prohibit non-transparent walls greater than 3 feet for all of Nob Hill residential zones (expand the mapped area on page 252 to include all of Nob Hill).	Section 14-16-4-6.9.B.6 carries forward the adopted provision from the Nob Hill Highland Sector Plan that walls cannot go higher than 3' within the Monte Vista and College View Historic District. In that SDP, wall heights are limited to 3' height only in the single-family, townhouse, and mixed residential zones within the Historic District. Staff would need direction from decision makers to expand the area where this provision applies.	On Pages 250-255, revise Section 14-16-4-6.9 for clarity.

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
145	Haines, Govinda		1/17/17	Use, Carports (page 221): Please expand the map of the prohibited area in section 1.b.ii. (Page 222) to include all of Nob Hill.	As with walls, the provision that prohibits carports in the Nob Hill Highland SDP only applies to single-family, townhouse, and mixed residential zones within the Historic District. This provision has been carried forward in the IDO. Staff would need direction from decsion makers to expand the area where this provision applies. See Lines 277, 296, 325-326, and 341 for carports.	
146	Negrette, Michelle		1/17/17	Please find a compiled list of major change requests identified by our team of consultants of current IDO draft regulations that negatively impact potential development. We have also attached the reports from Gibbs Planning and Placemakers for your review.	Noted. The commenter is from a City Economic Development / ABQ RIDE project team looking at encouraging Transit-Oriented Development along Central Avenue as a Premium Transit and Main Street Corridor. Staff has reviewed these reports in their entirety, which are included in the attachment to the Staff Report. Only those comments that provide recommendations for changes to the IDO have been included in this spreadsheet.	
147	Negrette, Michelle		1/17/17	Building side setbacks on interior lot lines do not allow a Main Street development.		On page 169, Table 4-1-2, Interior Side Setback, add a 0 ft. minimum for UC-MS-PT. On page 167, Table 4-1-1, Interior Side Setback, add a 0 ft. minimum for R-MH within UC-MS-PT.

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
148	Negrette, Michelle		1/17/17	Building frontage requirements, though they vary by zone, do not create a predictable environment that attracts retail. In some areas, additional building articulation standards are required. These seem superfluous and are often hard to find and difficult to know where they apply.	Staff needs more information about the intent of this comment. Section 14-16-4-1 establishes maximum front setbacks on UC-MS-PT Corridors in order to provide a predictable environment of buildings at the street edge. Citywide building design standards in Section 14-16-4-10 are intended to require high-quality development throughout the city. This approach is part of a larger strategy to build in standards for quality up-front rather than negotiate them on a case-by-case basis through Special Use zoning or Shopping Center Site Plan approvals. The standards from adopted Sector Plans and Overlay Zones have been carried over because they reflect carefully negotiated agreements between residents and property owners to protect the character of small areas. Character Protection Overlays or Historic Protection Overlays are mapped and described in Section 2-7. Section 14-16-4-1.2.B explains that the Overlays may have different dimensional standards, which prevail if different from citywide standards. While this is still a complex system, it is much less complicated than the existing system.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
149	Negrette, Michelle		1/17/17	Glazing requirements for retail are too low and should have clear glass.	Section 14-16-4-10.5.A sets out a requirement for 30% of the façade to be non-opaque and non-mirrored windows or doors within UC-MS-PT. CPOs for Nob Hill, EDo, and MX-FB-DT have higher requirements. In most cases, these requirements have been reduced from the adopted provisions, as the higher standards have proven problematic due to solar gain and the need for energy-efficiency. Staff would need direction from decision-makers to raise the requirement or add a requirement for clear glass. See also Lines 154, 164, 175, 214, 220, and 229.	
150	Negrette, Michelle		1/17/17	Parking standards, though improved, are too high and while much of Central has robust parking location standards, one consistent problem is the requirement to build at the corner for corner lots. Many parcels require buildings at 50% of the frontage, but the regulations do not indicate that if it's a corner parcel, the 50% must begin at the corner. This is critical for the other three corners' success, particularly in a retail/mixed use environment.	See Lines 30-34, 47, and 115 for other comments related to parking standards.	Add requirement for MS, 50% of the frontage must begin at the corner.
151	Negrette, Michelle		1/17/17	In general, reviewers found the organization of the document to be challenging, with regulations found in multiple areas. Reviewers recommended additional instructions be included on how to use the document.	The document while still complex, is much improved over today's system with multiple documents, many of which mix policy and regulation. The City intends to provide a Citizens Academy to familiarize and train staff and stakeholders on the new IDO.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
152	Negrette, Michelle		1/17/17	Most important, height restrictions due to proximity to residential areas prevent or severely limit development to one story along Central Avenue, the area that has been identified in the Comprehensive Plan as higher density, transit oriented development.	Staff believes that this comment refers to the fact that properties within CPO-5 along Central between Girard and Aliso cannot take advantage of being within a Main Street or Premium Transit station area. See Section 14-16-2-7.2.B.5.d.i.b. In these areas, maximum building height is proposed to be 45', which is more than one story. This comment might also be referring to the Neighborhood Edge provisions in Section 4-8, which limit building heights within 100 feet of residential zones. The shallow lots on Central might be limited to 30 feet as a result. Neighborhood Edge provisions are a powerful tool used intentionally to limit building heights from negatively impacting nearby residential zones. See Lines 82, 95-97, 140, 142, 232, 276, 309, 311-315, 327-331, and 337-340 for discussion of building heights in Nob Hill.	
153	Negrette, Michelle		1/17/17	In addition, reviewers have noted that it is very difficult to discern which regulations prevail and where to find them with respect to the CPO and HPO areas.	The Dimensional Standards Tables, Tables 4-1-1 - 4-1-3, indicate in their headers that "any different dimensional atandards in Sections 14-16-2-7 (Overlay Districts) and 14-16-4-8 (Neighborhood Edges) applicable to the property shall supersede the standards in" the tables. The two tables after the Table of Contents that list area-specific maps have been added to make it easier to determine where there are special rules for small areas.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
154	Negrette, Michelle		1/17/17	Requested Change: The percentage of the façade with glazing on the first floor on any MS or PT corridor should be a minimum of 60%. Rationale: This percentage also varies across zones and overlay zones, but for a walkable pedestrian environment that assures successful retail and incentivizes redevelopment, 60% is the minimum. Residential buildings could be as low as 30% at the first floor.	See Line 149. Nob Hill, Downtown, and EDo SDPs have standards at 60% for some development. Staff is considering this comment for subsequent recommendations. It appears there may be a difference in interpretation of how to measure the surface area that should be clarified. This is meant to be reasonable for all development but still result in good, active facades. Lines 149, 164, 175, 214, 220, and 229.	
155	Negrette, Michelle		1/17/17	Table B. F Recommend the corner condition is 5' min. – 15' max for UC-MS-PT. Rationale: Promotes greater predictability that is important to the success of the urban condition.	Comment refers to Table 4-1-2 for side setback.	On page 169, Table 4-1-2, Streetside of Corner Lot Side Setback, add a 0 ft. minimum, 15 ft. maximum for UC-MS-PT. On page 167, Table 4-1-1, Streetside of Corner Lot Side Setback, add a 0 ft. minimum, 15 ft. maximum for R-MH within UC-MS-PT.
156	Negrette, Michelle		1/17/17	Table 4-1-2: Requested Change: No side setback requirements on internal lots in MX zones. Rationale: The 5' side setback prohibits a main street condition. Zero side setbacks should be permitted within the limitations of fire code. Section 2-3 allows for a zero-rear setback on the alley, but that isn't indicated in this table. It should be included for clarity.	The tables in Section 2-3 currently have blanks in Row H. These were inadvertently left blank and should be filled in.	See Line 147. On the dimensional tables for the zones in Section 2-3, add "5 ft." for "Adjacent to alley…" in Row H.

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
157	Negrette, Michelle		1/17/17	4-3.4 B.2.b. Requested Change: Width of sidewalk should be tied to level of pedestrian activity and should be greatest near the stations and in MX-FB and MX-H. Recommend the following change for the MX zones: -MX-T and MX-L: 8' wide -MX-M: 10' wide -MX-H and MX-FB: 15' wide -All sidewalks along PT corridors within 680 ft. of the station: 10' wide minimum unless in MX-H or MX-FB Rationale: Tying sidewalk width to property size won't assure adequate sidewalks in TOD areas.		Staff is considering moving requirements to the DPM, Ch. 23 on Transportation and will consider these recommendations. The IDO will be revised accordingly based on coordination with the DPM Transportation subcommittee.
158	Negrette, Michelle		1/17/17	4-5.7. A.2. Change Request: Change façade articulation standard to 50'. Rationale: Requires a 25' change in material or architectural elements and at that frequency will likely result in very expensive, hyperactive structures.	On page 269, Section 4-10.5.A, building façade requirements are based on 40 feet. Staff recommends changing the requested standard to 40 feet to be consistent.	On page 227, Section 14-16-4-5.7.A.2, change 25 ft. to 40 ft.
159	Negrette, Michelle		1/17/17	4-5.7. B and C. Change Request: The garage standards for MX-FB should be applied to station areas as well. Rationale: Streets should be active and pedestrian oriented along Central. MS and PT should be included under C. for a predictable built environment that incentivizes private investment.	Section 4-5.7.B requires the project to build the first floor to be able to convert to retail, which would accommodate the intent of the request without proving a disincentive to development or potentially empty storefronts.	On page 227, Section 14-16-4-5.7.B, add "Premium Transit Corridor."

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
160	Negrette, Michelle		1/17/17	4-8.3. Change Request: Reduce step down to within 50'. Rationale: Requires a stepdown to 30' within 100' of a low density single-family zone. This stepdown is a common practice, but the best practice is to use a distance of 50'. The will usually be covered with the ROW if the change in zone is across the street and is normally adequate, particularly with the reduced heights in Albuquerque, to assure solar access. The R-T and R-1 zones abut much of the Central corridor, so this regulation could limit the anticipated private sector investment.	The Neighborhood Edge requirement for higher-intensity uses adjacent to lower-intensity residential uses was a provision important to many residents during the ABC-Z meetings. In fact, many asked for more than 100 feet. The edge provision provides protection for lower density residential areas with a standardized citywide approach that meets the intent of many customized strategies in various Sector Plans. Many residents are concerned about the higher buidling heights proposed in the IDO, and this provision is an important protection that makes the additional height more acceptable to nearby residents. Staff would need direction from decision-makers to lower the required distance. See also Line 152.	
161	Negrette, Michelle		1/17/17	4-8.5. Change Request: Clarify that 25' buffer is not needed if property is separated by a public ROW. Rationale: Requires a 25' buffer for any lot developed after 1990. This could be considered excessive in the TOD environment. If the ROW could contribute to the buffer, it wouldn't be an issue.	Section 4-8.5 requires a landscaped 10-ft buffer, not 25 ft.	On page 263, Section 4-8.5, edit to read as follows: "For lots abutting the zone districts listed in Section 14-16-8.2.a or b, a special buffer…"

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
162	Negrette, Michelle		1/17/17	4-10.4 Requested Change: Simplify and clarify design standards. Rationale: This section applies a series of architectural requirements that aren't rational nor regulated with clarity. This is quite unfortunate, and while it does not preclude density or mixed use, it most likely will assure a stylistic mess when it comes to architecture. The rational, restrained American Mercantile style of historic Downtown and the more eclectic, but simple forms of Nob Hill and Old Town cannot be replicated with the requirements of this section. Fortunately, the regulations do not apply to MX-FB, but one should expect these requirements to create hyperactive, overly embellished facades that do not reflect the simple massing and composed facades of Albuquerque.	These regulations were drafted to allow some flexibility for property owners to comply with the IDO while creating a variety of attractive, pedestrian-oriented streetscapes. We believe that offering property owners options for compliance is more consistent with Albuquerque's economic development traditions than trying to replicate a particular style. See also Line 148, 162, and 224.	
163	Negrette, Michelle	Placemakers	1/17/17	While the current map indicates a direct zone translation from the existing to the IDO, this includes some poor zoning practices from mid 20th-century. For example, most of Central is zoned commercial one parcel deep for its length. While the translation to mixed use assists with this over zoning of commercial, the depth of one parcel precludes any meaningful redevelopment in many areas. The upcoming TOD planning process could be a City-sponsored shift in the zoning map to provide a more meaningful physical plan, if supported by the adjacent neighborhoods.	Noted. The Neighborhood Edge provision is intended to provide adequate transitions/buffers between more intense development on the corridor and lower-density residential zones behind. See Lines 152 and 160. The project team acknowledges that future efforts are needed after a new toolbox in in place with the IDO to analyze and make discretionary, elective changes to zoning to better implement the Comp Plan vision and goals.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
164	Negrette, Michelle	Placemakers	1/17/17	There are numerous ways to address percentage and type of clarity of glazing throughout Sections 2-3 and 2-7. Likely this migrated over from the sector plans, but there should be a consistent method of measurement. In general, all TOD areas should require 100% clear glass at the street. The percentage of the façade with glazing on the first floor on any MS or PT corridor should be a minimum of 60%. This percentage also varies across zones and overlay zones, but for a walkable pedestrian environment that assures successful retail and incentivizes redevelopment, 60% is the minimum. Residential buildings could be as low as 30% at the first floor.	See Lines 149, 154, 175, 214, 220, and 229.	
165	Negrette, Michelle	Placemakers	1/17/17	While much of Central has robust parking location standards, one consistent problem is the requirement to build at the corner for corner lots. Many parcels require buildings at 50% of the frontage, but the regulations do not indicate that if it's a corner parcel, the 50% must begin at the corner. This is critical for the other three corners' success, particularly in a retail/mixed use environment.	See Line 150.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
166	Negrette, Michelle	Placemakers	1/17/17	The mixed-use districts are very different in character along the Central corridor, and likely should remain so. Permitting a zero-front setback is very good, but having a uniform 15' max is a little contrived. A better reflection of character and likely a more palatable range in the blocks off Central that include the MX-T and MX-L zones would be to have an 8' – 20' range, with 0' – 12' directly on Central, or in the MX-M and MX-H zones. The homogeneous setback standard is conventional for suburbia and does not reflect local character that can be leveraged in a TOD reinvestment strategy. Nor does it assist in a publically acceptable transition to the single-family neighborhoods.	The 15 ft. maximum allows flexibility up to the 15 ft. vs. proscribing a variation along the corridor. This approach is intended to provide the predictability for retail uses that the commenter noted is important in previous comments while still maintaining flexibility for individual projects.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
167	Negrette, Michelle	Placemakers	1/17/17	2-4.5 Mixed-Use Form-Based Zone (MX-FB) Mapping issue: While this is a robust and very useful zone for Downtown, its expansion with a single level of intensity will likely have unintended consequences.It has effectively up zoned the edges and could create a problem with land-banking as a result. The 2025 plan allocated districts within Downtown that permitted and excluded various building types, and created immersive environments while directing economic development. The loss of that nuance could be a problem for Downtown over the long term.	The Downtown 2025 Sector Plan has a strategy that allows a broad range of uses but controls building form more tightly, largely through building types, which allow up to 8 stories, even in the Housing focus areas. Staff has found the building types to be largely ineffective and hard to apply. The IDO draft removes the building types but leaves articulation and facade requirements. These changes are intended to meet the intent of the Plan while providing maximum flexibility to develop within Downtown. The Neighborhood Edge provisions in Section 4-8 apply to development within MX-FB that is adjacent to single-family and two-family uses, which may negate the "upzoning" at the edges that the commenter describes. Staff would need direction from decision-makers to reinstate the difference in uses based on the different focus areas in today's Downtown 2025 Sector Plan.	
168	Negrette, Michelle	Placemakers	1/17/17	The language of 2.b.ii. works well, but the example illustration at c. misrepresents the intent of b. The “enter” sign should be the last thing required if the building is properly designed. The marquee illustrated as well as the central location of the door are all that is needed to illustrate the regulations of b.		Edit illustration on page 31 to remove "Enter" sign.

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
169	Negrette, Michelle	Placemakers	1/17/17	2.c.i.b. is written in an unclear manner. The last sentence is giving a pass on the regulation rather than enforcing the regulation. A better practice is to simply require 65% or 75% minimum clear glazing at the frontage line. This assures an active pedestrian environment and simplifies the administration of the code. It also eliminates the problem that Downtown currently has with reflective or dark glazing that does not contribute to walkability.	Section 2-4.5.C.2.e.i.b requires 60% glazing. See also Lines 149, 154, 164, 175, 214, and 229.	On page 32, delete the second sentence in Section 2-4.5.C.2.c.i.b and move Section 2-4.5.C.2.c to follow section Section 2-4.5.C.2.e.
170	Negrette, Michelle	Placemakers	1/17/17	2.v.c. illustrates a building in the middle of a corner parcel on the right. The building should always hold the corner, and even if you do not elect to regulate that, you certainly should not illustrate the worst-case scenario. Recommend moving the building to the right corner of the illustration.		Change the illustration to move the building to the corner. Consider revisions to the text in v.b

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
171	Negrette, Michelle	Placemakers	1/17/17	2-5.2 Non-Residential Business Park Zone (NR-BP) This zone, with its restrictions on residential use, is not the ideal tool for incentivizing TOD. Additionally, its suburban lot size and setbacks will assure an auto-dependent environment. Since it occurs at Unser and Central, the Councilor of that district as well as the landowners and adjacent residents should seriously consider if this is the environment they are hoping to achieve. This zoning district works for business park solutions, but not for the needs of a TOD condition.	This zone district is not intended to incentivize TOD. It is the straight conversion for today's IP zone. Zone changes may be needed in the future for properties that are currently IP along Premium Transit corridors if TOD development is desired. The property owned by the City on the northwest corner of Central and Unser is currently zoned C-2. As of December 2016, the Conversion Map is showing NR-C for this property. New C-2 conversion rules that are proposed would result in this property being converted to MX-M, since the property is within 600 ft. of the Premium Transit station area. The MX-M zone would accommodate TOD development. See Line 53.	See Line 53.
172	Negrette, Michelle	Placemakers	1/17/17	Coors Boulevard Corridor – CPO-1 No standards in this subsection were of critical concern and the area is limited to the north side of the Coors & Central intersection.	Noted.	
173	Negrette, Michelle	Placemakers	1/17/17	Downtown Neighborhood Area – CPO-2 2.c.i. requires the building setback to relate to adjacent setbacks. This could be a problem when the adjacent buildings are a suburban format such as the 20' minimum front yard setback. If this is unintended for Central Avenue, it should be clarified in this paragraph.		On page 69, revise Section 2-7.2.B.2.c.i to apply to "R-1A, R-T, and R-ML" properties only. Revise Section 2-7.2.B.2.c.iv, revise to apply to MX-L and MX-M properties abutting Central Ave. Revise footnote 107 to reference subsections ii and iii instead of i and ii.

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
174	Negrette, Michelle	Placemakers	1/17/17	Downtown Neighborhood Area – CPO-2 2.c.iv. states a 10-ft. minimum which is more appropriate, but contradicts i. In addition to the contradiction, the existing conditions of much of Central has a zero front setback. While this is permitted in the second sentence of 2.c.i., it is prohibited in the last sentence. This section needs a good bit of clean-up for clarity and harmony with the built environment. To reflect existing conditions, the overlay should permit 0 – 15 front setbacks for parcels that face Central.	Staff is considering this comment for subsequent recommendations.	
175	Negrette, Michelle	Placemakers	1/17/17	Downtown Neighborhood Area – CPO-2 2.d.ii.a.ii has no metrics to judge what a “darkly tinted” window is. The best practice in a walkable, TOD environment is to require “clear glass.” This eliminates issues with tinting and mirroring.	See Lines 149, 154, 164, 214, 220, and 229.	
176	Negrette, Michelle	Placemakers	1/17/17	East Downtown – CPO-3 There were no problems in this overlay for TOD.	Noted.	
177	Negrette, Michelle	Placemakers	1/17/17	Nob Hill Highland – CPO-5 5.D. on page 79 has a photograph that appears before the text it illustrates, thus creating confusion to its relevance. It is a best practice to regulate with illustrations rather than photography.	The photograph is intended to illustrate regulation 2-7.2B.5.d.ii.a.iv, about the vertical alignment of windows in additions above historic buildings with the existing storefront windows below. In practice, this has been confusing to explain to applicants and staff believes that the illustration from the plan helps convey the intent. The related regulation has the text "(see photo)" to clarify what the image is intended to illustrate; it is not meant to be associated with regulations that follow the image.	Replace photograph on page 79 with an illustration.

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
178	Negrette, Michelle	Placemakers	1/17/17	Rio Grande Boulevard Corridor CPO-6 There were no problems in this overlay for TOD.	Noted.	
179	Negrette, Michelle	Placemakers	1/17/17	East Downtown HPO-1, Fourth Ward HPO-3, Huning Highland HPO-4, Old Town HPO-5, Silver Hill HPO-6 There may be some missed near-term value with requiring the HPOs to match scale and the limitation on expansion, but the long-term value of the character-rich historic districts offset this loss. These overlays can't be assessed for lost ROI in the near term because of the long-term value capture.	Noted.	
180	Negrette, Michelle	Placemakers	1/17/17	Section 3-2 This table will be reviewed from top to bottom and left to right for the zones in consideration: MX-T, MX-L, MX-M, MX-H, MX-FB and NR-BP. Comments will not be included for every missing use in NR-BP that is appropriate to TOD as the limitations of this zone were discussed in detail under Section 2-3.	Noted. See Lines 181-194. These comments refer to Table 3-2-1. See Also Line 171 for comments about the NR-BP zone.	
181	Negrette, Michelle	Placemakers	1/17/17	Dwelling, townhouse - The townhouse dwelling type is too low in density for MX-H and the core of MX-FB.	Single-family detached uses are disallowed in these zones as too low-density. As attached units, townhouses provide an ownership product that is higher in density and can provide options to the housing mix in these higher-density areas. Direction would be needed from decision-makers to remove TH as a permissive use in MX-H and MX-FB.	
182	Negrette, Michelle	Placemakers	1/17/17	Dwelling, live-work - The live-work is also too low in intensity for MX-H as its usually no more than a 3-story building.	See Line 181.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
183	Negrette, Michelle	Placemakers	1/17/17	High school - The inclusion of high schools, with their excessive parking and sports demands is inappropriate in TOD areas. The large use of land for a very limited time-frame has a very poor ROI.	It is important to note that APS is not subject to the City's zoning authority, so APS school cannot be disallowed or allowed by a City zoning category. For private schools, a high school use would have to be in a building that meets the dimensional standards and other requirements for that zone. Not all high schools have the same sports and parking requirements. Amy Biehl High School works successfully downtown with neither parking nor sports demands. See chapter 14-16-4 for site and building design standards for all zones. See also Agency Comments from APS.	
184	Negrette, Michelle	Placemakers	1/17/17	Religious Institution - The inclusion of large religious institutions, with their excessive parking and low use is inappropriate in TOD areas. Recommend this use is CV.	See Line 183. A religious use in a TOD area would be subject to the dimensional standards for that zone. Many churches function successfully within urban areas of town.	
185	Negrette, Michelle	Placemakers	1/17/17	Sports field - The inclusion of sports fields, with their excessive parking and limited use is inappropriate in TOD areas. The large use of land for a very limited time-frame has a very poor ROI.	Land costs and other market factors would seem to preclude sports fields from developing in areas with high TOD potential. It does not seem necessary to make them a prohibited use, particularly as there is not one zone for TOD but rather the full spectrum of mixed-use zones.	
186	Negrette, Michelle	Placemakers	1/17/17	Food, Beverage, etc. - This section is extremely limited for MX-T. Neighborhood pubs and cafes are an asset in this transition area.	See Line 87. Neighborhood-serving pubs and cafes are appropriate in MX-L, which is meant to include these uses. MX-T is meant as the transition zone between residential and the neighoborhood-serving uses in MX-L. Direction would be needed from decision makers to allow these more intense uses in the Transition zone.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
187	Negrette, Michelle	Placemakers	1/17/17	Motor Vehicle-Related - For the purposes of TOD ROI, the permissive use of autodependent facilities is excessive along the Central corridor. Many of these may be built in an urban format, but they are all heavy non-transit trip generators. At a minimum car wash, light vehicle repair, and light vehicle sales and rental should be conditional uses. Particularly since many of these uses were prohibited in the base sector plans.	See Line 185. More information is needed about where auto-related uses are prohibited along Central Ave. Direction would be needed from decision-makers to disallow auto-related uses along Central. If such uses were to be prohibited, new Use Specific Standards should be added to prohibit these uses within 660 feet of PT stations and/or along Main Streets and/or within Urban Centers.	
188	Negrette, Michelle	Placemakers	1/17/17	Self-storage - This use is entirely inappropriate on a MS or PT corridor as well as in a TOD due to the lack of public space activation, high trip generation, lack of pedestrian activity, and blank walls. Recommend removal from all station areas, MS and PT corridors unless limited to upper floors of a multistory building.	See Lines 88 and 185. See also Section 14-16-3-3.4.X for use-specific standards for self-storage uses. As with schools or any other uses that take up a lot of space and generate a lot of trips, this use would have to be on a site and in a building that meet the dimensional standards and other requirements for the zone where the use is located. See Line 183. There is some indication that self-storage facilities are complementary uses for multi-family uses, and that both might be needed in more urban areas.	See Line 88.
189	Negrette, Michelle	Placemakers	1/17/17	Retail - With the limitation on non-residential uses across all general categories in the MX-T zone, it is apparent that this zoning district will not be meaningful for the flexibility required by TOD. Recommend revisiting the definition of the district in 2-4.1. The inclusion of cafes, bakeries, and small retail all perfectly fit the description, but are prohibited in this table. There needs to be a realignment of the stated character with the permitted uses.	See Line 87. MX-T is not intended to encourage TOD but rather to transition from residential zones to more intense zones where TOD would be more appropriate. The traffic impacts of retail are not appropriate in this transition zone meant to be the closest to residential zones. Staff would need direction from decision makers to allow more retail in MX-T.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
190	Negrette, Michelle	Placemakers	1/17/17	Pawn shop - The permissive use of pawn shops across most mixed-use zones could have negative consequences. Recommend C in all MX zones.	Pawn shops have a Use Specific Standard limiting more than one pawn shop within a 2-mile radius. These seems more than adequate to protect mixed-use areas. See Section 3-3.4.EE.	
191	Negrette, Michelle	Placemakers	1/17/17	Drive-through etc. - These should be conditional in all MX zones since this is the base of the urban fabric for Albuquerque and represents most of the sector plans. While the overlays and 3-3.6 D. will supersede this table, for clarity there is no reason they should be permitted in areas where they are largely excluded and the is a priority on premium transit.	MX-T through MX-H are the base zone conversions for O-1 through C-3 throughout the city. MX-T does not allow drive-throughs at all. MX-M allows them permissively (as does C-2). The other MX zones allow them conditionally. The higher-quality standards and more pedestrian-friendly design requirements in Section 4-5.9 are intended to ensure quality drive throughs and protect pedestrians better than today's standards. See also Line 90.	
192	Negrette, Michelle	Placemakers	1/17/17	3-3.2 F. Townhouses should require rear garages in all MX zones.	Alley access is not available throughout the city. Requiring rear access would severely limit the potential for townhouse development in these areas.	
193	Negrette, Michelle	Placemakers	1/17/17	3-3.2 H.1. Has a test calculation been done to see how many trees would be required on a possible lot? For example, the condo development on the SE corner or Central and Carlisle could require 20 trees on site. This standard should be calibrated to change based upon context – more trees required in suburban conditions and fewer in urban contexts.	The tree requirements in Section 14-16-3-3.2.H were added since the Consolidated Draft of the IDO in response to a Council Resolution adopted in 2016.	On page 123, Section 14-16-3-3.2.H, add a provision that requires trees only for the first-floor units within DT-UC-PT-MS areas.
194	Negrette, Michelle	Placemakers	1/17/17	3-3.4 X. If self-storage is permitted in MX zones it should be limited to stories above the first level and be required to have fenestration on the upper levels.	See Line 188. Staff believes the Use-specific Standard that requires access from interior corridors is sufficient for MX-M.	On page 136, add a Use Specific Standard for MX-H and MX-FB zones that requires a building of two story or more and requires glazing on the upper levels.

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
195	Negrette, Michelle	Placemakers	1/17/17	Table 4-1-2: setback and build-to regulations were discussed in section 2-3. The 5' side setback prohibits a main street condition. Zero side setbacks should be permitted within the limitations of fire code. Section 2-3 allows for a zero-rear setback on the alley, but that isn't indicated in this table. It should be included for clarity.	See Lines 147 and 156.	See Lines 147 and 156.
196	Negrette, Michelle	Placemakers	1/17/17	Were studies done to show that the densities permitted can actually be achieved with these bulk standards? The bulk and density should match.	No. The general approach was not to correlate density with building heights but to allow property owners to use the property for many building types and be creative about maximizing one or the other standard.	
197	Negrette, Michelle	Placemakers	1/17/17	Table 4-1-4: Awnings, canopies, sills, etc. should all be allowed to encroach into the right -of-way to within 2' of the curb. This is common along Central and critical to successful retail.	This table does not address the type of encroachments requested here, which are generally permitted within the right-of-way with a permit.	Staff will ensure that encroachments into the right-of-way are adequately addressed in the DPM and allowed in retail areas.
198	Negrette, Michelle	Placemakers	1/17/17	4-3.4.B.2.b. Tying sidewalk width to property size won't assure adequate sidewalks in TOD areas. Width should be tied to level of pedestrian activity and should be greatest near the stations and in MX-FB and MX-H. Recommend the following change for the MX zones: MX-T and MX-L: 8' wide, MX-M: 10' wide, MX-H and MX-FB: 15' wide, All sidewalks along PT corridors within 680 ft. of the station: 10' wide minimum unless in MX-H or MX-FB		See Line 157.

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
199	Negrette, Michelle	Placemakers	1/17/17	Table 4-5-1. The new parking requirements are definitely an improvement however they are still unreasonably high for station areas across most uses. This can be a major barrier to redevelopment unless there is a municipal parking reserve that the applicant may utilize for a portion of their requirements.	See Lines 30-34, 47, 115, and 150 for other comments related to parking standards.	
200	Negrette, Michelle	Placemakers	1/17/17	4-5.3 D. The shared parking reductions and proximity to transit assist in the parking burden, but some of the reduction factors are non-standard. Residential and office usually share at 1.4.	See Lines 30-34, 47, and 115 for other comments related to parking standards.	
201	Negrette, Michelle	Placemakers	1/17/17	The calculation for station proximity is unclear. How is the 660' calculated? To the edge of the property? If the station is in the center lane, does the crossing distance count, or is it calculated along the street? This distance only benefits the directly adjacent property in most situations. A best practice is to do significant reductions for a minimum of a block, so in the historic blocks of Albuquerque, it should be 400'. Ideally, parking quotas would be market-based rather than regulated within that distance of a station.	See the definition for Measurement, PT Area on page 408.	On page 215, Section 14-16-4-5.3.D.3.b revise section to read "within 660 ft. of transit stations" to address the typo in this section.
202	Negrette, Michelle	Placemakers	1/17/17	The TOD planning charrette will address the parking issues in detail with Nelson/Nygaard consulting on the issue. It would be ideal if their recommendations could be considered for the final draft of the IDO.	Noted. Comments submitted during the IDO review process at EPC and City Council will be included as part of the record for the project.	
203	Negrette, Michelle	Placemakers	1/17/17	4-5.6. Parking location and design is well written and will produce a predictable, walkable TOD environment.	Noted.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
204	Negrette, Michelle	Placemakers	1/17/17	4-5.7. A.2. requires a 25' change in material or architectural elements and at that frequency will likely result in very expensive, hyperactive structures. The common requirement for façade articulation is 50'.	See Line 158.	See Line 158.
205	Negrette, Michelle	Placemakers	1/17/17	4-5.7. B and C. The garage standards for MX-FB should be applied to station areas as well. Streets should be active and pedestrian oriented along Central. MS and PT should be included under C. for a predictable built environment that incentivizes private investment.	See Line 159.	See Line 159.
206	Negrette, Michelle	Placemakers	1/17/17	4-6.3. B.1. requires a minimum of 10% of the lot is landscaped in the most urban environments including Downtown, Urban Centers, and Main Streets. This is an excessive area, and other than street trees and parking lot landscaping, landscape should not be required on urban lots. The city of London, with its many parks and squares is approximately 5% open space. This requirement precludes a zero-setback urban frontage, and will make it difficult to meet the parking requirements of UC and MS.	The definition of landscaped area is intended to include planters and street tree wells. Section 14-16-4-6.3.B also clarifies that inthese areas, the landscaped area need not be at ground level - i.e. rooftop gardens and planters on rooftops and public balconies may be included in this requirement.	On pages 232-233, review and revise Section 14-16-4-6.3 as necessary to improve clarity of regulatory language. On page 405, revise definition of "Landscaped Area" for increased clarity.
207	Negrette, Michelle	Placemakers	1/17/17	4-6.3. B.3. requires any area greater than 36 sf be covered with living, vegetative materials. The question is if this includes plazas? How are street trees calculated? Sub-section c. requires a minimum of five species but that seems to be for any area larger than 36 sf. This should be scaled to reflect area rather than a single standard. Five different plants will be very chaotic for an area as small as 6' x 6'.	See Line 206.	See Line 206.

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
208	Negrette, Michelle	Placemakers	1/17/17	4-6.5. B.1. and C.1. requirements are not a problem.	Noted.	
209	Negrette, Michelle	Placemakers	1/17/17	4-6.7. is a suburban standard. There should be a separate exemption for Downtown, UC, and MS since most of these conditions will have a 0' front setback.		On page 247, Section 4-6.7, revise to begin the provision with "In all but DT, UC, PT, and MS areas,"
210	Negrette, Michelle	Placemakers	1/17/17	4-8.3. requires a stepdown to 30' within 100' of a low density single -family zone. This stepdown is a common practice, but the best practice is to use a distance of 50'. This will usually be covered with the ROW if the change of zone is across the street and is normally adequate, particularly with the reduced heights in Albuquerque, to assure solar access. The R-T and R-1 zones abut much of the Central corridor, so this regulation could limit the anticipated private sector investment.	See Lines 82, 139, and 160.	
211	Negrette, Michelle	Placemakers	1/17/17	4-8.5. requires a 25' buffer for any lot developed after 1990. This could be considered excessive in the TOD environment. If the ROW could contribute to the buffer, it wouldn't be an issue.	See Line 161.	See Line 161.
212	Negrette, Michelle	Placemakers	1/17/17	4-8.6. requires a 40' separation from parking. This is excessive and would equal 2/ 3 of a parking bay. This subsection also requires the same edge lot buffering requirements as Industrial which is entirely inappropriate for mixed-use or TOD.	The Neighborhood Edge provisions are an important tool meant to protect lower-density residential zones next to higher-intensity zones. Direction from decision-makers would be needed to change the standard.	On page 263, Section 4-8.6, exempt lots less than 10,000 square feet and revise the text to require 40 feet or 25% of the lot depth, whichever is less.

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
213	Negrette, Michelle	Placemakers	1/17/17	4-10.4 applies a series of architectural requirements that aren't rational nor regulated with clarity. This is quite unfortunate, and while it does not preclude density or mixed use, it most likely will assure a stylistic mess when it comes to architecture. The rational, restrained American Mercantile style of historic Downtown and the more eclectic, but simple forms of Nob Hill and Old Town cannot be replicated with the requirements of this section. Fortunately, the regulations do not apply to MX-FB, but one should expect these requirements to create hyperactive, overly embellished facades that do not reflect the simple massing and composed facades of Albuquerque.	See Lines 148, 162, and 224.	
214	Negrette, Michelle	Placemakers	1/17/17	4-10.4.B.2 only requires 10% doors and windows while Section 2 has multiple requirements, most around 60% glazing at the first floor. It isn't clear if this is a contradiction, or if it is meant to cover other areas outside of those regulated in Section 2.	See Lines 149, 154, 164, 175, 220, and 229.	
215	Negrette, Michelle	Placemakers	1/17/17	4-10.5 also applies a series of regulations that will likely produce a hyperactive, non-contextual façade. The following in particular are problematic :	See Lines 148, 162, 213, and 224.	
216	Negrette, Michelle	Placemakers	1/17/17	A.1.a. would not permit the following storefronts: (comment includes photos of 2 buildings located in Albuquerque).	Staff is considering this comment for subsequent recommendations.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
217	Negrette, Michelle	Placemakers	1/17/17	A.1.c.ii. prohibits the historic American Mercantile common on Central Avenue, particularly in Downtown unless it is clear that tall windows are an acceptable solution to this requirement.	Staff is considering this comment for subsequent recommendations.	
218	Negrette, Michelle	Placemakers	1/17/17	A.1.c.iii. is inappropriate in a zero setback TOD environment. Applying this specifically to the Downtown, Urban Center, Main Street and Premium Transit Areas is a misunderstanding of the urban context.	Staff is considering this comment for subsequent recommendations.	
219	Negrette, Michelle	Placemakers	1/17/17	A.1.c.iv. is inappropriate in a zero setback TOD environment. Applying this specifically to the Downtown, Urban Center, Main Street and Premium Transit Areas is a misunderstanding of the urban context.	Staff is considering this comment for subsequent recommendations.	
220	Negrette, Michelle	Placemakers	1/17/17	A.1.e.ii is yet another standard for glazing. There should be a single location, probably best served in the zoning district standards, that governs glazing.	See Lines 149, 154, 164, 175, 214, and 229.	
221	Negrette, Michelle	Placemakers	1/17/17	B.1. and 2. have good intent, but to require public gathering areas for each 40’ or 60’ of a MS or TOD environment is expecting the building to provide a neighborhood amenity on a single parcel. One plaza or seating area per block is sufficient. This regulation is giving up a large percentage of marketable area unless sidewalk dining could be considered part of it. And even then, it is requiring every building to have food service.	These standards were drawn from the 'Big Box' regulations in the zoning code and made citywide, as part of the projects improvements to raise the quality of design standards for all development. The IDO regulations require some outdoor gathering area for large buildings that would have many employees. There is no requirement that it be provided at certain intervals along the building facade or that it is publically accessible. These areas could be provided in decks or rooftop areas. Direction from decision-makers would be required to change this requirement.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
222	Negrette, Michelle	Placemakers	1/17/17	Table 4-11-2 limits projecting signs to buildings 100' or greater in width. This is unfortunate as blade signs and hanging signs are very common historic types in Albuquerque and are appropriate on narrow buildings. This table also permits monument signs which are suburban in type and inappropriate in MS, UC, PT contexts.		On page 278, Table 4-11-2, delete "Lot must have 100' linear feet of frontage for the sign to be permitted." Revisit CPOs to add provisions reflecting existing prohibitions on Monument signs.
223	Negrette, Michelle	Placemakers	1/17/17	The scattered regulations make it difficult to find everything that applies to a specific parcel and will introduce the possibility of applicant frustration. However, it is a vast improvement over the current disparate ordinances. In addition, there is further opportunity for confusion with zoning districts, overlays, and place types all having overlapping and contradictory standards. A user's manual will likely be needed to show all the regulations that may apply to a single parcel.	This IDO organizes standards by type as opposed to repeating standards in each zone. This organization keeps the IDO shorter but does require looking at multiple sections for a particular parcel. Even when more standards are included with each zone description in other Zoning Codes, there are other sections you must read to learn all the rules that apply to a single property. Staff is comfortable with the proposed IDO organization as both efficient and rational.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
224	Negrette, Michelle	Placemakers	1/17/17	Predictability - While it is quite possible to achieve close to the anticipated ROI from premium transit along the Central corridor with this draft of the IDO, it is also quite possible to build less than urban standards within all the MX districts, with the current parking regulations, and with specific standards associated with Downtown, Main Streets, Urban Centers and Premium Transit. Many of the requirements of 4-10, while the intent is good, will likely result in fussy, excessive architectural expression and buildings that are more expensive and less urban due to the offsets required. This lack of predictability will likely disincentivize private sector development.	See Line 148. The building design standards in Section 4-10 are intended to raise the quality of development in general, which should raise predictability for all property owners. These standards are also intended to assure residents and neighbors that the IDO is requiring high standards that can be applied objectively by staff, as opposed to negotiating quality standards for each project on a case-by-case basis before the EPC. Without building design standards, more discretionary review would be required, which increasing the risk and lessens predicatbility of high-quality development throughout the city. More information is needed about how these standards should be adjusted to result in more predictable, high-quality development.	
225	Negrette, Michelle	Gibbs Planning Group	1/17/17	This review of the proposed Integrated Development Ordinance (IDO) finds that the present draft is a forward-thinking advancement of the existing zoning regulations and the adopted sector development plan, that has the potential to positively impact existing and future retail development in the Nob Hill Highland neighborhood. The IDO removes many of the onerous regulations of the Comprehensive City Zoning Code, while improving and complementing the form-based aspirations of the SDP.	Noted.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
226	Negrette, Michelle	Gibbs Planning Group	1/17/17	However, there are improvements that should be considered to better support existing retailers, promote retail industry development standards and further the vibrancy and sustainability of retail commerce in the Nob Hill neighborhood. They are as follows: • Addition of a frontage-type or architectural standard for buildings facing Central Avenue that promotes retail industry standards. • Remove side-yard setbacks for interior lots to allow for continuous frontage along Central Avenue. • Eliminate maximum building height and replace with maximum building floors. • Expand sign code to allow for 3-dimensional signage. • Allow flexibility in street tree requirements to prevent visual blockage of building entrances, displays or signage.	Noted. See Lines 228-235 for more detailed discussion of each of these recommendations.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
227	Negrette, Michelle	Gibbs Planning Group	1/17/17	Analysis: GPG finds that the proposed IDO contains several provisions which are improvements on previously established code or introduce new progressive requirements that favor retail development. These include: • Chapter 14-16-2-4.5 (e-iv) Corner Buildings – Corner buildings shall encourage intersection activity through their design. • Chapter 14-16-4-5 Parking and Loading: Parking requirements establish progressive minimums with advantageous adjustments and credits based on shared parking, proximity to transit and onstreet parking. • Chapter 14-16-4-6.6 Parking Lot Landscaping: Screening requirements for surface parking lots located within 30 feet of the front lot line.	Noted.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
228	Negrette, Michelle	Gibbs Planning Group	1/17/17	Recommendation: Chapter 14-16-4 Development Standards should include a retail-specific frontage-type or architectural standard. Discussion: The proposed development standards improve upon previous regulations; however, the generalized Mixed-Use Medium Intensity classification is less prescriptive for retail development because it must apply to a wide variety of blocks along Central Avenue. There is an effort to promote retail frontage through the Nob Hill Character Protection Overlay Zone and the Mixed-Use Form-Based Standards, yet retail industry standards could more effectively be enforced through a frontage-type or architectural standard. A retail-specific standard should address storefront design, store lighting, store maintenance, visual merchandising, signage and awnings. See Chapter 9 of Principles of Urban Retail Planning and Development.	The IDO does not regulate frontage types. Many of the commenter's recommendations for retail will be incorporated based on market conditions, which do not require City enforcement. Albuquerque's development market may not be hot enough to cover the higher costs associated with more minute regulations. These more detailed standards might be more appropriately applied by a Main Street organization.	
229	Negrette, Michelle	Gibbs Planning Group	1/17/17	Recommendation: Chapter 14-16-2-7.4 Nob Hill Character Protection Overlay Zone should require 75 percent fenestration on the ground floor as prescribed in MU-FB District Standards. Discussion: The Nob Hill CPO requirement of 60 percent fenestration is more appropriate for northern climates. The 75 percent requirement in the MU-FB District Standards is more suitable for the character of retail along Central Avenue.	The higher fenestration requirements in the existing Nob Hill SDP have proven problematic for recent development. While an active façade is an important consideration, energy efficiency, solar gain on southern exposures, and other design requirements must also be addressed and balanced. The revised standards in the IDO are intended to strike a balance between the need for fenestration and other façade considerations. See also Lines 149, 154, 164, 175, 214, and 220.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
230	Negrette, Michelle	Gibbs Planning Group	1/17/17	Recommendation: Chapter 14-16-4-1.4 Mixed-Use District Dimensional Standards should eliminate minimum lot size for residential land uses. Discussion: Most Nob Hill Highland blocks have a parcel depth of 100 to 150 feet suggesting that a residential development would need at least 145' (approximately three existing residential parcels) of block frontage to satisfy the minimum lot size. Ultimately, this prevents the type of "missing middle" housing that would be most appropriate for the Nob Hill Highland neighborhood.	Minimum lot sizes have been deleted from the Mixed-use zone districts.	
231	Negrette, Michelle	Gibbs Planning Group	1/17/17	Recommendation: Chapter 14-16-4-1.4 Mixed-Use District Dimensional Standards should eliminate side-yard setbacks. Discussion: Typical "Main Street" type development places buildings side-by-side with no side setbacks and there are many blocks along Central Avenue that exist in this layout. Side yard setbacks break apart an otherwise continuous urban block frontage. There should be a requirement for at least one midblock break in building frontage when public parking is located in the rear.		See Line 147.

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
232	Negrette, Michelle	Gibbs Planning Group	1/17/17	Recommendation: Chapter 14-16-4-1.4 Mixed-Use District Dimensional Standards should eliminate maximum building height and instead limit the number of stories. Discussion: Modern retail development characteristically includes 14- to 18-foot floor to ceiling heights on the ground level, while office and residential heights can vary according to use and type. The current 55-foot maximum may limit 4-story development. GPG recommends the IDO considers allowing 5-story development, as long as it appears like 4 stories from the street, as this represents the most efficient development under current building-type construction limitations.	This comment refers to a previous version of the IDO that allowed 55 feet in MX-M for UC-PT-MS. The 65' associated with UC-MS-PT is designed to accommodate 5-story buildings. The 45 feet associated with MX-M is designed to accommodate 3 stories. The IDO generally assumes 15' first floor plus 12' upper floors. The extra feet provided in both allow the flexibility for taller first or penthouse floors. Providing maximum building height provides the most predictable outcomes for residents, neighbors, and property owners. Residents often cite fears that developers might build 5 18-foot stories and result in 90-feet tall 5-story buildings. See Lines 82, 95-97, 140, 142, 152, 276, 309, 311-315, 327-331, and 337-340 for discussion of building heights in Nob Hill.	See Line 140.
233	Negrette, Michelle	Gibbs Planning Group	1/17/17	Recommendation: Chapter 14-16-4-6.4 Street Frontage and Front Yard Landscaping should be flexible in street tree planting requirements to prevent the blockage of building entrances, displays or signage. Discussion: Many retailers do not have robust marketing budgets and are dependent on their visibility from the street as advertising. Street tree planting requirements should allow for asymmetrical planting, small variations in the spacing between street trees and encourage planting near property lines or the edges of buildings.	The IDO includes flexibility for the Planning Director to allow different placement of landscaping as long as it amounts to the minimum requirement. See Section 4-6.4.P.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
234	Negrette, Michelle	Gibbs Planning Group	1/17/17	Recommendation: Chapter 14-16-4-10.6 Signs in Mixed Use and Non-Residential Zones should allow for and encourage 3-dimensional sculptural projecting signs. Discussion: Giving retailers an incentive to fabricate creative and unique signage contributes to the overall character of a neighborhood retail district. Visually appealing signage should be encouraged with size bonuses.	Signage requirements are generally carried over from existing standards. Direction would be needed from decision-makers to create new signage standards to allow unique, 3-D, sculptural signage in Centers and Corridors (DT-UC-MS-PT).	
235	Negrette, Michelle	Gibbs Planning Group	1/17/17	Recommendation: Chapter 14-16-4-10.6 Portable Sign Standards should be more explicit in prohibiting plastic or generic portable signs. Discussion: Plastic or generic portable signs can portray a retail area as cheap and poorly managed. Portable signs should have the appearance of being hand-made and use durable materials.	The City would struggle to enforce a requirement for quality portable signs, and it may not be worth regulating by the City. Such standards might be better administered by a Main Street organization or Business Improvement District.	
236	Negrette, Michelle	Gibbs Planning Group	1/17/17	Further Considerations: In addition to a review of the proposed IDO, GPG has been asked to provide suggestions to improve the retail commerce in Nob Hill and Albuquerque more broadly. These include short-term considerations for operations during the construction of the Albuquerque Rapid Transit (ART) and long-term strategies for tenant mix, anchor attraction and transit-oriented development. The following includes a discussion of each topic with key recommendations.	These recommendations were for actions unrelated to the IDO and are therefore not included in this comment response matrix. See the full letter in the project file for these recommendations.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
237	Negrette, Michelle	CABQ Econ Dev/UNM/ Greater Central Ave.	1/17/17	The purpose of the second IDO testing workshop was to assemble diverse groups that included a developer, a banker/lender, a neighborhood leader, a designer/architect, and a planner/ engineer and simulate the development of a mock project on small fictitious site on Central Avenue in Albuquerque using the proposed IDO. The goal of this exercise was to answer the following questions: 1. Can the proposed IDO work on small size lots? 2. Does the IDO create context sensitive design? 3. Are small sized developments using the proposed IDO be financially feasible for the developer?	Noted. The project team attended this testing session on Sept 21, 2016, and was provided copies of the report when it was released prior to submission of the EPC Draft IDO. In revising the Draft IDO for EPC submission, staff addressed many of the concerns raised in this process.	
238	Negrette, Michelle	Greater Central Ave.	1/17/17	Approximately 75 people attended the workshop, which was held from 6:00 pm until 8:30 on Wednesday, September 21, 2016. Dinner was provided by Economic Development and attends sat at assigned tables, grouped by neighborhood area of interest. The attendees represented a diverse set of players related to land use planning and project development.	Lines 239-274 include only the recommendations from the IDO testing session workshop. The remainder of the report can be found in the record for the project.	
239	Negrette, Michelle	Greater Central Ave.	1/17/17	Of the 8 groups, 4 tables resulted in a developable project, 3 did not pencil, and 1 did not finish.	Noted. The IDO is intended to balance the need to encourage development with requiring adequate standards that result in predictable, high-quality outcomes.	
240	Negrette, Michelle	Greater Central Ave.	1/17/17	All tables initially realized their lots were undevelopable by current zoning limit of .5 acres. Lots ranged from 50’ x 150’ to 150’ x 150.’	The minimum lot size requirement was removed in a subsequent draft of the IDO.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
241	Negrette, Michelle	Greater Central Ave.	1/17/17	Tables with a CPO had difficulty determining what triggered the requirements, which requirements trumped and some did not follow them.	Subsequent drafts provided a table of contents with small-area mapped standards. Because it is easy to overlook Overlays, they are used sparingly in the IDO. More often, mapped standards are found in the section relevant to that particular standard - such as mapped prohibitions of taller front walls in the front wall section. Having all the standards in one document, even in separate sections, is still a huge improvement over standards being buried in separate documents, sometimes multiple standalone documents. Just as today, interactive maps and Zone Atlas maps show where SU-2 zones apply, the Overlay zones will appear in future maps.	
242	Negrette, Michelle	Greater Central Ave.	1/17/17	Parking generally was an issue, particularly on lots smaller than 100' x 100.'	More information is needed about what the issue was related to parking. Presumably, too much parking was required in the IDO, but more information is needed about what should be adjusted.	
243	Negrette, Michelle	Greater Central Ave.	1/17/17	Typical community demands, such as height limits and underground parking generally negatively impacted a development to happen. However, if no parking was required, heights could be limited. Additional height bonuses did not help underground parking pencil.	Noted. More information is needed about what should be adjusted.	
244	Negrette, Michelle	Greater Central Ave.	1/17/17	All lots were under developable limit of .5 acres. This precludes small scale infill development, supports buildings that have at least ½ block frontage, requires land aggregation and renders many smaller lots undevelopable.	See Line 240.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
245	Negrette, Michelle	Greater Central Ave.	1/17/17	Parking requirements difficult to meet in almost all cases. Underground parking does not pencil, guest parking for residential is difficult to accommodate, hotel parking is not realistic.	Finding the right balance of how much parking to require is challenging. Residents in Nob Hill and Downtown Neighborhood Area decry the absence of parking restrictions, which impacts nearby residents as they see shoppers and diners parking on the street in front of their homes. However, the fact that these areas are seeing development may be partly attributable to the lack of parking requirements, which incentivizes development. The IDO parking requirements are intended to provide a reasonable minimum requirement. Direction would be needed from decision-makers to adjust these requirements.	On page 207, Table 4-5-1, add a new standard for hotel parking in DT-UC-PT-MS areas of 2 spaces per 3 hotel rooms.
246	Negrette, Michelle	Greater Central Ave.	1/17/17	Setback requirements are confusing and sideyard setbacks are introduced where not currently required, creating 10' alleys between buildings. Setbacks are limiting developable land area on small lots.	Section 5-4.15 and Table 5-4-1 were added to a subsequent version of the IDO to allow more flexibility for setbacks on small lots. Direction would be needed from decision-makers to make further changes. See also Lines 147 for adjustments to side setbacks.	See Line 147.

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
247	Negrette, Michelle	Greater Central Ave.	1/17/17	Open space and landscaping requirements are difficult to understand, landscape requirements do not necessarily benefit streetscape, open space requirements are not clear if roofs and balconies count.	Tables 4-1-1 through 4-1-3 establish minimum requirements for Usable Open Space as part of the tables that general establish the buildable envelope on each lot. Usable Open Space is defined in Section 6-1 and includes roof decks and balconies. Landscape requirements are established in Section 4-6. The Street Tree Ordinance separately requires tree planting along streets that are Collector or above. Direction would be needed from decision-makers to add further requirements for landscaped areas along public rights-of-way or to allow street trees to count toward landscape requirements for private property. In general, many residents have expressed a desire for more, not less landscaping, even in urban areas. Of course, landscape requirements must be balanced with the feasibility of high-quality development.	
248	Negrette, Michelle	Greater Central Ave.	1/17/17	Recommendations for MX-M and MX-L zones:	See Lines 249-256.	
249	Negrette, Michelle	Greater Central Ave.	1/17/17	Remove lot size limitation.	See Line 240.	
250	Negrette, Michelle	Greater Central Ave.	1/17/17	Remove side and rear setback requirements.	See Lines 147 and 246 for side setbacks.	See Line 147.
251	Negrette, Michelle	Greater Central Ave.	1/17/17	Clarify the open space requirements, allow rooftop and balcony to count.	Both rooftop decks and balconies count as usable open space. See Line 247.	
252	Negrette, Michelle	Greater Central Ave.	1/17/17	Encourage landscape requirements to be used in public realm, provide incentives.	See Line 247.	
253	Negrette, Michelle	Greater Central Ave.	1/17/17	Reduce required parking for hotel use.	See Line 245. More information is needed about what would be a better standard for hotel parking.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
254	Negrette, Michelle	Greater Central Ave.	1/17/17	Modify parking requirements, suggestions include regulating only uses which generate heavy parking needs, increasing parking reductions for residential in transit areas, reducing guest parking requirements, removing parking requirements on small lots.	See Line 245.	See Line 245.
255	Negrette, Michelle	Greater Central Ave.	1/17/17	CPO needs to be clearly identified as how and when it trumps straight zoning, what variance process can be applied and which areas have CPO. Should indicate CPO overlay on a map.	Overlay zones will be mapped by AGIS on an interactive map and in the Zone Atlas. Overlay requirements supercede straight zoning requirements, as specified in Section 2-7 and again in Section 4-1.2.B. Variances are generally not affected by Overlays. Variances are described in Section 5-5.2.K. View Protection Overlays are not eligible for Administrative Deviations, as described in Section 2.7-4.D and Table 5-4-1.	On page 320, edit Table 5-4-1 to remove reference to VPOs. In Section 5-4.15.B.4, edit to read as follows: "The requested deviation does not affect a property subject to a View Protection Overlay zone."
256	Negrette, Michelle	Greater Central Ave.	1/17/17	Clarify if alley is considered a street for setback purposes and parking access.		On page 387, Section 6-1, add to the definition of "Alley" to clarify that alleys do not count as streets for setback standards, unless specifically called out.
257	Negrette, Michelle	Greater Central Ave.	1/17/17	General Comments:	See Lines 258-274.	
258	Negrette, Michelle	Greater Central Ave.	1/17/17	Clarify if alley is considered a street for setback purposes and parking access.		See Line 256.
259	Negrette, Michelle	Greater Central Ave.	1/17/17	All lots were too small for zoning. Min lot size would have prevented development.	See Line 240.	
261	Negrette, Michelle	Greater Central Ave.	1/17/17	3rd floor made project pencil.	Noted. See Line 232.	
262	Negrette, Michelle	Greater Central Ave.	1/17/17	Open space requirement met by courtyard for residents.	Noted. See Line 247.	
263	Negrette, Michelle	Greater Central Ave.	1/17/17	Added retail store frontage.	Noted. The IDO is intended to provide flexibility to accommodate many types of projects.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
264	Negrette, Michelle	Greater Central Ave.	1/17/17	On street parking and transit bonuses for parking made project work.	Noted. The IDO standards associated with PT are intended to encourage transit-oriented development.	
265	Negrette, Michelle	Greater Central Ave.	1/17/17	Had to assume higher rents – lose 40%/year, 14% return.	Noted.	
266	Negrette, Michelle	Greater Central Ave.	1/17/17	Underground parking desired by neighbors made project numbers fail. ½ the rents needed for cost.	Noted. See Line 245.	
267	Negrette, Michelle	Greater Central Ave.	1/17/17	CPO lower density, maybe less development than appropriate on high-density corridor.	Overlay zones are used sparingly in the IDO for areas with significant architectural character, historic districts, and views. In these areas, more emphasis is placed on preservation than development to protect what is valued.	
268	Negrette, Michelle	Greater Central Ave.	1/17/17	Landscape requirements met by side setbacks. No meaningful landscaping on street. Require streetwise minimum.	See Line 247.	
269	Negrette, Michelle	Greater Central Ave.	1/17/17	Density definition, units may give false picture, (500 sf unit =6000 sqft) – what you count and how you count it – add in sf/unheated sf, etc.	Direction would be needed from decision-makers to remove density limits in Table 4-1-1 and 4-1-2 or to provide more nuanced definitions of density for different unit sizes.	
270	Negrette, Michelle	Greater Central Ave.	1/17/17	5 foot setback is required no matter what, may not match character.	Staff believes this comment refers to side setbacks, as other setbacks vary from zone to zone.	See Line 147.
271	Negrette, Michelle	Greater Central Ave.	1/17/17	Allow landscape requirement to count if on roof in urban areas.	Section 4-6.3.B.1 specifies that within DT, landscaping requirements need not be planted at the ground level. Direction from decision-makers would be needed to extend this provision to UC-MS-PT and possibly other Activity Centers. See also Line 247.	
272	Negrette, Michelle	Greater Central Ave.	1/17/17	CPO gave advantages – no setbacks, higher building heights, but parking requirements killed $ based on boutique hotel.	It is unclear which CPO is being referenced. See Lines 245 and 253 for hotel parking.	See Line 245.

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
273	Negrette, Michelle	Greater Central Ave.	1/17/17	Parking is driving the design, suggest no min, max requirements only.	See Line 245. Parking minimums provide some assurance to nearby residents and business owners that spillover impacts will be minimized. Parking maximums are intended to restrict parking more than what the market prefers to provide, which seems to run counter to the need to provide feasible standards for high-quality development. If parking maximums are set higher than the market prefers, there is little reason to regulate parking at all.	
274	Negrette, Michelle	Greater Central Ave.	1/17/17	1 parking space/room for hotel seems high.	See Lines 245, 253, and 274. More information is needed about an alternative standard that would be more reasonable.	See Line 245.
275	Eyster, Gary		1/18/17	CHARACTER PROTECTION OVERLAY ZONES…Nob Hill Highland- CPO-5…Applicability Area…The CPO-5 standards apply in the mapped area shown… (map runs from Girard Blvd to Washington St)…The mapped area does not include any of Highland. Don't you want the name of the CPO to match the area it covers?		On page 78, Section 2-7.2.B.5, change the name of CPO-5 to "Nob Hill."

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
276	Eyster, Gary		1/18/17	BUILDING HEIGHT, MX-M ZONE, CENTRAL AVE FROM GIRARD BLVD TO ALISO ST...The draft proposes that Building Heights will be governed by the city wide standard for MX-M, 45 feet….The draft states: ”Bonuses associated with Premium Transit are only available within one block of a Premium Transit Station”……This will allow another 20 feet of building height in these areas (65 ft). The community hammered out a 39 foot building height through the sector plan process in 2007. Neighbors gave a lot so others could get the heights up to 39 feet...I appreciate the desire to make standards consistent citywide but the purpose of a CPO is to recognize unique character that is worthy of preservation and preserve it. Building height in the CPO-5 zone between Girard Blvd and Aliso St should remain 39 ft and bonuses should not be available. The district creates city wide value from its historic character. Its historic character derives to a major extent from the heights of buildings being somewhat consistent with building heights during the historic period of significance.	See Lines 82, 95-97, 140, 142, 152, 232, 309, 311-315, 327-331, and 337-340 for discussion of building heights in Nob Hill.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
277	Eyster, Gary		1/18/17	CARPORTS…The draft states: "Carports for single family, two family detached dwellings, and attached townhouse dwellings are prohibited in the following mapped areas. (map of Monte Vista and College View Historic District)….This mirrors the current ordinance and I support it in the strongest terms. I would recommend making it larger, say the Nob Hill Highland Sector Plan area. I note that there are several three family dwellings in the mapped area. The language needs to cover them and perhaps it does.	Section 4-5.6.B.1.b that starts on page 221 prohibits carports for single-family, two-family detached, and attached townhouse dwellings. If the "three family dwellings" are attached townhouses, then this prohibition would apply. The ABC-Z process is intended to carry over adopted provisions for small areas but not to change the boundaries of where they apply. There is also a citywide standard in Section 4-1.3, Table 4-1-1 for the R-1 zone that garages or carports have a minimum setback of 20 ft., 5 feet beyond the 15-ft. minimum setback for the building. See also Lines 145, 296, 325-326, and 341 for carports.	On page 166, revise Table 4-1-1 to remove reference to carports. Add provision for 20 foot setback to R-T for garages.
278	Eyster, Gary		1/18/17	FENCE AND WALL STANDARDS…The drawing "In front of the primary building front façade" should probably refer to the front setback, 20 ft from the front property line, instead of in front of the primary building façade. It should show wall height of 36" max, not 42" max. The 36" max wall height is not high; why not allow max opacity of 100%?...Wall height behind the front setback should be 6 ft unless owner has an engineer's design, then 8 ft. max.	This comment refers to a graphic on page 250 in Section 4-6.9. The International Building Code requires an engineer to design walls over 6 ft. As this is not a zoning standard, staff does not recommend adding that language to the IDO. This prevents conflicts if/when the Building Code is updated, which happens periodically.	On Page 250, revise graphic illustration to reflect the correct 36" wall height and remove reference to opacity in graphic. On Page 242 remove graphic and replace with a graphic that better illustrates the policies in Section 14-16-4-6.5.B.

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
279	Eyster, Gary		1/18/17	The draft states: "WALLS, FENCES, AND RETAINING WALLS GREATER THAN THREE FEET are not allowed in the front setback area of parcels with single family detached dwellings, two family detached dwellings, and attached townhouse dwellings in the mapped areas shown. (map of Monte Vista and College View Historic District)….This mirrors the current ordinance and I support it in the strongest terms. I would recommend making it larger, say the Nob Hill Highland Sector Plan area. I note that there are several three family dwellings in the mapped area. The language needs to cover them and perhaps it does.	Section 4-6.9.B.6 on page 251 prohibits walls above 3 feet in the Monte Vista and College View Historic District to carry over the provision as adopted in the Nob Hill Highland Sector Plan. ABC-Z is not intended to change the boundaries of where these mapped provision apply. Staff would need direction from decision makers to expand the area where this provision applies.	
280	Michie, Susan		1/18/17	Below is the quote I referred to at the meeting yesterday, the full report published Dec. 2016 is attached. "A substantial majority of Americans are online shoppers, but for most this behavior is a relatively infrequent occurrence. Some 15% of Americans say that they make purchases online on a weekly basis (4% do so several times a week, while 10% do so about once a week) and 28% shop online a few times a month. On the other hand, nearly six-in-ten Americans say they buy online less often than a few times a month (37%) or they never make any online purchases (20%)."	Noted.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
281	Michie, Susan		1/18/17	As for Hey Johnny - despite their lament about online shopping, if you go to their website you will see they promised an online shopping option in November, but chose not to do it. If you read the news article it also states....Ford also cited a change in the Nob Hill area itself. He said the area has become more for breweries and restaurants rather than retailers.	Noted.	
282	Michie, Susan		1/18/17	My point being there is still plenty of room to attract brick and mortar retail to Nob Hill if we provide an attractive environment for them. We are not doing that now. The 1965 rule that exempts all parking for any change in use benefits a few property owners at the expense of everyone else in the community, including local residents, businesses, and other property owners. Given the current revamping of the zoning code (IDO) now will be the best time to remedy this issue. It is not unfair to apply the new standard "change in use" parking policy below for all commercial buildings to pre-1965 buildings too.	The IDO carries forward regulations from adopted Sector Development Plans. Direction would be needed from decision makers to change the exemption currently granted by the Nob Hill SDP.	
283	Michie, Susan		1/18/17	3. A change in use of a primary building that complies with the requirements of Tables 4-5-1 and 4-5-2 before the change in use, and that increases the minimum off-street parking requirements for the building, by more than 25 percent. Changes in use that result in a smaller increase in off-street parking spaces shall not be required to provide additional parking. (See IDO p. 202)	See Line 282.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
284	Michie, Susan		1/18/17	Doing so could... 1) Limit some new restaurant/bar activity, but not all 2) Stop the upward rent creep, that works against retail 3) Slow the agglomeration of alcohol outlets and related rise in violent street crime. 4) Help to buffer existing restaurants/bars against coming changes in liquor policy (i.e. SB 37) 5) Encourage a more diversified business mix to serve both local and visiting consumers. 6) Still allow new options for "change in use" for pre-1965 buildings also enhanced by other new "parking credits and adjustments" in the IDO (See IDO p.217). There will be no better time than now to change this policy.....just my two cents.	See Line 282.	
285	Davis, Kalvin	Geltmore, LLC.	1/20/17	This comment is a revision to the letter received 17 January 2017. The first part of the letter was repeated, and can be found in Lines 91-97. Lines 286-290 include only the additions made in the 20 January 2017 letter.	See Lines 286-290.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
286	Davis, Kalvin	Geltmore, LLC.	1/20/17	The suggestion we made above, related to increased building heights within 660 feet of Premium Transit stations, specifically in east Nob Hill between Carlisle and Washington, is made in the interest of regulatory consistency along the Premium Transit line and with the end goal of improving the long-term viability of local businesses in the area. The City recently commissioned the Gibbs Planning Group to perform a review of the IDO and make recommendations for changes that would better benefit retailers in the Nob Hill Highland Neighborhood. In their report, titled IDO Retail Review & Recommendations - Nob Hill Highland Neighborhood published on December 5, 2016, the Gibbs Planning Group made several recommendations that echo our suggestion related to the Premium Transit bonus. Consider the following excerpts taken directly from the report (emphasis added):	See also Lines 225-236 for the full comments from Gibbs Planning Group.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
287	Davis, Kalvin	Geltmore, LLC.	1/20/17	Recommendation: Chapter 14-16-4-1.4 Mixed-Use District Dimensional Standards should eliminate maximum building height and instead limit the number of stories. Discussion: Modern retail development characteristically includes 14- to 18-foot floor to ceiling heights on the ground level, while office and residential heights can vary according to use and type. The current maximum may limit 4-story development. GPG recommends the IDO considers allowing 5-story development[...], as this represents the most efficient development under current building-type construction limitations.	See Line 232.	See Line 140.
288	Davis, Kalvin	Geltmore, LLC.	1/20/17	Consider conducting office and residential feasibility analyses. Urban retail is best supplied in mixed-use environments where a steady supply of consumers are living, working and playing nearby. Mixed-use development should be encouraged if not required. Furthermore, since the Great Recession, many retailers are more willing to explore proven or up-and-coming urban sites over suburban or speculative sites due to the more dense and consistent trade areas that urban locations command.	Noted. New Mixed-use zone districts is intended to encourage mixed-use development. It is unclear whether the request for office and residential analyses is to determine whether these uses should be allowed in the MX zones or just to study how likely these uses will be. Such studies might be more appropriate by Main Street organizations or Business Improvement Districts.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
289	Davis, Kalvin	Geltmore, LLC.	1/20/17	Potential impact of transit-oriented development (TOD) on supporting retail: Investments in transit have a multiplier effect on private investment in the areas immediately adjacent to the proposed line. The guarantee of regular service and consistent supply of potential residents, workers and consumers provides developers with an added level of security in an otherwise volatile industry. Generally, retail within one-half mile of a transit stop will see improved visibility and sales after the opening of the transit line. These areas should be well-signed and pedestrian connections should be regularly maintained to encourage walkability. For-sale and for-rent residential within one mile of transit will be in demand, potentially spurring new or expanded development. Retailers often consider the residential density of prospective locations when making decisions on new store deployments.	Noted. The IDO is intended to provide flexibility to accommodate many types of projects and encourage transit-oriented development along Premium Transit corridors and walkability along Main Street corridors.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
290	Davis, Kalvin	Geltmore, LLC.	1/20/17	We urge the EPC Commissioners and City Council members to strongly consider our suggestion related to the Premium Transit bonus, as well as the recommendations of the Gibbs Planning Group report. Our suggestion, and the Gibbs recommendations, particularly the one related to maximum building height, are made in the interest of encouraging mixed-use, transit-oriented development and benefiting Nob Hill retailers. Increased building height is a critical component of mixed-use development. It would be extremely challenging, if not impossible, to finance a new mixed-use project that is three stories or less.	See Lines 82, 94-97, 140, 142,152, 232, 276, 309, and 311-315 for discussion of building heights in Nob Hill.	
291	Morris, Petra	LUCC Commissioner	1/27/17	For each of the HPO we include a link to the guidelines, we should also include the title of the document, in case the link goes down, gets scrambled, etc. People should know the name of the document that they are being linked to. For example HPO-2 would read: "The standards and guidelines applicable in the HPO-2 zone are found in the New Town Neighborhoods Development Guidelines, and are available online: link" --The New Town guidelines are applicable for Huning Highland, 4th Ward, and 8th and Forester, so it will be the same document title. Also we should consider referencing this for the proposed EDO HPO, as I think it applicable to that as well, but Leslie can probably speak to that better on relevance.		For each HPO, add the name of the document being linked to, as well as the online link.

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
292	Morris, Petra	LUCC Commissioner	1/27/17	When a Landmark is adopted, it is usually adopted with its own standards and guidelines. On page 97, under C. add the following sentence: "The standards and guidelines applicable to each City Landmark are available from the Historic Preservation Planner." --I'm not sure if we want to put each Landmarks standards online, or direct people to the planner, but somehow we should indicate that they exist and are to be followed.		On page 97, under C. add the following sentence: "The standards and guidelines applicable to each City Landmark are available from the Historic Preservation Planner."
293	Morris, Petra	LUCC Commissioner	1/27/17	On page 333, in the box next to 5-5.1. remove the reference to the Zoning Enforcement Officer. This is something that is the responsibility of the LUCC planner. This will make the box consistent with the text and will avoid ambiguity in the future.		On page 333, in the box next to 5-5.1. remove the reference to the Zoning Enforcement Officer.
294	Silbergleit, Beth; Trujillo, Dennis		2/25/17	We are writing to you today as we wIll be unable to join you for the scheduled meetings on the next two Mondays. We have lived in the Monte Vista subdivision since 2000 and our home on Bryn Mawr N.E. is a contributing property to the historic district.	Noted.	
295	Silbergleit, Beth; Trujillo, Dennis		2/25/17	Professionally, as a former assistant NM State Historian (Dennis) and as archivist at the Center for Southwest Research (UNM) and former Nob Hill Neighborhood Association board member (Beth), we are committed to maintaining the historic character of the entire Nob Hill area.	Noted.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
296	Silbergleit, Beth; Trujillo, Dennis		2/25/17	We are particularly pleased to see the CABQ Integrated Development Ordinance contain sections 4-5.6 prohibiting carports and section 4-6.9 prohibiting walls and/or fences higher than 3 feet in the front setback for single family, two family detached dwellings, and attached townhouse dwelling in the Monte Vista and College View Historic District. These provisions will help ensure that the historic streetscape in our neighborhood is maintained. Additionally, considering Albuquerque's increase in criminal activity, it is important to keep as many eyes on the street as possible. Lower walls help do this. Perhaps extending these regulations to the rest of Nob Hill should also be considered.	See Lines 145, 277, 325-326, and 341 for carports. See also Line 282.	
297	Silbergleit, Beth; Trujillo, Dennis		2/25/17	Thank you for your continued good work. ¡VIVA NOB HILL!	Noted. The project team is thankful for the participation and engagement from community members.	
298	Jaramillo, Jaime	WALH	3/13/17	The purpose of this memo is to (1) summarize the City of Albuquerque Planning Department responses to our questions during our meeting on February 6, 2017 regarding the IDO, (2) provide a draft WALH response to those responses, and (3) obtain approval to submit formal comments for staff and EPC consideration. The memo is organized into two topic areas; Planned Community Zone and Uses and Standards.	Noted. See Lines 299-307.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
299	Jaramillo, Jaime	WALH	3/13/17	Planned Community Zone: Comment: Page 55: "Because of their large size, projects in this district include new traffic networks and infrastructure construction, are anticipated to impose significant impacts on the community and require additional study and analysis to document and mitigate those impacts." – This statement is unnecessarily negative insinuating that Master Planned areas may inflict harmful or damaging impacts on the community, which is not the intent of Master Planned communities and should not be the purpose of the PC zone. Would the team consider rewording this? Proposed Language: We propose the following language: "Because of their ~~large~~ size, projects in this district will include new and expanded transportation ~~traffic~~ networks and infrastructure construction, are anticipated to accommodate future growth within ~~impose significant impacts on~~ the community, and this growth may require additional study and analysis ~~to document and mitigate those impacts~~."		Because of their large size, projects in this district will require additional study and analysis to document potential impacts on the community and mitigate them via new and expanded transportation networks and/or infrastructure."
300	Jaramillo, Jaime	WALH	3/13/17	WALH Comment: Are the Planned Communities Criteria remaining in effect? Planning Staff response: The PCC was not analyzed in the IDO transition process. This will be considered further. WALH response: Agree with this, but reiterate that this is our understanding.	The Planned Communities Criteria document is adopted by both the City and County and will remain in effect. Staff is taking another look at the PCC in light of the PC language in the IDO and may propose changes in the future but have no recommended changes at this time.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
301	Jaramillo, Jaime	WALH	3/13/17	WALH Comment: Page 55: "Permitted and conditional uses are negotiated on a case-by-case basis but may not include any use that is not included in Table 3-2-1 (Permitted Use Table)." – Due to the IDO's reorganization/reclassification of uses that are in the current Zoning Code, what is the anticipated solution to any discrepancy in uses listed in the current code, which may fall into another category and/or may not be listed at all in the IDO Permitted Use Table? This relates to our later discussions in Agenda items 2-4. Planning Staff response: Please submit a list of uses allowed in each zone during the IDO Phase II process. We commit to add something to mitigate any of these issues to the enactment ordinance. WALH response: Agree with this, but reiterate that this is our understanding.	Approved site plans and master development plans will continue to remain valid after the adoption of the IDO. See Lines 9, 61, 86, 100-102, 105, 107, 121, and 136. See Section 3-1.3 Unlisted Uses for how unlisted uses will be handled in the future. Beyond these provisions, the adoption of the IDO may change allowable uses on properties throughout the City, which is within the land use and zoning power of the City.	
302	Jaramillo, Jaime	WALH	3/13/17	WALH Comment: Page 57: "No phase of a Planned Community may develop more than 80 percent of the land area designated for residential or mixed-use development as single-family detached dwellings." – We are unsure what the intent of this statement is. Could this be problematic for the undeveloped PDA portion of Westland being that it is anticipated to be built out with single family homes?	This provision is intended to ensure a mix of uses on vast tracts of land that come in. It is difficult if not impossible for the City to enforce a mix of uses over many phases. This provision is intended to affect phasing so that each phase includes some non-residential and some residential uses, which will help maintain or improve the jobs-housing balance, particularly on the City's edges, where the PC zone will provide the accommodate the majority of future greenfield growth.	
303	Jaramillo, Jaime	WALH	3/13/17	Uses and Standards: Generally, we believe that the following conversions are problematic because several uses are lost in the conversion.	See Lines 304-307.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
304	Jaramillo, Jaime	WALH	3/13/17	WALH Comment: Westland SU-2 for Town Center. This zone is made up of C-2 permissive uses and R-2 permissive uses (excluding uses in R-T, R-LT, and R-1). The conversion from C-2 in this part of the City is NR-C (Non Residential Commercial). The primary issue with this conversion is that this area is intended to be a high intensity, mixed use zone, which is not allowed as the IDO is currently proposed. The differences between what is allowed under C-2 today and what is proposed under NR-C is the following: 1. Club (nightclub) was a permissive use and is proposed to be prohibited. 2. R-3 residential uses were permissive (provided certain design standards are met) and are now prohibited. 3. Golf driving range, miniature golf course, and baseball batting range were permissive uses and are now conditional. 4. Stand or vehicle selling fruit, vegetables, or nursery stock was a permissive use and is now prohibited.	See Line 301. As noted in the comment, some uses change in the converted zones. This area is proposed to be zoned as PC, which means that the adopted Westland Master Plan will remain on the books as the governing land use document for the area. This zoning conversion approach was agreed upon as the way to best preserve the existing entitlements and responsibilities from the adopted plan. The Westland Master Plan references R-2 and C-2 permissive uses. Section 1-10.3 states that Master Development Plans remain valid. Section 1-10.4 states that Master Development Plans that reference zones prior to the IDO will be administered per the relevant conversion zone in the IDO per table 2-2-1.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
304 (cont'd)	Jaramillo, Jaime	WALH	3/13/17	(cont'd)	Staff believes that the IDO conversion zones will allow the area to develop as a moderately-high density mixed use area but may result in changes to individual uses. On the West Side, C-2 converts to NR-C to address the imbalance of jobs and housing on the West Side and ensure land for jobs and services. The biggest change noted is from a zone that allowed residential uses to one that intentionally does not. The Westland Master Plan could be amended to specifically allow uses that would change under the IDO conversion zones.	
305	Jaramillo, Jaime	WALH	3/13/17	WALH Comment: Westland SU-2 for Planned Development Area. This zone is made up of R-T permissive uses. The conversion from R-T is (IDO) R-T. The differences between what is allowed under R-T today and what is proposed under the IDO R-T is the following: 1. Family day care use was permissive and is proposed to be conditional. 2. School was a permissive use and is proposed to be conditional. APS currently owns a 110-acre property in this zone and a new K-8 school is proposed for construction this summer. The schools are shown on the approved Land Use Plan.	The IDO changes these uses as the commenter notes, through the PC zone mapped for this area. The SU-2/PDA zone in the Westland Master Plan only includes "Uses Permissive in the R-T zone," but does not reference uses that are conditional. Therefore, those uses would not be allowed after the IDO is adopted. See Line 301 and 304. APS generally is not subject to the City's zoning standards.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
306	Jaramillo, Jaime	WALH	3/13/17	WALH Comment: Westland SU-2 for Town Center Village. This zone is made up of C-1, R-2, R-T, and R-LT permissive uses. We are only concerned about the C-1 conversion: MX-L. The differences between what is allowed under C-1 today and what is proposed under the MX-L is the following: 1. Church, or other place of worship was a permissive use and is proposed to be conditional. 2. Club (nightclub) was a permissive use and is proposed to be prohibited. 3. General retail was permissive in any size and is proposed to be limited to under 10,000 square feet. Restricted retail size is a concern within all mixed use zones (including our proposal in the next section related to MX-H).	Religious institution is a permissive use in all the MX zones. In general, the MX-L zone is the conversion for C-1 and is meant to provide neighborhood-serving commercial activity. The limit on retail to 10,000 square feet indicates a limit related to neighborhood-serving retail. See Lines 87, 89, 90 108, 186, 189, 305, and 307.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
306 (Cont)	Jaramillo, Jaime	WALH	3/13/17	4. Gasoline, oil, liquefied petroleum gas, including outside sales (gas station) was a permissive use (provided certain design standards are met) and is proposed to be prohibited. 5. Car washing was a permissive use and is proposed to be conditional. 6. Games, electronic and pinball was a permissive use and is proposed to be conditional. 7. Medical or dental laboratory was a permissive use and is proposed to be conditional, and will only be allowed conditionally if the site and/or building is vacant for five or more years. 8. Private Commons Development (cluster housing) was a permissive use and is proposed to be prohibited.	In the existing Zoning Code, gas stations were a Conditional use in C-1, which has proven problematic, since properties zoned C-1 are in such close proximity to residential zones and pose a potential negative impact. The IDO prohibits gas stations in C-1 but allows them in the conversion for C-2 - MX-M - which is intended for community-serving commercial uses. In general, the IDO is a significant departure from the pyramid structure of zoning, where uses build in the higher zones and allow the mix of all uses permissive in lower zones. The pyramid structure allows single-family in the same zones as non-residential uses and higher-density residential uses. These mixes tend to result in poor outcomes for single-family neighborhoods, where the most protections are wanted and needed from more intense activity. For this reason, the IDO disallows single-family homes from the MX zones; conversely, private commons development is also prohibited. The MX zones are intended for higher-density and higher intensity uses, both of which prove to be bad neighbors for single-family homes.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
307	Jaramillo, Jaime	WALH	3/13/17	WALH Comment: General Retail We are particularly concerned with the retail provisions proposed in the IDO. The large retail category should have a threshold of 75,000 square feet, like today's standard and to allow grocery stores to be categorized in medium retail. Also, very concerning is the downzoning which will occur in many zones if the retail provisions are adopted as is. Retail uses are not categorized by size now and are allowed in a wide variety of zones that way in the current code. It is our recommendation that the retail provisions for size and location in each zone are revisited.	Existing uses that are legal remain legal after the IDO is adopted. The City is within its land use and zoning authority to adopt new legislation with new zones and new standards. The IDO provides the opportunity to rethink what zones are needed in Albuquerque and what uses should be allowed in each. This change represents a huge departure from the pyramid structure of zoning in today's Zoning Code to a new structure that provides the ability to determine which uses should be allowed in each zone. As such, the new zones and conversions from existing zones result in some change of uses. See also Lines 87, 89, 90 108, 186, and 189.	
308	Landgraf, Gerald	Nob Hill Development Corporation	3/13/17	I am a property owner of several developed and undeveloped properties in the east Nob Hill area and support the City's effort in updating the zoning code through the Integrated Development Ordinance and their combined effort with the County in completing the revised Comprehensive Plan.	Noted. Staff appreciates all of the public input that has contributed to the draft IDO up to this point.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
309	Landgraf, Gerald	Nob Hill Development Corporation	3/13/17	The integration of the proposed IDO zoning with goals outlined in the Comprehensive Plan related to land use regulations, transportation, housing, and jobs will connect them in a thoughtful manner, with an eye towards accommodating future growth. The creation of the mixed-use zoning categories, in combination with height bonuses made available to development projects in appropriate locations like near Premium Transit, Urban Centers, Main Streets, and Downtown represents the best in current techniques of land use, transportation, and housing planning. The most thoughtful bonus criteria, which best aligns the goals of the Comprehensive Plan with the zoning and supports the future growth of the City, is the Premium Transit bonus.	Noted. See Lines 82, 95-97, 140, 142, 152, 232, 276, 311-315, 327-331, and 337-340 for discussion of building heights in Nob Hill.	
310	Landgraf, Gerald	Nob Hill Development Corporation	3/13/17	New mixed-use residential/commercial projects in the applicable bonus areas will create much needed housing near to jobs and transportation, reducing those individual's vehicle miles traveled and helping to normalize the City's jobs/housing balance. I believe that mixed-use projects that create new housing and commercial space near Premium Transit, Urban Centers, Main Streets, and Downtown will be of a great benefit to the City. I support the City's effort to encourage these types of projects and I believe that the more housing that can be added to these areas the better.	Noted. The IDO is intended to accommodate many types of projects and encourage transit-oriented development along PT corridors and mixed-use development in Urban Centers, Main Streets, and Downtown.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
311	Landgraf, Gerald	Nob Hill Development Corporation	3/13/17	Having experienced failed attempts at developing my properties in Nob Hill, I recognize the benefit of development height bonuses, and having recognized that, I do not believe that development height bonuses should be limited in the mixed-use zoned areas. While reviewing the IDO draft prepared for the EPC I noticed that the Nob Hill CPO section on building standards and building heights [section 2-7.2(5)(d)(i)(b)] has limited the ability of properties to qualify for development height bonuses. I believe that limiting development height bonuses in areas where they should be applicable is contrary to goals outlined in the Comprehensive Plan. The Planning Department, the EPC commissioners, and the City Councilors should act to modify this section of the Nob Hill CPO.	Noted. See Lines 82, 95-97, 140, 142, 152, 232, 276, 309, 312-315, 327-331, and 337-340 for discussion of building heights in Nob Hill. Direction would be needed from decision-makers to modify the Nob Hill CPO.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
312	Landgraf, Gerald	Nob Hill Development Corporation	3/13/17	The most thoughtful bonus criteria, which best aligns the goals of the Comprehensive Plan with the zoning and supports the future growth of the City, is the Premium Transit bonus. *Therefore, the Premium Transit bonus should be applied normally within the Nob Hill CPO (i.e. within 660 feet of a station) instead of the vague "within one block" as it is currently written. At the minimum, the Premium Transit bonus should be applied normally to the east of Carlisle while retaining the "within one block" language for the historic area between Girard and Carlisle. All other bonuses to development heights should also be available to properties to the east of Carlisle.*	See Line 311.	
313	Hufnagel, Tandi		3/17/17	I wrote to Pat and the Nob Hill newsletter to voice my concern over the "bonus" building height allowances within one block of the new ART stations in Nob Hill. From what I understand, that bonus has not been added at the Bryn Mayr station, but is at the Solano Station.	See Lines 82, 95-97, 140, 142, 152, 232, 276, 309, 311-315, 327-331, and 337-340 for discussion of building heights in Nob Hill.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
314	Hufnagel, Tandi		3/17/17	I would like to point out that there is some misinformation out there. We are hearing planners and others suggest that the historic core of Nob Hill runs from Girard to Carlisle when, in fact, studies during the Sector Plan work in 2007 clearly defined the historic core as Girard to Aliso. Attached are allowable building heights from the sector plan showing that they are the lower 39 ft. up to Aliso. So the new 45 ft. proposal, with an additional 20 ft bonus height near stations, would take the limit to 65 ft near the Solano station, which is within the historic core of Nob Hill.	The Nob Hill CPO is mapped with Aliso as the eastern boundary of lower Nob Hill, as the Sector Plan showed. The IDO would currently allow addition height near both the Bryn Mawr and Solano transit stations in lower Nob Hill as currently written. See Lines 82, 95-97, 140, 142, 152, 232, 276, 309, 311-315, 327-331, and 337-340 for discussion of building heights in Nob Hill.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
315	Hufnagel, Tandi		3/17/17	This is of great concern to the NH residents, as seen in the big response to my original message, below. The surrounding buildings are almost all one story - a five story building would stand out in a very negative way, would block the views that neighbors south of Central enjoy of the mountains, and would loom over Central itself. Three stories is the most that should be allowed in the historic neighborhood. This would preserve the architectural texture, maintain the "big sky" character of old Rte 66, feel appropriate to the scale of surrounding buildings, and prevent any tunnel effect on Central.	The IDO would generally allow 65 feet along Central, designated as a Main Street corridor in the Comp Plan. In recognition of the existing Sector Plan limits and the policies that recognize the character of lower Nob Hill, the IDO limits the Premium Transit building heights to within one block and does not apply Main Street building heights from Girard to Aliso. From Aliso to Graceland, PT building heights apply within 660 feet of transit stations, but Main Street building heights do not apply. There are competing policy interests within Nob Hill: preserving character and encouraging transit-oriented development associated with Premium Transit stations. The IDO attempts to balance those competing priorities in a way that poses minimal negative impacts to lower Nob Hill. Direction would be needed from decision-makers to change the CPO standards for Nob Hill. See Lines 82, 95-97, 140, 142, 152, 232, 276, 309, 311-315, 327-331, and 337-340 for discussion of building heights in Nob Hill.	See Line 140.
316	Hufnagel, Tandi		3/17/17	I know that you are nearing the end of the planning stages, but please, consider that the neighborhood very strongly does not want buildings over three stories in Nob Hill. 45 feet should be the maximum allowed height near the Solano station.	See Line 315.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
317	Hakim, Besim,		3/17/17	The general impression is that the IDO is an exercise in consolidation of the existing numerous documents into a more compact format so that users can find everything that is relevant in one place. In most cases the identification (name) of zone is new to comply with the general grouping of Residential, Mixed-use, and Non-residential.	Agreed. This is the overriding impetus for the Integrated Development Ordinance.	
318	Hakim, Besim,		3/17/17	The other general impression is the IDO does not depart from the contents and type of coding system that currently exists. No alternative coding mechanisms is evident in the document. It is suggested that existing standards be evaluated to determine if they should continue to be used, or revisions and improvements are necessary.	[Please note that the reviewer is looking at Module 1 - released in October 2015.] The use table is a significant change from the existing zoning code. The consultant for the IDO - Clarion Associates - read the existing Zoning Code, Subdivision Ordinance, Development Process Manual, Planning Ordinance, and adopted Sector Development Plans and has carried over many provisions that are still enforceable and effective. See footnotes throughout the IDO.	
319	Hakim, Besim,		3/17/17	It is also suggested that the IDO include a section on repairing and improving existing sprawled neighborhoods. There are numerous methods of achieving that as shown by examples in the book *Sprawl Repair Manual* by Galina Tachieva, published in 2010.	More information is needed about what should be adjusted in the IDO. The Comp Plan has significant guidance on where additional density is desired, such as Centers, Corridors, and Areas of Change. The IDO includes several tools to allow for densification in areas consistent with the updated Comp Plan.	Add to the Table of Contents a list of provisions specific to Downtown (DT), Urban Centers (UC), Activity Centers (AC), Main Street Corridors (MS), and Premium Transit Corridors (PT).

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
320	Hakim, Besim,		3/17/17	Re graphics: all aerial axonometrics should be replaced with actual air photos of typical existing areas within Albuquerque, or examples from other cities. This will communicate better the character of each zone. Some of the axonometrics, as shown in the draft of Module 1, do not inform or relate to the District Standards sketches on the opposite page.	The drawings illustrating each zone district have been adapted from aerial photography of Albuquerque areas that seem to illustrate the intent of each zone. More information is needed about how these could be adapted to be more informative.	
321	Hakim, Besim,		3/17/17	As for District Standards graphics: more than one sketch is needed to show other possible permutations. The intent behind the numeric standards shown in each sketch should be explained so that they do not convey arbitrariness.	The illustrations are meant to illustrate the definitions of dimesional standards, not regulate design itself. More than one illustration might make a reader assume those were the only permutations allowed, whereas one drawing is more certainly to be interpreted as an illustration only.	
322	Hakim, Besim,		3/17/17	The District Standards use of setback and height requirements are too specific and extreme. Introduction of performance and site contingent conditions will allow sensitive response to unforeseen special site conditions. These might also be communicated with generic sketches.	Variances and administrative deviations are intended to provide flexibility to address site contingent conditions and allow sensitive response. Standards are provided as requirements in order to result in predictable outcomes for neighbors and property owners and objective standards that can be administered and enforced by staff.	
323	Hakim, Besim,		3/17/17	Sections 4.1 to 4.10 are not yet available. These might clarify how local applications might be tailored to specific site conditions.	See EPC draft of the IDO, which includes standards for developing next to sensitive lands, Major Public Open Space, acequias, arroyos, etc.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
324	Hakim, Besim,		3/17/17	From the box on the cover of Module 1 document: What will the IDO do? - Integrate land development regulations and procedures in one place (This seems to be undertaken). - Simplify the City's current rules and procedures (No evidence that this is forthcoming, or introducing innovative alternatives). - Help implement the Comp Plan that is currently being updated (Wait and see to determine effectiveness).	See EPC draft of the IDO, which includes Chapter 5 Administration and Enforcement. Table 5-1-1 lays out all development processes and requirements. The IDO helps to implement the Comp Plan in terms of protections for neighborhoods (Section 4.8) and Open Space (Section 4-2 Site Design and Sensitive Lands), etc. Additional building heights and reduced parking requirements in DT, UC, MS, and PT areas are a direct tie to the Comp Plan, encouraging development within Centers and along Corridors.	
325	Eyster, Gary		3/20/17	4-5.6 B 1, page 221, CARPORTS, the draft states: no building wall may be built within any required setback area. It seems clear that it means one cannot construct a "wall" of a carport in a front or even a side or rear setback. I would love to think that it also meant a "very short wall" or what you and I would probably call a post….no vertical element… This would effectively keep carports out of setback areas which would be a huge benefit to ABQ. People could still build them beside their house behind the front setback.	It appears that this comment is asking if a structure post would be considered to be a wall, and therefore be prohibited. Structure supports would not be considered walls, and therefore are allowed in setback areas. For prohibitions on carports themselves, see Lines 145, 277, 296, and 341.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
326	Eyster, Gary		3/20/17	If it is to be left as "no building wall" you would have to define when a post becomes a wall. Structurally speaking a post wouldn't need to be over 4" if it's steel or 8" if it's wood to support a carport (with shear bracing at the connection to the roof structure). I might suggest that a wall is a structure with any horizontal dimension greater than 12"??? That would be an improvement over current ordinances.	See Line 325.	
327	Michie, Susan		3/20/17	My comments refer the following policy in the Nob Hill CPO-5 p. 79 of the IDO (Section: d.i.b) b. "On properties abutting Central from Girard Blvd. to Aliso Ave., height and density bonuses associated with the Main Street designation or Workforce Housing are not applicable. Bonuses associated with Premium Transit are only available within one block of a Premium Transit station."	See Lines 328-329 for responses to comments related to building heights in Nob Hill.	
328	Michie, Susan		3/20/17	This policy means that 65' tall buildings would be allowed within one block of a Premium Transit (PT) station. Please note several historic buildings are within the one block area of a PT station in Nob Hill and thus, vulnerable to demolition under the ABC-to-Z policies for the new Comp Plan and IDO. Including… *[Comment includes photos of these locations]* FORD MOTOR COMPANY BUILDING – NOW KELLY'S, MONTE VISTA FIRE STATION BUILDING – CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE…..	Noted. See Lines 82, 95-97, 140, 142, 152, 232, 276, 309, 311-315, 327-331, and 337-340 for discussion of building heights in Nob Hill.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
329	Michie, Susan		3/20/17	1) Allowing 65-foot building heights within one block of the Bryn Mawr transit station location is very undesirable for the community as this area contains some of the most characteristic and historic buildings, including the Monte Vista Fire Station, Kelly's (Ford Motor Building), and the entire commercial strip west of Nob Hill "The Place". In addition, some of the commercial property on the east side of this station area is directly adjacent to R-1 residential zoning with no MX-T buffer. Thus, the potential for a 65' tall building to adversely affect properties that are held by zoning and character protections to single stories is greater than in other areas of the city.	Noted. See Lines 82, 95-97, 140, 142, 152, 232, 276, 309, 311-315, 327-331, and 337-340 for discussion of building heights in Nob Hill.	
330	Michie, Susan		3/20/17	2) The proximity of the Nob Hill commercial district to a major institution (UNM) has already created a "high density" area. We are one of the most diverse, high density, areas of the city in terms of demographics, income, and housing, including supportive group and community housing. UNM recently added 800 new living units to this area. We can support BRT in Nob Hill without adding incentives for more density that is likely to undermine future student housing on campus. On campus student housing encourages students to live on campus, where security and support are at a premium.	Noted. See Lines 82, 95-97, 140, 142, 152, 232, 276, 309, 311-315, 327-331, and 337-340 for discussion of building heights in Nob Hill.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
331	Michie, Susan		3/20/17	3) We have consistently asked the city to respect the building heights between Girard and Aliso in our Sector Plan (39' or 3 stories) that was updated in 2014 with much input from the community. Community members have already compromised on this issue by agreeing to higher building heights from Aliso to Graceland (which allows the Premium Transit bonus of 65' within ¼ mile of a PT station, plus an additional 12' for the Workforce Housing bonus). The area between Girard and Aliso has a history of being limited to 3-story buildings and changing that seems grossly unfair to existing housing development that invested in our area in recent years on that premise.	Noted. See Lines 82, 95-97, 140, 142, 152, 232, 276, 309, 311-315, 327-331, and 337-340 for discussion of building heights in Nob Hill. The proposed building heights in the CPO do represent a concession to building heights established by the Nob Hill Sector Plan. As noted above, decision-makers must weight the competing priorities of preservation of character and encouragement of transit-oriented development. The IDO is one attempt at striking that balance. In general, the City is within its land use and zoning authority to change zoning and associated standards over time.	See Line 140.

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
332	Michie, Susan		3/20/17	In general, I believe the UC-MS-PT credits/bonuses for building heights, parking requirements, landscaping requirements, etc. are even more confusing than the Sector Plans they are replacing. In addition, they are not represented in the zoning maps that compare the old and new zoning codes. Thus, the public is being misled by the new zoning maps and the city planners' claims that our zoning codes are not being substantially changed.	The IDO does represent a significant change from the existing zoning framework that many have come to know well. Going from very tailored requirements for a particular area in a plan for a small area to one document that tries to standardize approaches to providing protections and incentives in appropriate areas for the whole city is quite a challenge. The table of contents for mapped areas has been added to help people understand special rules in special areas. Interactive online maps will also help demonstrate where specialized rules apply. In general, the IDO provides a tool that can address the special needs of an area while still addressing the entire City, which was the intended outcome. While standards for zones are changing in the IDO, the zoning conversions from existing zones to a new set of IDO zones is trying to match bundles of permissive uses as closely as possible. Where possible, standards for mapped areas are being carried over as closely as possible, while weighing the competing interest to standardize approaches where possible. This is all a balancing act, and decision-makers have discretion to adjust the IDO as necessary to strike a better balance.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
333	Michie, Susan		3/20/17	At the beginning of the ABC-to-Z process the consultants hired by the city promised that Sector Plan policies that could not be merged across the city would be honored. The Central Good to Great consultants also recommended that the building heights in Lower Nob Hill be limited to 3 stories. Nob Hill residents work harder than most communities to preserve and promote our history and cultural background - please don't undermine that work by allowing buildings that have little or no potential to contribute to the existing character and culture of our community.	The CPO for lower Nob Hill generally allows 45 feet, assumed to result in 3 stories. See Line 232 for comments related to adding story limits in addition to height limits. See also Lines 82, 95-97, 140, 142, 152, 232, 276, 309, 311-315, 327-331, and 337-340 for discussion of building heights in Nob Hill.	See Line 140.

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
334	Weir, Greg	Nob Hill NA	3/19/17	At our regular Board meeting on March 6th, 2017, the Nob Hill Neighborhood Association considered a number of statements on the Integrated Development Ordinance EPC Draft dated December 29, 2016. While there is much the Board likes in the draft, the Board is greatly concerned with some details in the IDO that would, if passed as written, detrimentally affect our neighborhood. The Board considered some of the most problematic sections and voted on specific changes to four clauses of the IDO text as well as the reasoning for such changes, as detailed in the attachment. The Board voted in favor of all the changes; the votes were, in order of the statements in the attachment, 11-1-0 (11 in favor, 1 opposed, 0 abstained), 9-2-1, 12-0-0, and 10-1-1. There were a number of other statements that the Board did not have time to consider on March 6th; these will be discussed at our next meeting and communicated to ABC to Z project team and directly to the EPC.	Noted.	
335	Weir, Greg	Nob Hill NA	3/19/17	2-4.1: Mixed-Use Transition Zone (MX-T) C. District Standards i. For the Nob Hill Highland Area, as mapped below, the Building Standard for the Height, principal Building, max. ft. shall be 26 ft.	See Line 143.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
336	Weir, Greg	Nob Hill NA	3/19/17	Reasoning: The 2007 NHHSDP allows a maximum height of 26 feet, consistent with the original residential nature of the buildings in this zone in Nob Hill. (NHHSDP, pg. 89) The character of this neighborhood must be maintained, and the existing character (in particular the massing of buildings that defines the streetscape) is based on the 26 foot maximum height.	See Line 146.	
337	Weir, Greg	Nob Hill NA	3/19/17	2-7.2.B.5 Nob Hill Highland-CPO-5 Proposed language: d. Building Standards i. Building heights b: On properties abutting Central from Girard Blvd. to Aliso Ave., height and density bonuses associated with the Main Street designation, Workforce Housing, or Premium Transit are not applicable. ~~Bonuses associated with Premium Transit are only available within one block of a Premium Transit station.~~ i. For MX-M Zone Districts in this area, building heights in this area shall be restricted to 39 feet.	See Lines 82, 95-97, 140, 142, 152, 232, 276, 309, 311-315, 327-331, and 338-340 for discussion of building heights in Nob Hill. Decision-makers should note that this would affect both the PT station at Bryn Mawr as well as the one at Solano Dr.	
338	Weir, Greg	Nob Hill NA	3/19/17	The community hammered out a 39 foot building height for this area through the sector plan process in 2007. (NHHSDP pg. 89) Neighbors allowed a lot so others could get the heights up to 39 feet from where they had been. The purpose of a CPO is to recognize unique character that is worthy of preservation and preserve it. The district creates city wide value from its historic character.	Noted. See Lines 82, 95-97, 140, 142, 152, 232, 276, 309, 311-315, 327-331, and 337-340 for discussion of building heights in Nob Hill.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
339	Weir, Greg	Nob Hill NA	3/19/17	2-7.2.B.5. Nob Hill Highland-CPO-5 Proposed language: d. Building Standards i. Building heights c: On properties abutting Central from Aliso Ave. to Graceland Dr., bonuses associated with the Main Street Designation or Premium Transit do not apply. ii. For MX-M Zone Districts in this area, building heights in this area shall be restricted to 54 feet.	See Lines 82, 95-97, 140, 142, 152, 232, 276, 309, 311-315, 327-331, and 337-340 for discussion of building heights in Nob Hill. Note that the base height for MX-M is 45 feet. This would be a one-off difference in building height. From the perspective of consistency in the interest of enforceability, the City would prefer to default to the MX-M height of 45 feet or go to the MS height of 65 feet.	
340	Weir, Greg	Nob Hill NA	3/19/17	Reasoning: Addition of non-applicability of the Premium Transit station to this section clarifies how bonuses can be applied in this area. Typical Premium Transit bonuses are available within two blocks. Because a Premium Transit Station is located within one block of Aliso Ave., one could interpret the bonus to be available on the block between Aliso. and Morningside Ave. This language clarifies that this bonus would not apply on this block. The 54 foot height was agreed upon in the NHHSDP in 2007, pg. 89.	The IDO as drafted would not allow additional building height associated with PT between Aliso and Graceland, since it limits PT to within 1 block of the station, and there are no stations proposed between Aliso and Graceland. Building heights within this stretch would be limited to 45 feet unless someone wanted to do Workforce Housing, which would be eligible for a 12-foot bonus, getting building heights to 57 feet (i.e. within 3 feet of the Nob Hill Sector Plan height limit).	
341	Weir, Greg	Nob Hill NA	3/19/17	4-5.6.B.1 Carports Proposed language: b. Carports in the *front yard setback* for single-family, two-family detached dwellings *and attached dwellings, and townhouse dwellings* are prohibited in the following mapped areas.	See Lines 145, 277, 296, and 325-326 for carports.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
342	Weir, Greg	Nob Hill NA	3/19/17	Reasoning: Addition of "townhouse dwellings" includes the 3 and 4 plex dwellings in the mapped area.	See Line 341.	
Below are comments received during the review and approval process for the ABC Comp Plan that referenced the IDO.						
a	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	MWG / ABQ Interfaith	9/14/16	There was no explanation of what the new zoning districts included from the old zoning district and how that would impact the neighborhood. The City Staff never explained as to how these new zone districts will preserve and protect the neighborhood culture, character and traditions.	Module 1, which describes zones, uses, and conversions from straight zones has been available since October 2015. A table of proposed conversions from SU-2 zones was also released with Module 1. An interactive conversion map showing how zones are proposed to change with the IDO has been available since May 2016. Dimensional Standards for each zone were released with Module 2 of the IDO in May 2016. Staff has made multiple public presentations when each Module was released, and offers office hours to walk through proposed changes with individuals and small groups, including the MWG on several occasions throughout the drafting process. Protections are established through overlay zones, use-specific standards, and dimensional standards, particularly Neighborhood Edge provisions (see Section 4-4.8).	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
b	Mexal, Catherine	Wells Park	9/19/16	Attached please find petitions signed by residents of Wells Park to indicate their opposition to Wells Park's residential section being re-zoned to anything other than Single-Family Residential, as we are now. We are protesting our re-zoning to R-T which would allow high-density townhouses (26-ft tall buildings on 2,200 sq. ft., 22 ft-wide lots) throughout our neighborhood of bungalows. All these issues would be solved by re-zoning the residential portion of Wells Park R-1. [This comment includes a petition to convert the S-R zone to R-1 with 86 signatures].	The Sawmill/Wells Park SDP zones much of the single-family neighborhood as S-R (single-family residential). Despite the SU-2 zone name, the S-R zone allows townhouses permissively. The zoning conversions proposed for the IDO match permissive uses as closely as possible. The SU-2/S-R zone has been converted to R-T to reflect the permissive townhouse use allowed by that plan. The S-R zone establishes limits and standards related to townhouses that have been carried over in the CPO-7 Sawmill/Wells Park. Contextual standards in Residential zones are intended to ensure consistency between new development and the existing development pattern in Areas of Consistency. See Section 4-1.3.B. Changing zoning to R-1 would be a downzoning in this case, and the project is not intended to make discretionary zone changes from one set of permissive uses to another. There are many single-family neighborhoods with R-T zoning throughout Albuquerque. This mismatch between zoning and land-use can be tackled in a future stage of City-sponsored discretionary zone changes.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
c	Mexal, Catherine	Wells Park	9/19/16	This would also open the door for bail bond offices and 18-person group-type residential facilities in our residential area.	Bail Bonds are currently considered Office uses under the existing zoning code and office uses are allowed in the R-T zone. The IDO moves bail bonds to be included in "Personal and business services," which are not allowed in R-T. See the definition of Personal and business services in Section 6-1 and the Permitted Use Table 3-2-1 in Section 3-2. In addition, the IDO has use-specific standards for bail bond services that further limit where bail bonds are allowed (see Section 3-3.4.V), including the introduction of a 1-mile distance separation for bail bonds. See Lines 5-7 for discussion of Community Residential Programs.	
d	Mexal, Catherine	Wells Park	9/19/16	Please note that many residents stated that for years they have fought some of the proposed permissive uses from encroaching into the residential area of Wells Park and none of the above issues are permitted in the Sawmill-Wells Park Sector Development Plan, even though all sector plans were to be “integrated” into the Comp Plan/IDO.	See Lines 5-7. Neither bail bonds nor community residential facilities are prohibited in the Sawmill/Wells Park SDP.	
e	Thompson, Blake		9/26/16	Concerned that changes to setback, height, and other building standards will negatively impact property owners in the Volcano Cliffs SDP area.	More information is needed about what changes are problematic. The Volcano Cliffs SDP area is included in CPO-8 Volcano Mesa. The City has the authority to change zoning and dimensional standards as part of its land use and zoning powers.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
f	Anchondo, Lucy	Avalon NA	11/4/16	We know that a significant amount of involvement from neighborhoods will be taken out of the process, from the get-go, as projects will be approved by the Planning Department in most instances, in a sort of "check-off list" method of approval.	The IDO standards are intended to result in higher quality development and to be written more clearly to achieve predictable results for neighbors, developers, and staff. The IDO distinguishes among small proects that are approprtiate for staff to review administratively, larger projects that require technical review by the Development Review Board, and discretionary decisions that need review by the Environmenal Planning Commission. The vast majority of projects that the Planning Department reviews today do not go to the Environmental Planning Commission, which is where neighborhoods often participate in the review and approval process. For larger projects and discretionary decisions, neighborhood involvement is proposed to take place earlier in the development review process for individual projects through the requirement for applicants to meet with recognized neighborhood associations prior to submitting to the City. The intended effect is that neighborhoods have more opportunity than they do today to participate in the development process. The process to approve special exceptions through the Zoning Hearing Examiner is not proposed to change. See Line q and w.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
g	Anchondo, Lucy	Avalon NA	11/4/16	There will only be specific instances that that the neighborhoods will be involved.	See Line f. Table 5-1-1 indicates which approvals require a neighborhood meeting, which require a public meeting and/or hearing, and which are policy decisions. In general, there is a misperception that most development projects go to the EPC, and therefore that neighborhoods are involved. Less than 20% of development between 2008-2014 required EPC approval. Almost half went directly to building permit. The rest went to the DRB and then building permit. Because meetings with neighborhood representatives will be required for most projects that require DRB or EPC approval, the changes in the IDO may result in *more* involvement with neighbors, not less.	
h	Anchondo, Lucy	Avalon NA	11/4/16	When the Applicant is required to meet with the neighborhood, as part of the process, checking off requirements from the list, this will eliminate grounds of Appeal, unless the neighborhood can afford to hire an attorney.	See Line g. The higher-quality standards in the IDO are meant to require upfront the protections that are currently negotiated on a case-by-case basis at EPC for the ~16% of projects that require EPC review. This is intended to help provide protection for all neighborhoods, some of which currently don't have the capacity to attend EPC hearings now, much less for every development in their area. Every decision by the City can be appealed and typically requires hiring a lawyer.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
i	Anchondo, Lucy	Avalon NA	11/4/16	Early meetings revealed to the public that, eventually, the EPC will also be eliminated from the process that it and the neighborhood are accustomed to having. We have since been informed that the neighborhoods and the EPC will still be involved, but it will be different and very limited.	See Line h. The EPC will still have purview over discretionary decisions. See Table 5-1-1.	
j	Anchondo, Lucy	Avalon NA	11/4/16	As we see things developing in this Plan, we know that there will be very few opportunities for the neighborhoods to participate.	See Lines f-h.	
k	Anchondo, Lucy	Avalon NA	11/4/16	The EPC's function will be greatly reduced and/or they will have a different role in the process, as the DRB will be the primary reviewing board.	See Lines h and i.	
l	Anchondo, Lucy	Avalon NA	11/4/16	Even though the DRB does have public hearings, they do not always notify us by mail, but rather by public notices, which the neighborhoods do not typically review on a regular basis, nor do we know the case numbers beforehand.	Table 5-1-1 indicates what type of notice is required for all decisions. Site Plan - DRB requires all notice as well as a neighborhood meeting.	
m	Anchondo, Lucy	Avalon NA	11/4/16	Once this Plan is approved, we would like to have new neighborhood notification policy implemented by the DRB, notifying the neighborhoods, by USPS mail and e-mail, before each and every hearing, involving the affected neighborhoods, since the DRB is a public hearing.	See Line l. DRB is a public meeting, not a public hearing.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
n	Gallagher, Pat	La Luz Landowners Association	11/4/16	A not so subtle shift of power has been included in the IDO. This is the part where the great ideas in the plan become law. The Environmental Planning Commission is chartered to listen to the public. While this volunteer/appointed commission is generally populated by members of the development community, it has a tradition of acting fairly. Its job is to weigh the merits of a given development plan and make sure that the public has its say. Sometimes the public has a better grasp of a given ordinance than does the planning department or the EPC, so the process serves as a checks-and-balance cornerstone. The new IDO is attempting to change all that. To trigger scrutiny by the public through the EPC depends on how big or intrusive a development is to be. The new plan intends to increase the threshold in square footage of what the EPC will review. That means that fewer projects will trigger neighborhood notification.	See Lines f-m, q, and w. The EPC is chartered to make discretionary decisions about land use. The DRB is chartered to review technical compliance with regulations. The IDO preserves these roles. DRB projects also require notification.	
o	Gallagher, Pat	La Luz Landowners Association	11/4/16	Finally, the IDO is filled with vague language which will work against the public in a court of law. The IDO says that a development cannot have “significant (adverse) impact” on a neighborhood. This is a phrasing that appears throughout the document. So it then falls on the neighborhood to hire a lawyer to prove that an impact is significant.	The IDO tries to make decision criteria as clear as possible, while still allowing an appropriate amount of discretion for decision makers. The project consultant drafting the IDO is a land use lawyer and has confirmed that this language is standard in city-wide codes.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
p	Gallagher, Pat	La Luz Landowners Association	11/4/16	Loopholes are a common way to neutralize a regulation. The following example is from Chapter 14-16-5. The chart on page 275 will allow a deviation of 10% in building heights and 15% in setback distance. Do you know what this can do to view preservation? From the same page there are reasons to ask for a deviation. Here is one: "*The applicant's site is subject to site constraints not generally shared by surrounding properties, and not created by the actions of the property owner, that would prevent the development of a permitted land use in a type of structure generally found on sites of a similar size in the surrounding area*" There are view sensitive places on Coors that fit this loophole where the 10% and 15% deviation provisions would result in destroying view preservation.	This comment refers to the Consolidated Draft of the IDO. In the EPC draft, administrative deviations are not allowed within a VPO zone. See Section 2-7.4.D.	Revise Table 5-4-1 and Section 5-4.15.B.4 to be consistent with Section 2-7.4.D.

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
q	Forbes-Gayton, Kim		11/4/16	I am also very happy to have learned that the process toward any development will not proceed unless a developer has shown proof to the City that it has in fact met with the potentially affected neighborhood, with either the neighborhood's registered blessing, or concerns about any proposed project. I believe this policy is a win-win, as the affected neighborhood/public gets to learn, weigh in on, and vote on any potential project before the developer commits to the costs and labor toward implementation and construction. This policy could alleviate public distrust and developer angst toward development in Albuquerque.	See Lines f-m and w.	
r	Norton, Peggy	NVC	11/4/16	We look forward to hearing how well the IDO encourages transit-oriented development along Central Ave., while protecting nearby residential neighborhoods from potential negative impacts of additional density and intensity.	Noted. See standards related to Premium Transit station areas and Neighborhood Edge provisions in Section 4-8. See Lines 146-274 for comments from a project team focused on transit-oriented development on Central Ave.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
s	Norton, Peggy	NVC	11/4/16	In pages 89 through 104 of the IDO there are at least two new permissive uses in the R-A, R-1, and R-T zones: Co-housing developments and Cottage developments. The density of each of these two permissive uses is significantly higher than the existing guidelines for development in the respective zones. In addition, the guidelines for these new permissive uses are vague and imprecise, e.g., what are the required separations between buildings?	The densities allowed in Co-housing and Cottage housing are based on the densities allowed in base zone for that property but calculated based on square footage rather than unit counts. See Use Specific Standards in Section 3-3.2D and 3-3.2E. While these housing types might result in more units than more typical single-family detached units, the benefit is a broadening of housing types available, particularly in rural areas where more people are expected to want to live over time, while still maintaining the character of the area. The limits placed on these housing types - a minimum and maximum project size and maximum unit sizes - are intended to protect the character of surrounding development.	
t	Norton, Peggy	NVC	11/4/16	During the October 13,2016 presentation by ABC-Z team members to NVC, the team was asked if the Albuquerque ordinances applied to the City Government and the answer was yes. There are sites in the North Valley where requests for zone changes to permit increased densities have been fought successfully. Adding new permissive uses (zone changes), without notifying affected residents, disenfranchises neighbors and neighborhood associations. The inserted new uses appear to be catering to members of the development community.	The IDO has been drafted and discussed with the public from February 2015 - December 2016. Direct project emails, monthly Neighborhood News articles, Facebook and Nextdoor posts, and paid and free advertising has attempted to raise awareness of the IDO throughout that time. Legal notice was given of this legislative change, and Recognized Neighborhood Associations were notified by email and mail for those without email. See Lines 87-90 and 303-307 for discussion of uses changing in the IDO.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
u	Norton, Peggy	NVC	11/4/16	NVC members saw this preferential and biased preference for the development community at two events: the EPC hearings and a "by invitation only" workshop.	The EPC Chair has discretion to assign time limits for speakers. The Chair often allows more time to representatives of an established group, such as Neighborhood Associations and Coalitions and professional organizations. The workshops referred to in this comment were held in September 2016, the first hosted by The Urban Land Institute and UNM, and the second by the CIty Economic Development Department. These events were attended by City staff, members of Neighborhood Associations, planners, developers, and design professionals.	
v	Norton, Peggy	NVC	11/4/16	With respect to the IDO, the team itself acknowledged that (1) permissive uses have been expanded in various zones, including the R-1 single family zone, and (2) there is no straightforward way for residents and property owners to determine whether and how their given zoning is affected by this expansion of permissive uses, i.e., there is no indication, either by highlighting, red-lining, chart or commentary, of new material. Following the meeting, the team committed to indicating new material in some way. This should be done and the information provided directly to all homeowners throughout the City-not just neighborhood associations- well before any EPC or Council hearing on IDO.	The project team has created summaries for each adopted SDP. In February 2017, the project team hosted meetings for recognized Neighborhood Association leaders to review the proposed zones. The Zoning Conversion Map and table of SU-2 zone conversions allow interested parties to understand and compare the proposed zones. See Line a. The footnotes in the IDO indicate how existing regulations have been carried over and changed throughout the drafting process. More information is needed about what concerns the commenter has about the draft as written. The City has the authority to change zoning and dimensional standards as part of its planning and zoning powers.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
w	Edward, John		11/29/16	The minimums by which Staff/ Administrative approval can approve a project should be as large as noted (not reduced) if not larger, especially in the Major Centers like Downtown, Uptown, Volcano Heights. They are the only trained professionals in planning and for many other people the decision is political and possibly without in depth knowledge due to limited training, time to review the material as they are not full time (i.e. EPC or City Council). Let the trained professionals of the planning department make the decisions that they are trained to make.	Noted. See Lines f-m and q.	
x	Edward, John		11/29/16	The size of the project should be based upon the scale of the impending area. For instance a 100,000 sq. ft. bldg. in downtown, uptown or Volcano Heights quite frankly is not very big and quite small. The minimum for approval for Staff should be larger as the zoning and densities and scale call for that. If you include economy of scale required for projects in zones like this 100,000 does not meet the minimums for regional or even national projects and investors who support them with capital investment. Project scales should be increased for retail, office, multi-family and industrial for the Staff/ Administrative approval. Consider that many projects don't get built due to the project being too small to be financed. If a project cannot get finacing then it will never get built. Special Language is needed to get larger minimums and especially so in the Downtown, Volcano Heights or other Major Centers.	The thresholds in section 5-5.1.F.1 were established citywide for all projects at a level that seemed reasonable for administrative review by staff. See Lines f-m and n-p. Direction would be needed from decision makers to revise the thresholds, partcularly in Downtown and Urban Centers.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
y	Edward, John		11/29/16	Approvals for higher density support structures, i.e. parking garages, transit center, etc in places like Volcano Heights or Downtown get quick administrative approval as the zoning in these planned areas cannot be built or support densities without these items present.	These uses would receive administrative approval if they are less than 100,000 S.F. per Section 5-5.1.F.1.d.	
z	Horvath, Rene'		12/14/16	IDO should not be submitted – not ready, incomplete.	There is ample opportunity through the review and adoption process at EPC and City Council to make necessary revisions to the IDO. More information is needed about what specific changes need to be made to the document.	
aa	Sandoval, Christina	City Parks & Recreation Department	12/15/16	Open Space Advisory Board wants to see a probibition from developing on 9% or greater slopes [originally in the Comp Plan about the Sandia Foothills] incorporated.	This comment refers to a Policy in the 2013 Comp Plan to acquire or regulate development on slopes over 10% in the Sanfia foothills. The project team understood that most of the areas in the foothills with slopes over 10% had been acquired as MPOS. Section 4-2.3.A.2 is intended to have the same effect, while giving latitude for regulating development on steep slopes less than 10% and extending this protection throughout the city.	
bb	Abeyta, Stephen	San Jose Neighbor-hood	1/18/17	Nothing is protecting us.	The San Jose SDP requires a landscape buffer in the is 5 ft. The IDO has a larger required buffer, which would provide greater protection for residents than what is required by the SDP. See Section 4-6.5.D.	Add a Use Specific Standard for industrial uses that require an air quality permit to either establish a distance separation between the permits or a maximum number per square area. Staff is doing analysis in order to recommend an effective approach.

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
cc	Caudill, Larry		1/18/17	Notion that there is incompatibility between zoning – don't buy that. Planning department is in charge of that.	The Planning Department is in charge of ensuring rational zoning that implements the Comp Plan. The proposed changes are intended to address the problem the Planning Department has with today's system in providing an efficient, consistent enforcement of zoning that should, but often struggles to, implement the Comp Plan.	
dd	Horvath, Rene	TRNA, WSCONA	1/18/17	Densities in the IDO are not appropriate.	See Line cc. The IDO attempts to strike a balance between encouraging development in appropriate zones while protecting surrounding development with Neighborhood Edge provisions, Contextual Standards for residential zones, and Building Design standards intended to result in higher-quality buildings throughout the city. Direction would be needed from decision-makers to change proposed densities in the IDO zones.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
ee		HNA, et al.	3/1/17	In low-income communities of color along the railway, and existing within the I-25 and I-40 corridors where uses of residential housing and industrial activities are adjacent, to avoid land-use conflicts (adverse noise, air pollution) and to protect the health, safety of residents from adverse impacts to maximize the health effects of families living near and around industrial development, housing should continue to remain a low-density residential area. In low-income communities of color along the railway, and existing within the I-25 and I-40 corridors where uses of residential housing and industrial activities are adjacent. Where existing residential housing is near/adjacent to industrial uses, impacted communities shall have a Redevelopment Program that engages community members to participate in the planning of redeveloping of their community by planning land uses carefully so that land is used in a better way than before. Polluting industries should be restricted from locating in these areas saturated with other polluting industries. This will improve the quality of the environment of that area.	The IDO codifies the commitment to long-range planning with communities on a 5-year cycle. See Section 5-3 for a description of the Community Planning Area assessments. The Comp Plan maps single-family uses and zones as Areas of Consistency, and the IDO includes extra landcape buffering where Areas of Consistency abut Areas of Change. See Section 4-6.5. See also Neighborhood Edges in Section 4-8 for other protections for low-density residential zones next to higher-intensity zones.	See Line bb.

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
ff	Varoz, Camille		3/3/17	It is my testimony in writing and through Public Comments that I have had concerns with the Density Living concept. The already existing structures down 4th Street are not complementary to our southwest architecture. The elevations are beyond 4-stories, when you take into consideration the heating and cooling units on top of the building. The setbacks are a concern.	The North 4th Sector Development Plan allows multi-story development and establishes setbacks similar to those proposed in the IDO. This Sector Development Plan was developed over several years with residents, business owners, and other stakeholders. The IDO is intended to carry over the existing zoning entitlements established in that SU-2 zoning. See the conversion table for SU-2 zones for the proposed IDO conversions. See also the Conversion Map online.	See Line 140.
gg	Varoz, Camille		3/3/17	The structure on 4th south of Griegos is beyond 4-stories. If there are guidelines and criteria for the developers, who monitors the building plans from start-finish? The density structure on south 4th Street past Mountain Road, the elevation and setbacks are not inline with the building codes. After the fact is NOT acceptable.	The Planning Department is responsible for monitoring building plans from start to finish. Likely, the building meets the SU-2 zoning in the North 4th Corridor Sector Development Plan.	
hh	Varoz, Camille		3/3/17	4. **Equity:** the zoning changes and development has to be equitable for all neighborhoods. Public Notices have to be distributed to all neighborhoods in both English and Spanish.	The existing Zoning Code does not currently require public notification in English and Spanish. Direction would be needed from decision-makers to add that requirement in the IDO.	
ii	Horvath, Rene		3/3/17	How will those designations and R-270 be used to evaluate zoning changes? For example, much of the Coors Corridor in the Taylor Ranch area is developed, yet the designation is “area of change”? This brings about a great amount of uncertainty for property owners throughout our neighborhood. (TRNA Feb.10, 2016)	Both R-270-1980 and Areas of Change/Consistency have been incorporated into the IDO as criteria for zone changes. See Section 5-5.3.B.3. Zone change requests in Areas of Consistency must show 2 of 3 criteria that warrant the zone change. Zone change requests in Areas of Change must show 1 of 3 (same as today's Zoning Code).	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
jj	Horvath, Rene		3/3/17	a) ~~Encourage~~ Provide meetings between developers and residents to identify and address issues prior to official submittal of projects for approval.	See Table 5-1-1 that requires meetings between applicants and Recognized Neighborhood Associations for projects requiring DRB or EPC review.	
kk	Horvath, Rene		3/3/17	b) ~~Encourage~~ Require pre-application review by staff and relevant departments/ agencies to facilitate coordinated reviews and early identification and resolution of issues.	See Table 5-1-1 that requires pre-application review by staff for projects requiring DRB or EPC review.	
ll	Vencill, Elizabeth		3/6/17	Buildings look the way they look because of soil conditions (sandy) for building.	This comment was related to building heights. The IDO does not require multi-story buildings. The quality of soil conditions on each site will certainly affect the design of buildings. This concern is largely a building issue handled by International Building Codes rather than a zoning issue, in which soil conditions do not come into play.	
mm	Valles, Joe		3/7/17	At least some of the Sector Plans were specifically adopted to keep rampant apartment development at bay in order to accommodate job-creating zoning. The current market trend in ABQ is to build apartments. Many of the plans contain C-2 Zoning and if recent attempts to accommodate apartments through commercial zoning is any indication, then say goodbye to the opportunity of having offices, shopping and jobs in those sector plans.	C-2 is proposed to convert different on the East and West sides specifically to address the jobs-housing imbalance. Properties zoned C-2 west of the river convert to NR-C, a Non-Residential Commercial zone crafted intentionally to preserve land for offices, shopping, and jobs. See also Lines 5, 90, and 304.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
nn	Donna & Mike		3/7/17	I know that you have encouraged community discussion about the Plan, and recently set aside time to meet with Raynolds Addition residents at the Hotel Blue. This is to your credit, and I am sorry I couldn't make it to that meeting. Although I don't know if I could have asked informed questions at the time. The Jesse Lopez comment made me curious about this zoning issue, so I'm asking if you could share your perspectives on how zoning variances, if any, may impact the Raynolds Addition neighborhood.	The project team is appreciative of all the public input and participation in reviewing and improving the IDO. Staff is happy to meet with Neighborhood Associations to discuss the implications of the IDO. Staff also holds office hours Monday and Friday afternoons for individuals or small groups. Contact abctoz@cabq.gov to request an appointment.	
oo	Strozier, Jim		3/13/17	The purpose of this email is to express concern regarding a proposed policy in the Comprehensive Plan and regulation in the Integrated Development Ordinance regarding on-street parking and residential parking permits. The regulation/policy reads as follows: Comprehensive Plan – the following policy should be removed: Chapter 7 – Urban Design Policy 7.4.2.b.iii. Credit on-street parking toward parking requirements, except where residential parking permits are used.	Parking in residential areas near active commercial areas is highly contentious. The IDO credits on-street parking toward minimum parking requirements except in areas where neighborhoods have established residential parking permits. By creating residential parking permit areas, the City is acknowledging priority for residential parking, and the IDO is respecting that City acknowlegment.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
pp	Strozier, Jim		3/13/17	This proposed regulation and policy is contradictory to the Comp Plan's stated goals of encouraging higher density and intense development along transit corridors and activity centers. On-street parking should be allowed to be counted toward the off-street parking requirement when residential parking permits are in place. On-street parking spaces can only be counted toward the off-street parking requirements when the on-street spaces are adjacent to the site. Future residents of the proposed project will be able to park in these on-street spaces by applying for a parking permit through the City. If it is a non-residential project, then those adjacent spaces are appropriate for customers and should not be reserved for non-adjacent neighbors. We believe this policy could be contradictory to revitalizing urban areas of the city as called for in the Draft Comprehensive Plan.	See Line oo. The purpose of residential parking permits is to help ensure that parking from nearby businesses does not encroach into the neighborhood, which has been a concern from many neighborhood residents. The Comp Plan policy is intended to continue those protections when non-residential development occurs.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
Below are written comments received after the 21 March 2017 comment deadline and before the 4 April 2017 @ 1 p.m. EPC 48-Hour Rule comment deadline.						
343	Ward, Em	SRMNA	3/21/17	The Planning Department has repeatedly made a claim that existing zoning code is problematic. No verifiable example of conflict within the Code of Ordinances that has hampered or confused a permitting process has been presented. No example of two applicants receiving different responses under the same set of circumstances has been presented. The Commission and the public have been told there is a problem that needs to be fixed without providing concrete evidence a problem exists. Developers, particularly out-of-state developers, decrying the inability to do whatever they want, wherever they want, whenever they want in our city is not a problem.	See Lines 671-697. See April 6, 2017 Staff Report Section II Background. See also Lines 92, 317, cc, 343, 360, 385, 420, 506, 593, and 600.	
344	Ward, Em	SRMNA	3/21/17	We request that the Commission require proof of a systematic problem, not a handful of cases scattered over decades, that requires the complete overhaul of the current zoning regulations to remedy. Please note that this request was presented to a Planning Department ABC-Z team member at and IDO Study Session in early January of this year. Thank you for your time, consideration, and	See Line 343.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
345	Blanc, David		3/21/17	In advance of us meeting again soon, I wanted you to see and hear the perception of another research and reading of the current IDO set forth for the East Downtown (EDo) corridor and the intended mixed-use development opportunities at the fringe of the HHHD Neighborhood. It's really important that we all get this right the first time regarding both the MX designation and the CPO's, if any, which could help shape this transit corridor and influence economic development.	Noted. Staff appreciates the public engagement throughout this process. See Lines 346-349.	
346	Blanc, David		3/21/17	As previously stated in our December meeting, the residential historic community (the HHHDA) should not be treated any differently than the other residential neighborhoods adjacent to the transit corridor throughout this City. In fact, if we want the historic characteristics of the neighborhood to thrive, the best support is a buildable, walkable and shoppable corridor. Currently the MX-L designation promotes an exceptionally low density perception and the confusion of the CPO furthers that perception. Please read below, professional Matthew Lambert's brief comments to me today.	Noted. See Line 349 for note from Matthew Lambert.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
347	Blanc, David		3/21/17	The UCOZ and the current regulatory documents for this area should not be the sole determinants of the new IDO designation unless the City intends the Historic neighborhood and the EDo corridor to fail. The new transit investment is an Economic Development tool but, without an IDO that promotes high density redevelopment through a simple Form Based Code and especially at Transit Stations, the massive investment made by the City and the private sector over the past 10-15 years will have been a waste.	ABC-Z is proposing to replace the City's existing system of over 700 individual zones to a set of 22 zones. The IDO aims to most closely match the permissive uses allowed by existing zoning. Because the EDo Regulatory Plan and the Huning Highland SDP reference the C-1 permissive uses in the SU-1/CRZ zone, much of the corridor has been converted to the MX-L zone, which corresponds to the C-1 zone. The CPO allows additional height in this area. Discretionary rezonings are contemplated as part of the future CPA Assessment process, but are not within the scope of this project.	
348	Blanc, David		3/21/17	The BCCP and the HHHDA neighborhoods have worked together for years in promoting the future redevelopment of their corridor. How can we now help you and your staff make the modifications to support the needs and perception to make the IDO a successful element for our future?	See line 347.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
349	Lambert, Matthew via Blanc, David	DPZ	3/21/17	Because you are MX-L the site density is limited to 30 units / acre. We thought it got the premium transit density bonus but that doesn't apply to MX-L, only MX-M and above. So you are limited to a maximum of 18 dwelling units. Of course we think that this is ludicrous at a transit station and that you should be able to build more units.	The commenter is correct in that MX-L and MX-M do not have higher densities permitted with higher buildings. MX-L is a zone meant for neighborhood-serving commercial and residential uses near neighborhoods. MX-M is the straight conversion for C-2, which is currently limited to 75 du/acre by the C-1/C-2/C-3 ordinance passed by Council in 2012. For these reasons, staff did not feel that additional density allowances were appropriate in MX-L or MX-M, while the highest densities are encouarged in MX-H - the highest-density zone.	Staff is looking for direction from EPC about whether to write a Condition that would provide an upper tier of allowable density in MX-L and/or MX-M, give the higher building heights allowed in those zones in UC-MS-PT areas.
349 (cont'd)	Lambert, Matthew via Blanc, David (cont'd)	DPZ	3/21/17		See Line 347. The building heights in the EDo Regulatory Plan are generally re-established through the Main Street building heights, which allow buildings of up to 55 feet, plus the Workforce Housing bonus of another 12 feet. See Table 4-1-2, starting on page 169. Please note that the EDo regulatory plan limits building heights to 30 within 35 feet of Residential zones, a provision that is carried over in CPO-3 on page 71. It is possible that many properties on the corridor might not be able to maximize building heights or density.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
350	Trujillo, Michael	NMDOH	3/22/17	I remember the initial meetings. I remember seeing what our neighborhood was zoned as, and what it be zoned as under the plan. I recall that the new zone classification was in line with what our neighborhood is, and what it should naturally evolve into. Density is coming to Downtown and it is nice. I like to sometimes fool myself into thinking I am walking in Portland or Chicago when I walk Downtown.	Noted. Staff appreciates all of the public input that has contributed to the draft IDO up to this point.	
351	Trujillo, Michael	NMDOH	3/22/17	Yep, I recall being so satisfied with the plan that eventually saw no reason to go to any more public meetings, which were numerous. I find it odd that very people who said there was no community outreach were people who were in attendance at the early meetings in 2015. They could've spread the word to likeminded neighbors just as I did. What I am saying is that Mikaela and you CABQ folks really got the word out on this one.	Noted. Staff appreciates all of the public input that has contributed to the draft IDO up to this point.	
352	Davis, Kalvin	Geltmore, LLC.	3/22/17	The dimensional standards for the R-ML zone need to be reworked. The minimum lot width should either be eliminated, or be adjusted in conjunction with actual lot depth. Please consider the following example.		Further analysis is needed to respond to this request, which may result in a future Recommended Condition of Approval.

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
353	Davis, Kalvin	Geltmore, LLC.	3/22/17	In the UNM area neighborhood a significant amount of the zoning is proposed to be R-ML. Per the dimensional standards, to develop 'multifamily' on a lot zoned R-ML the lot must be at least 6,000 square feet and have a minimum width of 60 feet. There is a problem with the minimum width criteria as it assumes a lot depth of 100 feet. In the UNM area neighborhood the lots are approximately 140 feet deep and 50 feet wide, meaning that they are about 7,000 square feet. Therefore, the lots in the UNM area neighborhood are around 17% larger in square feet than the minimum required lot size (7,000 square feet vs. 6,000 square feet), but because they are only 50 feet wide they are precluded from developing as 'multifamily.' The minimum lot width to develop 'multifamily' in this area should accommodate lots that are 50 feet wide, so long as they have the appropriate lot area. See the image in the original comment. All the lots zoned R-ML in that graphic would be precluded from multifamily development per the current 60 ft. minimum width standard.		See line 352.
354	Davis, Kalvin	Geltmore, LLC.	3/22/17	Thank you for considering this input. I think reworking this standard is an important step to fostering new "incremental" multifamily development on lots within this area.	Noted. Staff appreciates the public input throughout this process.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
355	Contreras, Mike		3/30/17	We do have a developer wanting to put a call center in the back, apartments in the middle, and retail on the central frontage. These three uses would not only bring needed employment to the area, it would bring needed housing and needed retail. I doubt that the developer I am working with could work within the NR-C zoning, and would need the MX-H zoning. Everything around it is proposed to have the MX-H zoning designation, even the Legacy Church property which is located further west than 7226 Central SW, is proposed to have the MX-H designation. Can you send me the document that shows the guidelines for your zoning proposal? I do not see the justification for what you are proposing.	See Lines 53 and 567-568. See also Lines 360 and 366.	
356	Contreras, Mike		3/30/17	Also, the Legacy Church property is currently zoned SU-1, Church & Related Facilities, it's located further west than 7226 Central SW, and you are planning on changing it to the MX-H designation. We want the 13.5+/- acres located at 7226 Central Ave. SW zoned MX-H, just like the Legacy Church property, and the rest of the properties on the north and south sides of Central to the east and west. This would make it fair and equitable for all.		This conversion was made in error. Staff intends to update the conversion map between EPC's review of the IDO and its introduction at City Council to address inconcsistencies and changes to the conversion criteria made during EPC, as well as approved zone changes.

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
357	Blanchard, Bret		3/30/17	As you are aware, I serve as general counsel for Mountain Run Partners, Ltd. The purpose of this correspondence is twofold. First, this correspondence shall serve as confirmation of our meeting on March 24, 2017. That meeting was requested to discuss the zoning proposed in the contemplated Integrated Development Ordinance (IDO) for a certain parcel of property owned by Mountain Run Partners, which is more particularly described on Exhibit A attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference. The address of the property is 1701 12th Street NW, Albuquerque, New Mexico 87104 ("Property") and the parcel ID number is 101305948009140405. Specifically, the IDO proposes that the Property be zoned NR-LM. As we discussed, Mountain Run Partners would like to change the proposed zoning for the Property. As such, the second purpose of this correspondence is to request, in writing, that the proposed zoning for the property be changed from NR-LM to NR-C.	This comment refers to a location near 12th Street and Aspen Ave NW. This property is currently zoned SU-2/Sawmill-Industrial. The proposed conversion for this zone is NR-LM. Staff is proposing to change the conversion of the Sawmill SU-2/S-I zone to NR-BP, which will preserve more of the C-2 uses allowed in this zone, as well as the live/work use.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
358	Blanchard, Bret		3/30/17	This request should be granted because the current zoning for the property, S-I Sawmill Industrial Zone ("S-I Zone"), allows for a number of commercial uses contemplated by the NR-C Zone. Pursuant to A.2.h of the S-I Zone, uses permissive and as regulated in the C-2 Zone and commercial uses listed in the I-P Zone are allowed provided they are contiguous to an arterial street. A portion of 12th street that runs contiguous to the Property is considered an arterial and therefore the commercial uses listed in A.2.h of the S-I Zone are allowed on the Property. In making this request for NR-C Zoning, Mountain Run Partners agrees to the relinquishment of the rights and/or uses listed in NR- LM Zone not allowed and/or included in the NR-C Zone.		Further analysis is needed to respond to this request, which may result in a future Recommended Condition of Approval.
359	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	Martineztown Work Group (MWG)	4/1/17	In response to the email below on the IDO Zoning Conversion Comments, attached is the letters MWG has sent to the City Planning Staff. On Monday, April 3, 2017 at 3:30 p.m., the MWG would like to see the zoning categories side by side an understand clearly what zones have increased in intensity and if there are zones that have decreased and understand why? The MWG continues to request that the single family dwellings are zoned R-1 before the IDO Zone Code is approved.	Noted. Staff met with the commenter on April 3, 2017 and reviewed the Martineztown/Santa Barbara SDP zones in relation to the proposed IDO zones. See lines a and v about comparing existing zoning to the IDO.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
360	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	MWG	4/1/17	For at least the last 27 years, the residents of Martineztown/Santa Barbara have asked the City to the protect the health, safety and welfare of the residents with R-1 zone. Residents during the Urban Renewal and today expressed that our neighborhood is not for sale and the City continues to ignore our request and allow the business community to dictate our property rights and our right to have a family friendly and environmental protected neighborhood.	ABC-Z is proposing to replace the City's existing system of over 700 individual zones to a set of 22 zones. The IDO aims to most closely match the permissive uses allowed by existing zoning. Because the referenced SU-2/NRC zone refers to C-1 uses, the proposed IDO conversion for this area is MX-L. Discretionary rezonings are contemplated as part of the future CPA Assessment process, but are not within the scope of this project.	
361	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	MWG	4/1/17	On the record, MWG has also stated that all of Martineztown/Santa Barbara should be an Area of Consistency and that there should not be any building higher than two stories. Most importantly, to keep the sector plans. The MX zone legally allows four story apartments obviously this is not compatible with historic neighborhoods and should not be allowed.	Because Martineztown/Santa Barbara has mixed use and industrial zoning throughout the neighborhood, portions have been designated as Area of Change. However, much of the land within the core residential area, with documented residential uses, has been designated as an Area of Consistency in the Comp Plan, adopted by City Council on March 20, 2017.	
362	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	MWG	4/1/17	All emails and any other letters or documents from MWG in regards IDO is required to be part of the EPC packet. Any all documents from MWG should be provided for the record to the Environmental Planning Commission.	Noted.	
363	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	MWG	4/1/17	Martineztown Work Group (MWG) has only begun to touch the surface of a long and complicated Integrated Development Ordinance (IDO). There has been some questions already asked of the Planning Staff regarding the designated zoning and the Intent and MWG awaits a reply.	Noted.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
364	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	MWG	4/1/17	What MWG has found is the document seems to allow government more discretion and allow very limited public process. The troubling part of this document is that it does not provide the current Comp Plan language Intent. "This article is intended to create orderly, harmonious, and economically sound development in order to promote the health, safety, convenience, and general welfare of the citizens of the city."	Noted. See Section 14-16-5 Administration and Enforcement for the development procedures and public notification requirements. See lines 37, 58, 59, h, l, k-m, hh, jj, kk about notification and required meetings. See lines f-m, n, q, t, and u about public involvement. IDO Section 1-3, Purpose, indicates the purpose of the IDO is to implement the Comp Plan, promote econdomic development, protect the health, safety, and general welafare of the public, among other provisions.	
365	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	MWG	4/1/17	What the consultant failed to provide was the public process for the public to be part of the development in IDO. From the first initial meeting with the consultant, he stated he would write the document because it was to technical, but for whose benefit? This document is definitely not for the benefit of residents or the neighborhoods in the city of Albuquerque	See April 6, 2017 Staff Report Section IX Public Engagement. See lines a and z about public involvement opportunities through the IDO drafting process. See also Lines a, z, nn, 403, 419, 420, 572, 575, 581, 584, 588, 591, 592, 604, and 651.	
366	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	MWG	4/1/17	The intensity of zones proposed for Martineztown/Santa Barbara does not reflect the current dominant historical residential land use of single family dwellings. The proposed zoning is detrimental to the health, safety and welfare of the residents. There should be no Area of Change in the adopted Comprehensive Plan for historical Martineztown/Santa Barbara Neighborhood. The only change required is to zone the residential R-1 and to keep and update the neighborhood sector plan.	ABC-Z is proposing to replace the City's existing system of over 700 individual zones to a set of 22 zones. The IDO aims to most closely match the permissive uses allowed by existing zoning. Discretionary rezonings are contemplated as part of the future CPA Assessment process, but are not within the scope of this project.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
367	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	MWG	4/1/17	The proposed designation of our neighborhood does not provide the correct history or does not include the current name, legal boundary or how the City intends to protect the residential area from incompatible land uses that were illegally allowed in a predominantly poor minority historical residential area.	See line 366 about the IDO zone conversion approach.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
368	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	MWG	4/1/17	MWG recommends that each zoning in the current Martineztown/Santa Barbara Neighborhood is reviewed with staff with each current and new zone category side by side for review. This is the only way to understand what goals and objectives the City is considering for the neighborhood, which continues to be contrary to the preservation of our historical residential neighborhood. More importantly, with this clear understanding, the neighborhood will understand what environmental impacts the City continues to impose on the neighborhood. A study needs to be done to see if the Comp Plan provides the neighborhood adequate open spaces for light and air including solar access; avoids undue concentration of population, secures safety from fire, panic, and other dangers; helps control congestion in the streets and public ways; controls and abate unsightly use of buildings or land; to facilitate adequate provisions for community utilities and facilities such as transportation, water, sewer, schools, and parks; encourages the most appropriate use of land; to properly channel flood water runoff; to conserve and stabilize the value of property; and to enhance the appearance of the landscape.	See lines 366 about discretionary rezonings and lines a and v about comparing existing zoning to the IDO.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
369	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	MWG	4/1/17	There is no reason for this document to be long and complicated since the zones were down to only a few categories that do not represent unique Albuquerque Historic Neighborhoods. The neighborhood leaders need time to have each section of IDO thoroughly explained before the plan is approved. MWG recommends a six month review of the document with staff.	See lines 17, 36, 151, 223, 241 about the structure and organization of the IDO. See line z about opportunities for input and revision of the IDO prior to adoption.	
370	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	MWG	4/1/17	What MWG understands to be true is the current public process works so why change the process. If there is any changes there should be stronger regulations to make sure development does not affect the quality of life for all residents and not just a selected certain residents in certain neighborhoods. Furthermore, renters are residents and should not be left out of the public process.	See lines 21, 224, f, h, and dd about neighborhood protections, including Neighborhood Edge provisions, Contextual Standards for residential zones, and Building Design standards intended to result in higher-quality buildings throughout the city. Citywide building design standards in Section 14-16-4-10 are intended to require high-quality development throughout the city. This approach is part of a larger strategy to build in standards for quality up-front rather than negotiate them on a case-by-case basis.	
371	Besim, Hakim		4/1/17	The document is too long and difficult to use. It requires excessive cross-referencing to arrive at a complete picture of what is required for a specific site or project. As it stands now it is likely that it would require the training of individual(s) whose job will be to help applicants, individuals and companies, to understand and follow the detailed requirements set out in the IDO. Pages 9 through 101 can be vastly improved.	See lines 17, 36, 151, 223, 241 about the structure and organization of the IDO. See line z about opportunities for input and revision of the IDO prior to adoption. The City Planning Department currently has a Development Facilitiator Planner who has job duties as suggested in this comment. More information is needed about what specifically should change in pages 9-101.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
372	Besim, Hakim		4/1/17	Section 2-3, pp. 9-52, Residential Zone Districts, that includes Section 2-4, pp. 21-40, Mixed- Use Zone Districts, with the exception of Mixed-Use Form Based Zone (MX-FB), pp. 29-40, Section 2-5, pp. 41-52 Non-Residential Zone Districts, the following comments apply:	See lines 373-380.	
373	Besim, Hakim		4/1/17	The air view drawings are not useful and can be deleted. The axonometric, shown on the reverse side of each zone, can be placed on the front page and can be partially enlarged to show its contextual location relative to adjacent properties.	Noted.	
374	Besim, Hakim		4/1/17	Each zone's dimensional standards must include an **intent** statement for the standards that are indicated in the box that contains standards for the lot, setbacks, building standards, etc. Without the information in an intent statement the numerical standards can easily be considered as arbitrary. It should be noted that the (MX-FB) zone is user friendly and easy to understand and contrasts with the numeric standards, and their related axonometric diagrams, for all other zones.	Noted. The introductory statement for each zone is intended to establish the intent of each zone.	
375	Besim, Hakim		4/1/17	Consider extending the Downtown area standards (MX-FB-DT) to apply to the Downtown Neighborhood Area (CPO-2). East Downtown (CPO-3) can also benefit from MX-FB-DT standards; or consider grouping the parcels indicated into two or three groups and apply general standards to all parcels plus additional specific standards to the two or three groups.	See line 366 about the IDO zone conversion approach.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
376	Besim, Hakim		4/1/17	Coors Boulevard Corridor (CPO-1), pp. 65-67, and (VPO-1), pp. 98-100, rules and standards should be placed together, such as those on pages 98, 99, and also to include those on pp. 392- 394	The CPO and VPO are complementary, but apply to different (and overlapping) geographies. Because they have different purposes, staff believes the currently proposed structure is more clear	
377	Besim, Hakim		4/1/17	Re Garage Types in Volcano Mesa as indicated in Table 2-7-1 on pp. 87, 88. These types might be applicable to other zones.		Further analysis is needed to respond to this request, which may result in a future Recommended Condition of Approval.
378	Besim, Hakim		4/1/17	Consider applying General Standards to all these zones: CP0-4, CPO-5, CPO-6, CPO-7, and CPO-8, plus additional specific standards for each zone as needed. This will simplify implementation	Each CPO was created to reflect the unique standards in areas with SDPs with character and design related regulations. See line 366 about the IDO zone conversion approach.	Further analysis is needed to respond to this request, which may result in a future Recommended Condition of Approval.
379	Besim, Hakim		4/1/17	Old Town (HPO-5), p. 94, building heights should also be controlled relative to their effect on blocking the views of the Sandia Mountains.	The maximum building height in the Old Town CPO is 26, unless otherwise provided in this IDO or the Landmark Commission requires a lower height to protect the character of the area.	
380	Besim, Hakim		4/1/17	An example of a prescriptive standard that is not necessary is item 3-3.2.C.3b. on page 121; the percentage that is indicated in the previous item C.3a is sufficient.		Further analysis is needed to respond to this request, which may result in a future Recommended Condition of Approval.
381	Besim, Hakim		4/1/17	Section 4-9, Solar Access, p. 265: graphics are needed to complement the requirements indicated for building heights.	The table on page 265, Solar Rights Maximum Building Height appears to clearly describe the height allowed at certain distances from the northern lot line. More information is needed about what type of graphic is needed to clarify this table.	
382	Besim, Hakim		4/1/17	Section 4-10, Building Design, pp. 267-271. What are the sources and basis for these standards? Are they inspired by developments in other cities that are deemed successful?	These standards were drawn from the 'Big Box' regulations in the zoning code and made citywide, as part of the projects improvements to raise the quality of design standards for all development	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
383	Besim, Hakim		4/1/17	Section 4-11, Signs, pp. 272-293. Signage requirements should be based on clear design principles and criteria. This section can be streamlined. Graphics are needed. Examples of signage design principles and good graphics can be found in the book *Street Graphics* , by William Ewald, Jr. and Daniel Mandelker.		Staff intends to revise the signage requirements and add illustrations of sign types prior to adoption of the IDO. This will be addressed as a Recommended Condition of Approval.
384	Besim, Hakim		4/1/17	Sections 5-1: Procedures Summary Table, 5-2: Review and Design-Making Bodies, 5-3: The Planning System, 5-4: General Procedures, 5-5: Specific Procedures, 5-6: Non-conformities, 5-7: Violations, Enforcement, and Penalties, pp. 298-385. Are these seven sections taken from the Development Process Manual (DPM)? If they are, do they replace the DPM?	These tables and regulations summarize and carry forward existing procedures primarily found in the current Zoning Code. Some modifications are proposed; these changes are indicated in the footnotes. Many of the procedures in the current DPM are similar to those provided in the zoning code, except many are out of date. They are also not regulatory, as the DPM is not adopted by City Council. The DPM is concurrently being updated to remove overlapping content. This project is being closely coordinated with the IDO effort.	
385	Besim, Hakim		4/1/17	The whole IDO needs to be streamlined with the goal of making it user friendly. Graphics, wherever needed, will help in achieving that goal. Examples of user-friendly graphics are on pages 31-40, 230, 240-244, 248-251, and 254.	This comment reflects the intent of this IDO, which streamlines the current complex regulatory system of a Zoning Code (nearly 400 pages), along with 63 Sector Development Plans with zoning regulations. More information is needed about where more graphics are needed, in addition to the examples listed above.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
386	Bittay-D'Intino, Carrie		4/2/17	I own and live at 1210 Walter ST NE in the Santa Barbara - Martineztown neighborhood and have tremendous concern in regard to a property across from mine which is proposed to be re-zoned as MX-M from its current zone as C-3. This property is sizable and has frontage on Walter ST NE, Mountain, and Edith. Under the current C-3 zone the maximum allowable construction height on this lot is 26' and current existing structures are well below this. Under the proposed MX-M zone, the maximum allowable height is 45' which is a considerable leap from the current allowable height. While I have no qualms with the use allowable under MX- M, with the exception of signage, the allowable height is of particular concern because it is a drastic change from the current allowable height, does not keep with the character of the neighborhood, and is not in keeping with the traditional use of this property and other properties of this size in the neighborhood.		Further analysis is needed to respond to this request, which may result in a future Recommended Condition of Approval.

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
387	Bittay-D'Intino, Carrie		4/2/17	Further, my lot is buffered to the rear (east) by Stone ST which is considerably elevated above this particular section of Walter ST NE. Utilizing a 2016 solar access diagram of Albuquerque along with the accurate longitude and latitude of my lot, it can be undeniably concluded that any structure built immediately in front (west) of my home on Walter ST NE which exceeds the currently allowable 26' building height will significantly impede solar access to my home placing my lot, as well as those adjacent to it, in a veritable pit with a dearth of natural light and resulting in increased energy expenses, decreased quality of life for myself and my family, and possible decrease in property value.	The IDO carries forward Solar Access regulations from the zoning code, however, these only protect land with a Residential zone district.	
388	Bittay-D'Intino, Carrie		4/2/17	I would kindly request that the zoning board and all other committees and boards involved in this decision making process add a codicil and/or exception to this proposed C-3 to MX-M property by maintaining the current maximum allowable height of 26' and by restricting signage to that which is in keeping with the character and traditions of the Santa Barbara - Martineztown neighborhood.	See line 386 and 387.	See line 386 and 387.
389	Krause, Carol	SBMTNA	4/2/17	According to our current 1990 SBMT Sector plan areas with SU 2 C-3 zoning have a max height of 26 ft. This is consistent with surrounding building heights and is consistent with our vision for the future of SBMT.	See line 386 and 387.	See line 386 and 387.

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
390	Krause, Carol	SBMTNA	4/2/17	However the new MX-M zoning, while matching similar uses does not match building height with a 45 ft limit. This is doubling the current max and is unacceptable as nearly all of the SU2 C3 areas are abutting single story residential use areas. Such heights would invade solar rights of neighbors and be inconsistent with the surrounding buildings.	See line 386 and 387.	See line 386 and 387.
391	Krause, Carol	SBMTNA	4/2/17	Please see the attached picture of all C3 areas highlighted in yellow(ish) color. *See the original comment for this map.*	Noted.	
392	Krause, Carol	SBMTNA	4/2/17	This needs to be addressed in the new IDO to ensure we do not burden our community with buildings that are out of character or would create an unwanted hardships for neighbors.	See line 386 and 387.	See line 386 and 387.
393	Black, John		4/3/17	The only change to my IDO comments are that three tracts of land (Tr. 3F-1-A & Tr. 3G-1-A & Tr. 3H of the Black Ranch Subdivision on East Side of Coors north of Paseo del Norte) that recently received a zone change from O-1 to C-1 as attached.		Staff intends to update the conversion map between EPC's review of the IDO and its introduction at City Council to address inconcsistencies and changes to the conversion criteria made during EPC, as well as zone changes approved since December 2016.
394	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	Historic Neighborhood Alliance (HNA)	4/4/17	I have attached the letter from the Historic Neighborhood Alliance to the Environmental Planning Commission with the survey.	Noted.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
395	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	HNA	4/4/17	Greetings! This letter is a follow-up letter, to an original letter sent on March 20, 2017, addressing inequities in the process for the proposed Albuquerque & Bernalillo County Comprehensive Plan and the Integrated Development Ordinance (IDO). The Integrated Development Ordinance, for the City of Albuquerque, is a regulatory document that creates new zoning codes and definitions for land uses, directly impacting private and public property. Both documents should reflect a process that ensured and produced equitable participation so that these documents reflect the values of the entire community and ensure constitutional rights and due process. The public participation process, for the proposed Comprehensive Plan and the IDO, have failed to be inclusive of minorities and provide equal voice in the process of democracy as shown by the City's own data (attached to this letter). **We are requesting that the proposed Integrated Development Ordinance be deferred for 14 – 16 months to allow time for the implementation of our recommendations as outlined in this letter.**	See Lines a, z, nn, 465, 403, 419, 420, 572, 575, 581, 584, 588, 591, 592, 604, and 651 about opportunities for input and revision of the IDO prior to adoption.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
396	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	HNA	4/4/17	The City Resolution, sponsored by Councilor Isaac Benton and Councilor Trudy Jones at the request of Mayor Richard Berry, that initiated this project in 2014, provided for a timeline of 3 to 4 years for this project, "to provide a rigorous public participation process to ensure meaningful input and maximize citizen and stakeholder engagement." Community meetings and outreach efforts were kicked off in 2015. Based on the City's own data, the participation of minorities in the development and vision process for the proposed Albuquerque and Bernalillo Comprehensive Plan and the proposed Integrated Development Ordinance (IDO) was well below their representation in terms of population. From 1,115 polled attendees at these planning meetings, **79% of respondents were white, non-Hispanic**, only **15% of respondents were Hispanic, Latino or Chicano**, **less than 2% for Native Americans.**	Noted.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
397	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	HNA	4/4/17	In county-wide and focus group meetings, **the following statistics** depict the lack of inclusion of minorities in the planning process. On May 20 and 21 of 2015, the city's planning department held 2 county-wide meetings at Los Griegos Community Center and Hiland Theater respectively. At Los Griegos, of the 39 polled attendees, close to 60% were white, non-Hispanic and only 25% were Hispanic, Latino or Chicano. Both Native American (0%) and Black or African Americans (0%) were not represented at these meetings. At the next meeting at Hiland Theater, of the 58 polled attendees, 82% were white, non-Hispanic and only 11% were Hispanic, Latino, or Chicano. Only 2% were Native American and no Black or African Americans were represented at the meeting.	The data cited here refer to demographic information collected at 6 of the Comp Plan kick-off meetings. Similar data was not collected at the remainder of 100+ public meetings for this project. Following these Vision Workshops, the project team requested and received an additonal $50,000 for paid advertising to reach more residents and stakeholders. Please see the attachment to the April 6 staff report for advertising for this project.	
398	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	HNA	4/4/17	Close to half of the population in Bernalillo County is Hispanic (48%) as outlined in the proposed Comprehensive Plan, 80% Hispanic in the South Valley as outlined in the report by University of New Mexico (UNM) Bureau of Business & Economic Research (BBER), and 80%	Noted.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
399	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	HNA	4/4/17	in the West Central Area according to a Retail and Market Analysis Report by Prime Properties for the City of Albuquerque. According to census data, the International District is 61% Hispanic, 23% White Non-Hispanic, 7% Native American, 2% African American and 2% Asian. Millennial participation throughout the planning process was also skewed. At a meeting held at on March 31, 2015 at Tractor Brewing, of the 39 attendees polled, 74% were white, non- Hispanic and only 15% were Hispanic, Latino or Chicano. Less than 5% were Black or African American and 0% were Native American.	Noted.	
400	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	HNA	4/4/17	According to the National Real Estate Investor, currently minorities, specifically Hispanics, make up almost half of all Millennials in the United States. This is also reflected in Bernalillo County, where, according UNM BBER, most Millennials live in southwest area of Bernalillo County and Hispanics make up the largest percentage of the millennial population in Bernalillo County. In addition, according to the Albuquerque Public Schools (APS), two-thirds of APS population identifies as Hispanic, Latino, or Chicano.	Noted.	
401	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	HNA	4/4/17	Data for developers and business owners was also skewed at the May 20, 2015. Of the 33 participants, **over 80% were white**, non-Hispanic and only **13% were Hispanic**, Latino or Chicano. Native Americans (0%), Black or African Americans (4%) and Asians (0%) were not represented at this meeting.	Noted.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
402	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	HNA	4/4/17	The process for developing the proposed Integrated Development Ordinance (IDO) and the proposed Comprehensive Plan, both of which address and affect a community's right to be involved in decisions regarding the development of their land and community, has failed to appropriately include the Spanish speaking community. The draft documents for the Integrated Development Ordinance (IDO) are written in English only. The costs of this budget item should have been prioritized and included in the overall budget for this project and funded by the City, City Councilor discretionary funds, in addition to seeking support from foundations in the state.	Noted.	
403	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	HNA	4/4/17	All this data shows that the City Planners and Consultants implemented a public outreach plan that was culturally insignificant and ineffective. As community-based planners, residents, community members, business owners, retirees, we have asked ourselves is this poor planning, or by design? In particular, why has the City of Albuquerque not notified all property owners, via regular mail, regarding these proposed regulatory changes?	The legal requirements for notice of a change to the Zoning Code includes a legal ad in the newspaper and notice to recognized neighborhood associations. Both have been satisfied for the IDO. For legislative actions, it is not common practice or required by ordinance to mail notice to all property-owners. The project team did consider a postcard mailing, but the cost was in the tens of thousands of dollars. Clearly, more input and more participation is beneficial on a project this important and with such a large scope and potential for impact.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
403 (cont'd)	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta (cont'd)	HNA	4/4/17		The City developed a rigorous public outreach and engagement strategy beginning in February 2015 with multiple meetings in multiple venues at every major milestone in the drafting process, including Module 1 in October 2015, Module 2 in May 2016, Module 3 in August 2016, and the Consolidated Draft in October 2016. Recognizing that public meetings are not the only or even the best way to engage the public, the project team presented by invitation at stakeholder and neighborhood meetings, provided information about the project at 30 community events, and met one-on-one withe property owners and small groups during office hours on Mondays and Fridays.	
403 (cont'd)	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta (cont'd)				The City cannot control who decides to engage, but the project team has tried to provide multiple opportunities and avenues for information, discussions, and input. Information was collected via public meetings, presentations to different stakeholder groups upon request, bilingual online surveys, online IDO Conversion Map comment forms, and office hour appointments. Notification went out through multiple advertising venues, regular project update emails, and notices posted on the project webpage.	
404	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	HNA	4/4/17	We recommend the following proactive solutions and steps to reconcile this inequitable process:	See Lines 405-413.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
405	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	HNA	4/4/17	Defer the proposed City of Albuquerque/Bernalillo County Integrated Development Ordinance for at least 14 – 16 months.	See Lines a, z, nn, 465, 403, 419, 420, 572, 575, 581, 584, 588, 591, 592, 604, and 651 about opportunities for input and revision of the IDO prior to adoption.	
406	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	HNA	4/4/17	Equity not only as a goal of the IDO, but as a process as well, authentically engaging and empowering neighborhoods with inclusive public participation	The 2017 Comp Plan update includes equity as a Guiding Principle and describes the Citizens Academy and Community Planning Area Assessments as ongoing ways to engage and empower communities with inclusive public participation. IDO Section 5-3.3 on page 307 codifies the City's committment to long-range community planning through Community Planning Area Assessments. See also Line 403.	
407	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	HNA	4/4/17	Sector Plans shall remain in effect until Community Planning Assessments are completed through a meaningful neighborhood-based process representing diverse stakeholders.	The SDPs have been retained as part of the Comprehensive Plan, see Appendix D. Retaining Sector Development Plans as regulatory tools after adoption of the IDO would create two sets of rules for approximately 50% of the City. Those portions of the City covered by SDPs would not receive the benefit of the additional protections added to the IDO. This could also cause conflict in different review and approval processes.	
408	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	HNA	4/4/17	Community-based development according to Sector Development Plans as equitable tools (participation, input and legal standing) for communities to engage in the development and protection of their neighborhoods.	Agree. More information is needed about what specifically should change in the IDO to reflect this recommendation.	
409	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	HNA	4/4/17	Work in partnership with the Racial Equity Project, which is convened by Living Cities. The City of Albuquerque was identified and selected as a site to address racial equity.	Agree. More information is needed about what specifically should change in the IDO to reflect this recommendation.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
410	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	HNA	4/4/17	Proper, equitable notification to residents and neighbors, for example: Sending notifications through the County Assessor mailing regarding property values and taxes in addition to utility bills such as electric or gas bill.	Noted. See lines 37, 58, 59, h, I, k-m, hh, jj, kk, 598, and 599 about notification and meetings required by the IDO.	
411	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	HNA	4/4/17	Publishing drafts of the plan in Spanish (and other languages) as equitably as possible Develop a working group composed of multiple, diverse stakeholders from neighborhoods, to initiate a culturally significant and effective strategic community-based development plan of action, ensure meaningful integration of community feedback and recommendations, oversee implementation, and conduct yearly evaluations based on metric defined by the neighborhoods.	Drafts of the Comp Plan were translated into Spanish, and meetings were conducted in Spanish. Spanish-speaking staff is available at every public meeting to communicate with individuals who prefer to use Spanish. The recommendation to engage a working group of diverse stakeholders is envisioned as part of the Community Planning Area assessment process, see Section 5-3 of the IDO. The Comp Plan has adopted two short-term actions to assist in this effort, see Chapter 12 Actions 12.5.5.2 and 12.5.5.3	
412	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	HNA	4/4/17	Require all City/County Staff Planners, the Director of Planning for the City of Albuquerque and Bernalillo County, the Mayor for the City of Albuquerque, and all Albuquerque City Council Members and Bernalillo County Commissioners to participate in an Anti-Racism training specific to the history of land use and zoning in the Southwest, specific to the history of New Mexico.	Agree. This has been incorporated in the Comp Plan as an ongoing action for City staff, see Chapter 12 Action 12.5.5.1.	
413	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	HNA	4/4/17	Identify and work with planning experts from our neighborhoods who know our unique history, culture, and traditions of planning and development. The consultants should reflect the diversity of the neighborhoods. This is part of any job creation strategy.	Agree. This is envisioned as part of the Community Planning Area assessment process, see Section 5-3 of the IDO.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
414	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	HNA	4/4/17	This work can be accomplished through funds that the City has for planning to address poverty and equity work. What is the status of this funding?	Staff believes the commenter is requesting the status of UDAG funds, which are outside the scope of ABC-Z. Requests for the status of these funds should be directed to the Department of Family & Community Services, which controls these funds. The Community Planning Area Assessments will be the work of long-range planners within the Planning Department.	
415	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	HNA	4/4/17	In closing, we are requesting that the proposed Integrated Development Ordinance (IDO) be deferred for 14 to 16 months to allow time for the implementation of the recommendations outlined in this letter. Repeating past mistakes that have been made through inequitable planning policies, trends, and best practices do not serve our city. We invite you to develop a vision for our communities that is equitable, ensures due process, upholds our constitutional rights, ensures civil rights, environmental justice, traditional and historical land rights and decision-making, and community-based planning that builds community.	This work is envisioned as part of the Community Planning Area assessment process, see Section 5-3 of the IDO. See lines a and z about public involvement opportunities through the IDO drafting process.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
416	Gallagher, Pat		4/4/17	A relatively simple process just approved the new Comp Plan in City Council. The Comp Plan is a complicated policy statement with far reaching implications. Quite more complicated is the IDO. It is regulatory. The new document proposes thousands of changes of regulatory law affecting hundreds of thousands of citizens. Every page of the nearly 500 page document contains changes in the way business is to be done in developing land in Albuquerque. Clearly the development interests got a head start in proposing these changes, and the Planning Department spent two years putting it all together. Now the citizens have but a few weeks to find the changes, analyze their effects, write comments and prepare for a public forum. This is impossible, unfair and a degradation of governance.	See Lines a, z, nn, 465, 403, 419, 420, 572, 575, 581, 584, 588, 591, 592, 604, and 651 about opportunities for input and revision of the IDO prior to adoption.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
417	Gallagher, Pat		4/4/17	Perhaps the most far reaching change is how the EPC itself is involved. Power is shifted to the executive branch to approve plans heretofore the province of the EPC and the public. They call it streamlining; we call it a power grab. Currently, Site Plans get reviewed by the EPC based on well considered Sector Plan criteria. The proposed new IDO sweeps away that process with administrative approval and the public is not even notified. Only a Big Box-sized development would trigger EPC scrutiny.	See IDO Section 5-5.2F about the thresholds of site plans proposed to go to the EPC for review and line h about the amount of current site plans that go to EPC for review. See lines i, k-m, n, x, y, 509, 541-543, and 568-570 for information about the EPC's role and thresholds for approvals. See lines 37, 58, 59, h, I, k-m, hh, jj, kk, 598, and 599 about neighborhood notification and required meetings under the IDO regulations. See lines 221, 224, 370, f, h, dd, 596, and 612 about neighborhood protections, including Neighborhood Edge provisions, Contextual Standards for residential zones, and Building Design standards intended to result in higher-quality buildings throughout the city.	
418	Gallagher, Pat		4/4/17	On the West Side we have just experienced the future IDO and it is not pretty. A development approved in 2005, was somehow revived and the public was not notified. Administrative approval allowed its flawed View Preservation analysis to go forward without proper correction. Buildings will get built that obstruct views of the mountains and Bosque and no one can be held accountable. No appeal is available. The public is currently the only channel for doing and checking legitimate view analysis and we are being cut out of the process.	All decisions that the City makes can be appealed, under the current zoning code and the proposed IDO. See Lines h and 547.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
419	Gallagher, Pat		4/4/17	Regarding the IDO version of the View Preservation regulation, small variations in definitions will allow ambiguous calculation of "massing," which is a very important part of the regulation. Furthermore the fairly simple 1984 Coors Corridor version is scattered among the Comp Plan, the regulatory section of the IDO and its separate definitions section. It is virtually impossible to comprehend and follow as proposed. This regulation alone took years to develop and now we must digest the new version in a few short weeks. Adding insult to injury, the EPC is being pushed to approve its own dismissal/recusal from this important process.	SSee Lines a, z, nn, 465, 403, 419, 420, 572, 575, 581, 584, 588, 591, 592, 604, and 651 about opportunities for input and revision of the IDO prior to adoption. The IDO intends to make the regulations more clear and easy to understand within the regulatory context, because the policies are not enforcable. More information is needed about what specifically needs to change in the IDO to maintain the current View Preservation regulations from the Coors Corridor Plan.	Further analysis is needed to respond to this request, which may result in a future Recommended Condition of Approval.
420	Gallagher, Pat		4/4/17	Only a few examples are shown here; there are hundreds more that could and should be addressed. This IDO needs to be dismantled and considered in its parts. There should be a public hearing on every part of each Sector Plan that is being deconstructed. Only in this way can we, the people, and the EPC retrieve the voice it has had in the arena of land development.	See line a about the approach to breaking out the IDO into Modules for serial public review of the different sections. The IDO project did not promise to carry forward each individual regulation from the 63 SDPs that contain regulations, rather the purpose was to carry forward the best rules to make them citywide where that made sense, and to retain area-sepecific regulations where the regulations were only suited for a smaller geography. Revising and updating regulations is within the legislative power of the City; more information is needed about what specifically needs to change in the IDO to respond to this comment.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
421	Michels, Donna		4/4/17	The IDO Zoning Conversion Map needs to provide users with more details. For instance, the parcel of land at 1325 Park Ave SW, Albuquerque, NM 87102 is labeled on the map as “PD,” which the map legend identifies as “Planned Development.” But the map doesn't provide a way to find out what development is planned for the parcel. This creates uncertainty. Please improve the IDO Zoning Conversion Map to add clarity to zoning designations.	The IDO Conversion Map provides information about the current zoning and the proposed IDO conversion zone. At this property, the current zone is "SU-1 for PRD with R-3 restrictions." Below the map are instructions for understanding the existing and proposed zoning. For sites with the SU-1 zone, a resident must visit the file room in the Planning Department on the 3rd floor, Plaza del Sol, 600 2nd Street to view the approved site plan for their property. The PD zone carries forward the approved site plan entitlements and restrictions.	Eventually, Staff would like to review the approved site plans for all of the land in the City zoned R-D and SU-1 for PRD to determine the best base zone for each part of the development. This analysis may have to occur after adoption of the IDO during the community assessment process.
422	Murphy, Kim		4/4/17	I have reviewed Planning Staff's tabulation of Public Comments assembled for the EPC Hearing on April 6, 2017. My particular interest relates to Staff responses to matters raised in my previous memo dated January 17, 2017, as addressed in Comments 98 through 139.	See Lines 98-139 for previous comments.	
423	Murphy, Kim		4/4/17	I appreciate very much Staff's effort to reply to these questions, comments and concerns, many of which have been satisfactorily clarified. However, there are several issues that require additional consideration. They fall into two general categories: 1) those that relate to the "validity" of existing Master Development Plans, and 2) general matters.	Noted.	
424	Murphy, Kim		4/4/17	Existing Master Development Plans:	See Lines 425-427.	
425	Murphy, Kim		4/4/17	Concur with Staff response to Comment 105 that Master Development Plans should be defined as a subset of "Master Plans"	Noted. See Line 105.	See Line 105.

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
426	Murphy, Kim		4/4/17	For the purpose of determining appropriate development review procedure under 14-16-5 (Administration & Enforcement), Master Development Plans approved prior to the IDO effective date should be designated "Policy Decisions: Amendment to Zone Map- EPC" (14-16-5-5.3.B). Discussion/Rationale: Staff response to Comment 105 highlights possible confusion between Master Development Plans (aka Site Plan for Subdivision) and Site Plans. Historically, Master Development Plans are principally zoning instruments, often combined with development standards, which have been approved by the EPC. As such, they are policy decisions that are much different than physical site plans. Clarifying that EPC will maintain jurisdiction over these prior-approved zoning documents provides important historic consistency.		Staff is working on a Condition that would require Master Development Plans for new NR-BP zone designations (i.e. zone changes for more than 20 acres) to be approved by the EPC as a policy decision, similar to requirements for the PD or PC zones, which also go to EPC. Future *amendments* of Master Development Plans (existing prior to IDO or after the effective date) could be reviewed and decided by the DRB. Properties with existing NR-BP zoning but no adopted Master Development Plans would develop with a Site Plan via the thresholds for decision-making bodies in the IDO (i.e. size limits for Administrative or DRB).
427	Murphy, Kim		4/4/17	Sections 14-16-5-6.5 (Nonconforming Signs) and 14-16-5-6.6 (Nonconforming Site Features) should be amended to provide that development parcels within existing Master Development Plans approved prior to the IDO effective date and where at least 50% of a particular parcel area or 50% of the approved gross square footage of such parcel has been developed as of the IDO effective date will be governed by the applicable sign and site feature development standards set forth in said Master Development Plan, so long as such sign and site features relate to a permitted use, i.e. not an approved conditional use or a nonconforming use.		Further analysis is needed to respond to this request, which may result in a future Recommended Condition of Approval.

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
428	Murphy, Kim		4/4/17	Discussion/Rationale: Currently the draft IDO does not adequately deal with partially developed or potentially redeveloping existing Master Development Plans that have pre- IDO approval. Staff responses to Comment 101 seem to focus on changes to an approved site plan and not to future phases of an approved Master Development Plan. Today, existing development within the built portion of the Master Development Plan conforms to the approved development standards. So long as the development is at least 50% complete, it seems reasonable that future phases should conform to the development standards contained in the approved Master Development Plan to ensure consistency of design, aesthetics, and functionality.	See Line 427.	Further analysis is needed to respond to this request, which may result in a future Recommended Condition of Approval.
429	Murphy, Kim		4/4/17	General Matters:	See Lines 430-433.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
430	Murphy, Kim		4/4/17	MX-L Zone: Include the following as conditional uses: o Personal and business services, large o General retail, medium	The IDO proposes to change future developments in the MX-L zone by limiting the size of each individual business to smaller sizes than would be allowed in the C-1 zone. The pupose of this is to retain a smaller scale for development that is in close proximity to neighborhoods and to retain the neighborhood serving character envisioned by this zone. Adding medium and large size retail and services goes contrary to the new tool to regulate the impacts of different uses by their size. Staff has received comments to reconsider the thresholds for the small, medium, and large sizes of retail and services, which would be a better solution to allowing the size and types of buisinesses appropriate to each level Mixed Use zone. See Lines89, 111, 306, and 307.	Further analysis is needed to respond to this request, which may result in a future Recommended Condition of Approval.
431	Murphy, Kim		4/4/17	All MX & NR Zones: Increase general retail building square foot parameters in order to align with market conditions, as follows: o General retail, small: <15,000 sf (currently 10,000 sf in draft) o General retail, medium: 15,000 sf to 65,000 sf (currently 10,000 sf to 50, 000 in draft); groceries: <80,000 sf (currently 70,000 sf in draft) o General retail, large: >65,000 sf (currently 50,000 sf in draft); groceries: >80,000 sf (currently 70,000 sf)	See line 430.	See line 430.

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
432	Murphy, Kim		4/4/17	Section 5-4.23 (Expiration of Approvals): Although an existing regulation is in place (14-16-3-11), I'd recommend that the time periods be "reset" to those proposed in the IDO.	See Line 116.	Further analysis is needed to respond to this request, which may result in a future Recommended Condition of Approval.
433	Murphy, Kim		4/4/17	Section 5-5.2.D (Expansion of Nonconforming Use or Structure): 2,500 sf limitation seems unreasonably low.	Currently, the nonconforming regulations are applicable to building expansions of 250 SF or more. The IDO has increased this number to reflect a more reasonable threshold than today's regulation.	Staff is looking for direction from EPC about whether to write a Condition that allows larger percentages to reflect a reasonable building expansion size for small and large lots.
434	Wolfley, Jolene	TRNA	4/4/17	TRNA submitted a revised version of these comments after the 1 p.m. deadline of 4 April 2017. See Lines 916-950 for the full comments, as revised.	See Lines 916-950	
435	Leach, Mike	CARNM	4/4/17	Page 24 Mixed Use Moderate Density replaces C-2 on Page 25 it says “no outdoor storage” Presently there are plenty of properties zoned C2 that do have a need for outside storage. For example a gas automotive repair shop, paint and body shop, etc. I would think it would be reasonable to add on this page “no outdoor storage unless it is screened by solid wall or opaque fence 6” in height when abutting residential zoned property”.	Note: comments in lines 435-479 all refer to the October Draft. This note has been deleted from the MX-M District Standards, on page 26. See new footnote 48 documenting this change.	
436	Leach, Mike	CARNM	4/4/17	3.2 Permitted Use Table.	See Lines 437-479.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
437	Leach, Mike	CARNM	4/4/17	Dwelling, live-work Page 98. Presently our zoning code allows a watchmen's quarters under M-1 and M-2 zoning. This table needs to be either changed to "Dwelling, live-work, watchman's quarters or a new heading in the table labeled "Dwelling watchman's quarters" and should be labeled either a P or an A under NR-LM (M-1) or NR-GM (M-2). It should also be defined in the definitions portion of the IDO as "Dwelling, Watchman's Quarters"	The use Dwelling Unit, accessory has been extended to all Non-Residential zones in response to this comment. See revised footnote 301 that documents this change.	
438	Leach, Mike	CARNM	4/4/17	Sorority or fraternity Page 99. The definition in the IDO is for sororities and fraternities associated with an educational institution to house students. There are also other fraternal organizations within the City and County that are not associated with an educational institution. For example American Legion, Veterans, Elks, Order of Eagles, Fraternal Order of Police. Either another category for these private non-educational related fraternal organizations needs to be added into the table and also a definition for these types of fraternity needs to be added. Presently these types of fraternities are located in C2 through M1. This category should be a P under the new NR-C, NR-BP, NR-LM and NR-GM.	The use "Sorority or fraternity" on page 106 is a type of group living, and is listed with other Group Living uses. The type of social and fraternial organizations mentioned in this comment are considered to be "Club or event facility" in the IDO. See page 111. This use is permissive in the C-1 to M-1 equivalent zones (MX-L to NR-LM). It has been added as a conditional use in the O-1/MX-T zone and as a conditional vacant use in the M-2/NR-GM zone. See footnote 242 documenting this change.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
439	Leach, Mike	CARNM	4/4/17	Adult or child day care page 100, should be a P under NR-LM (M-1) and NR-GM (M2) not an A. I know of several day care facilities in Albuquerque metro area that are in M-1 zoning.	In order to reflect the primary purpose of the NR-LM and NR-GM zones, this has been added as an accessory use to the primary manufacturing uses. Existing day care facilities will remain legal, nonconforming uses after adoption of the IDO. See footnote 194 documenting this change.	
440	Leach, Mike	CARNM	4/4/17	Under Elementary or middle school and also under High school page 100 we need to add "Charter school". We have all leased and sold property to Charter Schools. The last one I did was to Corrales International School at 5500 Wilshire NE. Property is zoned M1. This should be allowed as a P under both NR-LM (M-1) and NR-GM (M-2). Some charter schools are specialized in town as Vocational Schools. Page 101 allows a vocational school in all commercial zoning.	The definition for school in Section 6-1 on page 417 would include charter schools in the elementary/middle or high school use categories. There is no need to distinguish charter schools separately in Use Table 3-2-1.The IDO generally permits school permissively in all the Mixed-use zones, NR-C, and NR-BP. Schools do not seem to be a compatible or appropriate use in the industrial zones NR-LM or NR-GM. After a discussion with the commenter, schools were added as a CV (conditional vacant) use in M-1, as an appropriate use for a building that has been vacant for longer than 5 years.	Staff is considering a Condition to make Vocational schools CV within NR-LM and NR-GM, consistent with the University or college use.

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
441	Leach, Mike	CARNM	4/4/17	Under Nursery page 101 why does the table have no nursery allowed under any commercial zoning and a C under NR-LM (M-1) and NR-GM (M-2)? Then they have a note 199 that says first sentence "Availability extended to NC-LM and NC-GM." If it has been extended then it should be a P not a C. It should also be a "P" for MX-M (C-2) MX-H through NR-GM (M-2). For some reason the City does not want residents to be able to buy nursery products in town. As written any future business that wants to use a future site as a nursery business pretty much will not be able to have a nursery. This would also apply to the big box retailers Home Depot, Wal-Mart, Lowes etc.	The Nursery use, on page 108 of the IDO, is intended to apply to the larger industrial-agricultural operations that are very land intensive, and not appropriate in the Mixed-Use Zones. See Nursery definition on page 411. Small scale retail operations, which may grow plant starts, such as big box retailers and garden stores would be regulated as a General Retail use, allowed in a variety of zones depending on the size of the business. See page 113 of the IDO. See footnote 263, which indicates the retail sale of "flowers and plants" is included in this new use category.	
442	Leach, Mike	CARNM	4/4/17	Under Health Club or Gym Page 102 should be a "P" under NR-BP (IP), NR-LM (M-1) and NR-GM (M-2). Almost every personal training gym, cross fit gym and exercise facilities that have opened up in the last 10 years go to IP and M-1 properties because they need high ceilings (i.e. a warehouse type of property). Having this as an "A" will hurt future businesses that may want to open an gym because all warehouse inventory in Albuquerque will most likely qualify as a gym location because of the way the IDO is presently drafted.	The Health club or gym use, on page 109, has been extended as a permissive use in the NR-C, NR-BP, and NR-LM to respond to this comment. It remains an Accessory use in the M-2/NR-GM zone to reflect the primary intent of that zone to maintain land zoned appropriately for larger industrial and larger-scale job creating businesses. See footnote 221 that documents this change.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
443	Leach, Mike	CARNM	4/4/17	Under Restaurant Page 102 it should be a P under NR-GM (M-2).	The Restaurant use, on page 109, is allowed as an Accessory use in the M-2/NR-GM zone in response to this comment. See footnote 224 that documents this change. See lines 439 and 442.	
444	Leach, Mike	CARNM	4/4/17	Under Heavy Equipment Sales, Rental, Fueling and Repair Page 103 should be a P under NR-C (C-3) and NR-BP (IP). Wagner Equipment formerly Rust Tractor the Caterpillar Dealer on Osuna is on IP zoned land. Under the definition for this use this is exactly what the Caterpillar dealer does on the IP zoned land. Throughout this table I am seeing that the City Planning for some reason wants to remove all of the present uses that are allowed in IP zoning. I believe they want NR-BP to be just for office buildings and possibly high tech. If they eliminate the other uses in IP they will continue to hurt businesses in Albuquerque and our local economy.	The Heavy vehicle and equipment sales, rental, feuling, and repair use, on page 110 has been extended to the IP/NR-LM zone in response to this comment. It has not been extended to the NR-C zone. See footnote 233 that documents this change. See lines 439 and 442 about the uses allowed in the Non-residential zones. See line 439 about uses that become nonconforming with adoption of the IDO.	
445	Leach, Mike	CARNM	4/4/17	Under Light Vehicle Repair Page 103, should be P under NR-GM not an A.	The Light vehicle repair use, on page 110, has been made permissive in the NR-GM zone in response to this comment. See footnote 235 that documents this change.	
446	Leach, Mike	CARNM	4/4/17	Under Outside Vehicle Storage Page 103, should be a P under MX-M (C-2), NR-C (C-3) and NR-BP (IP). They allow under Light Vehicle Repair as a P in these zones. Most vehicles are stored outside in a fenced yard. If they need to add language about yard screening they should.	Screening is already a requirement in the Mixed Use zones. The intent of the IDO is not to allow Outdoor vehicle storage as a primary use in the Mixed Use zones. Parking operable vehicles outside in the course of other businesses, such as vehicle repair and auto sales will still be permitted in the Mixed Use zones.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
447	Leach, Mike	CARNM	4/4/17	Under Bank and Club or event facility Page 103 why is it a "CV" under NR-GM (M-2). Why should a bank, club or event facility be prevented from locating on NR-GM (M-2) zoned property? Should be a P	See lines 439 and 442 about the uses allowed in the Non-residential zones.	
448	Leach, Mike	CARNM	4/4/17	Under Construction contractor facility and yard Page 104, should be a P under NR-C (C-3) and NR-BP (IP). All of the larger commercial contractors located in the North I25 corridor are either located on M-1 or I-P zoned property. Again as I mentioned above, the City Planning seems to wanting to eliminate lots of uses that are presently allowed in our present IP zoning.	The use Construction contractor facility and yard, on page 111, is still listed as a Conditional use in the MX-M, NR-C, and NR-BP zones.	Further analysis is needed to respond to this request, which may result in a future Recommended Condition of Approval.
449	Leach, Mike	CARNM	4/4/17	Under Retail Sales Bakery Goods and Confectionary Shop page 105, should be a P under NR-LM. Earth Grains (formerly Rainbow Bakery) and Pastians Baker are presently in M-1. Note 244 says "Added to NR-C, NR-BP, NR-LM and NR-GM districts". If that is the case then why does the table say "A" under NR-LM (M-1) and NR-GM (M-2)?	The Bakery goods or confectionery shop use, on page 112, has been extended as a Permissive use in the M-1/NR-LM and M-2/NR-GM zones. See footnote 260 that documents this change.	
450	Leach, Mike	CARNM	4/4/17	Under Transportation Railroad Yard page 106, should be a P under NR-LM (M-1). Almost all of the existing rail served property in the Albuquerque metro area are either M-1 or M-2.	The Railroad yard use, on page 114, has been extended as a Permissive use in the M-1/NR-LM zone. See footnote 272 that documents this change.	
451	Leach, Mike	CARNM	4/4/17	Under Wholesaling and Storage, Cold Storage Plant Page 108 should be a P under NR-C (C-3) and NR-BC (IP).		Further analysis is needed to respond to this request, which may result in a future Recommended Condition of Approval.
452	Leach, Mike	CARNM	4/4/17	Under Wholesaling and Storage, Outdoor Storage Page 108 should be a P under NR-LM (M-1).		Further analysis is needed to respond to this request, which may result in a future Recommended Condition of Approval.

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
453	Leach, Mike	CARNM	4/4/17	Under Wholesaling and Storage, Above-ground storage of fuels or feed Page 108. I believe they mean for the huge storage containers on the south side of town. There needs to be some clarification on this for all the businesses around town that have an above ground gasoline storage tank stored in a concrete containment barrier where this is a P in NR-C (C-3), NR-BP (IP), NR-LM (M-1).	This use is intended to regulate the storage of fuels or feed as a primary use of a site. Storage of fuels or feed that are ancillary to the primary operations of another business or use will continue to be allowed. This may warrant clarification in the definition section or through Use-Specific Standards.	Further analysis is needed to respond to this request, which may result in a future Recommended Condition of Approval.
454	Leach, Mike	CARNM	4/4/17	Under Wholesaling and Storage, Wholesaling and distribution center page 108, this needs to be a P under NR-BP (I-P). Probably 75% of Albuquerque's distribution space is presently located in IP zoning. Again, I believe this is another example where City Planning visions NR-BP to be only for office buildings and R & D facilities. If this stays as not permissive under NR-BP (IP) the unintended consequences will be detrimental to the future economic growth of Albuquerque.	The Wholesaling and distribution center use, on page 116, has been added as a Permissive use in the IP/NR-BP zone. See footnote 293 that documents this change. This use has also been added as a Conditional Accessory use in several Mixed Use zones. See lines 439 and 442 about the uses allowed in the Non-residential zones.	
455	Leach, Mike	CARNM	4/4/17	Under Accessory Uses, Drive-through or drive-up facility page 109, should be listed as an A under both NR-LM (M-1) and NR-GM (M-2). A bank or a driveup fast food restaurant should be allowed to locate in NR-LM (M-1) and NR-GM (M-2) and have a drive-up/drive-through with their business.	Since the October Draft, Restaurant has been added as a Permissive use in the NR-LM zone and Accessory use in the NR-GM zone. It seems appropriate to also add drive up facility as accessory in those zones. See lines 439 and 442 about the uses allowed in the Non-residential zones.	On page 116, for the Drive-through or drive-up facility use, add an "A" to the NR-LM and NR-GM zones.

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
456	Leach, Mike	CARNM	4/4/17	Under Accessory Uses, Parking of more than two truck tractors and two semitrailers for more than two hours page 110, should be an A under NR-C (C-3) and NR-BP (IP). As mentioned above wholesaling and distribution has truck deliveries all day long with semis being stored overnight etc.	This use is allowed as a Conditional Accessory use in the NR-C and NR-BP zones, on page 118. See lines 439 and 442 about the uses allowed in the Non-residential zones.	Further analysis is needed to respond to this request, which may result in a future Recommended Condition of Approval.
457	Leach, Mike	CARNM	4/4/17	Under Accessory Uses, Parking of non-commercial vehicle should be an A under all commercial zoning. As written this could be interpreted that an employee who works a night shift is not allowed to park his personal vehicle at work. I believe they are only thinking residential		Further analysis is needed to respond to this request, which may result in a future Recommended Condition of Approval.
458	Leach, Mike	CARNM	4/4/17	Under Accessory Uses, Parking of recreational vehicle, boat, and/or recreational trailer. A category should be added for RV Storage. Most of our RV Storage, boat storage and trailer storage is either in C3, IP, M1 or M2. So shouldn't it be a category under Wholesaling and Storage on Page 108 and added as a P under NR-C, NR-BP, NR-LM and NR-GM?	The use Light vehicle sales and rental, on page 110, includes this use when it is the primary use of a site, as is described in this comment. It is permissive in all the zones requested.	On page 110, for the Light vehicle sales and rental use, add "storage" to more accurately reflect the range of business types captured by this IDO use category. Revise footnote 236 to include reference to storage and sales of boats.
459	Leach, Mike	CARNM	4/4/17	Use Regulations Commercial Uses Page 124 Paragraph L. Light Vehicle Fueling Station,	See line 460.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
460	Leach, Mike	CARNM	4/4/17	subparagraph 3 "No inoperable vehicles shall be stored outside an enclosed building". There are a number of gas stations that also have an automotive repair component. If they are not done with repairing a car where it is still "inoperable" they normally store a car outside in a fenced secured yard area if they do not have room within the shop. This needs to be amended with allowing outside storage provided it is adequately screened.	On page 132, the Use-Specific Standard for Light Vehicle Repair provides andditional standards for this use. A Light Vehicle Fueling Station could also conduct Light Vehicle Repair in the zones that allow both uses. See line 439 about uses that become nonconforming with adoption of the IDO.	
461	Leach, Mike	CARNM	4/4/17	Subparagraph 4 "This use shall not be located where the only vehicle access to the lot is from a local street". What does this mean? You have to drive-in from a street to get into a gas station. Should they add "residential" between the words "local and street".	This use specific standard is intended to require at least one access to Light Vehicle Fueling Stations to be from a road classified as a collector or arterial street. See line 439 about uses that become nonconforming with adoption of the IDO.	
462	Leach, Mike	CARNM	4/4/17	Subparagraph 5 This paragraph contradicts Paragraph 4 above because it says access is from a street.	More information is needed about what specifically should change in the IDO to respond to this comment. It is unclear what is contradictory about provisions 4 and 5.	
463	Leach, Mike	CARNM	4/4/17	Use Regulations Commercial Uses Page 125 Paragraph M. Light Vehicle Repair. Subparagraph 1. Limiting outdoor storage to two inoperable vehicles at anytime. This number needs to be raised. Maybe a city planner should talk to a typical mechanics shop on what is reasonable		Further analysis is needed to respond to this request, which may result in a future Recommended Condition of Approval.

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
464	Leach, Mike	CARNM	4/4/17	Use Regulations Commercial Uses Page 126 Paragraph P. Bank. Subparagraph 2. Banks have to be 1 mile apart from each other? What is this about? Do they mean title loans or normal banking institutions? This should be deleted or the definition needs to be expanded or another category added. Subparagraph 3 the beginning of the sentence "Regardless of whether any use was established prior to the adoption of the required separation distances in this Section 3-3.4p" should be deleted, remaining sentence should stay.	On page 135, the second provision is intended to only apply to Small Loan Businesses (title and short term loans). Only the first provision is intended to apply to all types of bank.	On page 135, revise R.2 to read: "A Small Loan Business may not be located…" to clarify that it does not apply to all banks. Revise R.3 to delete the phrase "Regardless of whether any use was established prior to the adoption of the required separation distances in Section 14-16-3-3.4R" and retain the sentence: "All Small Loan Businesses are subject to these annual reporting requirements. On page 421, add the following defined term to carry forward the current zoning code definition: "Small Loan Business. Any business requiring licensure under the New Mexico Small Loan Business Act, NMSA 1978 Sections 58-15-1 through 58-15-39, including but not limited to businesses offering Payday Loans, Title Loans, Installment Loans, or Refund Tax Anticipation Loans."
465	Leach, Mike	CARNM	4/4/17	Use Regulations Commercial Uses Page 127 Paragraph S. Office Subparagraph 2 and 3 please explain why bail bonds need to be 1 mile apart from each other? Subparagraph 3 please define what a "Small Loan Business" is?	On page 135, Personal and Business Services, the separation distance for bail bonds offices carries forward a provision from the Downtown Neighborhood Association Sector Development Plan, and expands the protections citywide. The intent is to prevent potential impacts within a neighborhood by distributing the uses. See line 439 about uses that become nonconforming with adoption of the IDO.	On page 421, add a definition for "Small Loan Business."

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
466	Leach, Mike	CARNM	4/4/17	Use Regulations Commercial Uses Page 129 Paragraph AA. Liquor Store Subparagraph 3. Why is the 1,000 ft requirement away from any other liquor store being added. There are plenty of properties where a grocery store sells liquor and within a strip center being anchored by a grocery store there is a specialty liquor store. For example Smiths grocery on North 4th street. Across the street is “Kelly’s Liquors”. Almost every grocery store in Albuquerque along with some Drug stores that sell liquor are within 500 feet of some kind of residential zoning of single and multi-family zoning. If the 500 feet from the property line of a shopping center for example or is 500 feet from the physical liquor store to a residential area?	The existing Zoning Code describes liquor retail as "off-premises" sale of alcohol, which is often a concern of neighbors and residents. See Line 837. The existing zoning code has a provision that the City has been injoined from enforcing limiting the sale of minis, fortified beer and wine, broken packages, etc. Many SDPs limit liquor retail in myriad ways. The IDO attempts to replace these limits on liquor retail with a consistent, enforceable provision for distance separation from properties where liquor is sold for off-premises consumption. Unlike the existing Zoning Code, which measures from the point-of-sale (which can be tricky to enforce and leads to loopholes), the IDO defines this measurement from property line to property line. See Section 6-1 Definitions, "Measurement, Separation of Uses," on page 409.	
467	Leach, Mike	CARNM	4/4/17	Use Regulations Commercial Uses Page 129 Paragraph BB. Pawn Shop. Why are they saying pawn shops have to be 2 mile radius from other pawn shops?	Pawn shops are regulated per Table 3-2-1 on page 113, with Use Specific Standard 3-3.4.EE starting on page 138. Pawn shops were brought up as a concern by residents through focus groups and meetings during the ABC-Z process. See line 465 about separation distances. See line 439 about uses that become nonconforming with adoption of the IDO.	On page 138, revise Section 3-3.4.EE to one mile, consistent with the standard for Small Loan Businesses that Council adopted (now included in the Use Specific Standard for Banks per 3-3.4.R).

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
468	Leach, Mike	CARNM	4/4/17	Use Regulations Commercial Uses Page 137 Paragraph L. Outdoor Storage NR-C (C-3), NR-BP (IP), NR-LM (M-1) should be exempted like NR-GM (M-2). Subparagraph 2 still have language that any item taller than a screening wall will have to be stored 100 feet from the screening wall. This 100 feet requirement needs to be deleted. If this is not deleted anyone with construction equipment will be required to purchase excess land to meet this 100 foot requirement. This is an unintended consequences paragraph that will hurt our economy for business that will not locate in Albuquerque.	Removing the regulations to screen outdoor storage in the NR-C, NR-BP, and NR-LM zones runs contrary to current practice and what is proposed in the IDO. There are many locations with residential uses directly abutting industrial and manufacturing properties, and this is one of the ways to protect and buffer adjacent uses. The exclusion of the NR-GM category was made to reflect the higher intensity allowed by this zone. These properties are also larger in size. Additional research is needed to determine if it is appropriate to remove or reduce the height restriction in the Mixed Use and lighter industrial zones.	Further analysis is needed to respond to this request, which may result in a future Recommended Condition of Approval.
469	Leach, Mike	CARNM	4/4/17	Accessory Uses Paragraph Q page 147 Parking of Recreational Vehicle, Boat or Recreational Trailer Subparagraph 7. a and b. These two paragraphs should be deleted. They say you have to get an electrical permit to charge battery and pay permit fee! I guess they will have the non burn night and waste water department run around looking for people who might be charging the batteries to a boat, trailer or RV to make more government jobs.		Further analysis is needed to respond to this request, which may result in a future Recommended Condition of Approval.

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
470	Leach, Mike	CARNM	4/4/17	Development Standards Non Residential Development Page 178, Paragraph 2. Sidewalks Required subparagraph b. i., ii, and iii. These paragraphs on sidewalk widths need to either be cut down or revised to the specific uses. For example and office development has more visitors coming and going to it than an industrial building. So if you develop a 30,000 s.f. industrial building it should not require 15' wide sidewalks.	This language appears in the EPC draft on page 189, Section 4-3.4.B.2.b.	On page 189, Section 4-3.4.B.2.b, revise the language in iii to exclude non-retail uses in NR-LM and all development in NR-GM. Staff is reviewing this language with the DPM subcommittee for Transportation. This comment may also impact discussions of general retail size thresholds and perhaps thresholds for decision-making bodies. (Revised 4/19/2017)
471	Leach, Mike	CARNM	4/4/17	Development Standards Paragraph C. Block Dimension Subparagraph 2. Other Areas Page 178. Block length of 800 feet is not practical for Industrial Subdivisions. This might make sense for residential, but they need to expand this language. As written, if you do an industrial subdivision you will need to have a street every 800 feet. So if a large industrial employer wants to locate in a new industrial subdivision in Albuquerque, the new subdivision will not be able to offer a larger tract of land larger than 14.69 acres contiguous (800' x 800') because of this restriction.	This language appears in the EPC draft on page 194, Section 4-4.5.C.2. This section is intended to ensure connectivity for modes of transportation other than the vehicle. The best way, from an urban perspective, is via blocks, which provide a grid that offers choice and redundancy that helps address congestion and emergency access. (Revised 4/19/2017)	Staff is reviewing this language with the DPM subcommittee for Transportation. More clarity is needed about the definition of street that qualifies to make a block, since internal drive aisles and private streets serve the same function of providing access for cars as well as other transportation modes. It may be appropriate to provide larger block sizes in the NR-LM and NR-GM zone districts. (Revised 4/19/2017)
472	Leach, Mike	CARNM	4/4/17	General Landscaping Standards C. Required Plant Materials Pages 215 and 216 subparagraphs 5 and 7. Subparagraph 5 requires 75% living ground cover. Subparagraph 7 restricts that only 5% can be ground cover can be gravel or crusher fines. This is unreasonable. I do not know any landscape projects over the past 20 years that meet this standard in Albuquerque for commercial real estate.	This language appears on page 234 in Section 4-6.3.C.7. This provision limits the use of gravel and crusher fine to a maximum of 50% of the outdoor space. Staff feels that this requirement is reasonable and would need direction from decision makers to change. (Revised 4/19/17)	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
473	Leach, Mike	CARNM	4/4/17	Development Standards Parking lot landscaping Paragraph 1 Front Lot Edge subparagraph b, Page 228. This paragraph states any surface parking lot located within 30 feet of the front lot line shall be screened from the street either by a masonry wall 3' to 4' tall or landscape 10 feet in width or by landscape berm. So if I understand this correctly if you have parking along a street after the normal 20ft building setback which you have to have landscaped the regulation is saying that if there is a car parking area then you need to add an additional 10' of landscaping or a masonry wall 3' to 4' height. Do not understand this reasoning.	On page 245, the Front Lot Edge regulation requires screening of parking lots within 30 feet of the front lot line in order to screen the vehicles from the public right-of-way. This requirement is carried forward from multiple Sector Development Plans and from the current zoning regulation for similar screening for parking lots larger than 100 parking spaces. The intent is to screen vehicle lights from the public right-of-way and to create a more inviting pedestrian environment and to screen vehicle parking areas that are between the building and the public right-of-way.	
474	Leach, Mike	CARNM	4/4/17	Development Standards Parking lot landscaping Paragraph D. Interior Subparagraph 4. Tree Requirements Page 229. No parking space may be more than 100 feet from a tree trunk. This overall section does not define whether interior landscaping applies toward the overall landscape requirement of 15% for site. Page 230 Subparagraph 5. Location and Dimension of Landscape Areas requires landscape islands of minimum of 8' in width after every 20 adjacent parking spaces. This 8' of width needs to be reduced. Also on interior landscaping areas for trees shall be no less than 36 s.f.	On page 246, Interior parking lot provides minimum standards for trees and landscaping within the parking area. These standards are carried forward from current zoning code requirements, and can be counted as part of the 15% landscaping required for most sites (page 232 and 236).	On page 236, revise section 4-6.3J to add required parking lot landscaping to the regulation about overlapping landscaping requirements. Confirm that Usable Open Space requirements are also allowed to be applied to the overall site landscape requirements.
475	Leach, Mike	CARNM	4/4/17	Development Standards Fence and Wall Paragraph B. Maximum Height Subparagraph 1. Along street frontage masonry wall is limited to 3 feet in height this conflicts with the language on page 228 of 3 to 4 feet in height.		On page 245 and 250, revise the wall height standard of a maximum of 36 inches to remove conflict with the Parking regulations, which require screening walls between 3 feet and 4 feet in height.

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
476	Leach, Mike	CARNM	4/4/17	Canopy lighting Paragraph I Page 241-242. Says "The canopy fascia shall not be internally illuminated". I guess I need a clearer understanding of this language.	On page 259, Section 4-7.4I is intended to prohibit internally illuminated canopies, which are similar to box signs.	
477	Leach, Mike	CARNM	4/4/17	4-10.4 Mixed Use and Non Residential Development Page 247. What is NR-ML and NR-MU? These zoning classifications do not show up on 3.2 Permitted Use Table.	These regulations do not apply to development in the NR-LM, NR-GM, NR-SU, and NR-PO zone districts. These zone references have been updated since the Consolidated Draft. The incorrect references to NR-ML and NR-MU were updated to refer to NR-LM and NR-GM.	
478	Leach, Mike	CARNM	4/4/17	4-10.4 Mixed Use and Non Residential Development Page 248 Subparagraph A Building Facades 1. Downtown, Urban Center, Main Street and Premium Transit Areas Paragraphs c and d are burdensome.	On page 269, these regulations were carried forward from the Large Retail Facility regulations and applied instead to the areas of DT, UC, MS, and PT, which are intended to be highly pedestrian environments. See Lines 148, 158, 162, and 224. The higher quality design standards are intended to offset a more streamlined, administrative approval process. See also Lines 148, 162, 213, 215, 221, 224, f, h, dd, 370, 511, 542, 597, and 615.	
479	Leach, Mike	CARNM	4/4/17	Page 295 they still have left a traffic impact study for a building visits either coming or going of 100 requiring a traffic impact study. Would like to see this increased to 150 to 200. Another burdensome cost on business. If you build a 10,000 s.f. office building you will easily have 100 visits a day.	This requirement has been removed from section 5-4.10 on page 314 of the EPC Draft. The IDO defers to the regulations in the Development Process Manual, which is concurrently being updated to reflect more current standards and requirements.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
480	Negrette, Michelle	TOD Corridors Team	4/4/17	Our TOD Corridors Initiative team is charged with looking at how to support TOD (Transit Oriented Development) within the Central Avenue Corridor toward realizing the opportunity of attracting $2 billion in new and re-investment, collectively saving $1 billion for households, supporting 9,000 new jobs, and reducing poverty by 25% in 10 years (26,000 people) through coordinated transit and land use planning that creates more transit-served, walkable urban places that people want to return to. The initiative is an unprecedented collaboration between the City's Transit, Planning and Economic Development Departments funded by a federal TOD Planning Grant.	Noted.	
481	Negrette, Michelle	TOD Corridors Team	4/4/17	We have been reviewing the current draft of the IDO with neighborhood associations, community leaders and advocates, local developers and design professionals in order to understand how the proposed zoning will affect both TOD and community. Our focus is within a 5/8 mile radius of each of the ART stations currently under construction.	Noted.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
482	Negrette, Michelle	TOD Corridors Team	4/4/17	In addition, we have been working over the past several months with a number local and national of analysts, policy experts, practitioners, urban designers, planners, energy efficiency experts, incremental developers, financing and economic modeling consultants and others to examine what potential development might look like as it proceeds under the proposed IDO. This work culminated in a Central Corridor Workshop Week Mar 7-13, and we expect an integrated report of findings and recommendations in early June.	Noted.	
483	Negrette, Michelle	TOD Corridors Team	4/4/17	In general, we support the IDO. It is a more streamlined tool, which assures clearer development regulations, more predictable and enforceable development, as well as a more straightforward approval process. We appreciate the reduction of parking requirements and additional height bonuses allowed in the Premium Transit Corridor. However, our team has some concerns about the complexity of the zoning in the station areas. In addition to the base zone, there are typically overlay zones (CPO, HPO), Premium Transit and Main Street bonuses, Areas of Change and Consistency as well as neighborhood edge conditions. The Old Town station area, for example, located at Rio Grande and Central includes three CPO overlays as well as an HPO. In the EDo station area at Walter, there is a CPO and two HPO overlays.	Noted.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
484	Negrette, Michelle	TOD Corridors Team	4/4/17	We understand that as complicated as the proposed zoning process is, it is far more concise that the existing process. However, many of these layers could be compiled or simplified and consolidated in order to clearly and succinctly articulate the regulations. We recommend a tighter look at these areas to determine how to create a more user-friendly approach to the regulations.	Noted. The different overlay zones are clearly identified with maps that correspond to the regulations. After adoption, the maps will be available on the City's GIS interface, so it will be easy to determine which set of regulations apply to each property. Typically, only one overlay will apply to each property. Because there are different standards that apply to different properties, staff believes that the system as proposed is the most clear way to indicate which rules apply to each property. If the overlays were consolidated to one for each geography, there would need to be the same number of maps embedded in the CPO to establish which standards and regulations applied to each property, and it would not be immediately clear which set of rules and procedures apply within the larger overlay zone. See also Lines 11, 153, 255, 376, and 378.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
485	Negrette, Michelle	TOD Corridors Team	4/4/17	Potentially more impactful to future development is the 30' height limit within a 100' setback from R-1 properties. This is beyond current setback limitations and seems too uniform in its application and too extreme. While we appreciate and acknowledge that buffering is essential between single family and mixed-use development, these situation could be handled in a more context-sensitive way, with perhaps a landscape buffer or a building stepback condition, while protecting the residential area from feeling overly encroached upon. In areas along Central Avenue where the lots are not very deep development above two stories is limited to the front 20' or so of the parcel, effectively preventing most market-demand buildings from being built. The effect is contrary to TOD development principles that advocate for increased development densities on the transit corridor. In the EDO CPO area, the buffering for this edge condition is proposed as 30' within a 35' setback. Properties that are specifically separated by a public ROW over 20' should not be required to meet these conditions.		Further analysis is needed to respond to this request, which may result in a future Recommended Condition of Approval.

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
486	Negrette, Michelle	TOD Corridors Team	4/4/17	Another general concern relates to parking requirements. Though reduced in Premium Transit areas, most parking requirements are higher than TOD standards. Many of the parcels in older portions of the city, including Nob Hill and Edo, are smaller and difficult to accommodate parking on site. In a TOD area, more generous parking reductions and methods to share and consolidate parking between business would support both TOD planning principles and local businesses which can't accommodate parking requirements on site.	The EPC could consider revising parking standards for very small infill sites to encourage redevelopment in TOD locations.	Further analysis is needed to respond to this request, which may result in a future Recommended Condition of Approval.

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
487	Negrette, Michelle	TOD Corridors Team	4/4/17	Finally, we would like to recommend that alternative strategies be considered with respect to the single-family neighborhoods adjacent to the Central corridor. While we support that these areas should not change, the grouping of these areas with single-family areas of consistency is misaligned. These neighborhoods are traditional neighborhoods, not single family. Most of these neighborhoods consist of a very nice scale of single-family homes with secondary dwelling units, duplexes, triplexes and fourplexes in the form of single-family homes and mom and pop retail with apartments on the second floor on the corners of collector streets. Euclidean zoning, imposed on these neighborhoods for years, has made these residences non-conforming and illegal to replicate. This is a loss to our community. These traditional neighborhoods allow for diverse ages, income and family size. The housing typologies provide opportunities for multi-generational living, household income and increased density in at a comfortable scale. We recommend allowing for these types of housing, both existing and new construction in neighborhoods along the Central Corridor in order to support TOD densities in a form comfortable and compatible with existing neighborhoods.	See line 366 about discretionary rezonings. This comment references the Areas of Change and Consistency, which are the City's new development areas adopted in the Comp Plan. As a Comp Plan designation, changes to the methodology that created the map would need to be done through an amendment to the Comp Plan, which is anticipated in approximately 5 years. Changes to the zoning for residential neighborhoods along the Central Corridor that occur after adoption of the IDO through the discretionary CPA process would be reflected in the updated Areas of Change and Consistency map at that time.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
488	Negrette, Michelle	TOD Corridors Team	4/4/17	If Central Avenue is expected to function as an economic engine of the City and take advantage of the recent BRT investment, zoning regulations in the Central Corridor need to be clear, concise and support higher density, mixed use development	Agree.	
Below are comments taken from verbal testimony at the 6 April 2017 Hearing						
489	Moye, Laurie	PNM	4/6/2017	See Staff Response to Agency Comments Lines 180-188.	See Staff Response to Agency Comments Lines 180-188.	
490	Sandoval, Christina	City Parks & Recreation Department	4/6/2017	See Staff Response to Agency Comments Lines 189-196.	See Staff Response to Agency Comments Lines 189-196.	
491	Lovato, GP	West Old Town NA	4/6/2017	Missed 48-hour deadline for comments - I am having ongoing discussions with staff to answer my questions. Appreciate presentations and staff responsiveness.	Noted. Staff appreciates public participation in this process.	
492	Lovato, GP	West Old Town NA	4/6/2017	The IDO includes a change of zoning for the Bio Park - we have questions of interpretation of special uses. We are working with Cultural Services to better understand the BioPark Master Plan and its implications on our neighborhood.	Noted. Based on discussion with the City Department of Cultural Services, the IDO introduces a new zone, NR-PO-D, which refers to uses and standards in the BioPark Master Plan.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
493	Lovato, GP	West Old Town NA	4/6/2017	Properties that are grandfathered - would like to better understand that process.	Based on conversations with the commenter, staff understands that this comment refers to two mobile home parks in the West Old Town Neighborhood that may have outlasted the amount of time that they were intended to be allowed. Staff has been unable to determine if/when those mobile homes became nonconforming and/or should have been removed. The IDO includes a provision (Section 3-3.2.B) that says that mobile homes outside of the R-MC zone become non-conforming structures after 30 years. This regulation comes from the existing zoning code. In addition, the IDO carries forward a provision that nonconforming mobile homes are allowed to remain for the life of the structure, but not more than 50 years. For other approvals or permits that were approved prior to the Effective Date of the IDO becomes the beginning of that time period (see Secton 5-4.23.B.2). Applying this rule to the regulation about mobile homes, that 30 year period would start over for existing mobile home developments outside of an R-MC zone. Staff would need direction from decision-makers to change this rule.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
494	Lovato, GP	West Old Town NA	4/6/2017	Concerns about "pre-existing conditions" and precedents - questions about how that works.	Clarification may be needed. Based on discussions with the commenter, this comment likely refers to a parcel in the BioPark used by Cultural Services to store outdated equipment. The project team has encouraged meetings between the neighborhood and Cultural Services to address concerns about what appears like "dumping" on the property. In Section 4-12.1.I, the IDO refers to the City's Weed, Litter, and Snow Ordinance that prohibits litter being deposited on private property. This ordinance is separate from the Zoning Code and will remain in effect. (Revised 4/19/17)	Further analysis is needed to respond to this request. Staff will review the sections of the IDO that address outdoor storage and suggests revisions for clarity if needed in a future Recommended Condition of Approval. (Revised 4/19/17)
495	Lovato, GP	West Old Town NA	4/6/2017	Staff has been responsive and is working on answering our questions.	Noted. Staff appreciates public participation in this process.	
496	Jaramillo, Jaime	Consensus Planning	4/6/2017	We work with regulations every day. Current regulations are problematic.	Noted.	
497	Jaramillo, Jaime	Consensus Planning	4/6/2017	Draft has come a long way through public input, meetings, testing, comments.	Noted. Staff appreciates all the comments and discussions at meetings that have improved the draft with each Module.	
498	Jaramillo, Jaime	Consensus Planning	4/6/2017	Strong mixed-use zones to allow urban development while protecting neighborhoods.	Noted.	
499	Jaramillo, Jaime	Consensus Planning	4/6/2017	I support the administrative deviations and the additional controls and protections through Overlays.	Noted. See Section 5-4.15 for allowable deviation thresholds and Section 2-7 for Overlays.	
500	Jaramillo, Jaime	Consensus Planning	4/6/2017	Clear, has references, and is consolidated, which I support.	Noted.	
501	Jaramillo, Jaime	Consensus Planning	4/6/2017	The IDO is sensitive to context. It is also rooted in the Comprehensive Plan and will help implement the vision.	Noted.	
502	Jaramillo, Jaime	Consensus Planning	4/6/2017	Not perfect - never going to be. We will always have questions and things that need work. However, I still support.	Noted.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
503	Salazar, Karen	Santa Barbara / Martineztown	4/6/2017	Santa Barabra neighborhood - pleased that the Comp Plan passed and hope the IDO is adopted quickly, because I believe it will benefit our neighborhood. No more deferrals or delays.	Noted.	
504	Salazar, Karen	Santa Barbara / Martineztown	4/6/2017	Concerned about homeless day shelters - at least 3 in my neighborhood. I have compassion for homeless people, but when they close at 5 p.m., the homeless people remain in the neighborhood and cause concern for safety. Not sure how zoning relates to this use.	The IDO introduces a new use "Daytime gathering facility," regulated per Use Table 3-2-1 on page 107. Other shelters (homeless shelters, domestic abuse shelters, emergency shelters, etc.) are included in the "Group Home" use regulated by the IDO on page 106 per the same table.	Staff is working on a Condition that would carry over a provision for a distance separation of Group Homes of 1500 feet and a provision that caps the number in the Community Planning Area with the most facilities until all areas have an equal number. Staff is also working on a Condition that would include a distance separation of 1500 feet between Daytime Gathering Facilities.
505	Salazar, Karen	Santa Barbara / Martineztown	4/6/2017	Our NA invited staff to a meeting, and they were very helpful.	Noted. Staff appreciates all the comments and discussions at meetings that have improved the IDO throughout this process.	
506	Salazar, Carl	Santa Barbara / Martineztown	4/6/2017	Have been following the process since it began. Our neighborhood has been fighting about our Sector Development Plan for years. Hope that it will solve many of our concerns. Hope to see it adopted quickly.	Noted. Staff appreciates the public engagement throughout this process.	
507	Wolfley, Jolene	TRNA	4/6/2017	Sent in a letter within the 48-hour rule that was approved by the Board.	Noted. See Lines 434 and 916-950.	
508	Wolfley, Jolene	TRNA	4/6/2017	The IDO is a lot of good work. There are substantial issues that remain. Urge Commissioners to challenge the work.	Noted. Staff appreciates the public engagement throughout this process.	
509	Wolfley, Jolene	TRNA	4/6/2017	In May 2016, we worked on the Bosque Plaza Shopping Center. Requested that the site plan be sent to EPC due to proximity to the Bosque and increased scrutiny.	Noted. This comment refers to a project that is unrelated to the IDO.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
510	Wolfley, Jolene	TRNA	4/6/2017	Identified where there has been increased review near the Bosque. In the IDO, these properties would go to the DRB and not get that increased review.	See Lines x, y, 417, 543, and 544.	Further analysis is needed to respond to this request, which may result in a future Recommended Condition of Approval.
511	Wolfley, Jolene	TRNA	4/6/2017	SU-1 and Shopping Center zoning that requires increased review will lose that protection. [Showed 2 maps demonstrating SU-1 zoning for much of the property between Bosque and Coors - See the Supplemental Staff Report for supporting documents submitted during verbal testimony.]	See Lines x, y, 417, 543, and 544.	
512	Wolfley, Jolene	TRNA	4/6/2017	Request: create and SU-1 zone for areas near the Bosque to cover unique topographic features; amend Coors VPO to require EPC review of projects within the VPO area; and/or amend language about development "abutting" MPOS to refer to land "adjacent" to MPOS. Those MPOS standards should apply to properties within 300 feet of the MPOS.	See Lines 9, 46, and 511.	Further analysis is needed to respond to this request, which may result in a future Recommended Condition of Approval.
513	Wolfley, Jolene	TRNA	4/6/2017	Need analysis of review/approval thresholds for the different decision-making bodies. Look at last 2 years of cases to better understand how the threshold would impact cases.	See Lines x, y, 543, and 544. Staff is working on the analysis requested.	
514	Dixon, Rob	EDo NA	4/6/17	Vote taken in 2015 - unanimous to support the position below.	Noted.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
515	Dixon, Rob	EDo NA	4/6/17	EDo Master Plan, a form-based code, was created in 2003 through a 5-day charrette process. EDo plan has zoning, design standards, and a complete streets section and was approved by LUCC, EPC, and Council. These standards in the EDo plan represent a delicate balance between different interests, including the interests of residents in the Huning Highland neighborhood and businesses along the Central Corridor in the EDo area.	Noted.	
516	Dixon, Rob	EDo NA	4/6/17	EDo plan followed the Downtown Form-Based Code. We think of those 2 codes as predecessors to the IDO.	Noted. The IDO structure follows recent best practices, which many of the more recent SDPs followed, including those mentioned by the commenter, as well as Nob Hill SDP and Volcano Heights, among others.	
517	Dixon, Rob	EDo NA	4/6/17	We support the IDO and think it is a great initiative.	Noted. Staff appreciates the public engagement throughout this process.	
518	Dixon, Rob	EDo NA	4/6/17	We were informed recently in an email from Michelle Negrette that there are a number of down-zonings in the EDo area that we do not support. Have heard that there are other areas along Central that have the same issue and we stand in solidarity with them.	See Lines 523-530 for the comments from Michelle Negrette that were submitted by Mr. Dixon.	
519	Dixon, Rob	EDo NA	4/6/17	Making significant investment along the ART Corridor. Downzoning does not support those investments.	Noted. Downzoning more typically refers to taking away permissive uses. The conversions proposed for the IDO generally maintain uses, matching EDo zoning that refers to C-1 with the IDO zone that is the straight conversion for C-1, for example. See Line 347. The IDO intends to support transit-oriented development, particularly along Premium Transit Corridors. See Line 349 about density and building height. See also Lines 523-230.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
520	Dixon, Rob	EDo NA	4/6/17	Various projects in the planning stages (e.g. Lobo Rainforest Building, 1st & Central). Downzoning creates uncertainty, which makes those projects less viable.	Noted. See Lines 520-530.	
521	Dixon, Rob	EDo NA	4/6/17	Downzoning turns would-be supporters into opponents.	Noted. See Lines 520-530.	
522	Dixon, Rob	EDo NA	4/6/17	Request that our entitlements stay the same, at which point we will support the IDO. If there is a downzone, we will not support the IDO.	Noted. See lines 523-530.	
523	Negrette, Michelle via Rob Dixon	EDo NA	4/6/17	There are now side and rear setback requirements that are greater than existing. It is not clear if these requirements apply in an alley condition.	CPO-3 for Edo on page 71 lists setbacks that are consistent with the EDo plan. (Revised 4/19/17)	See Lines 147, 246, and 256.
524	Negrette, Michelle via Rob Dixon	EDo NA	4/6/17	It also does not seem necessary to have a 5' side setback unless adjacent to an existing building with windows (there is language protecting this condition in the current SDP).		See Line 147.
525	Negrette, Michelle via Rob Dixon	EDo NA	4/6/17	The 10' setback from the [????] is new to the Corridor Preservation and Corridor General Zones and addition to the 5' in the Street General Zone.	More information is needed from the commenter about what setback this comment is referring to.	Further analysis is needed to respond to this request, which may result in a future Recommended Condition of Approval.
526	Negrette, Michelle via Rob Dixon	EDo NA	4/6/17	In general heights have been reduced on properties fronting Central by approximately. Properties along Central in general are reduced 17', except within 660' of the transit stop, where buildings are allowed an addition 3'.	See Line 349. The Main Street building height alloances and Workforce Housing bonus generally maintain the EDo building heights.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
527	Negrette, Michelle via Rob Dixon	EDo NA	4/6/17	Other language which is of concern regarding heights is the language regulating buildings adjacent to hostorically significant or contributing structures. Currently the language reads "portion of structure" within 15' of significant or contributing structures is limited to 3 stories more than the historic building or the limit of the code. Now the language is more vague and could be Interpreted as the whole structure. This language would only app!y to historic buildings in the 660' station area, as the height is limited to 35' except within 660' station area and that precludes three stories anyway.		On page 71, revise Section 2-7.2.B.3.d.i.a to read "Within the CPO-3 zone, any portion of a building within 35 feet of a single-family Residential zone district shall be limited to 30 feet." On page 72, revise Section 2-7.2.B.3.d.i.b to read: "any portion of a structure"
528	Negrette, Michelle via Rob Dixon	EDo NA	4/6/17	Neighborhood edge height limits for properties that are adjacent to residential have increased from 24' to 30' within the 35' setback area from an R·1 property.	The IDO uses 30' building heights as the lowest building height for mixed-use and non-residential buildings due to the fact that many single-story commercial buildings today need to be 30' to accommodate the necessary HVAC and other infrastructure for those buildings. See also Lines 150 and 210.	
529	Negrette, Michelle via Rob Dixon	EDo NA	4/6/17	At this time, I have not found any language which permits the porch and arcade encroachments currently allowed	See Line 197.	See Line 197.
530	Negrette, Michelle via Rob Dixon	EDo NA	4/6/17	In addition the building types and frontages that generate predictable outcomes have been removed.	The building types and frontages are in an appendix and are meant to illustrate the required design standards from the EDo plan. The building types and frontage illustrations are not regulatory. Staff believes the design standards in CPO-3 taken from the EDo plan are sufficient to provide predictability of quality and articulation. (Revised 4/19/17)	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
531	Murphy, Kim	Albuquerque Academy	4/6/17	Have been monitoring the process since 2015 and providing written comments. Vast majority of questions and suggestions have been addressed through the process. Appreciate all the efforts of the project team.	Noted. Staff appreciates all of the public input that has contributed to the draft IDO up to this point.	
532	Murphy, Kim	Albuquerque Academy	4/6/17	Unqualified support for the IDO.	Noted. Staff appreciates all of the public input that has contributed to the draft IDO up to this point.	
533	Murphy, Kim	Albuquerque Academy	4/6/17	Issues addressed in April Comments regarding Albuquerque Academy.	See Lines 422-433 for the letter referred to in this comment.	
534	Murphy, Kim	Albuquerque Academy	4/6/17	How to deal with approved Site Plans for Subdivision. Unclear how "validity" would be determined - complexities in how to interpret.	See Lines 61, 100-102, 107, 116. Staff believes the commenter is referring to the "Period of Validity" for the Expiration of Approvals per Table 5-4-2, starting on page 327. The IDO indicates that Site Plan - Administrative and Site Plan - DRB expire within 5 years; Site Plan - EPC expires within 7 years. All have an exception that if 50% of the gross square footage indicated on the Site Plan has been developed, the site plan does not expire.	Staff is working on a Condition that would tease out IDO standards related to platting/lots/infrastructure from those affecting above-ground development. This would affect Table 5-4-2, as well as Sections 1-10, 5-4.24, and 5-5. For example, added language will indicate that putting in a substantial portion of the necessary underground infrastructure would exempt developments from IDO standards about lots and infrastructure requirements, while building 50% of the gross square footage would exempt developments from building design standards.
535	Murphy, Kim	Albuquerque Academy	4/6/17	Site Plans for Subdivision often have very specific, tailored requirements, reflected by SU-1 zoning. Unclear whether conversions will be appropriate for all of them. AA is fine with proposed conversion, but may not be appropriate for all similar situations.	Staff has made an effort to match uses allowed in various SU-1 zones with the closest combination of allowed uses. See also Lines 9, 366, and 511.	Staff is working on a Condition to provide more clarity about Administrative Amendments, which would address issues of updating existing Site Plans for Subdivision and approved Site Plans for SU-1 zones.

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
536	Murphy, Kim	Albuquerque Academy	4/6/17	For Master Plans that have received approval, unclear how development standards will be applied with zone conversion. Recommend further work with staff to clarify.		See Line 426. Staff is working on a Condition to add Master Development Plans to Table 5-1-1, as well as additional language in Section 2-5.2.C. Staff will also review and revise Sections 1-10, 5-4.24, and 5-5 for consistency with proposed additions.
537	Murphy, Kim	Albuquerque Academy	4/6/17	Exisiting Master Plans are zone documents approved by the EPC, not Site Plans - should need to come back to EPC for any amendments to maintain historical consistency.		See Line 426.
538	Horvath, Rene	WSCONA	4/6/17	WSCONA Resolution.	See Lines 985-998 for the Resolution submitted by WSCONA.	
539	Horvath, Rene	WSCONA	4/6/17	Slow down approval process.	See Lines a, f, z, nn, 419, 420, 543, 555, 572, 731, 735, 793, 820, 830, 870, 873, and 881.	
540	Horvath, Rene	WSCONA	4/6/17	Monumental change, which includes new permissive uses, standards, etc. Not well understood by the community. Need more time to review.	See Lines a, f, z, nn, 419, 420, 543, 555, 572, 731, 735, 793, 820, 830, 870, 873, and 881.	
541	Horvath, Rene	WSCONA	4/6/17	Zone changes <10 acres go only to EPC, not Council. This is a large portion of cases.	This follows how zone changes are handled in the existing zoning system. See Lines x, y, 417, 543, and 544.	
542	Horvath, Rene	WSCONA	4/6/17	Sweeping shifts of power from EPC to staff. Almost all cases have admin/staff approval.	The IDO standards are intended to result in higher quality development and to be written more clearly to achieve predictable results for neighbors, developers, and staff. See Lines 221, 224, f, i, k-m, n, dd, and 511.	
543	Horvath, Rene	WSCONA	4/6/17	DRB review of site plans <100,000 square feet is too large a threshold.	See Lines f, i, k-m, n, x, y, and 417. Staff would need direction from decision-makers to change the threshold for DRB and EPC review.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
544	Horvath, Rene	WSCONA		Administrative Deviations give too much latitude.	Many of the most recent SDPs include an administrative deviation of 10% across the board for all dimensional standards as a best practice. Administrative Amendments to site plans of less than 10% to dimensional can also be granted by staff under today's system. The IDO provides a more tailored approach for how much deviation is appropriate for different kinds of dimensional standards, as well as those that apply to small vs. large lots.	
544 (cont'd)	Horvath, Rene (cont'd)				The ABC Comp Plan update empahsizes the importance of infill development to counteract market forces leading to sprawl. Often, small adjustments in zoning standards can make or break an infill development. Administrative deviations are meant to lay out which kinds of adjustments are appropriate, the threshold appropriate for staff approval, and the criteria under which they may be granted. See Section 5-4.15.B. starting on page 320. See also Lines p, w, and 499.	
545	Horvath, Rene	WSCONA	4/6/17	Need Board of Appeals to allow for citizen review.	In other states, it is unusual for the City Council to act as a land use judge in appeals cases. The fact that City Council must have the final decision-making authority over appeals means that our system has at least one more step than most other cities in other states. Partly for this reason, the IDO proposes eliminating the Board of Appeals (BOA) in order to streamline the appeals process and get the appeal before the ultimate land use authority (i.e. City Council) in a more timely fashion.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
546	Horvath, Rene	WSCONA	4/6/17	There should be an economic analysis of the changes in the IDO and the impacts of densification.	An economic analysis cannot analyze changes before they are made. Such a study could be conducted after the IDO, with any recommendations rolled into annual updates of the IDO. The CPA process includes some performance metrics related to Centers and Corridors that could also get at this issue. See Comp Plan Appendix D. See Lines 734, 800, 801, 814, 877, 880, and 883.	
547	Horvath, Rene	WSCONA	4/6/17	Changes to neighborhood standing for appeals.	See Lines h, 418, 549, 922, 927, 935, 936, 944, and 992.	
548	Horvath, Rene	WSCONA	4/6/17	Zone conversion map includes sweeping changes to entitlements. Changing SU-1 zones to straight zones puts engineers in charge of decisions.	See lines 9, 366, 511, and 535. Where SU-1 zones have a valid site plan, those site plans will remain in effect. See Section 1-10.3. See Lines 61, 100-102, 107, 116, and 762.	
549	Horvath, Rene	WSCONA	4/6/17	New procedures for declaratory rulings are problematic.	Based on a discussion with the commenter, staff believes this is in reference to the IDO language that Declaratory Rulings are final. That language is meant to signal that they are appealable, as opposed to decisions to defer or continue a case, which are not. See also Lines 944, 994, 1132, and 1133.	Staff is reviewing the IDO for language related to Declaratory Rulings to clarify how they can be appealed and perhaps to add language that applicants can ask for a Declaratory Ruling on the same topic at least a year after the last was issued.
550	Horvath, Rene	WSCONA	4/6/17	Replacing facilitated meetings with pre-submission meetings is problematic. No incentives for developers to address neighborhood concerns.	See Lines 37, 58, 59, h, l, k-m, hh, jj, kk, 598, and 599.	
551	Horvath, Rene	WSCONA	4/6/17	Large retail facilities ordinance not carried over into the IDO.	See Lines 221 and 382.	Staff will review the current regulations for large retail facilities to determine if any of these regulations have not been incorporated into the IDO.

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
552	Horvath, Rene	WSCONA	4/6/17	Revisions to Coors VPO need more work.	More information is needed about what elements of the Coors VPO need additional work. See Lines 1051-1068.	
553	Horvath, Rene	WSCONA	4/6/17	Request more time for public and written comment.	See Lines a, f, z, nn, 419, 420, 543, 555, 572, 731, 735, 793, 820, 830, 870, 873, and 881.	
554	Horvath, Rene	WSCONA	4/6/17	Staff needs to return to Coalitions to better explain and justify the changes.	Neighborhood Associtions and Coalitions are on the ABC-Z email list and receive regular updates about the progress of the IDO. Staff have held public meetings at each milestone of the project and attend Neighborhood Association and Coalition meetings by trequest.	
555	Horvath, Rene	WSCONA	4/6/17	Request 14-16 month deferral to implement neighborhood recommendations. We just finished going through the Comp Plan approval process and need more time to review this document.	See Lines a, f, z, nn, 403, 419, 420, 543, 573, 731, 735, 796, 823, 833, 873, and 881.	
556	Horvath, Rene	WSCONA	4/6/17	Difficult to understand and interpret the document.	See Lines 17, 36, 151, 223, 241, 371, and 600.	
557	Balizer, Ken		4/6/17	Property owner on Rio Grande Blvd.	Noted.	
558	Balizer, Ken		4/6/17	Meeting with staff was enormously helpful to help better understand changes to the code.	Noted. Staff appreciates all the comments and discussions at meetings that have improved the IDO throughout this process.	
559	Balizer, Ken		4/6/17	Pleased to see permissive uses in my community for co-housing, cluster, and cottage development. These are more community-oriented development types that create community through design. These types of development create interaction and support and are desired by middle-income residents.	Noted. See also Line s.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
560	Balizer, Ken		4/6/17	Rio Grande Blvd area is being converted to large homes. The current zoning would allow me to create 5 large homes on my lot - not interested in that. Interested in doing cottage housing - submitted project that was approved by EPC but but later denied by the LUHO.	Noted.	
561	Balizer, Ken		4/6/17	Contextual Standards for lot sizes and setbacks don't make sense - take away ability to do cottage or co-housing development.		Further analysis is needed to respond to this request, which may result in a future Recommended Condition of Approval.
562	Abeyta, Stephen		4/6/17	Major industrial businesses in San Jose neighborhood, which is a recognized Environmental Justice community by the EPA with disproportionate amount of polluting industry	Noted.	
563	Abeyta, Stephen		4/6/17	Encourage the adaptation of an "Industrial overuse overlay" - Industrial uses could still be permitted in indoor facilities with filtration systems.		See Line bb.
564	Abeyta, Stephen		4/6/17	By-right zoning will hurt our community because it will allow more hazardous facilities, like asphalt shredding.	The existing zoning system is based on zones that allow uses permissively and conditionally in each zone. SU-1 zoning is the exception. Modern cities cannot be run with every property needing high levels of review for every change. See Lines bb, 681-686, 749, 762, and 883. The IDO generally requires higher level of review - often through Conditional uses - for land uses that often have negative impacts on surrounding properties.	See Lines bb and 788.

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
565	Abeyta, Stephen		4/6/17	Particulate matter and VOC are a problem due to the inversion effect in ABQ and low elevation. We have done measurements and are doing our best for our community.	Noted. Air quality is monitored by the City Environmental Health Department and regulated by the EPA through an air quality permit for Albuquerque and Bernalillo County. The regional Air Quality Board reviews and decides air quality permits for different types of development, per EPC standards. The IDO does not have jurisdiction to regulate emissions.	See Lines bb and 788.
565 (cont'd)	Abeyta, Stephen (cont'd)				Discretionary zone changes to downzone industrial properties near residential areas could be part of a package of City-sponsored zone changes following IDO adoption. Similarly, the CPA process will include working with residents and stakeholders to looking into incompatibilities between land uses and zoning and making recommendations for future zone changes.	
566	Contreras, Mike		4/6/17	Zoning conversion from SU-1 PDA to NRC. Under current zoning, planned residential development is allowed. NR-C zoning takes away ability to do residential on the site. Concerned that this is a downzone for the parcel.	The site in question is currently zoned SU-1 for PDA and converted to PD. Given the information that C-2 is the highest permissive use allowed in the SU-1, the most appropriate conversion is NR-C. Based on policies to address the jobs-housing balance, C-2 zoning on the West Side is proposed to convert to NR-C unless it is within 660 ft. of a Premium Transit station. Those properties that are within 660 ft. of a PT station would be converted to MX-M. The subject property is more than 660 ft. from the proposed PT station areas on Central, which supports the conversion to NR-C. See also Lines 5, 53, 90, 171, 304, mm, 355-6, and 366.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
567	Contreras, Mike		4/6/17	Suggest changing criteria for distance from a transit center - currently 660 ft. Suggest instead a distance requirement of 1320 ft. along the PT Corridor that doesn't extend into the neighborhoods.	The IDO uses 660' from Premium Transit stations to encourage walkability near PT stations, while also addressing the jobs-housing balance by encouraging more jobs on the West Side. 660' represents a distance that is easily walkable, which is why it is used to encourage mixed-use near PT stations. C-2 and C-3 zones convert to MX zones. See also Lines 53, 355-6, 566, 662, 669, and 700. For opposition to additional building heights, see Lines 140-143, 276, 313-315, 327-329, 331, 333, 336, 337, 339, 340, and 660.	Staff is looking for direction from EPC about whether to write a Condition changing the distance from PT stations for additional building height. See also Line 728.
568	Gallagher, Pat		4/6/17	Worked for the last 10 years on view proptection along Coors Corridor. Working with EPC gives us the opportunity to discuss important issues of view protection. Deep respect for this process and for the EPC - allows us to get the details right.	See Lines i, k-m, n, x, y, 509, 542, and 543.	
569	Gallagher, Pat		4/6/17	Allowing staff to make decisions will lead to mistakes.	See Lines x, y, 417, 541-543.	
570	Gallagher, Pat		4/6/17	IDO changes the threshold for what projects go to EPC. EPC should hold on to its position of authority. If EPC loses authority, people lose their authority. Need to maintain EPC's role in the process.	See Lines i, k-m, n, x, y, 509, 542, and 543.	
571	Blanc, David		4/6/17	Submitted a letter on April 1. Don't think it was received by the Commission. Request that it be included in the record.	Staff received the letter on April 4 after the 48-hour deadline for the hearing. This letter is included in the public comments in the Supplemental Staff Report for the April 24 hearing. See Lines 951-957.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
572	Adams, Kathy	La Luz Landowners Association	4/6/17	Ordinary residents lack the experience and knowledge that many other commenters have. I am representative of ABQ residents at large.	Noted. Staff has held public meetings throughout the ABC-Z process, attends Neighborhood Association meetings upon request, and has held office hours since August 2016 to discuss the project and answer questions from residents. See also Lines a and nn.	
573	Adams, Kathy	La Luz Landowners Association	4/6/17	Question whether following general trends in the United States is good enough for Albuquerque.	The IDO includes many standards tailored for Albuquerque, including mapped areas where special rules apply, special regulations for development near Major Public Open Space, Overlay Zones, and Use Specific Standards for many uses that local stakeholders find problematic. See Lines 662, 764, 767, 880, and 884.	
574	Adams, Kathy	La Luz Landowners Association	4/6/17	Attended focus group about Admin and Enforcement. Had concerns about barriers to participation. Still have those concerns.	See Lines a, f-m, n, q, t, u, nn, z, 364, 419, 420, and 572.	
575	Adams, Kathy	La Luz Landowners Association	4/6/17	During the Comp Plan hearings, Trudy Jones told us that the IDO process would address specific resident concerns.	The EPC and Council review processes are opportunities to address specific concerns and make changes to the draft. More information is needed about what specific concerns this comment is referring to. See Lines a, f-m, n, q, t, u, nn, z, 364, 419, 420, and 572.	
576	Adams, Kathy	La Luz Landowners Association	4/6/17	IDO is not a fluid document. It is a complex and almost incomprehensible document that is hard for ordinary citizens to understand.	See Lines 17, 36, 151, 223, 241, and 371.	
577	Adams, Kathy	La Luz Landowners Association	4/6/17	Communication, cooperation, and collaboration imply community involvement in development. Administration and Enforcement section needs to support community involvement. Need to revise this section to remove any barriers to community involvement anywhere in that section.	See Lines a, f-m, n, q, t, u, nn, z, 364, 419, 420, 572, and 575.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
578	Adams, Kathy	La Luz Landowners Association	4/6/17	We want development that enhances our community and preserves natural resources.	See Line 46. More information is needed on how the natural resource and feature protections can be improved in the IDO.	
579	Adams, Kathy	La Luz Landowners Association	4/6/17	Urge the EPC to look at records and development, particularly on the West Side, that are standing the test of time.	Noted.	
580	Norton, Peggy	North Valley Coalition (NVC)	4/6/17	Support a deferral for more outreach and time. I still feel like I know nothing about the document.	See Lines a, f, z, nn, 419, 420, 543, 555, and 572, and 575.	
581	Norton, Peggy	NVC	4/6/17	We have no hard copies of the document.	Hard copies of the EPC draft IDO have been available in all ABC libraries since January 2017 and in community and senior centers since March 2017. Hard copies of previous drafts have been available through these locations as well. Staff has made hard copies of all drafts available to interested parties through a lending library, starting in August 2016.	
582	Norton, Peggy	NVC	4/6/17	Where is the definition of a manufactured dwelling?	See "Dwelling, Manufactured Home" on page 397.	
583	Norton, Peggy	NVC	4/6/17	Ken Balizer's property was denied a zone change for cottage housing, but the IDO allows cottage housing permissively.	See Lines s and 559-561.	
584	Norton, Peggy	NVC	4/6/17	Many people want to be engaged. How do we make the document useful?	Staff appreciates all of the public engagement up to this point and is open to suggestions about how to further engage with residents. See Lines a, f-m, n, q, t, u, nn, z, 364, 419, 420, 572, and 575.	
585	Varoz, Camille		4/6/17	Have attended many City Council, EPC, LUPZ meetings about development in the city.	Noted. Staff appreciates the public engagement throughout this process.	
586	Varoz, Camille		4/6/17	Development happening in ABQ impacts the whole area.	Agreed.	
587	Varoz, Camille		4/6/17	There has been a lot of time alotted inequally to give more time to developers.	EPC has discretion over the amount of time that people are allowed to speak during public testimony.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
588	Varoz, Camille		4/6/17	Community members need to be equitably represented. There have been presentations on the inequity of representation.	See Lines a, z, nn, 403, 419, 420, 572, 575, and 581. Staff has worked to hold meetings throughout the city and at various times to be accessible to as many residents as possible. Staff also hold office hours and attend Neighborhood Association and other community organization meetings by request. Participation in these meetings is voluntary for the public.	
589	Varoz, Camille		4/6/17	We can't wrap our minds around these long documents to provide comments.	See Lines a, z, nn, 17, 36, 151, 223, 241, 371, 419, 420, 572, 575, 581, and 584.	
590	Varoz, Camille		4/6/17	Support stepping back - what do we have to lose if we take more time? More time would allow changes to be more equitable and allow us to keep our beautiful environment.	See Lines a, f, z, nn, 419, 420, 543, 555, and 572.	
591	Silverman, David		4/6/17	Project team used existing zoning maps to convert them to the closes set of new zones. Conversion map has been available for property owners to review and comment on the map.	Noted. Staff appreciates the public engagement and comments that have been received.	
592	Silverman, David		4/6/17	City is within its authority to revise the zoning map. The Conversion Map has been available since April 2016.	Noted.	
593	Silverman, David		4/6/17	Represents rethinking of what zones are appropriate for ABQ and what is needed in each. There is some change of uses, but this is within the City's authority to do. This is an improvement over the current pyramid structure of zoning.	Noted.	
594	Silverman, David		4/6/17	Staff is not allowing descretionary decisions, which is a prudent decision. Existing uses stay legal.	Noted. See Line 89.	
595	Silverman, David		4/6/17	The IDO is not perfect, but it is an improvement over the current system.	Noted. See Lines 317, cc, 343, 360, 385, 420, and 506.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
596	Silverman, David		4/6/17	More protections for single-family residences.	Noted. See also Lines 221, 224, f, h, and dd.	
597	Silverman, David		4/6/17	Calls for higher quality development and allows for more predictable results.	Noted. See also Lines 221, 224, f, h, dd, 511, and 542.	
598	Silverman, David		4/6/17	Nieghborhood involvement happens earlier in the process in the IDO, which will allow for more opportunities for people to be involved.	Noted. See also Lines 37, 58, 59, h, I, f-n, q, t, u, hh, jj, kk, 364, and 598.	
599	Silverman, David		4/6/17	The vast majority of development today equires no notice. Now, email notice is required for more development.	Noted. See Table 5-1-1 for notice requirements for all development decisions.	
600	Silverman, David		4/6/17	IDO is more transparent and easier to understand.	Noted. See Lines 17, 36, 151, 223, 241, and 371.	
601	Silverman, David		4/6/17	Citizens Academies are a good opportunity for residents and the development community as well.	Noted.	
602	Dann, Jennifer / Hurteau, Sarah	NM State Forestry / Nature Conservancy	4/6/17	Great efforts to imrove landscaping and infrastructure regulations.	See also Lines 1037-1041 for more specific comments submitted in writing by commenter.	
603	Dann, Jennifer / Hurteau, Sarah	NM State Forestry / Nature Conservancy	4/6/17	Suggest a community-based board or community with a focus on natural infrastructure. Would help promote collaboration to maximize the impacts of this infrastructure on the community and encourage discussion about trees, plants, and soil to address community concerns like urban heat island and placemaking.	Noted. Staff would need direction from decision makers to create a new community board or commission.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
604	Grothus, Barbara		4/6/17	How people are being treated is insulting. Dismissive behavior toward people who are here to participate and share their concerns. When people come with good information and input, every effort is made to diminish the number of residents involved. Dismisses the community work being done to understand and review these types of documents. Doesn't seem to do any good to put this effort in.	Noted. The project team is grateful for all the participation of stakeholders throughout this process. Staff has considered all comments received through written comment, public testimony, and at community meetings in drafting the IDO. Changes made to the IDO based on public comment prior to the EPC draft are footnoted with reference to changes made based on public comment. Recommended changes and items for EPC discussion are noted in the "Change" column of this spreadsheet. See also Lines a, z, nn, 419, 420, 572, 575, 581, 584, 588, 591, 592, 731, 735, 796, 823, 833, 873, 884, 906.	
605	Grothus, Barbara		4/6/17	Need to slow the process down so that we have the time to review and understand the document. Developers love it. We need to understand it better.	See Lines a, f, z, nn, 419, 420, 543, 555, and 572.	
606	Davis, Kalvin		4/6/17	Planning staff has been working long and hard on the ABC-Z process. Staff have been available, responsive, and helpful.	Noted. Staff appreciates public participation in this process.	
607	Davis, Kalvin		4/6/17	Goals that speak most to me are integrating land use and transportation and promoting sustainable development patterns.	Noted.	
608	Davis, Kalvin		4/6/17	Have heard a lot about the outward growth of the city, focused on streets and cars, over time through my family. Should focus on growing inward. I don't want to have to get in my car to go places. City should support walkable, bikable, transit-oriented development and housing options to support different lifestyles.	Noted.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
609	Davis, Kalvin		4/6/17	Strongly support MX zone category, which aligns well with Centers and Corridors. Urban style development and transit go hand in hand and help address congestion and the jobs-housing balance.	Noted.	
610	Davis, Kalvin		4/6/17	Concerned about CPOs limiting Workforce Housing and PT bonuses, which allow urban-style development. Without those bonuses, we wont see those types of developments.	Noted. See lines 51, 93-97, 142, 152, 276, 290, 309-315, 327-329, 331, 332, 337, 340, 347, and 349.	
611	Feltner, Evelyn	Inez NA	4/6/17	Lots in our neighborhood are different shapes and sizes. Concerned about changing R-1 zone to several R-1 zones based on lot size. We think this is a way to put a wedge in neighborhoods. Would like to keep the R-1 zone.	IDO Section 4-1.3.B Contextual Resiential Development in Areas of Consistency, starting on page 167, is intended to ensure that infill development in existing residential areas follows the pattern of existing development in terms of lot sizes and setbacks. See also Line 729.	
612	Feltner, Evelyn	Inez NA	4/6/17	No provision for separation/Open Space/buffer between S-F neighborhoods and apartments. Our experience is that people are concerned with apartments - people are much happier when there is a buffer (30 ft. in the case of the ABQ Village apartments). Single-Family neighborhoods don't like having large buildings towering over them - privacy, solar access, character.	Section 4-6.5.B describes required buffering between multifamily and low-density residential dwellings. In Downtown, Urban Centers, and Main Streets, fencing is required. Outside of these areas, a 15' landscape buffer is required. See Section 4-6.5.B.2 for more specific description of the buffering requirements. Staff would need direction from decision makers to increase this required buffer.	
613	Feltner, Evelyn	Inez NA	4/6/17	Hope there is a way to include a necessary separation between apartments and S-F neighborhoods.	See Line 612.	
614	Feltner, Evelyn	Inez NA	4/6/17	Our other concerns have been addressed. These two are outstanding.	Noted. Staff appreciates the public engagement and comments that have been received and influenced the current draft IDO.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
615	Ward, Em	SRMNA	4/6/17	The IDO is a wink and nod to out-of-state developers.	The IDO includes more stringent building design standards than the current zoning code in order to require more from developers, while also offering more transparent and consistent requirements and expectations. See Lines 221, 224, f, h, dd, 382, 511, 542, 597, 662, 673, 675, 682, 694, 701, 743, 775, 776, 806, 809, 859, 871, 872, and 881-887.	
616	Ward, Em	SRMNA	4/6/17	An agent at a previos meeting yelled "Get rid of it" in reference to R-270-1980.	R-270-1980 has been incorporated into the current draft of the IDO. See Lines ii and 1029.	
617	Ward, Em	SRMNA	4/6/17	Staff encourages passing the Comp Plan and IDO before addressing mismatched zoning - this is a is a problem.	The IDO is a legislative action to completely replace the City's zones with new ones. Dicscretionary zone changes cannot be made legislatively, which is why staff is not addressing zoning-land use mismatches or other discretionary zone changes as part of this process. See also Lines 89, 366, 592-594, 685, 700, 706, 744, 767, 802, 843, 855, 864, 881, 882, and 884.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
618	Ward, Em	SRMNA	4/6/17	IDO disregards aberrant development to steam ahead for a decade before changes can be made.	The project team has spent the last two years working with the public, stakeholders, City staff, and decision-makers to develop the IDO and include requirements for more high quality development throoughout the city. This approach is part of a larger strategy to build in standards for quality up-front rather than negotiate them on a case-by-case basis. See Lines 221, 224, f, h, dd, 511, 542, 597, and 615. Necessary changes to the IDO identified through the Community Planning Area assessment process or experiences related to specific cases will be made on an annual basis starting in the Fall of 2018. See Sections 5-3 Planning System and Section 5-4.5.D abot annual updates to the IDO. See also Lines 670, 694, 812, 871, 883, and 889.	See Line 871.
619	Ward, Em	SRMNA	4/6/17	Calling changes an update, not a revision, minimizes the extent of changes.	The 2017 Comp Plan was an update because the Vision and substance of adopted goals and policies remained in place. The IDO is an overhaul of the existing Zoning Code.	
620	Ward, Em	SRMNA	4/6/17	Planning staff is under directive to finish process as quickly as possible while minimizing public concerns and input.	Planning staff is under a directive to provide many opportunities for meaningful input and participation and to respond to concerns raised. See Lines a, z, nn, 419, 420, 572, 575, 581, 584, 588, 591, 592, and 604 for other comments about the public engagement process.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
621	Ward, Em	SRMNA	4/6/17	IDO weakens zoning protections, changes zones, decreases oversight by EPC and gets rid of community input.	See Lines 221, 224, f, h, dd, 511, 542, 596, 597, 612, 615 for increased zoning requirements and protections. See Lines 37, 58, 59, h, I, k-m, hh, jj, kk, 598, and 599 for public notification and meeting requirements. See Lines f-m, n, q, t, u, 364, 418, and 547 for ongoing opportunities and requirements for public involvement.	
622	Ward, Em	SRMNA	4/6/17	Need to look at real-world impacts.	More information is needed about what this comment is asking for. See Line 546, 662, 731, 735, 796, 823, 833, 873, and 884.	
623	Ward, Em	SRMNA	4/6/17	Agree that there is room for improvement, but several more months are needed for adequate review, feedback, and integration.	Drafts of the IDO have been available for review, feedback, and integration of public input since October 2015. The EPC draft of the IDO has been available since its submission to EPC in December 2016. There is still time to make changes in response to public comment during the EPC and Council review and approval processes over the coming months. See Line 662. See Lines a, z, nn, 403, 419, 420, 572, 575, 581, 584, 588, 591, 592, and 604 for other comments about the public engagement process.	
624	Ward, Em	SRMNA	4/6/17	What are staff trying to hide by rushing through?	The project time worked hard to address issues and concerns raised by stakeholders throughout the drafting process since October 2015, and staff will continue to work hard to improve the draft throughout the review and approval process. See Lines a, f, z, nn, 419, 420, 543, 555, and 572.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
625	Ward, Em	SRMNA	4/6/17	Staff are pushing the idea that Millennials are moving to urban areas based on 2004 projections. There are more recent studies showing the opposite trends. Millennials want the same thing as everyone else - single-family homes, parks, and good schools.	See Lines 573, 608, 647, 798, and 877.	
626	Ward, Em	SRMNA	4/6/17	Need evidence-based solutions. What are the problems we face? What role do policy and zoning have? Demand evidence that proposed changes do not negatively impact neighborhoods and evidence that the problems that the IDO is described to address are truly problems	See Lines 343, 344, and 671-697.	
627	Ward, Em	SRMNA	4/6/17	Need more current data that reflects changes to the projections. We have presented Census numbers that show that growth is not happening at the rate projected.	As described in IDO Section 5-3.1, the Comp Plan is now on a 5-year update cycle so that the document can reflect the latest forecast and trends. This also co-incides with a 5-year update of the regional Metropolitan Transportation Plan, which coordinates transportation efforts among local jurisdictions, including federal and state funding.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
628	Ward, Em	SRMNA	4/6/17	Want to avoid sprawl, especially in sensitive areas, because of the impact on limited resources. There are areas where there is vacant land and vacant buildings - this is housing that is available that doesn't require new construction.	The IDO attempts to incentivize the conversion of existing buildings to accommodate residential uses through administrative approvals. See Section 5-5.1.F.1.c. Some vacant buildings can be rehabbed to fit the needs of current users, while others may not be in good enough condition or offer the type of space that the market demands. In the latter case, and in the case of vacant lots, new construction will be required. All of these types of infill development are encouraged in the 2017 Comp Plan. The IDO intends to make the rules more clear and consistent to allow for infill development to occur in a way that is respectful to nearby development, particularly single-family neighborhoods. See Lines 221, 224, f, h, dd, 511, 542, 596, 597, 612, and 615.	
629	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	MWG/HNA	4/6/17	Recommends deferral for at least 14-16 months.	See Lines a, f, z, nn, 419, 420, 543, 555, and 572.	
630	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	MWG/HNA	4/6/17	Request that the MTSB SDP update created by Sites Southwest be adopted before the IDO is adopted. It gives us the R-1 zoning we want.	This comment refers to a proposed update to the MTSB SDP that was not adopted by City Council and that is outside the scope of the ABC-Z process.	
631	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	MWG/HNA	4/6/17	MX zone not compatible in historic neighborhoods. MX-M allows 4-story buildings - not appropriate for this neighborhood.	See Line 361.	
632	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	MWG/HNA	4/6/17	Nieghborhood is single-family residences - want to preserve and have a family-friendly neighborhood.	See Lines 359, 360, 361, and 366.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
633	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	MWG/HNA	4/6/17	Significant air quality, traffic, fire, structural impacts. City failed to address these conditions.	All buildings in the city are required to meet internation building safety codes and comply with local air quality and emergency access requirements. More information is needed about what impacts this comment is referring to.	
634	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	MWG/HNA	4/6/17	Not consistent with the SDP, Comp Plan, or R-270-1980.	See Lines ii and 1029.	
635	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	MWG/HNA	4/6/17	Our neighborhood and other neighborhoods have been replaced by the Central ABQ CPA. This doesn't reflect our rich history.	This comment refers to the Central ABQ Community Planning Area, which is included in a map of Community Planning Areas that was adopted into the Comp Plan in 2001. The CPA map was revised slightly in the 2017 Comp Plan. See Figure 4-3 on page 4-16. The Central ABQ CPA was not changed in the 2017 update. These CPAs are intended to be used for more comprehensive and ongoing planning efforts in the city and do not replace Neighborhood Association boundaries or detract from historic neighborhood character. See Line 856.	
636	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	MWG/HNA	4/6/17	Minority voices were not heard in the process.	See Lines a, z, nn, 403, 419, 420, 572, 575, 581, 584, 588, 591, 592, and 604.	
637	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	MWG/HNA	4/6/17	The neighborhood association is run by business owners who don't live in the neighborhood.	Requirements for Recognized Neighborhood Associations can be found in a separate City Ordinance, O-92 and are not impacted by the IDO.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
638	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	MWG/HNA	4/6/17	Gentrification in the neighborhood displaces existing residents and changes the character of the neighborhood.	The IDO is not intended to promote displacement. It is intended to promote development along Centers and Corridors to implement the Comp Plan vision, and it is also intended to provide protections for neighborhoods and Open Space as the Comp Plan calls for. It does not create development or stop development but rather to allow appropriate development in appropriate areas with appropriate standards and protections. See Lines 775, 798, 800, 814, 827-829, 836, 856, 864, 871, and 880.	
639	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	MWG/HNA	4/6/17	Our nieghborhood would like the same benefits and protections that other neighborhoods get. Not having R-1 zoning, reflecting the existing land uses, means we don't have the protections that other single-family zoned areas have.	See Lines 359, 360, 361, and 366.	
640	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	MWG/HNA	4/6/17	There shouldn't be buildings more than 2 stories. No tap bars liquor stores, industry.	See Lines 359, 360, 361, and 366.	
641	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	MWG/HNA	4/6/17	Want to keep O-92.	The IDO does not replace O-92, which remains a separate City Ordinance. The IDO refers to O-92 and its rules for Recognized Neighborhood Associations.	
642	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	MWG/HNA	4/6/17	Sites Southwest understood what we needed. We were in agreement with businesses about the zoning in that plan. But Council wouldn't hear it. We don't want piece-meal zoning, we want the R-1 zoning. We want our property rights addressed.	See Lines 359, 360, 361, 366, and 630.	
643	Abeyta, Esther		4/6/17	San Jose has 1% of City population, 29% of polluting industry.	Noted.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
644	Abeyta, Esther		4/6/17	Bosque is near our neighborhood, but it doesn't get the same protections in our neighborhood as it does in other areas to the north.	The Comp Plan policies for the bosque apply equally to all areas. The IDO provisions for Major Public Open Space would also apply equally adjacent to the bosque in all areas. See Section 4-2.8 starting on page 181.	
645	Abeyta, Esther		4/6/17	The LUHO doesn't understand the impacts of industry and the Air Quality Board doesn't address land use or zoning.	Noted.	
646	Abeyta, Esther		4/6/17	Requesting an industrial overuse overlay for the San Jose neighborhood.	See Lines bb and 163.	
647	Vencill, Elizabeth		4/6/17	Premise of Comp Plan and IDO is based on presumtion about Millennials and Boomers wanting high density urban living. More current studies show that they want single-family homes, children, and places to park their cars. CABQ should do a study on what Millennials in the city want.	See Lines 573, 608, 625, and 877.	
648	Vencill, Elizabeth		4/6/17	Bought a property across from the Highland Theatre and spent a lot of money rehabbing it based on SDP. SDP says the area is a major transit stop with potential for TOD, commercial should be on bottom floor with residential only allowed above. MX-H zoning in IDO will allow residential on the ground floor. Not compatible with the area.	The Nob Hill Highland SDP allows for mixed use development. In the CCR-1-3 zones, which were convered to Mixed-Use zones in the IDO, have a provision that ground floor development facing Central should be built to appear as shopfronts and have front fenestration, but the SDP does not require that there be commercial on the ground floor. This provision was carried forward on Central between Girard and Graceland in Section 2-7.2.B.5.d.ii.b. Staff would need direction from decision makers to extend this requirement to more locations along Central and/or to other MX zones.	
649	Vencill, Elizabeth		4/6/17	Walgreens on Central and San Mateo, Chinese restaurant, strip of retail - need more of that type of development, not this.	Noted.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
650	Vencill, Elizabeth		4/6/17	The IDO was put together over years, but there has not been community input over years.	See Lines a, z, nn, 403, 419, 420, 572, 575, 581, 584, 588, 591, 592, and 604.	
651	Vencill, Elizabeth		4/6/17	Sign-in sheets from public meetings were done at city facilities and mostly attended by city staff and developers.	City-hosted meetings are generally held at city-owned/managed locations, since they are readily available to City departments for such events. City staff attended many meetings by invitation in non-City-owned facilities. ABC-Z meetings have been open to the public. However, public participation is voluntary. See also Lines a, z, nn, 403, 419, 420, 572, 575, 581, 584, 588, 591, 592, and 604. The project team has found that one-on-one meetings were an important additional opportunity for discussion and input. To date, there have been over 80 such meetings.	
652	Vencill, Elizabeth		4/6/17	The public was not as aware in 2015, More people participated over time. Their input was not heard.	See Lines a, z, nn, 403, 419, 420, 572, 575, 581, 584, 588, 591, 592, 604, and 652.	
653	Vencill, Elizabeth		4/6/17	Urge a deferral to give people more time to read.	See Lines a, f, z, nn, 419, 420, 543, 555, and 572.	
654	Vencill, Elizabeth		4/6/17	Ensure that SDP is protected.	More information is needed about what elements of the Nob Hill Highland SDP have not been incorporated into the EPC Draft IDO. See Line 884.	
655	Kinney, Virginia		4/6/17	Asking EPC to honor the highly contested Casa Placitas apartments Sector Development Plan. This was a highly contested document that was 2 years in the making. Courts determined that the SDP was a legal document. SU-1 zoning was given to the site. Asking the EPC to include these rugulations for the SDP in the IDO.	This comment refers to a Site Development Plan for the Casa Placida apartments (see letter submitted by commentor into the record during this hearing). The Site Plan for this development will remain valid after adoption of the IDO, even though the zoning will change from SU-1 to MX-M. See Lines 61, 100-102, 107, and 116 for more about the validity of site plans after adoption of the IDO.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
656	Kinney, Virginia		4/6/17	If the City includes just our SDP in the IDO, that is not enough. The City made promises to the neighbors that need to be upheld. The City cannot change an SDP at will - the adjacent neighbors must agree	See Line 655.	
Below are comments taken from verbal testimony at the 10 April 2017 Hearing						
657	Eyster, Gary	Nob Hill NA	4/10/17	Nob Hill celebrated 100 year anniversary.	Noted. Albuquerque's historic and vibrant neighborhoods are a huge asset and make our city unique.	
658	Eyster, Gary	Nob Hill NA	4/10/17	Joining the love train for staff. Project team very attentative, earnest, and transparent.	Noted. The project team is grateful for all the participation of stakeholders throughout this process.	
659	Eyster, Gary	Nob Hill NA	4/10/17	I'm supportive of IDO, with concerns.	Noted.	
660	Eyster, Gary	Nob Hill NA	4/10/17	Building Heights on Central - Girard to Aliso / Aliso to Washington. Neighborhood voted – 9 for and 2 opposed to limit building heights to 45' for lower Nob Hill; 12-0 opposed to heights over 45' from Aliso to Washington. PT building heights should not be applied in Nob Hill.	To implement the Comp Plan vision to encourage growth along Corridors with regulatory "teeth", the IDO allows up to 65 feet in the MX-M zone for buildings on Main Streets and within 660 feet of Premium Transit stations.	
660 (cont'd)	Eyster, Gary (cont'd)	Nob Hill NA	4/10/17		Because the Nob Hill SDP limits heights to 39 feet, the CPO for Nob Hill (CPO-5) removes the Main Street provision and Workforce Housing bonus and only allows buildings to 65' feet on the blocks abutting the Premium Transit corridor. Staff felt this was an appropriate balance between implementing the Comp Plan and protecting the character of Nob Hill. See Section 2-7.2.B.5.d.b.	Staff is asking direction from the EPC on whether a Condition is appropriate removing PT height provisions between Girard and Aliso altogether or perhaps only at the eastmost station (Bryn Mawr).

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
660 (cont'd)	Eyster, Gary (cont'd)	Nob Hill NA	4/10/17		There are no Premium Transit stations identified between Aliso and Graceland Drive. CPO-5 allows the Workforce Housing bonus but not the Main Street height provisions between Aliso and Graceland, so that buildings of 57' would be possible, consistent with the Nob Hill limit of 54' in this segment. See Section 2-7.2.B.5.d.c. See also Lines 39, 41, 82, 51, 93-97, 140, 141-143, 152, 276, 290, 309-315, 327, 329, 331-333, 336, 337, 339, 340, 347, 349, and 610.	On page 79, revise Section 2-7.2.B.5.d.i.c to read as follows: "On properties abutting Central Ave. from Aliso Ave. to Graceland Dr., additional building heights associated with the Main Street or Premium Transit designations do not apply."
661	Eyster, Gary	Nob Hill NA	4/10/17	Told our SDP will be rolled into IDO; in some respects it has, carports, and front wall heights to protect our historic character.	Agreed. See Section 4.-5.6.B.1 for carports. See Section 4-6.9.B.6 for wall heights.	
662	Eyster, Gary	Nob Hill NA	4/10/17	There is a strong desire on part of Planners to see the city with uniformity. Nob Hill is historic district, and should be treated differently. Heights will change the character of immediately adjacent neighborhoods.	Consistent regulations are the easiest and most efficient to enforce. Each customization is an opportunity for something to be missed by staff. The IDO seeks to strike a balance between regulations that can require consistent high-quality development throughout the city and those that need to be customized to protect unique character in neighborhoods, historic districts, Open Space areas, and other small areas.	See Line 660.
663	Eyster, Gary	Nob Hill NA	4/10/17	[Map of Nob Hill displayed.] College View historic district from 1926 is adjacent to the commercial corridor. Tall buildings will cast shadows across Copper. It is important to limit heights – 39' from SDP and draft IDO is 45' with PT bonuses of another 20 feet for 65' adjacent to our historic district.	The Neighborhood Edge provision was adjusted from "abutting" to "adjacent" to respond to public comments about College View. This provision limits building heights on Mixed-use and Non-residential properties to 30 ft. within 100 feet of low-density zones.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
664	Eyster, Gary	Nob Hill NA	4/10/17	For this matter, I'm speaking in a personal capacity: Neighborhood Edges provision – limit bldgs. To 30' within 100' of a property line. Southern end of College View, built as multifamily. Some live/work units. According to IDO, multifamily does not get the protections. I would ask that this be removed.	The Southern end of the College View district is proposed to conver to R-T. The IDO does not allow multi-family development in the R-T zone, so the multi-family development in this area may be considered either townhouses or nonconforming multi-family. Whether or not the Neighborhood Edge provisions apply would depend on whether the structures are townhomes or multi-family. (Revised 4/19/17)	Staff will consider applying the Neighborhood Edge provision to development adjacent to live/work dwellings. (Revised 4/19/17)
665	Susan Michie	Nob Hill Resident	4/10/17	Opposed to building height policy in Nob Hill CPO.	Noted.	
666	Susan Michie	Nob Hill Resident	4/10/17	Loved ABQ. Bought into a community in Nob Hill, not an investment property.	Noted.	
667	Susan Michie	Nob Hill Resident	4/10/17	Agree with limiting urban sprawl. New housing must be balanced with community stability.	Agreed. The updated ABC Plan says that infill in Centers and Corridors is vital to limiting market pressures that lead to sprawl, and that new development should be compatible with and enhance community identity.	
668	Susan Michie	Nob Hill Resident	4/10/17	Nob Hill SDP has appropriate height guidelines, which have been used for recent multifamily development, so they can work for developers.	Noted.	
669	Susan Michie	Nob Hill Resident	4/10/17	In 2014, City updated SDP. This issue was discussed and retained 39' in lower Nob Hill; 54' in upper Nob Hill. It is not an old, irrelevant SDP. Don't ignore the plan in favor of development community.	Staff contends that the IDO MX-M 45' (3 stories) is generally consistent with the Nob Hill height limit of 39' (3 stories). In upper Nob Hill, the CPO allows the Workforce Housing Bonus, which would allow buildings up to 57', which would be generally consistent with the Nob Hill height limit of 54'. See above for discussion of building height within 660 feet of PT stations.	Staff will provide Conditions that revert to Nob Hill SDP limits if EPC agrees that the IDO standards are substantively different and inappropriate.

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
670	Susan Michie	Nob Hill Resident	4/10/17	CPA will revisit neighborhood in 5 years and can revisit height limits at that time. Easier to increase at that time, harder to limit.	See Lines 660 and 669.	See Lines 660 and 669.
671	Michel, Racquel	CABQ Staff - Transportation Planning	4/10/17	The Transportation Section (TS) responds to questions about Traffic Impact Studies (TIS), in addition to other transportation reviews.	Noted.	
672	Michel, Racquel	CABQ Staff - Transportation Planning	4/10/17	[Displays list of items TS reviews – curb cuts, EPC, DRB, DRC, ADA, Certificate of Occupancy, ZHE, Bernalillo County, TIS, Administrative Amendments]	Noted.	
673	Michel, Racquel	CABQ Staff - Transportation Planning	4/10/17	For each review, Transportation Staff reviews traffic code, sidewalk ord., subdivision ord., zoning code, 43 SDPs, 4 design overlay zones, 5 corridor plans, 3 area plans, 4 other regulatory plans, DPM, and general engineering principles. There are too many things to look at and too many that are conflicting.	Noted. The IDO is intended to pull in the regulations from many of these standalone ordinances, while reviewing them for consistency and best practices. The IDO is intended to make regulations more clear and compiled in one document, making it harder to overlook and easier to enforce.	
674	Michel, Racquel	CABQ Staff - Transportation Planning	4/10/17	Redundancies and conflicts lead to staff needing to make judgement calls. It is hard to remain consistent, especially with high staff turnover. I am most senior engineer, and I've only been at the City for 3 years. I have to enforce decisions made by my predecessor, even though I would have made different decisions. Hard to train new staff on all of these plans – cheat sheets, but still need to track down information ourselves. All these plans make up a mountain of paper to enforce.	Noted. See Line 673.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
675	Michel, Racquel	CABQ Staff - Transportation Planning	4/10/17	Private citizens would also benefit from the proposed changes to the current zoning system. Out of town applicants, residential property-owners, and mom and pop applicants are challenged to understand the complications of the system. Even to understand what types of applications to make, websites, forms, etc., just to follow the application process. Smaller developers have the most problems.	Noted. It is a key goal of the IDO to have all the requirements for development in one place, where they are easier to find and understand by all stakeholders.	
676	Michel, Racquel	CABQ Staff - Transportation Planning	4/10/17	Examples of conflicting standards – DNA SDP intends no driveways on lots with alley access. It's written well and clearly, and they're limited to 16 feet wide. There's a loophole that they don't preclude drive cuts, so when we allow those, that completely negates the point of the SDP regulation.	Noted.	
677	Michel, Racquel	CABQ Staff - Transportation Planning	4/10/17	In Sawmill/Wells Park SDP, there is a restriction that Planning Director can't approve development that exceeds traffic thresholds at Level of Service D, E, or F. That is a huge range. D is not that bad of volume, but it means most new development should be denied. This means we are often making decisions that go against engineering principles.	Noted.	
678	Michel, Racquel	CABQ Staff - Transportation Planning	4/10/17	We are trying to translate best practices from SDPs to DPM design standards. Trying to implement wider sidewalks, better connectivity without definite number or requirement. In DPM, trying to understand intent of plan and make into specific requirements.	Noted. The project team appreciates the coordination and planning efforts between the DPM subcommittees and the ABC-Z project team working on the Comp Plan and IDO.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
679	Michel, Racquel	CABQ Staff - Transportation Planning	4/10/17	Provided comments to Staff about the IDO, coordinated work with DPM. Bringing in design standards from zoning code about parking space standards, not lost, and putting in the appropriate place	Agreed. See Line 678.	
680	Vos, Michael	CABQ Staff - Development Facilitator	4/10/17	I work at the front counter helping applicants, homeowners, etc., understand the process and how to get the approvals they need.	Noted.	
681	Vos, Michael	CABQ Staff - Development Facilitator	4/10/17	[Displayed a list of SDPs with site development plan with different approval process.] Existing system has different process depending on lot size, area, zoning, etc.	Noted.	
682	Vos, Michael	CABQ Staff - Development Facilitator	4/10/17	North I-25 all have a site plan requirement via DRB, regardless of size or use. In La Cueva, similar sites all go to EPC, then to DRB for sign-off. In the Downtown area, all development has an administrative review and approval process. In Uptown, there is an administrative and Uptown Review Team approval process. In Nob Hill, anything under 5 acres goes directly to building permit. They are all different depending on where the project is located.	Noted. Table 5-1-1 in the IDO provides a standardized approach to processes based on the type of approval, location, and size of the project. These thresholds are attempting to balance the desire to streamline development that meets objective requirements for quality building projects with the desire to provide appropriate opportunities for notice and input for larger projects and those that require policy decisions.	
683	Vos, Michael	CABQ Staff - Development Facilitator	4/10/17	For SU-1 sites, most come to EPC, unless delegated to the DRB. Our system leads to different reviews of similar projects/sizes, with different processes, different sets of standards, different criteria, different reviewers, different interpretations depending on where located.	Noted. See Line 682.	
684	Vos, Michael	CABQ Staff - Development Facilitator	4/10/17	This doesn't just affect large or sophisticated developers. It affects small local businesses and individual homeowners.	Noted. See Line 675.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
685	Vos, Michael	CABQ Staff - Development Facilitator	4/10/17	Numerous single-family residences with SU-1 zoning. Homeowners have to submit a site plan for a patio cover, additional review and fees. In normal R-1 areas, this same request would just go to building permit. Not a level playing field for all - big or small - with unequal results.	Noted. One of the unintended consequences of the existing zoning framework is that some areas have more protections than others, and some areas are unnecessarily hampered by red tape for minor changes by inflexible protection methods. The IDO is intended to extend protections for single-family residences to all neighborhoods, particularly as the CPA process results in discretionary zone changes to R-1 where needed, while allowing small changes to be approved administratively by staff.	
686	Vos, Michael	CABQ Staff - Development Facilitator	4/10/17	[Response to Commissioner Gonzales question about whether fewer things go to EPC in IDO with less notice] The IDO has many more design standards. You put the rules out there, the notification process. The IDO should make standards better; some still have public hearings, with process for public input.	Agreed. See Table 5-1-1 and thresholds for Administrative review in Section 5-5.1.F.	
687	Montano, Vincent	CABQ Staff - Code Enforcement Staff	4/10/17	Land use – a lot goes into it. The existing code can be a good thing when straight forward, although it has many antiquated uses and terms.	Noted.	
688	Montano, Vincent	CABQ Staff - Code Enforcement Staff	4/10/17	When in a SDP or Overlay Zone, projects can be overwhelmingly deterred or delayed because of the complicated layers of regulations.	See Line 662.	
689	Montano, Vincent	CABQ Staff - Code Enforcement Staff	4/10/17	Code enforcement's role is to act as an interpreter of regulations.	Noted. The project team appreciates the collaboration and coordination effort with Code Enforcement staff in drafting and reviewing the IDO.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
690	Montano, Vincent	CABQ Staff - Code Enforcement Staff	4/10/17	[Response to Commissioner Hudson asking how the IDO will improve process] Enforcement would be easier to explain with consistent standards, particularly for guys out in the field.	See Lines 662, 673, and 675.	
691	McIntosh, Ben	CABQ Staff - Code Enforcement Supervisor	4/10/17	Worked with CABQ for 12 years, worked my way up. There are issues with the existing system. Pre-application Review Team (PRTs) have highlighted issues.	Noted.	
692	McIntosh, Ben	CABQ Staff - Code Enforcement Supervisor	4/10/17	A site at Central and Broadway has 4 separate documents that impact it: EDO SDP, Zoning Code, CANDOZ, Downtown 2025 SDP. Within the plans, there is conflict regarding parking. It takes staff to determine what is required. What's more restrictive?	Noted. See Lines 662 and 673.	
693	McIntosh, Ben	CABQ Staff - Code Enforcement Supervisor	4/10/17	Many SDPs are good documents, written to support neighborhoods. Even when there are good policies, sometimes the regulations don't support/enforce them.	Noted. See Lines 662.	
694	McIntosh, Ben	CABQ Staff - Code Enforcement Supervisor	4/10/17	For example, in the North I-25 SDP, there is a policy against new single-family residential dwellings. However, the regulations allow this use. New development is in conflict with the policy direction.	Noted. Not only is the ABC-Z project intended to remove these inconsistencies where we find them but to propose a Planning System going forward that keeps policies up-to-date through 5-year updates to the ABC Comp Plan, provides an annual update to IDO regulations, and commits the City to an ongoing cycle of long-range community planning through the CPA process.	
695	McIntosh, Ben	CABQ Staff - Code Enforcement Supervisor	4/10/17	It takes 2-3 years for new staff to understand how to interpret the rules without assistance and make decisions in the field. Zoning Code, SU-2, and SU-1 have different review processes and things to look for.	Noted. See Line 673.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
696	McIntosh, Ben	CABQ Staff - Code Enforcement Supervisor	4/10/17	This has an impact on customers. When asked "can I do this on my property," there is no simple answer; staff has to do extensive research. The IDO Use Table will make this easier to manage and advise owners on a day to day basis.	Noted. See Lines 673 and 675.	
697	McIntosh, Ben	CABQ Staff - Code Enforcement Supervisor	4/10/17	Citizens also struggle with this. They have to look at multiple documents to understand what's allowed. Hard to tell them where they need to go for the information they need. The IDO will be very helpful.	Noted. See Line 675.	
698	Haines, Govinda	Nob Hill Resident and Business Owner	4/10/17	Do not support increased heights for commercial and transition zoned properties.	See Lines 660 and 669.	See Lines 660 and 669.
699	Haines, Govinda	Nob Hill Resident and Business Owner	4/10/17	Historical character fundamental to the charm. Lower Nob Hill is the best example of 1920s architecture in the City. High density, but small scale. High density of shop fronts per block. Human scale creates walkable environment, integrates with single-family residential neighborhood.	Noted.	
700	Haines, Govinda	Nob Hill Resident and Business Owner	4/10/17	Lower nob hill has a 39' building height limit; IDO building heights go up to 45' and 65'. That's upzoning. Planners have told us the intention is not to change the zoning. Please retain the heights.	See Lines 662 and 669. Upzoning is more typically defined as adding more permissive uses to a zone. The project team has tried to make clear that the intent of the ABC-Z project is not to change zoning from one set of permissive uses to a different set. Clearly, many zoning regulations are changing in the IDO from existing regulations, but the intent is to keep entitlements generally consistent.	See Lines 660 and 669.

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
701	Haines, Govinda	Nob Hill Resident and Business Owner	4/10/17	If this is not the case, let's talk about how to achieve the results we want and protect historic character.	See Lines 662 and 669. The Nob Hill CPO-5 and other mapped areas with regulations specific to Nob Hill are intended to carry over protections from the Nob Hill SDP. See also Line 887.	
702	Haines, Govinda	Nob Hill Resident and Business Owner	4/10/17	Greater Central meeting came up with a good incentive - provide offsite parking as a credit for additional building heights.		As long as this provision would apply citywide, this would be an appropriate addition to the IDO. Staff is looking for EPC direction to draft a Condition accordingly.
703	Salinas, Veronica	Nob Hill Resident	4/10/17	Opposed to proposed Nob Hill heights and Neighborhood Edges. Lived in Nob Hill for over 12 years. Also have investment properties.	Noted.	
704	Salinas, Veronica	Nob Hill Resident	4/10/17	One of largest and most cohesive historic examples, yet no protections in place to protect this asset.	See Lines 661, 662, and 663.	
705	Salinas, Veronica	Nob Hill Resident	4/10/17	Met with planners; attended most meetings.	The project team is grateful for all the participation of stakeholders throughout this process.	
706	Salinas, Veronica	Nob Hill Resident	4/10/17	Asked for historic zone for the Monte Vista district. Asked for carport and wall heights for the entire Nob Hill Area. Both requests were denied. Planners said they would require a change in zoning. Yet planners have implemented a change clearly in contrast to area interest.	See Line 700. The adoption of the IDO and conversion map is a legislative process. As such, the changes to zoning that it makes must apply citywide and not target any particular properties or make changes that target properties in a particular geographical area. Area-specific standards that are already adopted are being carried over, but new area-specific standards are not being introduced, nor are boundary changes appropriate during this legislative process.	
707	Salinas, Veronica	Nob Hill Resident	4/10/17	The IDO proposes a building height increase in Nob Hill, even though at meeting after meeting, neighbors have opposed height increase.	See Line 660 and 669.	See Line 660 and 669.

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
708	Salinas, Veronica	Nob Hill Resident	4/10/17	Commercial building-step down. New IDO makes exception for stepdown next to multi-family residential. Want Neighborhood Edges to apply to duplexes and triplexes as well.	See Line 664.	
709	Sazlav, Stephanie	Nob Hill Resident	4/10/17	Support of IDO, with caveats.	Noted.	
710	Sazlav, Stephanie	Nob Hill Resident	4/10/17	Limit heights to 39' Girard to Aliso. Don't allow Premium Transit additional heights to stay constant with current requirements.	See Lines 660 and 669.	See Lines 660 and 669.
711	Sazlav, Stephanie	Nob Hill Resident	4/10/17	Route 66 is important, small local businesses. Maintain visibility to connect Central Ave visually and for pedestrian access.	Noted. Albuquerque's historic and vibrant neighborhoods and districts are a huge asset and make our city unique.	
712	Sazlav, Stephanie	Nob Hill Resident	4/10/17	Maintain 20' setback and low front yard walls.	See Line 661.	
713	Sazlav, Stephanie	Nob Hill Resident	4/10/17	Fort Collins Rapid Transit project. Low buildings, sightlines to neighborhoods. No raised platform. Common area was an asset.	Noted.	
714	White-house, Jeanne	Nob Hill Resident	4/10/17	Wife of the Dr. David Cameron - Rt. 66 historian who put College View historic district on the historic record. He normally speaks. Lived on Aliso since 1976. We chose to stay for the historic character.	See Line 657.	
715	White-house, Jeanne	Nob Hill Resident	4/10/17	In 1990, David was hired to do historic overlay for Monte Vista and College View. He did a survey of over 800 contributing buildings. He was so proud to drive from Arizona to our house and survey the neighborhood. Many are duplexes and triplexes.	Noted.	
716	White-house, Jeanne	Nob Hill Resident	4/10/17	I would support the IDO if it protected duplexes and triplexes as low-density residential.	See Line 664.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
717	White-house, Jeanne	Nob Hill Resident	4/10/17	I could see ART would increase building heights on Central.	See Line 660.	
718	White-house, Jeanne	Nob Hill Resident	4/10/17	I've worked hard to maintain historic character. Visual qualities of street neighborhood - no walls. Residents felt encouraged to walk to commercial district and stroll from one side to another. This is the first residential area where people could walk from residences, to commercial, across to other residences. Want that to remain.	See Line 661.	
719	Trujillo, Dennis	Nob Hill Resident	4/10/17	Add my voice to those who have spoken before. Opposed to changing heights in Nob Hill.	Noted.	
720	Trujillo, Dennis	Nob Hill Resident	4/10/17	17 year resident. Former historian for the state of NM. I understant the perils for change and the benefit of retaining historic areas to keep what makes Albuquerque unique.	Noted. Albuquerque's historic and vibrant neighborhoods are a huge asset and make our city unique.	
721	Newton, Dennis	Santa Fe Village NA / WSCONA member	4/10/17	Concerned about proposed zoning near Montano and Unser on the east, surrounded on 3 sides by Petroglyph National Monument.	Noted.	
722	Newton, Dennis	Santa Fe Village NA / WSCONA member	4/10/17	IDO proposes to change the R-D zone to MX-T and PD. We are concerned with both. The purpose of MX-T is to provide a buffer between commercial and SFR. This is a residential neighborhood. We have 1,030 homes, strictly residential. With this new zone, we will see offices. This is not a commercial area. This is strictly residential. We would greatly appreciate a change to a different zone. We do not want to see businesses.	R-D allows some limited commercial and office uses with a site plan, sector development plan, or combination of both. Since large swaths of properties are zoned R-D, and staff could not easily determine whether these areas had plans adopted, MX-T was originally proposed as the conversion from R-D zones on the West Side, since non-residential uses are needed on the West Side to help address the imbalance of jobs and housing.	Because much of the area did not build out with these uses, staff proposes to convert R-D to PD consistent with the East Side until more research can be done to propose zoning conversions that match entitlements more closely.

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
723	Silver-glades, Beth	Nob Hill Resident	4/10/17	Opposition to increased building heights in Nob Hill.	See Lines 660 and 669.	See Lines 660 and 669.
724	Strozier, Jim	Consensus Planning	4/10/17	Thanks to the IDO team; this is a monumental effort.	The project team is grateful for all the participation of stakeholders throughout this process.	
725	Strozier, Jim	Consensus Planning	4/10/17	Support the IDO, with some comments/concerns at policy level issues. Talked with staff many times, on many different issues. These comments focus on 30,000 level, not the details	Noted.	
726	Strozier, Jim	Consensus Planning	4/10/17	Size of retail facilities in the MX zones. We've raised the issue to staff. This is a new thing that shows up in the conversion from C-1, C-2, C-3. New thresholds for size that didn't exist before.	See Table 3-2-1, page 113, for General retail small, medium, and large. Small is 10,000 SF or less. Medium is up to 50,000 SF (except grocery, which is allowed up to 70,000), and large is 50,000+ SF	
727	Strozier, Jim	Consensus Planning	4/10/17	Currently we have Large Retail Facility ordinance for buildings over 75,000. When buildings get larger, there are different rules… This approach is ok and is better than disallowing buildings of a certain size.	A new IDO is an opportunity to create a new set of rational zones and uses in each. The new range of Mixed-use zones is intended to provide uses and buildings appropriate to different areas: MX-L for neighborhood-serving retail, MX-M for community-serving retail, and MX-H for walkable urban areas. Accordingly, only small retail is allowed in MX-L. Medium retail is allowed permissively in MX-M and above. Large retail is Conditional in MX-M and MX-H and permissive in NR-C and NR-BP.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
728	Strozier, Jim	Consensus Planning	4/10/17	Another issue – West Side vs. East Side zone conversion. Commercial conversion on West Side has been to NR-C instead of the mixed use zones. I understand issue of jobs to housing balance, but don't think zoning is the best tool. As a city, we should come up with an economic development strategy to for diverse jobs. Mixed-use centers are appropriate on the east side and the west side. We will regret this decision to eliminate Mixed Uses on the West Side.	Zoning is perhaps the most powerful tool to reserve certain areas for non-residential activity on the West Side to help with the jobs/housing imbalance. C-2 properties were converted to MX-M within 660 feet of Premium Transit stations to provide opportunities for mixed-use with the most potential to support and be supported by a non-automotive transportation option and dedicated transit on a river crossing.	Staff is looking for direction from EPC about whether it is appropriate to draft a Condition that would change the conversion rules for C-2 on the West Side to MX-M within Activity Centers designated by the Comp Plan.
728 (cont'd)	Strozier, Jim (cont'd)				Over time, as more West Side areas fill with non-residential uses, it may be appropriate to change zoning to mixed-use zones to allow housing nearer to non-residential uses and encourage more walkable, urban areas. In the interim, given existing market trends, much of the land zoned mixed-use would likely be developed as apartments, further limiting opportunities for non-residential uses in the future.	
729	Strozier, Jim	Consensus Planning	4/10/17	Residential context – feels like it is exclusively addressed by the lot size requirement. Neighborhood character is more complicated that lot size – it is density, parking, height, etc. These things can help a project fit into the context of a neighborhood more than lot size. We need to be more fine grain that lot size. Please look at this more carefully. A footnote says it is being looked at still; consider more than lot size.	The 4 flavors of R-1 deal with lot size. The Contextual Standards for Residential Zones (Section 4-1.3.B) deal with setbacks, widths, and, to some extent, density. Neighborhood Edges (Section 4-8) deal with heights. More information is needed about what additional standards are needed.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
730	Strozier, Jim	Consensus Planning	4/10/17	Comment from the Code Enforcement is on point. I can read a Sector Development Plan, and I can't tell what they can or can't do; ask Code Enforcement and sometimes still don't understand what it means.	See Line 689.	
731	Benton, Isaac	CABQ City Councilor	4/10/17	Thank you for your service (EPC). Encourage you to dig deep on this one. You are the Council's eyes and ears. Connect us to the community. Take a hard look at this and provide as many considerations as you see fit.	Noted. Project team appreciates Council's support and careful consideration throughout the ABC-Z project.	Staff will work hard to provide Conditions that respond to public concerns and EPC direction.
732	Benton, Isaac	CABQ City Councilor	4/10/17	Want to emphasize Neighborhood Edges. This is the fine and sensitive line. Respect the historic neighborhoods and the unique features in this community.	Noted. Albuquerque's historic and vibrant neighborhoods are a huge asset and make our city unique.	
733	Benton, Isaac	CABQ City Councilor	4/10/17	Suggest re: building heights, also hear from building designers to see how they translate into building projects, to see whether they are economical to build other housing options.	Agreed. The project team appreciates the testing sessions with designers hosted by ULI and City Economic Development in September 2016, as well as charrettes for Greater Central Ave. in March 2017.	
734	Benton, Isaac	CABQ City Councilor		Vertical mixed-use projects: Not for everyone. People may want to live over stores. It is a form you see all over the world. Not for everyone, but good for some individuals to live in smaller and different places. Could be beneificial for working folks, older people looking to downsize, young folks who can't afford to buy homes yet, people getting back on their feet.	Agreed. Mixed-use living is not for everyone, yet in an online survey for ABC-Z in May/June 2015, it was one of the top 3 responses for housing options needed in Albuquerque. The existing housing stock in Albuquerque provides very few opportunities for mixed-use living.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
734 (con 'td)	Benton, Isaac (cont'd)				The IDO recognizes the need for a full spectrum of housing options. The conversion map confirms that R-1 will remain the predominant housing option in Albuquerque. Multifamily zones will still provide apartment options. A full new range of Mixed-use zones should allow more options and incentives to add vertical mixed-use living options to the housing stock in the future.	
735	Benton, Isaac	CABQ City Councilor	4/10/17	Council intends to listen further to the public comments as it goes forward.	Noted. The EPC will forward a recommendation and recommended Conditions of Approval to Council for consideration, first by the Land Use, Planning, and Zoning Committee and then the full Council.	
736	Young, Judy	East Gateway	4/10/17	Concerned about new ordinance and the proposal that all the SDPs are coming under the IDO.	Noted.	
737	Young, Judy	East Gateway	4/10/17	I live in a neighborhood trying to save a historical, archaeological site. The East Gateway SDP is the only document that identified this site. We are fighting, but we can't get too far without the ear of decision-makers.	Noted.	
738	Young, Judy	East Gateway	4/10/17	The [Singing Arrow] park is being taken away. Parks all over the city can be taken away. This 4.6 acre park is one of the few green areas in our area. You think it would be stable, but it can be taken away.	The commenter is referencing a case that is happening under existing zoning, which is outside the scope of the ABC-Z project. The Singing Arrow park is City-owned property, currently zoned R-1 and converting to NR-PO-A as a City-owned park. Even under the IDO, community centers are allowed within the NR-PO-A zone to encourage co-location of public facilities. (Revised 4/19/17)	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
739	Young, Judy	East Gateway	4/10/17	Put us in jeopardy of flash floods, like one in Houston where I lost my 16 year old [son]. With this ordinance, it can be done without any input. More and more greenspace taken away. I urge you not to approve this!	The City is required to meet drainage requirements for development, including community centers. See Line 738. (Revised 4/19/17)	
740	Young, Judy	East Gateway	4/10/17	[Response to Commissioner Hudson question about the park case.] We are in appeal. The park will be taken away by a [multigenerational] center. We are downhill from the park. Does there have to be a flood study? No. this is happening all over Albuquerque. Please help us. You are all we can go to for help.	See Line 739. (Revised 4/19/17)	
741	Young, Judy	East Gateway	4/10/17	My mother all she said in the last weeks of life, we are from NM, there aren't a lot of us. The worst thing in ABQ was Alvarado being torn down. All she could do was cry because historical sites and Route 66, once they are lost, they are gone forever. Please don't take them from us.	Agreed. Albuquerque's historic assets make our city unique. See Line 662.	
742	Meyer, Keith	NAIOP / CARNM	4/10/17	Support the IDO and the process. EPC has done a great job at making input available to everyone.	Noted. The project team is grateful for all the participation of stakeholders throughout this process.	
743	Meyer, Keith	NAIOP / CARNM	4/10/17	It is a professional embarrassment that I cannot tell people what they can do with their land, particularly those from out of state. They don't understand that there are so many overlays, you cannot know the answer.	Agreed. See Lines 673 and 675.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
744	Meyer, Keith	NAIOP / CARNM	4/10/17	Support the IDO, even though it's not perfect. Concerned about social engineering to skew jobs and housing on the west side. I wish the IDO was more market-sensitive.	Helping improve the jobs-housing balance is an explicit intent of the IDO, which is the key implemention tool of the ABC Comp Plan's vision for the city. See Line Strozier 3). The range of zones, and range of uses in each zone, are intended to provide many opportunities for uses and projects that the market may want. If the commenter is recommending that zones be changed to respond to the market, that falls outside the scope of the ABC-Z project but could be tackled through the CPA process or as a follow-up package of City-sponsored zone changes. See Lines 700 and 706.	
745	Meyer, Keith	NAIOP / CARNM	4/10/17	Also concerned about size of retail. I learned in El Paso about a project for a super Walmart with a 4,000 SF drive through pickup window. Retail is fluid with what happening with Amazon and other online retailers. Dictating the size of retail can lead to functional obsolescence in the zones/categories.	See Lines 727 and 694.	
746	Meyer, Keith	NAIOP / CARNM	4/10/17	In El Paso, the development review process is much expedited. Within 5 minutes, I was talking to a person, and within 3 days they could give comments for 3 potential development sites. Within 3 days, second round of comments. They had 10 service desks. Answered question about curb cuts. Easy rules. If 15' apart, you can get them approved. They have a business process. Business development goes to the front of the line. That is their process. You can get a building permit in 3 days. We do not have that process here, unfortunately.	Noted. See Lines 673, 675, 662, 689, and 682.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
747	Meyer, Keith	NAIOP / CARNM	4/10/17	[Response to Commissioner Gonzales: Didn't market forces create the jobs/housing imbalance on the West Side?] That imbalance started 30-50 years ago. Major employers located east of the river (Kirtland AFB, Sandia Labs, etc.); nothing west of the river. Retail follows rooftops. Not a perfect science, but other services follow. We are seeing that on SW mesa now due to the rooftops. Movie theaters and services now showing up. Market place responds to what it sees; we will see change in the future.	Noted. See Lines 744 and 728.	
748	Meyer, Keith	NAIOP / CARNM	4/10/17	[Reponse to Commissioner Gonzales question: What could have been done to mitigate the imbalence? Few connections between east and west. The market drove rooftops without amenities.] Things could have been done; more employment centers could have been designated	Noted. The ABC Comp Plan designates more Employment Centers on the West Side. The IDO zoning conversion is meant to implement the policies to emphasize non-residential development within those Centers. See Line 744 and 728.	
749	Meyer, Keith	NAIOP / CARNM	4/10/17	A lot of places that have been zoned SU-1 (special use) by the City. In past 6 months, we had an employer, 60,000 SF facility looking for a site. Had to move quickly. Looked at three sites. On west side, had to rule out 2 sites that were SU for IP, because it would have taken 90 days just to figure out whether the use was allowed. They went to a straight zone on the east side. People want predictability. All the special use on the West Side slows growth.	Agreed. Much of the SU-1 zoned property on the West Side was originally zoned as SU-1 to allow a mix of uses not allowed by the outdated single-use zone categories and/or to require higher development standards near neighborhoods or open spaces.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
749 (cont'd)	Meyer, Keith (cont'd)				The IDO allows a greater mix of uses by-right in the straight zones and requires higher development standards near neighborhoods and Open Space upfront. These changes are intended to balance the need to streamLine high-quality development with the need to provide protections for neighborhoods and Open Space.	
750	Fishman, Jackie	Consensus Planning / Los Duranes NA	4/10/17	Appreciate the Los Duranes CPO in the IDO. SDP adopted in 2012. Appreciate that city and staff recognized the unique character.	Noted. Albuquerque's historic and vibrant neighborhoods are a huge asset and make our city unique.	
750 (cont'd)	Fishman, Jackie	Consensus Planning / Los Duranes NA	4/10/17	In general, I am in support of the IDO and commend the consultant and City staff on the job they have done to bring the IDO to this point. Staff has made themselves available to discuss areas of concern and have responded In a very thoughtful and deliberate manner. It is virtually impossible to catch every issue that may be contained In this densely written document, and consultant/agents will continue to find these as we bring projects forward through the entitlement process.	Noted. The project team is grateful for all the participation of stakeholders throughout this process. See Lines 694 and 871 for discussion of annual updates to the IDO to fix errors as they are identified over time.	
751	Fishman, Jackie	Consensus Planning / Los Duranes NA	4/10/17	Wanted to mention: front yard setbacks. We pored over with consultants for months. Very contextual. Look at neighbors setbacks and come up with average. Request staggered front yard setback. Add the word 'staggered' to make the intent clear.	Only a and b are intended to create staggered setbacks, so changing the heading is not appropriate. (Revised 4/19/17)	On page 76, Section 2-7.2.B.4.c.i a and b, revise language to read: "To encourage staggered setbacks, the following standards are required for …" (Revised 4/19/17)

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
751 (cont'd)	Fishman, Jackie	Consensus Planning / Los Duranes NA	4/10/17	c.i.a.ii and iii. page 76- The front setback called out in these two sections require the setback to be within 5 feet of the average setback of existing buildings within 300 feet, and for new subdivisions, within a minimum of 5 feet set back or set forward from the front facade of principle dwelling locating on one adjoining property facing the same street. The LDSDP regulation was 6 feet, and I request that this dimension be reinstated as written in the LDSDP.	This language appears in CPO-4 for Los Duranes on page 76. The IDO uses 5 feet more consistently for a front setback, which staff feels is not appreciably different from 6 feet. The acequia setback that came from the Los Duranes SDP is also 5 ft. Deviations of up to 15% are allowed for front yard setbacks (per Table 5-4-1). See also Line 660. (Revised 4/19/17)	Staff is looking for direction from EPC about whether to write a Condition that defers to the 6-foot front yard setback for Los Duranes in CPO-4. (Revised 4/19/17)
752	Fishman, Jackie	Consensus Planning / Los Duranes NA	4/10/17	The regulation section talks about setbacks where garages face the street (Section C.1.a.2). Seems to be removed from CPO. Not sure why, put that back in.	The IDO includes this provision as a general standard citywide in Section 4-1.3 in Table 4-1-1. This is an example of a good standard in a sector plan that was made citywide. (Revised 4/19/17)	
753	Fishman, Jackie	Consensus Planning / Los Duranes NA	4/10/17	Acequia standard (page 178). I mapped it myself. There are only 2 labels, none of the streets and acequias on the map. Hard to tell where thy fall in the neighborhood.		On page 178, revise map to add street labels.
754	Fishman, Jackie	Consensus Planning / Los Duranes NA	4/10/17	Senior living facilities – Conditional in R-2 but Permissive in R-3. Request permissive in R-2.	The IDO stays away from defining things based on seniors, which has been problematic for the city to enforce. Independent living would be considered multifamily in the IDO, which is permissive in both R-ML (R-2) and R-MH (R-3) per Table 3-2-1 on page 105. The addition of assisted living or nursing home is a separate use in the table on page 106.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
754 (cont'd)	Fishman, Jackie	Consensus Planning / Los Duranes NA	4/10/17		Many nursing homes and continuing care facilities are handled as SU-1 in today's system, presumably because more review is needed to address potential impacts. The existing zoning code does not allow nursing homes in R-2 at all. The conditional use in R-ML splits the difference and allows them as a conditional use, which includes additional review. In general, the new zones in the IDO are meant to include distinctions, which is why the use is shown as permissive in R-MH, which is the most intense Residential zone, where the most intense residential uses are appropriate. (Revised 4/19/17)	
755	Fishman, Jackie	Consensus Planning / Los Duranes NA	4/10/17	Off street parking should reflect all four levels of care, which are being built. Missed independent living and memory care.	Clarion does not think parking standards need to be distinguished to track with how these facilities currently divide these services, as that approach changes over time. The IDO currently has 2 parking standards, with more parking required for independent living and less parking required for assisted living.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
755 (cont'd)	Fishman, Jackie	Consensus Planning / Los Duranes NA	4/10/17	Group Living: Parking Table 4-5-1, Assisted Living or Nursing Home, page 203 - is a significant Improvement over the current regulation (1 space per 2 beds).However, this category does not take Into consideration other levels of care in senior living facilities. The two other common categories are Independent Living (IL) and Memory Care. If the Intent of the IDO Is to require the same levelof parking for Independent Livlng as typical multi- family,the project Is likely to be overparked. While many independent living residents have vehicles, most of these projects provide shuttle services to the residents. My suggestion would be to have a minimum of 1 space per independent living unit,regardless of the number of bedrooms, and to call this out specifically In the Off-Street Parking Requirements Table 4-5-3. I would also suggest calling out Continuing Care Retirement Communities (CCRC) in a manner that describes how the applicant calculates parking for four different levels of care.	See Line 755.	Further analysis is needed to respond to this request, which may result in a future Recommended Condition of Approval.
755 (cont'd)	Fishman, Jackie	Consensus Planning / Los Duranes NA	4/10/17	Only Assisted Living Facility and Nursing Home are defined in the IDO. Assisted Livng is narrowly defined and does not reflect the typical facility being built in the community.My request is to either add separate definitions for Independent Living, Memory Care, and Continuing Care Senior Community or a combined definition for all levels of care.	See Line 755.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
755 (cont'd)	Fishman, Jackie	Consensus Planning / Los Duranes NA	4/10/17	[Proposed new definition] Senior Living Facility - housing designed specifically for seniors that may include different levels of care: independent living, assisted living, memory care, or skilled nursing, or any combination of the above.These projects may be designed as continuing care communities that allow residents to transfer to higher levels of care as needed. Support services typically include commercial level kitchens with shared dining facilities for residents; medical services with personnel that provide assistance with medication, administration, dressing, bathing, and social activities; activity rooms; indoor recreational amenities; gift shops; hair salons; administrative offices; laundry services; worship space; etc. Projects may be designed with all levels of care within one or more buildings on a site. Independent IMng units may be designed and constructed as part of a central building along with other levels of care or be designed and constructed as single family attached or detached units that Include their own kitchen. Projects may also include overnight guest units to accommodate short term visitors.	The definition of these facilities for seniors only has proven problematic for the City to enforce. The project team requests more information about how memory care facilities perform from a land use perspective to understand whether they are similar to another IDO use or require being called out.	Staff will further consider whether a Condition is needed to address how to calculate parking for the combination of uses - assisted living, multifamily, and/or nursing home.
756	Fishman, Jackie	Consensus Planning / Los Duranes NA	4/10/17	See my letter for additional comments on parking and drive-thrus.	See Line 756 (cont'd, below)	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
756 (cont'd)	Fishman, Jackie	Consensus Planning / Los Duranes NA	4/10/17	I strongly support the change from parking based on the number of bathrooms to the number of bedrooms; long overdue.	Noted. See Table 4-5-1 for parking standards.	
756 (cont'd)	Fishman, Jackie	Consensus Planning / Los Duranes NA	4/10/17	Restaurant parking has been modified in the IDO to allow the parking calculation to be either according to square feet or design capacity, whichever Is greater.This Is an improvement over the current Zoning Code.	Noted. See Table 4-5-1, page 207, for Restaurant minimum parking requirements.	
756 (cont'd)	Fishman, Jackie	Consensus Planning / Los Duranes NA	4/10/17	For UC-MS-PT, the minimum parking is 5 spaces per 1,000 sq.ft. GFA or 1 space per 3 persons design capacity, whichever Is greater. However, in "other areas" the minimum parking goes up to 8 spaces per 1,000 sq.ft. GFA, but stays the same with 1 space per 3 persons design capacity as the UC-MS-PT. It seems like the minimum parking for design capacity In the "other areas" should be higher to reflect a more suburban location. As proposed, this is likely not enough parking for typical Albuquerque restaurant development. My suggestion would be to increase the design capacity to at least 4 persons.	The parking standards in Table 4-5-1 that the commenter refers to are minimums, not maximums. (Revised 4/19/17)	On page 207, Table 4-5-1, reduce the minimum parking required for Restaurant in UC-MS-PT to 1 space per 4 persons design capacity. (Revised 4/19/17) On page 207, Table 4-5-1, review other standards that mention design capacity and reduce them for UC-MS-PT areas. (Revised 4/19/17)
756 (cont'd)	Fishman, Jackie	Consensus Planning / Los Duranes NA	4/10/17	Bank parking standard was decreased from the current Code to the proposed IDO. For UC-MS-PT, the IDO requires 2.5 spaces per 1,000 SF GFA and for other areas, 4 spaces per 1,000 SF GFA.	See Table 4-5-1, page 208, for Bank minimum parking requirements.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
756 (cont'd)	Fishman, Jackie	Consensus Planning / Los Duranes NA	4/10/17	The number of spaces in the UC-MS-PT seems on the right track, but the regulation for other areas appears to be excessive. It Is rare that you see any bank parking lot even close to being full, again, given the trend of on-line banking. My suggestion would be to either use the 2.5 spaces per 1,000 SF for all banks, regardless of location, or to step the requirement down for "other areas" to 3 spaces per 1,000 SF.		On page 208, Table 4-5-1, revise minimum parking requirements for Bank to 2 spaces per 1,000 SF GFA for UC-MS-PT and 3 spaces per 1,000 SF GFA for other areas.
756 (cont'd)	Fishman, Jackie	Consensus Planning / Los Duranes NA	4/10/17	I also question why both square foot (sq.ft.) and GFA (gross floor area) are used In the table. Typically, we calculate parking requirements based on net leasable area and do not include stairwells, closets, etc. My suggestion would be to use either GFA or net leasable area and remove the square footage, as it is confusing.		Further analysis is needed to respond to this request, which may result in a future Recommended Condition of Approval.
756 (cont'd)	Fishman, Jackie	Consensus Planning / Los Duranes NA	4/10/17	Under Bank, Financial Institution, or Automated Teller Machine the minimum required stacking spaces is per lane and differentiates between Urban Centers, Main Streets and Other Areas.The previous stacking requirement was 6 spaces regardless of the number of lanes.The current proposal is 4 spaces per lane.	See Section 4-5.9, starting on page 229 and Table 4-5-7.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
756 (cont'd)	Fishman, Jackie	Consensus Planning / Los Duranes NA	4/10/17	However, for a recent application for a credit union, Raquel Michel (City Transportation Engineer) researched other communities and found that the minimum stacking requirement is 120 feet in total, which was subsequently applied to the credit union by the EPC. Another consideration is that fewer bank customers are using drive-through services and are opting to use on-line banking instead.There is simply no reason to require this amount of pavement for a bank in 2017.My request would be to revise the stacking requirement to 120 feet in total, regardless of the number of lanes.	The consultant is considering this request. Staff is also consulting with the Transportation Engineer. (Revised 4/19/17)	Further analysis is needed to respond to this request, which may result in a future Recommended Condition of Approval.
757	Moye, Laurie	PNM	4/6/2017	See Staff Response to Agency Comments Lines 180-188 and 197-199.	See Staff Response to Agency Comments Lines 180-188 and 197-199.	
758	Wolfley, Jolene	Taylor Ranch NA	4/10/17	Going to discuss the second point in our letter.	Noted. See response to written comments in Lines 916-950.	
759	Wolfley, Jolene	Taylor Ranch NA	4/10/17	The SU-1 site plans establish the actual zoning for the site. A legal review of the zones should be done to determine if it can be legally changed in a legislative action. Our contention is that the SU-1 zoned site cannot be converted without a public review, per R-270-1980, state law.	As long as the SU-1 sites are converted to zones with the same general set of uses, they can be converted through a legislative action. The question of the right level of review and public input in the future for different types of developent in different areas is a separate consideration worthy of discussion and deliberation through the IDO adoption process.	
760	Wolfley, Jolene	Taylor Ranch NA	4/10/17	Coors and Montano: All this area is SU-1. The conversion has NR-C, has a Site Development Plan for Subdivision, but no Site Development Plan for Building Permit.	Staff needs more information. We apologize and may have misunderstood the comment. (Revised 4/19/17)	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
761	Wolfley, Jolene	Taylor Ranch NA	4/10/17	The site plan disallows drive-thrus, gas stations. If the property owner were to decide to submit a new site plan for this area, both uses would be allowed straight zoning per the NR-C conversion. Under 100,000 SF, EPC would never see them. We have drive-thrus and gas stations prohibited, and that would not carry forward. This is one example of hundreds you will see affected in this way.	Agreed. Approved site plans stay in place per Section 1-10.3. The question is whether the IDO provides adequate design standards for these uses, allows them in appropriate zones, and provides adequate protections for neighborhoods and Open Space. If not, then the standards need to be improved, uses need to be added or prohibited in certain zones, or processes adjusted to provide adequate review and input.	Staff is looking for direction from EPC about whether the standards for these uses need to be improved, protections need to be strengthened, or review processes adjusted.
761 (con'td)	Wolfley, Jolene (cont'd)				One of the key outcomes of this process is to provide a zoning map for the city that is more transparent about what uses are allowed in which locations. Only 53% of parcels have straight zoning today. In the other 47% of parcels, uses cannot be determined by looking at the zoning map because of SU-1, SU-2, and/or SU-3 zoning. See Lines 662, 673, 675, 689, 682, 743, and 749.	
762	Wolfley, Jolene	Taylor Ranch NA	4/10/17	Make sure that you allow plenty of time for public and staff review. It requires a lot of drilling down and deliberation.	Agreed. The project team appreciates the careful review and consideration by stakeholders and the EPC.	
763	Wolfley, Jolene	Taylor Ranch NA	4/10/17	Otherwise you will be allowing the Planning Department and consultants to set policy decisions. EPC has expertise to bring to bear to the analysis of IDO. You need to become well-versed enough to write new rules if you see fit.		Agreed. The project team stands ready to help prepare conditions as needed per the EPC direction to respond to public comments and EPC concerns.
764	Wolfley, Jolene	Taylor Ranch NA	4/10/17	If you do not take the time to deliberate, it could result in a lot of lawsuits.	It is important to think deeply about whether the IDO is a good zoning code for Albuquerque - with a good set of zones, appropriate uses, appropriate standards and requirements, and appropriate review/approval processes. See Line 744	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
764 (cont'd)	Wolfley, Jolene (cont'd)				The only consideration of avoiding lawsuits that is appropriate is not targeting individual properties or geographic areas for new or different rules, which would be quasi-judicial and therefore not appropriate for this legislative process.	
765	Wolfley, Jolene	Taylor Ranch NA	4/10/17	Council is relying on your good advice on these matters.	Agreed. See Line 731 and 735.	
766	Wolfley, Jolene	Taylor Ranch NA	4/10/17	[Response to Commissioner Gonzales question to clarify EPC's existing role in properties between bosque and Coors Blvd.] Existing policy [per SU-1 zoning] is that all development would come to EPC. All has a site plan for building permit except for the corner piece. Under what is being proposed, any land that is vacant or could be redeveloped, it would hit that threshold of 100,000 SF of commercial space [to be reviewed administratively].	Agreed. See Lines 761 and 764.	
767	Wolfley, Jolene	Taylor Ranch NA	4/10/17	If you do the changes I was suggesting last week, this is a trail head, which could trigger MPOS design standards and EPC review. This whole area between the bosque and Coors from Western Trail to Alameda is in SU-1 or Shopping Center sites. The majority of building permits have come to EPC.		See Lines 507-513. Staff is looking for direction from EPC about whether to write one of the following conditions: 1) MPOS standards apply within the VPO, 2) MPOS standards apply to properties within 330 feet of MPOS boundaries, 3) all development within VPOs requires EPC review, and/or 4) all property within Coors VPO is converted to PD.

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
768	Wolfley, Jolene	Taylor Ranch NA	4/10/17	You could have a provision that all Building Permits come to EPC to see that all development is the style and layout that promotes the view you are trying to preserve. For example, it's not great to have Sonic, a potential user of the site, in the foreground to the bosque, with all its neon and glaring lights.		See Line 767.
769	Wolfley, Jolene	Taylor Ranch NA	4/10/17	What I just noticed, the NR-C would also allow light manufacturing that could go in by right, as I understand.	NR-C allows light manufacturing permissively per Table 3-2-1, page 114.	Staff is looking for directon from EPC about whether to write a condition that light manufacturing be conditional within VPO zones or disallowed within a certain distance of MPOS areas.
770	Wible, Jim		4/10/17	Encourage you to continue to examine IDO as it is before you. I'm thankful for this effort. I struggle with the current zoning code, not as much as you do.	Noted. The project team is grateful for all the participation and careful review of stakeholders and decision-makers throughout this process.	
771	Wible, Jim		4/10/17	Inconsistencies today that we need to work through with the IDO and promote something that is repeatable across the city.	Noted. See Lines 662, 673, 675, 689, 682, 743, and 749.	
772	Wible, Jim		4/10/17	We need dollars injected into our economy.	Agreed. Economic vitality is one of the guiding principles in the updated ABC Comp Plan, and streamlining high-quality development and providing options within multiple zones for multiple kinds of development are key ways the IDO is intended to implement the Comp Plan. See Lines 744 and 749.	
773	Wible, Jim		4/10/17	If you make a change to a Sector Development Plan now, you will not be able to update that in all 62 SDPs. With the IDO, if there is an error in the use table, you correct it in one place, and it applies citywide. You know the rules and how to apply them to a site upfront.	Agreed. See Lines 662, 673, 675, 689, 682, 694, 743, and 749.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
774	Wible, Jim		4/10/17	ABQ should have a similar type of business process to El Paso – efficient and uniform citywide.	See Line 746.	
775	Murphy, Kim	UNM	4/10/17	One of the public comments is about a proposed conversion to one of the zoning designations for UNM land. I have experience from my position as former real estate director for UNM. I contacted UNM.	The comment in question refers to a location near the UNM North Golf Course, which is currently zoned R-3, and is proposed to be converted to R-MH, which is the closest conversion in the IDO base zones. Because the land is owned by UNM, which is a subdivsion of the State, the City's zoning rules do not apply. See Line 779.	
776	Murphy, Kim	UNM	4/10/17	City zoning cannot be enforced on state land. UNM is constitutionally created as educational entity by the state.	Agreed. The state and divisions of the state (such as UNM) are exempt from City zoning. See Lines 183, 305, 775, and 779.	
777	Murphy, Kim	UNM	4/10/17	City zoning maps are on UNM property. Golf course is R-3, C-2 on Central Ave. etc. When the IDO map conversion came in, the pre-existing zoning was converted into the new scheme. R-3 becomes R-MH. Etc. This is an historical burden that has been created, or an anachronism has been created.	Agreed. City zoning on UNM property is an anachronism. The conversion map shows the IDO zone matching the straight zones indicated. See Lines 183, 305, 775, and 776.	
778	Murphy, Kim	UNM	4/10/17	UNM is cognizant that we are immune, but neighbors looks at the maps and could become concerned.	Neighbors should look to the UNM Master Plan for potential development on UNM property.	
779	Murphy, Kim	UNM	4/10/17	We're requesting to work with staff to determine whether existing zones could be converted to zones more consistent with UNM master plan and future land uses desired by UNM and neighbors. We would like to work with staff to better match zones to reflect plans for those lands, even though we are immune. Should spend more time addressing this in response to public comments.	Discretionary zone changes, even for entities immune to City zoning, is not part of the scope of the ABC-Z project and cannot be accommodated in this legislative process. The project team is grateful for the communication and collaboration with UNM. See Lines 183, 305, and 775-778.	It may be appropriate during a follow-up package of City-sponsored zone changes to include discretionary decisions to change zoning on UNM properties, while noting in the adopting resolution that UNM is immune to City zoning standards and enforcement.

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
780	Abeyta, Stephen	San Jose Resident	4/10/17	Thriving, immigrant community surrounded by industrial activity.	Noted. Albuquerque's historic and vibrant neighborhoods are a huge asset and make our city unique.	
781	Abeyta, Stephen	San Jose Resident	4/10/17	Tremendous pollution in our community; people are getting sick. Your life expectancy is 10 years less than those outside of neighborhood.	Noted.	
782	Abeyta, Stephen	San Jose Resident	4/10/17	The majority of residents are poor: less than 150% of poverty guidelines. People have benefited from charitable food gifts.	Noted.	
783	Abeyta, Stephen	San Jose Resident	4/10/17	We face tribulations of constant noise, loud bangs from trains running into each other, smells, truck traffice, cement dust. It's an environmental mess.	Noted.	
784	Abeyta, Stephen	San Jose Resident	4/10/17	Staff has testified that it's hard to enforce all the rules and regulations, review plans thoroughly, and they have to make judgement calls. that may explain why we're suffering.	Noted. See Lines 662, 673, 675, 689, 682, 694, 743, and 749.	
785	Abeyta, Stephen	San Jose Resident	4/10/17	You have chance to put protections in the IDO to help poor people in our neighborhood.	Agreed. See Line 764.	Staff is working on a condition for a new Use Specific Standard that would require a distance separation of 1,000 feet for industrial uses that require an air quality permit
786	Abeyta, Stephen	San Jose Resident	4/10/17	My wife and I won't move. We will not abandon our neighborhood; even though we could. We love our neighborhood. The Lord hears the cry of the poor. Please hear our cries.	Noted.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
787	Abeyta, Stephen	San Jose Resident	4/10/17	[Response to Commissioner Gonzales question about how residential areas were first allowed near industrial activity.] Established in the 1800s as a worker community for the Railroad. People worked to enhance the rail system. Boundaries from Kathryn/Broadway, down to Gibson up to I-25, south to Rio Bravo, to the RR tracks.	Noted.	
788	Abeyta, Stephen	San Jose Resident	4/10/17	Polluting companies along 2nd street are tremendous. Conduit for the Waste Treatment Facility runs under the neighborhood, emitting sulphur smells. Permitted industrial activity. Off-loading from trains, like Atlas Company, they off-load petrochemicals in dented tanks that allow gasses to seep up from the trains parked in our neighborhood. The petrochemicals latch onto the cement-crushing dust and particulates from the freeway and trains idling, and the inversion in Albuquerque brings them down. We have measured them by bucket sampling that shows particulate matter at ground level. They're supposed to go up to the upper atmosphere and stay there.	Noted.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
789	Abeyta, Stephen	San Jose Resident	4/10/17	We have been addressing it as best we can by doing testing, trying to fight air permits, trying to fight at EPC, getting good neighbor contracts. We're doing all we can, but it is expensive to us. It all comes out of pocket for us. We were told by everyone that this is the only place we can make change with you all. I'm not opposed to the IDO or the Comp Plan. I see good work. I like what you are doing for the homeless. I know you are volunteering, and I thank you for your time. We are hoping and praying that the changes could come from this particular board.	Noted.	See Line 785.
790	Horvath, René	Taylor Ranch	4/10/17	I met with the staff after the March 20th Council meeting [adopting the Comp Plan]. They showed us the conversion map for Coors and Montano. These yellow areas are C-2 zones: SU-1/C-2 zones. Those zones have heights related to the O-1 zone, with building heights of 26' plus angle planes	Agreed.	
791	Horvath, René	Taylor Ranch	4/10/17	NR-C conversion for C-2 allows 55'. That's way too high. That would not go over well. This area has view regulations that would kick in. Even over here, anywhere in town, this is a pizza place, gas station, car wash. These heights are 12-15' at the most. 26' is the most appropriate.	C-2 allows much taller buildings than 26' through the angle plane provision.	On page 171, Table 4-1-3, change the max. building height for NR-C to 35 feet [2], which would limit building heights to 35 feet except on large parcels, where heights would be unlimited for portions of the building more than 100 feet from each property line.
792	Horvath, René	Taylor Ranch	4/10/17	There are no setbacks on the NR-C.	NR-C has 5-ft front setbacks. See Table 4-1-3 on page 171.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
793	Horvath, René	Taylor Ranch	4/10/17	Changing the zoning so much, 2 minutes is not enough. We want more time, be willing to take written comments. I'm not sure it's a good idea to change things up so drastically.	EPC is taking written comments through April 20 at 1 p.m. Written comments received after that time will be forwarded to Council for consideration at the next stages in the review/approval process. See Lines a, f, z, nn, 419, 420, 543, 555, 572, 731, 735, 793, 820, 830, 870, 873, and 881.	
794	Vencill, Michelle	Parkland Hills NA	4/10/17	Represent those who can't afford to. Under the IDO, developers would no longer need to get neighborhood approval to build.	Under the existing system, developers do not need to get neighborhood approval to build.	
795	Vencill, Michelle	Parkland Hills NA	4/10/17	We were told there are protections in the Comp Plan passed in March.	The most powerful policy protection added to the ABC Comp Plan through the update is the mapping of single-family uses as Areas of Consistency map, coupled with policies that development in these areas should reinforce the character and intensity of exising development, and adequate transitions and buffers should be provided where Areas of Change abut Areas of Consistency. (See Chapter 5, Figure 5-6, Policy 5.6.3 and Policy 6.5.4.)	
796	Vencill, Michelle	Parkland Hills NA	4/10/17	All I could find is implementation. The language in that chapter sounds top-down, like educating residents and those responsible for implementing the plan. The Citizens Academy will raise understanding about moving towards vision. This doesn't sound like a dialogue. Sounds authoritarian. "It is good for your neighborhood, you just don't realize it."	This language was revised through Floor Amendments before adoption to reflect the intent of dialogues through the Citizens Academy and CPA process.	
797	Vencill, Michelle	Parkland Hills NA	4/10/17	Are you going to tell them in Martineztown that if development skyrockets, they can't afford property taxes, and they will lose their home?	The IDO is not intended to create development or stop development but rather to allow appropriate development in appropriate areas with appropriate standards and protections. See Line 761	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
798	Vencill, Michelle	Parkland Hills NA	4/10/17	I don't want Albuquerque to be San Francisco. This project is trying so hard to attract people to the city that want high density and mass transit - but those people don't want to live here. They want to live in Austin. Trying too hard to attract people who don't want to live here that they will drive away people who do want to be here. Please keep in mind the preferences of those who already live here, not just getting new people who don't want to live here.	The project is not intended to attract outsiders but rather to provide a few more options for more urban, walkable living options for those who may want it - including retirees and younger people in Albuquerque. See Line 735.	
799	Vencill, Michelle	Parkland Hills NA	4/10/17	I don't know what my neighborhood will be like in 10 years. I regret buying property here.	Existing zones have been converted to the closest matching IDO zone. More information is needed about what standards are of concern.	
800	Vencill, Michelle	Parkland Hills NA	4/10/17	You don't want to hear from me. I don't feel confident that you want to hear what I have to say.	The project team is grateful for all the participation of stakeholders throughout this process and is listening carefully to concerns and suggestions that can improve the draft IDO, as well as future planning processes.	
801	Dinelli, Pete		4/10/17	I'm a former City Councilor in the 1980s. I recall vividly remember enacting the Comp Plan. At the time there were 27 sector plans. I'm watching news media on this very carefully, reading and watching online.	Noted. The project team is grateful for all the participation of stakeholders throughout this process.	
802	Dinelli, Pete		4/10/17	Millions of dollars spent over time on SDPs that are now being consolidated. Please take whatever steps are necessary to protect neighborhoods and their character from being overwhelmed by development, particularly historic areas like Huning Highland and Martineztown	See Line 662. Albuquerque's historic and vibrant neighborhoods are a huge asset and make our city unique.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
803	Dinelli, Pete		4/10/17	I understand full well intent of program, streamlining and making it easier for development to come into ABQ. What is at stake is preserving character of historic neighborhoods.	There are many goals of the ABC-Z project, including extending the protections that are benefiting some historic neighborhoods with Sector Development Plans to all neighborhoods, without compounding the existing issues of keeping multiple standalone plans up-to-date and not in conflict with citywide standards. Noted. See also Lines 662, 673, 675, 689, 682, 694, 743, 749, 764 for other goals of the project.	
804	Dinelli, Pete		4/10/17	Thanks for your service. It's a difficult task. Best of luck.	Noted.	
805	Dorn-Jones, Diana	United South Broadway, Executive Director	4/10/17	I was born in South Broadway. Want to share my concerns.	Noted. The project team is grateful for all the participation of stakeholders throughout this process.	
806	Dorn-Jones, Diana	United South Broadway, Executive Director	4/10/17	One of the oldest SDPs. We've seen maybe 75-100 cases. We're here all the time for conditional uses and variances. SDP was a useful tool to make sure we were following wisdom, thought of residents in the SDP -- the only tool that was resident driven. Very concerned about losing this tool. We use it and won all but one of the cases. That one we won on appeal.	Noted. Policies from the Sector Plans were carried into the ABC Comp Plan update. Area-specific regulations have been carried into the IDO. Many outdated regulations in the older SDPs have been updated in the IDO and replaced with stronger neighborhood protections and higher-quality design standards.	
807	Dorn-Jones, Diana	United South Broadway, Executive Director	4/10/17	Understand the Sector Plan texts are in the Comp Plan appendix.	A floor amendment added the Sector Plan texts to the Comp Plan appendix. See also Line 806.	
808	Dorn-Jones, Diana	United South Broadway, Executive Director	4/10/17	Very confusing about moving from 1970s way of doing things to a 21st century. Not opposed to change. Moving away from the pyramid structure of the Zoning Code, but moving to what?	The IDO allows uses in different zones through the Permitted Use Table 3-2-1, which starts on page 105.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
809	Dorn-Jones, Diana	United South Broadway, Executive Director	4/10/17	Not a professional planner, but I can learn and understand our SDP. Don't want it to go away. I like how we do things.	The CPA process and the Citizens Academy are intended to provide ongoing opportunities for residents to understand the Comp Plan, IDO, and City processes for capital projects, etc.	
810	Dorn-Jones, Diana	United South Broadway, Executive Director	4/10/17	Concerned about crime and high-intensity development in our neighborhood. Looks different to fight crime in other neighborhoods. Lots of absentee neighborhoods.	Existing zones have been converted to the closest matching IDO zone. More information is needed about what standards are of concern.	
811	Dorn-Jones, Diana	United South Broadway, Executive Director	4/10/17	Some gentrification in our neighborhood. Happens organically. Houses for $30k and several for $100k.	Noted.	
812	Dorn-Jones, Diana	United South Broadway, Executive Director	4/10/17	1,100 people showed up for the Comp Plan process. City needs to do a better job; this is about democracy.	The project team has tried hard to provide many opportunities for input and participation, including community events, presentations at stakeholder and neighborhood meetings, and one-on-one office hours. Participation is voluntary. See Lines a, z, nn, 365, 403, 411, 419, 420, 554, 572, 575, 581, 584, 588, 591, 592, 604, and 651.	
813	Houde, Kris	CICM	4/10/17	South Martineztown is a small residential neighborhood: elementary school, 100 units of public housing. Over-shadowed by Lovelace.	Noted. Albuquerque's historic and vibrant neighborhoods are a huge asset and make our city unique.	
814	Houde, Kris	CICM	4/10/17	Lighting, traffic, lack of maintenance of the High Street slope, lack of action to vacate Walter Street, despite commitment to do so.	Noted.	
815	Houde, Kris	CICM	4/10/17	I do support some of the regulations; I oppose some of the regulations. I cannot make a broad sweep of support or opposition.	Noted.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
816	Houde, Kris	CICM	4/10/17	Disagree with staff response #17 to our comment from medical inpatient to expanding use to more ambulatory services. This expanded use should trigger a new parking review. New oncology use will result in additional staff, patient activity, so a parking review is necessary. Different parking review for ambulatory services and inpatient vs. medical office	Section 4-5.2.B sets out what activities trigger compliance with parking requirements, including a change of use. Table 4-5-1 requires different parking standards for different uses. Hospitals are on page 205. Medical or dental clinic is on page 208. Staff would require those parking standards per the square footage of each use. (Revised 4/19/17)	On page 202, Section 4-5.2.B, revise the language for clarity. (Revised 4/19/17)
817	Houde, Kris	CICM	4/10/17	Change with drastic effects – basketball court to helipad. Administrative decision. Noisy helicopter use over our neighborhood. Administrative decisions can be a slippery slope that causes impact in our neighborhood.	Helipads are regulated per the Use Table 3-2-1 on page 113 and are conditional accessory within the Mixed-use zones, starting with MX-M. They are accessory or permissive in Non-residential zones. The Use Specific Standard makes helipads conditional for non-emergency and non-law enforcement uses in the Non-residential zones.	On page 139, Section 3-3.4.FF.2, revise to read: "In Non-residential zones, all helipads for purposes other than …" (Revised 4/19/17
817 (cont'd)	Houde, Kris	CICM	4/10/17		Hospitals are being converted to MX-H under the IDO, so adding a helipad would require a hearing before the ZHE. Existing helipads would be considered approved conditional uses. (Revised 4/19/17)	
818	Houde, Kris	CICM	4/10/17	I'm worried about the extent of administrative changes - like the change of use without neighborhood input to add a helipad on a basketball court. Slippery slope that can destabilize the residential neighborhood.	See Lines 816 and 817. See also Lines XX (administrative changes list). (Revised 4/19/17)	
819	Houde, Kris	CICM	4/10/17	I disagree with some decisions of planners; with great support for the IDO.	Noted. The project team is grateful for all the participation of stakeholders throughout this process.	
820	Houde, Kris	CICM	4/10/17	Will the EPC make substantive changes, or does the IDO transfer existing zones to new terminology? Do we wait to the CPA process to propose substantive changes to the zoning, or do we propose them now?	As long as changes can be applied citywide, substantive changes will be made to the IDO as recommended Conditions of Approval. See Lines 697 and 703.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
821	Solano, David	Santa Barbara-Martineztown Resident	4/10/17	Retired from the Army and Navy. Disabled veteran. I have fought for people of this country to have freedoms about how they want to live and where they want to live. We should not be forced to make a decision [to move] based on other's decisions. Or forced to accept Ordinances. I cannot accept decisions about where or how I want to live in my own home.	We appreciate your service for the freedoms we enjoy in this country. The IDO does not make anyone move. New Ordinances are adopted through a process that involves public hearings. Ultimately, new Ordinances are decided by the City Council, the ultimate land use and planning authority for the City, made up of elected officials.	
822	Solano, David	Santa Barbara-Martineztown Resident	4/10/17	There are some good, some bad regulations.	Noted.	
823	Marquez-Martinez, Librada	Santa Barbara-Martineztown Resident	4/10/17	I was born in the house I live in. It was always a Martinez house for many years.	Noted. Albuquerque's historic and vibrant neighborhoods are a huge asset and make our city unique.	
824	Marquez-Martinez, Librada	Santa Barbara-Martineztown Resident	4/10/17	I am a member of MWG. Here today to oppose the IDO. Zoning does not preserve my single-family residential home character and uniqueness.	Existing zoning through the Martineztown-Santa Barbara SDP allows a mix of uses in residential areas. These have been converted to mixed-use zones in the IDO. Discretionary zone changes to R-1 would be appropriate as a follow-up package of City-sponsored zone changes for properties wanting to only single-family uses in the future.	
825	Marquez-Martinez, Librada	Santa Barbara-Martineztown Resident	4/10/17	What they want to do with us is to kick us out, any time they want, move us to a reservation like Indians? I'm all against it. … Want to stay residential… Want residential neighborhood… support for the residences and community center	The IDO does not make anyone move. See Line 824.	
826	Solano, Crista	Santa Barbara-Martineztown Resident	4/10/17	I oppose the IDO. I would like to see the neighborhood preserved. Proposed zoning takes away our homes.	Noted. See Lines 824 and 825.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
827	Great-house, Olivia	San Jose Resident	4/10/17	I oppose the IDO and would like the EPC to defer the IDO for 14-16 months to give the NA time to meet with the Planning Department.	Noted. The project team has been holding meetings about the IDO since February 2015, with meetings at each milestone and office hours Monday and Friday afternoons. Contact abctoz@cabq.gov to request an appointment or for a team member to come to a meeting in your neighborhood.	
828	Great-house, Olivia	San Jose Resident	4/10/17	Our NA fought against high-rise apartments not too long ago. Four appeals and then we won. The SDP did help us.	More information is needed to determine whether the IDO changes standards in a way that would affect the ability to do high-rise apartments in San Jose.	
829	Great-house, Olivia	San Jose Resident	4/10/17	We put windows on our south side walls. I would not want my south side to be covered by apartments and cover the sun. I haven't heard anything about solar protections or water.	The IDO carries over existing solar protections and adds new best practices. Table 4-1-4 (page 173) allows additional height and setback encroachments for rooftop solar collectors. Section 4-4.5.B.2 + footnote 672 (page 194) generalizes block layout for solar access from the more limited application in the Subdivision Regulations.	
829 (cont'd)	Great-house, Olivia (cont'd)	San Jose Resident	4/10/17		Section 4-6.5 (page 241) – Edge Buffer Landscaping required where multi-family and non-residential uses are developed adjacent to residential zones. A 25' buffer, with screening and landscaping is required. This larger setback will protect solar rights if larger buildings go in near residential land.	
829 (cont'd)	Great-house, Olivia (cont'd)	San Jose Resident	4/10/17		Section 4-6.8 (page 247) – No screening of rooftop or ground-mounted solar energy equipment that would reduce the efficiency or effectiveness of the solar energy equipment is required.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
829 (cont'd)	Great-house, Olivia (cont'd)	San Jose Resident	4/10/17		Section 4-8 (page 262) – Neighborhood Edges: Maximum building height is 30 feet within 100 feet of residential zones. Increasing the side and rear yard setbacks adjacent to residential zones a minimum of 10 feet beyond that otherwise required. This larger setback will protect solar rights for the adjacent lot.	
829 (cont'd)	Great-house, Olivia (cont'd)	San Jose Resident	4/10/17		Water is provided and regulated by the ABCWUA. Water is addressed in Section 4-3.7 on page 195.	
830	Vencill, Matt		4/10/17	It is paramount that this is not voted now in its current status; that it is heard in steps.	Noted. See Lines 731, 735, and 793.	
831	Vencill, Matt		4/10/17	The City hurried through a decision on A.R.T., and now maybe we don't have the money.	Noted.	
832	Vencill, Matt		4/10/17	It seems this is only for the benefit of people who seek to make money from the residents, not for the residents of this city.	There are many intended benefits of ABC-Z. See Lines 92, 317, cc, 343, 360, 385, 420, 506, 593, 600, 662, 673, 675, 689, 682, 694, 743, 749, 764, 803 for goals of the project.	
833	Vencill, Matt		4/10/17	It is frightening for people who own these homes, now they can be flattened, turned into whatever they want, and you could have nothing to say.	Nothing in the IDO forces people out of their homes. Redevelopment can happen on any parcel in the City under today's system. There are varying processes based on location, project size, etc. See Lines 682 and 794.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
834	Vencill, Matt		4/10/17	I live near San Mateo and Central - an intersection that's a huge problem. The only place to buy alcohol near my neighborhood is Shell. It is littered with people panhandling, sleeping, falling out into the street. Problem for EMT and the police. They want to do that to another gas station at Washington and Lomas. Fear in residents mind about what happened at San Mateo could happen in their area.	The IDO places more restrictions on liquor retail, including a distance separation of 1,000 feet from other liquor retail, and carries over the distance separations from schools, churches, and residential zones. See Use Table 3-2-1 on page 113 and Use Specific Standard 3-3.4.DD on page 138.	
835	Vencill, Matt		4/10/17	Not voting on this is the safe bet, but maybe not the wrong bet.	Noted. See Lines 731, 735, 794, and 820.	
836	Krause, Carol	Santa Barbara - Martineztown NA	4/10/17	We are in support of the IDO and have no intent to delay it.	Noted. The project team is grateful for all the participation of stakeholders throughout this process.	
837	Krause, Carol	Santa Barbara - Martineztown NA	4/10/17	Need to go on record with our concerns and ask for more time to work them out with staff before the last EPC hearing. We have met with city staff to discuss these concerns; need more time to hash them out.	Noted. See Lines 731, 735, 794, and 820.	
838	Krause, Carol	Santa Barbara - Martineztown NA	4/10/17	MX-L zone in the historic neighborhood. 35' height in the neighborhood areas, taller than 26 ft. allowed now. Up to 30 dwelling units per acre.	MX-L is the conversion for the SU-2 Neighborhood Residential Commercial in the Martineztown-Santa Barbara SDP, which allows R-2 and C-1 permissively. 35 feet is an appropriate building height limit in MX-L, since it allows a single-story neighborhood commercial building.	Staff is looking for direction from the EPC to 1) reduce building height in MX-L to 30 feet and/or extend the applicability of the Neighborhood Edge provision to single-family detached use (in addition to single-family zone), which would limit building height to 30 feet within 100 feet of a single-family detached home.

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
839	Krause, Carol	Santa Barbara - Martineztown NA	4/10/17	Most lots in the SU-2 NRC (Neighborhood Residential Commercial) zone are narrow and long - 35-50 feet wide. Doesn't leave much room for large development. This zone is inconsistent in use, size, and height. This is now Area of Consistency. Also need protections so that lots can't be consolidated to build tall buildings in MX-M.	The narrow lots in Martineztown will either limit development itself and the scale of development, or incentivize the consolidation of lots for development. Ultimately, the rezoning of lots with exclusively single-family uses to R-1 through a follow-up package of City-sponsored discretionary zone changes will kick in the Contextual Residential Standards (See Section 4-1.3.B), which ensures that development match the scale and setbacks of development on the same block.	See Line 838.
840	Krause, Carol	Santa Barbara - Martineztown NA	4/10/17	We are proposing to change the MX-L to MX-T. Very similar in land use, with allowance of single-family dwellings. There is one property on Indian School should stay MX-L, large lot, commercial use. Should stay MX-L.	See Line 838. Changing the conversion amounts to a discretionary zone change, which is not appropriate at this time through a legislative action. This change could be considered for a follow-up package of City-sponsored zone changes. See also Line 824.	
841	Krause, Carol	Santa Barbara - Martineztown NA	4/10/17	Land uses under MX-L are out of consistency with the neighborhood. Allows large type land uses, town houses, medium to large group homes, multifamily dwellings, please exclude these uses	These uses are allowed under the existing zoning. See Lines 761, 838, and 839.	
842	Krause, Carol	Santa Barbara - Martineztown NA	4/10/17	Our small narrow lots, based on original acequia rights cannot be used for the higher mixed uses. MX-T wouldn't allow consolidation of lots for multifamily uses.	MX-T is still a Mixed-use zone, which does not have the same Contextual Standards as Residential zones, which limit lot setbacks and building size. See also Lines 839 and 840.	
843	Bell, Nique	Santa Barbara-Martineztown Resident	4/10/17	Support the Comp Plan and the IDO.	Noted. The project team is grateful for all the participation of stakeholders throughout this process.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
844	Bell, Nique	Santa Barbara-Martineztown Resident	4/10/17	Other discrepancy in zoning we need to discuss. SU-2 C-3 zone converted to MX-M, which allows 45' with no height limit if more than 100 feet from each side - a major concern. Martineztown SDP limits building height in SU-2 C-3 to 26' unless site is over 5 acres.	The Martineztown-Santa Barbara SDP allows C-2 uses and a handful of C-3 uses in the SU-2/C-3 zone. The IDO zone that best matches is MX-M, which is the straight conversion for C-2 on the East Side. As the commenter notes, MX-M does allow 45', with unlimited height on portions of the property more than 100 feet from each property edge. See Lines 662 and 761.	See Line 838.
845	Bell, Nique	Santa Barbara-Martineztown Resident	4/10/17	With exception near Embassy Suites, all lots surrounded by single-family residential. Nothing to prevent people from consolidating large lots and building high buildings.Need either to remove the unlimited heights or restrict them near residential uses.	See Line 844.	See Line 838.
846	Bell, Nique	Santa Barbara-Martineztown Resident	4/10/17	We support mother in law homes and the ability to have them.	The Martineztown-Santa Barbara SDP does not allow accessory dwelling units within R-1 zones. They are allowed in the Mixed-use zones where mutiple dwelling units are allowed on a lot. See Table 3-2-1 for Dwelling Unit, Accessory on page 117.	
847	Bell, Nique	Santa Barbara-Martineztown Resident	4/10/17	Several properties abut steep hill size; may not be appropriate for MX-M.	See Lines 847, 700, and 706.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
848	Bell, Nique	Santa Barbara-Martineztown Resident	4/10/17	Setback standards, long lots; conditional uses should be grandfathered in. What will happen to small animals, farming uses?	Development that was legal prior to the IDO is grandfathered in. See Section 5-6 Nonconformities for more detail. Animal-keeping is covered in the Accessory uses in Use Table 3-2-1 on page 116. Farming uses are covered in the same table on page 108: Agricultural, general and Community Garden.	On page 103, Section 3-1.4, revise the heading to read "Previously Allowed Uses" and revise language to read: "but that was a Permitted Use or an approved Conditional use prior to…" Add a new subsection that reads: "Uses that were permissive or approved conditional uses prior to the effective date of the IDO and that are no longer allowed in that zone become nonconforming uses. See Section 5-6 Nonconformities." (Revised 4/19/17)
849	Bell, Nique	Santa Barbara-Martineztown Resident	4/10/17	Want design to be compatible with existing development.	Staff has worked with the SBMT NA to create guidelines for development, which could be adopted as a CPO as a follow-up action after the IDO is adopted. See Line 662.	
850	Vigil, Angela	MWG	4/10/17	Speaking on behalf of multiple properties in the Martineztown.	Noted. The project team is grateful for all the participation of stakeholders throughout this process.	
851	Vigil, Angela	MWG	4/10/17	Pino and a Martinez - families been here for generations, hence the name Martineztown.	Noted. Albuquerque's historic and vibrant neighborhoods are a huge asset and make our city unique.	
852	Vigil, Angela	MWG	4/10/17	No one listening to us.	The project team has met with the Martineztown Work Group multiple times, in addition to public meetings. Requests for discretionary zone changes cannot be accommodated through the ABC-Z process. See Lines 700, 706, 838-840, and 844.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
853	Vigil, Angela	MWG	4/10/17	City decided we were an Area of Change, part of Downtown. We are not part of Albuquerque Downtown. We are not an Area of Change. We are a small village in the city.	Properties with single-family uses are mapped as Areas of Consistency in Martineztown. See Line 795. The ABC Comp Plan includes Martineztown within the Community Planning Area called Central Albuquerque, consistent with the map that has been in the Comp Plan since 2001. Martineztown does not appear in the Downtown Center as mapped in the Comp Plan.	
854	Vigil, Angela	MWG	4/10/17	I am against the IDO.	Noted.	
855	Vigil, Angela	MWG	4/10/17	The people in support of this are primarily business owners; they do not live in the neighborhood. They live elsewhere…. Parkland, Richmond Dr. SE.	Noted. The project team is grateful for all the participation of stakeholders throughout this process.	
856	Vigil, Angela	MWG	4/10/17	We want our neighborhood to stay the way it is. Don't want 4 story buildings; we don't want apartments.	The existing zoning in the Martineztown-Santa Barbara SDP allows apartments and does not include protections that will discourage development of buildings that are out of scale and out of character of the neighborhood.	
857	Vigil, Angela	MWG	4/10/17	The city is continuing on its quest to conquer the city, remove the SDP that we took so long to write. My grandmother helped write the SDP.	See Lines 662, 673, 675, 682, 694, 803, and 806.	
858	Vigil, Angela	MWG	4/10/17	We want SF dwelling. Want R-1. We want Areas of Consistency. Stop this nonsense. Stop sign is red for stop. Keep this area the same as it is. My familia helped build those adobes for the San Ignacio church. For us this is who we are. We are Martinez's, we are proud, we want the land the same. Don't want businesses in. Please help us out!	See Lines 700, 706, 838-840, 844, and 852.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
859	Vigil, Angela	MWG	4/10/17	We've had multiple meetings with the Work Group. One meeting had 150 people at the church at Lomas and Edith. We had to close up shop because we could not fit them all in. People were upset and angry.	This was a meeting sponsored by the HNA and the Work Group. The project team attended but was on the agenda or given the opportunity to speak. We have met with the Martineztown Work Group on multiple occasions. See Line 852	
860	Grothus, Barbara	Raynolds NA / Downtown Neighborhood Area	4/10/17	I know you are not going to value our neighborhood. It's really unfair how you treat people who come here.	The project team is grateful for all the participation of stakeholders throughout this process.	
861	Grothus, Barbara	Raynolds NA / Downtown Neighborhood Area	4/10/17	Looking at page 30- of the document, show 9 blocks of our neighborhood. Told redirecting our neighborhood boundary by blocks near 8th Street. Not seeing the change we requested to Area of Consistency.	The ABC Comp Plan has an action to look a the boundary of the Downtown Center, which is the same as the Downtown 2025 SDP. The ABC-Z project is not intended to change boundaries of Centers in the Comp Plan or boundaries in SDPs. That would be more appropriate through the CPA process that will follow the IDO adoption. See Line 706.	
862	Grothus, Barbara	Raynolds NA / Downtown Neighborhood Area	4/10/17		In 2000, that SDP zoned these blocks with a housing focus, which allows R-2 uses permissively and up to C-2 uses by going to EPC, a variant on the conditional use process unique to this SDP. The original conversion proposed did not reflect the focus areas in the SDP.	On the conversion map, add boundaries within the MX-FB-DT that reflect the use table in the Downtown 2025 Plan. Add a section on building heights that reflect the highest building heights allowed by allowable building types in each focus area
863	Grothus, Barbara	Raynolds NA / Downtown Neighborhood Area	10-Apr	Not seeing height restrictions. If it is taller than 30', they need to step it down.	The Neighborhood Edge provision for Downtown shows up in two places in the document: Section 4.8 on page 262 and in the MX-FB-DT section on page 38. See also Line 838	On page 38, replace existing text with a cross-reference to Section 4-8.2.A.2.b.

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
864	Grothus, Barbara	Raynolds NA / Downtown Neighborhood Area	4/10/17	Seeing 4 story building across the street. Neighborhood taken over by projects like this; pay nothing into the tax base. They use tax credits. Tax-free status for 30-40 years while our taxes go up. Our streets are filled with their cars, but we are locked out of their buildings. This is how we are treated in our neighborhood.	The Downtown 2025 SDP allows building types in the Housing focus area with building heights up to 8 stories. That SDP does not include parking requirements, so that has been carried into the IDO. The IDO does not address tax-free status of development or tax credits.	
865	Grothus, Barbara	Raynolds NA / Downtown Neighborhood Area	4/10/17	This plan continues to validate concerns our NA raised. Councilor Benton tells us to wait for IDO, but it has the same language. I don't know how our neighborhood can have a voice in this. We have sent letters, met with staff, spoken at Council. If you live downtown, you are screwed.	See Lines 697, 703, and 861.	
866	Grothus, Barbara	Raynolds NA / Downtown Neighborhood Area	4/10/17	We have solid neighborhood blocks, historic buildings, but no historic overlay, so we are not protected.	See Line 863.	
867	Gallegos, John	NAIOP	4/10/17	6th generation NM. NAIOP voted for CP and IDO. Unanimously voted 33 members at the march meeting. Members have reviewed and continue to review and recommend changes.	Noted. The project team is grateful for all the participation of stakeholders throughout this process.	
868	Gallegos, John	NAIOP	4/10/17	One good element is ability to revisit IDO ordinace every year, as a living document. This can reflect changing goals of citizens and processes that are not working.	Agreed. See Section 5-4.5.D on page 312.	On page 307, Section 5-3, add a cross reference to the annual update to the IDO per Section 5-4.5.D.
869	Gallegos, John	NAIOP	4/10/17	Document will emphasize job creation and economic development in our community.	Agreed. See Lines 744, 748, and 772.	
870	Gallegos, John	NAIOP	4/10/17	We understand IDO changes will be available in the redline at council. Thank you for what you do for our community.	Agreed. See Lines 731, 735, and 820.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
871	Varoz, Camille	North Valley Coalition / Historic Neighborhood Alliance	4/10/17	Lived in Barelas for 11 years; kids went to Longfellow elementary school in Martineztown. These are historical areas that represent consistency and give value to our city.	Agreed. Albuquerque's historic and vibrant neighborhoods are a huge asset and make our city unique.	
872	Varoz, Camille	NVC / HNA	4/10/17	I did speak on April 6th as an individual. I do respect commission being here and opportunities to discuss. It is your job to support/vote on IDO, as Council did on the Comp Plan. There is so much at stake here.	Agreed. See Lines 731, 735, and 820.	
873	Varoz, Camille	NVC / HNA	4/10/17	Tonight there have been many NA representatives and real estate agencies/establishments. Lot of developers that have spoken about the Comp Plan and IDO. I hope that these hearings are not in vain in terms of NA representatives.	Agreed. The project team is grateful for all the participation of stakeholders throughout this process.	
874	Varoz, Camille	NVC / HNA		I don’t know that I support all that the IDO represents. The codes and density living situations that would highly impact residential areas.	Noted. See Lines 734, 795, 797, and 811.	
875	Varoz, Camille	NVC / HNA	4/10/17	When you look at downzoning, where bed and breakfasts could have alcohol and expand in the future. Liquor should be considered highly where there are schools and residential areas with children, not just meeting the needs of millennials.	Bed and breakfast use is regulated per Table 3-2-1 on page 109 and Use Specific Standard 3-3.4.H on page 129. The State liquor permitting process includes a permit for Bed and Breakfasts. The IDO defers to this state process, as referenced in the Definition for Bed and Breakfast in Section 6-1 on page 388. The distance separation from residential uses for other alcohol-related uses is not workable for Bed and Breakfasts, since these are largely converted single-family homes within single-family residential neighborhoods.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
876	Varoz, Camille	NVC / HNA	4/10/17	Work towards change, absolutely. But please consider neighborhoods. Need thoughtful deliberation.	Agreed. See Lines 662 and 803.	
877	Vencill, Elizabeth	Highland NA / HNA	4/10/17	Comp Plan and IDO are based on out-of-state studies about what Millennials want that are old.	One of the key studies informing the Comp Plan and IDO is a 2012 Travel Preference Survey done by MRCOG in Bernalillo County, which showed a preference for more transportation options other than the car, more housing options, and a preference for living in more rural and more urban areas (but not suburban areas) in the future.	
877 (con 'td)	Vencill, Elizabeth (Cont'd)	Highland NA / HNA	4/10/17		Both documents acknowledge that single-family housing in suburban areas is and will remain the predominant built environment in Albuquerque. See the conversion map for R-A and R-1 zones, which makes up the vast majority of parcels in Albuquerque. See Section 4-8 for Neighborhood Edges limiting building heights next to low-density residential zones, as well as other landscaping and buffers required to protect Areas of Consistency.	
877 (con 'td)	Vencill, Elizabeth (Cont'd)	Highland NA / HNA	4/10/17		The new Mixed-use zones encourage additional housing and living options in the future for those who may want them, with higher heights and densities allowed in Centers and Corridors, where the Comp Plan says to encourage growth and development. See also Line 743.	
878	Vencill, Elizabeth	Highland NA / HNA	4/10/17	What is the conflict? No one has proved there is one. I'm a lawyer. Ask for proof of premise, and if you can't, the whole argument falls apart.	See testimony from CABQ staff - Rachel Michel, Michael Vos, Vincent Montano, and Ben McIntosh in Lines 671-697.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
879	Vencill, Elizabeth	Highland NA / HNA	4/10/17	If there are conflicts, get those out, without tearing up the whole town.This is all being driven by the redevelopment of the railyards.	The inconsistencies are not just a matter of a handful of overlapping policies or regulations but rather systemic issues of an outdated Zoning Code that does not allow the mixing of uses that match economic development needs or changing desires for housing options, nor the protections for neighborhoods or Open Space that result in compatible and high-quality development.	
879 (cont'd)	Vencill, Elizabeth (Cont'd)	Highland NA / HNA	4/10/17		This has resulted in the need for thousands of SU-1/SU-2/SU-3 zones, which may represent good design standards and good public input but leave 47% of properties on the City's zoning map completely opaque as to what uses are allowed, what standards apply, and what processes must be followed.	
880	Vencill, Elizabeth	Highland NA / HNA	4/10/17	Need certainty about where you live, continuity of zoning. Move into an area, with R-1 you want to continue feeling that way, without change. You don’t want a bar in your neighborhood.	Agreed. The IDO intends to give greater certainty and predictability through showing straight zones throughout the city, with standards for high-quality development that are known upfront, and standardized processes that ensure that standards are met, and that when they are met, approvals are assured.	
880 (cont'd)	Vencill, Elizabeth (Cont'd)	Highland NA / HNA	4/10/17		Zoning standards should be reviewed and updated to include best practices at least every generation. This has not been done citywide in Albuquerque since the 1970s. See Line 761.	
880 (cont'd)	Vencill, Elizabeth (Cont'd)	Highland NA / HNA	4/10/17		The Citizens Academy and CPA process are intended to provide ongoing opportunities to review and recommend changes to policies in the Comp Plan and regulations in the IDO.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
881	Vencill, Elizabeth	Highland NA / HNA	4/10/17	Don Elliot says you can keep working on the IDO after it's adopted. That's just backwards.	Clearly, the IDO needs to be reviewed with an eye toward whether it is good enough to be adopted - whether it is a good rule book for Albuquerque. The consultant was pointing out that the standard need not be that it is perfect but rather whether it is rational and workable and whether it provides high-quality standards and protections for neighborhoods and Open Space. See Lines 662, 761, 803, 806, and 868.	
882	Vencill, Elizabeth	Highland NA / HNA	4/10/17	We have area specific regulations; the SDPs work for the neighborhoods that developed them. Area-specific considerations led to SDPs. They work for each neighborhood.	Agreed. See Lines 662 and 806.	
883	Vencill, Elizabeth	Highland NA / HNA	4/10/17	Some people don't have them, but they can just get one. Make one and bring it to the City to adopt.	There is no budget for developing SDPs for the 50% of the City that does not have them, nor to update the 60+ SDPs that do exist on a regular basis to assure best practices for neighborhood and environmental protections. See Line 773.	
884	Vencill, Elizabeth	Highland NA / HNA	4/10/17	My Nob Hill SDP has been worked on and tweaked; I’ve been told over and over that regulations have been carried forward into the IDO. I asked how they were, because it didn’t seem to happen. I outlined every place Nob Hill was mentioned. Mostly in footnotes. Not carried forward the commitment to Hiland theater, solar rights, parking, info on infill.	See Line 661. See the Mapped Areas list of area-specific regulations in the second table after the Table of Contents. See also Lines 145, 277, 296, 325-326, 341, 660, and 701 for other comments about carports and walls. Prohibitions on drive-throughs, design standards in the Nob Hill CPO, second-story residential setbacks, and demolition review for historic buildings have all been carried over. See Line 381, 387, and 829 for solar rights. Highland theatre is not a policy or regulation in the Nob Hill SDP.	On page 202, Section 4-5.2.A.1 create a new d that reads as follows: "Non-residential uses other than Restaurants in establishments of less than 3,000 s.f. in CPO-5 for Nob Hill." On page 80, Section 2-7.2.B.5.f, add a cross reference to Section 4-5.2.A.

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
885	Vencill, Elizabeth	Highland NA / HNA		IDO would add adult uses.	Adult entertainment is regulated per Use Table 3-2-1 on page 108 and Use Specific Standard (USS) 3-3.4.F on page 128. Adult retail is regulated in the same table on page 112 and the same USS. See Line 761.	
886	Vencill, Elizabeth	Highland NA / HNA	4/10/17	CPAs don't satisfy a replacement for SDPs, since this will be a top-down process. The staff are instructed to go out to train the neighborhoods about the preferred solution, which is density and no cars.	There is no such instruction to staff. The Comp Plan describes a community-planning process to listen to residents, property owners, business owners, and other stakeholders about their desires and concerns and to help recommend policy and regulation changes and prioritze capital improvement projects and other implementation efforts to address issues that stakeholders raise.	
887	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	Martineztown Work Group (MWG)	4/10/17	Any of the proposed zones, MX-T, MX-L, etc,. not consistent with health, safety, moral welfare.	More information is needed about how the proposed zones are inappropriate. See Lines 662, 761, and 838.	
888	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	MWG	4/10/17	In conflict with CP goal 4.1 – enhance, preserve distinct community identity.	More information is needed. See Lines 700, 706, 838, 839, and 844.	
889	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	MWG	4/10/17	Martineztown-Santa Barbara SDP promotes preservation of existing neighborhood.	Based on discussions with the commenter, staff believes this refers to the height limits in the SDP, not the mixed-use zoning in the plan. See Lines 838, 839, and 844.	
890	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	MWG	4/10/17	Error when zoning was established. No change to the established neighborhood. No justification to the change. NAs continue to pay residential taxes.	Based on discussions with the commenter, staff believes this refers to the original zoning of non-residential zones on single-family residential properties, which eventually led to the allowance of mixed-use zoning in the 1990s SDP as a compromise. See Lines 359-361 and 366.	
891	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	MWG	4/10/17	NM legislature recognized neighborhood. NA established in 1800s, 1930.	Noted. Albuquerque's historic and vibrant neighborhoods are a huge asset and make our city unique.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
892	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	MWG	4/10/17	[Shows Sites Southwest proposed zoning map.] This was community planning.	The Sites Southwest version of the Martineztown-Santa Barbara SDP never made it to submittal for EPC review.	
893	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	MWG	4/10/17	[Shows IDO Conversion map] It is disturbing when you look at this. The IDO allows 4-story apartments. You can put all apartment or all commercial in SDF neighborhood. SDP allows only 26' in height.	See Lines 838, 852, and 856.	
894	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	MWG	4/10/17	Have staff response from 2012 that says "SU-2/C-3 is misleading" which is why they converted to MX-M. That was their exact words from the document I have.	See Lines 844 and 845.	
895	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	MWG	4/10/17	Here with hundreds of letters, petitions, emails telling you we want R-1, uses compatible with the neighborhood.	See Lines 838, 852, and 856.	
896	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	MWG	4/10/17	These commercial categories don't provide for the community. How do they benefit the neighborhood, high school, churches?	The conversion is reflecting the existing uses in the Martineztown-Santa Barbara SDP.	
897	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	MWG	4/10/17	The Planning Department promotes mixed uses - shops and retail.	There are generally benefits to having neighborhood-serving shops and retail near residential areas, but it is not appropriate everywhere, as both the Comp Plan and IDO acknowledge. See Lines 741 and 877.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
898	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	MWG	4/10/17	This is out of character, buildings of 4 stories. R-2 from the zoning code allows single-family uses to 4-plexes. The IDO MX-M prohibits SF residences, which is the main use in Martineztown.	Single-family residents often do not want to be next to apartments, and many SDPs limit apartment development in many different ways. In the IDO, Residential zones range from low-density to higher-density. See Use Table 3-2-1 on page 105. RA and R-1 allow only SF detached. R-T and R-ML allow SF detached and townhouses to 4-plexes. R-MH allows townhouses and multifamily. The Mixed-use zones allow the lower-density townhouses to the higher-density residential uses. See Lines 761, 838, 853, and 856.	See Lines 140, 660, and 669.
899	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	MWG	4/10/17	This is directly from one of the city's handbooks that I have. It is easy to understand. If you read this book [IDO], I don't know how anyone can understand.	Staff is not familiar with the handbook shown. It is not the Zoning Code. Clearly, at some point, the Planning Department felt the need to create a handbook to explain the Zoning Code, which is not easy to understand just from reading it. The IDO is complex - as is every zoning document. The question is not how easy it is to understand but rather whether it is a good rule book for Albuquerque. See Line 761.	
900	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	MWG	4/10/17	[Referring to the handbook] Setbacks in R-2 similar to R-1, densities half of R-3 zone, etc.... the R-4 zone... R-2 is closer to Single family.	The IDO also has an interior logic. See the Table of Uses 3-2-1 and Dimensional Standards tables 4-1-1 through 4-1-3. See Line 761.	
901	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	MWG	4/10/17	The MX-M allows permissive uses in this category in violation of the zoning ordinance that says to protect health, safety, and moral welfare.	More information is needed about how the proposed zones are inappropriate. See Lines 662, 761, and 838.	
902	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	MWG	4/10/17	We need more time; 14-16 months. We are opposed to it. We provided a letter today.	See Lines a, f, z, nn, 419, 420, 543, 555, 572, 731, 793, 820, 830, 870, 873, and 881. See Lines 1008-1035 for comments submitted by the MWG on 4/10/17.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
903	Gallagher, Pat		4/10/17	Thank you for holding meetings. There needs to be a discussion on every aspect of the IDO where all stakeholders have equal time to make their case. Not possible in these two minutes.	Noted. The project team is grateful for all the participation of stakeholders throughout this process.	
903 (cont'd)	Gallagher, Pat (cont'd)		4/10/17		The IDO was developed and reviewed in sections between October 2015 and October 2016, with meetings for each Module and comments taken on each for revision at the next draft.	
903 (cont'd)	Gallagher, Pat (cont'd)		4/10/17		The EPC has discretion to decide how much time is alloted for each speaker. 2 minutes for individuals and 5 minutes for neighborhood associations/organizations is typical, particularly when there are many speakers.	
904	Gallagher, Pat		4/10/17	View Preservation Overlay needs its own hearing. Talking about site lines would take an hour. Not covered properly in these hearings.	The VPO is not meant to be new standards but rather a carryover of adopted provisions. The level of review needed for original adoption is necessarily deeper than a carryover.	
905	Gallagher, Pat		4/10/17	We need to cover these subjects: Zoning on pollution.What about densification and violent crime? High rises. Changing SU-1 to generic commercial. Deviations. Thresholds. Shouldn't we discuss each topic in its own hearing? For Coors Corridor Plan, each hearing focused on specifics; it's not happening here.	The EPC will cover topics in these hearings until it is satisfied that a recommendation can be voted on. See Lines 731, 735, 793, and 820.	
906	Gallagher, Pat		4/10/17	Stop this wholesale push for one glorious and incomprehensible blast. Reject the approach. Don't get overrun. Take the time to do it right.	The first two hearings were to take public comment. Subsequent hearings will be for substantive discussions about topics until the EPC is ready to vote on a recommendation.	
907	Vencill, Craig	Highland Neighborhood Resident	4/10/17	Preserving character of our neighborhoods in Albuquerque. If blighted, development is great.	Noted. See Lines 803 and 806.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
908	Vencill, Craig	Highland Neighborhood Resident	4/10/17	Fear this is just about development, not planning. If we lose integrity of Albuquerque, with what our community looks like and destroy the unique character of South Broadway, far northeast heights. If all we get are high rises, then we'll just look like all the ugly cities around America.	See Lines 662 and 761. Albuquerque's historic and vibrant neighborhoods are a huge asset and make our city unique.	
909	Vencill, Craig	Highland Neighborhood Resident	4/10/17	State land office land built in Santa Fe with modernesque style because they could override the zoning code. Will that happen here?	The State is immune from city zoning codes. Albuquerque does not have restrictions on style as Santa Fe does. Design standards in the IDO raise the bar on development quality citywide. See Section 4-10. Character Protection Overlays (CPOs) carry over building design standards unique to small areas in adopted SDPs. See Section 2-7.2.	
910	Vencill, Craig	Highland Neighborhood Resident	4/10/17	Stand back, take some thought. Come up with sensitivies to protect character.	See Lines 662, 803, and 886.	
911	Ward, E.	SR Marmon NA	4/10/17	The SRM NA letter was not included in the staff report, even though we turned it in by the deadline. It was included in the packet of letters under the 48 hour rule, but we wanted it available to you and responded to by staff in the staff report.	Staff apologizes that this and a handful of others were overlooked for staff reponse in the staff report for April 6. Please see Lines 343 and 344.	
912	Ward, E.	SR Marmon NA	4/10/17	I wonder if it wasn't included because of the specific request for examples of conflicts in the Zoning Code, SDPs, that causes all these difficulties that the Planning Department says we need a new zoning ordinance.	See Lines 671-697 for staff testimony. See also Line 877.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
913	Ward, E.	SR Marmon NA	4/10/17	If you look page 5-7 in the staff report, there are vague statements about how the DPM and Zoning Code sometimes conflict, but nothing specific about problems that happen frequently or just 3 times per year. Staff complains about vague language but only offers vague language. I would ask that you demand of the planning staff that they provide concrete examples of the need to overhaul the ZC.	See Line 761 and Lines 878-879.	
914	Ward, E.	SR Marmon NA	4/10/17	We were informed we were referred to as crackpots or wackos.	Members of the project team do not remember any circumstance of anyone being called crackpots or wackos.	
915	Ward, E.	SR Marmon NA	4/10/17	Consultant claims EPCs are in decline nationwide. They make you think that we don't need you. Accept my exhortation to not go down without a fight.	The consultant did not say EPCs are in decline, but rather that their roles are changing to be less about site plan review and more for policy decisions, such as zone changes, Comp Plans, Facility Plans, Capital Implementation Programs, etc. The IDO also describes in Section 5-3 that the EPC will review Community Planning Area Assessment Reports.	
Below are written comments received after the 4 April 2017 @ 1 p.m. EPC 48-Hour Rule comment deadline and before the 12 April 2017 @ 5 p.m. deadline for comments to be addressed in the Supplemental Staff Report for the 24 April 2017 hearing.						
916	Wolfley, Jolene	TRNA	4/4/17	If possible, please use these documents. I corrected a couple of typos on our letter. Then I found the attachment I wanted to include, which I referenced in our letter. We urge the Environmental Planning Commission to carefully review the IDO without being rushed. The IDO is a monumental change in law for the City of Albuquerque. For that reason, we ask that these steps be followed:	See Lines 434 and 917-950. See also Lines See lines a, f, z, nn, 419, 420, 543, and 573.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
917	Wolfley, Jolene	TRNA	4/4/17	1. In your first hearing/decision: Review the consolidation of existing documents into the IDO and carrying forward existing policy. Section by section review is needed.	Summaries of the policies, zoning, and/or regulations of existing sector and area development plans, and how they are reflected in the updated Comp Plan and in the EPC Draft IDO, were posted on the project webpage in mid-February 2017 and have been distributed in public and small group meetings: https://abc-zone.com/documents and filter by Adopted Plans.	
918	Wolfley, Jolene	TRNA	4/4/17	2. In a subsequent hearing: Review new policy in the IDO and analyze its merits and the economic impact of the new policy. (See points made in this letter) Section by section review is needed.	The IDO does not contain policies. The recently adopted Comp Plan contains policy guidance and recommends actions, such as the one provided in this comment. Staff envisions reviewing the adopted City policies in further detail as part of the CPA assessment process. Any updated/revised policies could then be reflected in amendments to the Comp Plan and/or the IDO.	
919	Wolfley, Jolene	TRNA	4/4/17	3. In a third hearing process: Review methodology for converting existing zoning to new zoning. (Are State law principles in R-270-1980 being followed?) (See section C of this letter.)	The IDO is not proposing to re-zone properties but rather to convert the existing set of zones to a new set of zones. The request before the EPC and Council is a legislative not a quasi-judicial matter. The conversion protocol is part of the IDO and is being considered by the EPC and Council. See Line 89, t, ii, 403, 420, 592-594, 759, 919, and 759.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
920	Wolfley, Jolene	TRNA	4/4/17	4. In later hearings: Adopt a new zoning map quadrant by quadrant so property owners in those quadrants are well aware of what is happening. Identify parcels whose zoning should be reviewed individually—for which a citywide zoning sweep is not appropriate.	Staff have identified some categories of existing zoning (e.g. RD, SU-1/PRD) that are already getting additional scrutiny. Property-owners have been commenting on their zoning on-line and in office hours with staff, and others can continue to do so during the same period. (The on-line Zoning Conversion map has been on the ABC-Z project webpage since April 2016) Adjustments made during the EPC phase will be reflected in an updated conversion map for the Council phase. With a complete zoning overhaul like the IDO, cities usually adopt a transition period to allow for additional public input and corresponding clean-up of zones on specific properties to ensure that the zones are converted accurately and consistently. See Lines 3, 4, 73, 74, 421, and 1000.	
921	Wolfley, Jolene	TRNA	4/4/17	There is a great deal of new policy in the IDO. It needs to be carefully considered and not rushed. Each EPC Commissioner should fully understand what is going on and not pass on the new IDO until they do understand and concur with the new policies.	The IDO does not contain policy. It consists of land development regulations that will govern land development and help implement the policies in the Comp Plan and Sector Development Plans. See Lines a, f, z, nn, 419, 420, 543, 555, 572, 731, 735, 793, 820, 830, 870, 873, 881, 902, and 921.	
922	Wolfley, Jolene	TRNA	4/4/17	A. The IDO makes sweeping shifts of power from citizen boards (EPC, Board of Appeals) to the Planning Director and staff.	See lines n, x, y, 417, 541-544, 925, and 987 about the IDO's approval process and thresholds for approvals. See Lines 148, 162, 213, 215, 221, 224, a, f, h, dd, 370, 511, 542, 597, 615, and 923 about higher quailty development standards.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
923	Wolfley, Jolene	TRNA	4/4/17	1. Much of the work of the EPC would be administrative under the IDO. Many land use decisions—especially those affecting the Bosque, Escarpment, Foothills, culturally important neighborhoods, preservation of community character, making areas pedestrian friendly—involve many components that are discretionary. Important discretionary land use decisions occur during the site planning process when developers have a concept for development and some of the site characteristics are known. The premise of the IDO is that you can write up front regulations sufficient to remove all discretionary decision making. This premise is faulty when it comes to unique areas of Albuquerque that are unique topographically and culturally.	The IDO aims to improve the quality of development across the city with clearer and stronger regulations, and also recognizes the uniqueness of certain areas through more specific regulations. It is up to the EPC to consider whether the regulations, the thresholds for approval, and the decision criteria are sound, or to recommend adjustments. See Lines i, k-m, n, x, y, 417, 541-544, 925, and 987.	
924	Wolfley, Jolene	TRNA	4/4/17	The EPC has significant experience deliberating on these discretionary areas and applying their discretionary authority. In a recent case regarding the Bosque Plaza Shopping Center (see TRNA letter to EPC re: Bosque Plaza attached to the letter)--which is proximate to the Bosque--the EPC reaffirmed that the EPC should review the site plans for subdivision and also each site plan for building permit. More than one Commissioner commented that this is why we have an EPC….to review projects near environmentally important areas like the Bosque. While this need for EPC is critical, the IDO does not allow for EPC to take this role.	See Lines i, k-m, n, 417, 509, 542, 543, 568-570, and 924.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
925	Wolfley, Jolene	TRNA	4/4/17	The IDO criteria for Administrative review is alarming. What is the justification for the criteria that is selected for administrative review? (see slide below from staff presentation). The majority of the development projects will fit this criteria—or could be made to fit this criteria through clever project phasing. It would take most development projects now reviewed by the EPC—developments with far ranging impacts—to be reviewed only administratively.	See Lines i, k-m, n, x, y, 417, 541-544, and 987.	
926	Wolfley, Jolene	TRNA	4/4/17	2. The Administrative Deviations give the Planning Department wide latitude to make rule changes. (see p. 320, 5-4.15) This whole section needs to be clearly justified. Percentage deviations may seem simple to administer. However, you have parcel sizes that vary tremendously, so that ten percent on a small parcel would have very different implications than ten percent on a large parcel. The Administrative Deviations would also allow as much as fifty percent deviations on side and rear setbacks. What intent and purpose is there to a deviation that is no where near the standard? Should this be done administratively? Wouldn't this be a discretionary type of decision to be reviewed publicly?	The 50% deviation of setbacks applies in limited situations--smaller lots (approx 1/4 acre) in mixed use and non-residential zones--and is based on input from designers after testing of the IDO on urban infill sites. The building code also requires a minimum distance between buildings for fire safety. See also Lines p, w, and 499.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
927	Wolfley, Jolene	TRNA	4/4/17	3. The Board of Appeals is eliminated in the IDO. The Board of Appeals is the only other body of citizen decision makers like the EPC. They deliberate on the actions of the Zoning Hearing Officer. Having the Zoning Hearing Officer, who is an attorney, have his/her work reviewed by another attorney (the Land Use Hearing Officer) means that we have double legal review and no review by a body of appointed citizens with ties to the community. If the intent is to streamline the work of the Zoning Hearing Officer, a better approach would be to retain the Board of Appeals and have their decisions go straight to the City Council, without the extra step of going to the Land Use Hearing Officer.	Noted. See Lines 545, 927, and 990. The intent of the change is not to streamline work for the ZHE; the ZHE will see the cases regardless of the appellate body. A large number of appeals to BOA are further appealed to Council. Council hires the LUHO to review and recommend appeals that come to Council. LUHO helps Council make informed decisions within the scope of their discretion. It is a slightly different role than the BOA. To accommodate the request from this commenter, Council would have to agree to not using its own LUHO for appeals to ZHE decisions. Direction would be needed from decision-makers to change the approach proposed in the IDO. (Revised 4/19/17)	
928	Wolfley, Jolene	TRNA	4/4/17	4. New requirements for EPC service may eliminate worthy candidates. Many successful Environmental Planning Commissioners have had backgrounds in neighborhood associations and professional background in other fields like engineering, etc. The IDO may disqualify such people from serving. "…the Mayor shall attempt to appoint members with experience in community planning, architecture, landscape architecture, urban design, real estate development, transportation, and/or real estate finance." 14-16-5-D-3. P. 305 This qualification list should include those who have actively served in planning related activities in their neighborhood. It should also include civil engineering.	The types of experience listed in the IDO for planning commissioners are not intended to preclude community-based volunteer experience. The phrase "experience" intentionally includes both personal/life and professional experience. (Revised 4/19/17)	On page 305, move the requirements in Section D.3 to B. Add civil engineer to the list of qualifications desired for service on the EPC. Revise other subsections accordingly. (Revised 4/19/17)

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
929	Wolfley, Jolene	TRNA	4/4/17	B. An Economic Impact Analysis of the proposed zoning districts and the dramatic change in densification to most parts of the City needs to be evaluated. Giving land in Albuquerque dramatic new development rights (entitlements) in one sweeping process needs serious economic evaluation. 'Over-entitling' land with development rights can lead to unintended consequences in the market place.	It is not clear if the comment is referring to residential densification only or also to non-residential intensification. The IDO does not make dramatic changes to either in "most parts of the City." It does aim to implement the Comp Plan Centers and Corridors vision in a more targetted way and to address the jobs-housing imbalance on the West side by protecting commercial zoning there. The IDO therefore does not cap residential density in two zones, R-MH and MX-H, but only on sites within an Urban Center, on a Main Street Corridor, and/or 660 ft of a Premium Transit Station (ART stations on Central). MX-M allows 75 du/acre, whereas existing C-2 allows that density on 3 long transit corridors (Central, Montgomery, and San Mateo). Other zones that allow residential development allow the same or very similar densities to the existing zones. See Lines 288, 343, 482, 513, 546, 763, 918, 932, 933, and 991.	Further analysis is needed to respond to this request, which may result in a future Recommended Condition of Approval.

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
930	Wolfley, Jolene	TRNA	4/4/17	I worked for the City of Phoenix as a Senior Planner for all of the 1990s. Earlier, in the 1980s the City of Phoenix entitled some land to be higher density village centers. Land owners absorbed these entitlements into their land values and raised the asking price for the land. While the Phoenix intention in entitling the land was good, the Phoenix leaders lacked an understanding of the impact of their decision on land markets. The entitlements were ahead of market forces that sought that amount of densification. So the result was that development went everywhere except in the village centers. The development market did not desire to be dense and therefore, it went to areas where the land was the lowest price. There were major unintended consequences.	Noted. See Line 929.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
931	Wolfley, Jolene	TRNA	4/4/17	The IDO allows extreme changes in densification throughout the City of Albuquerque. The densification is in height allowances, changes in parking requirements, and allowance of deviations in setbacks. It is very likely that many land owners will seek to capture these entitlements in the value of their land and will raise their land asking price. If the Albuquerque land development market is not ready to build at these densities, there could be a loss of developments from Albuquerque to neighboring jurisdictions like Bernalillo County, Rio Rancho, and Los Lunas. Will the next big developments choose Albuquerque or Santolina? Land prices will play one of the biggest factors in those decisions.	See Line 930. See also Lines 39, 41, 82, 95, 140, 141, 143, 152, 276, 331, 333, 336, 337, 339, 340, 386, 389, 390, 660, 662-665 for other commets about building heights. See also Lines 30,-32, 47, 114, 150, 199, 200, 242, 245, 253, 254, 273, 274, oo, pp, and 486 for other comments about parking. See also Lines p, w, 499, and 926 for additional comments about Administrative Deviations.	
932	Wolfley, Jolene	TRNA	4/4/17	It would be irresponsible for the EPC to approve these sweeping increases to development entitlements without conducting an independent economic analysis. The independence is needed from staff and consultants who are now immersed in their current ideas in the IDO.	See Line 929.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
933	Wolfley, Jolene	TRNA	4/4/17	The Albuquerque Journal recently reported on a regional land development expert who reported to commercial developers on Albuquerque's best chances for economic development. He evaluated Albuquerque alongside competing markets in Arizona, Nevada, Texas and Oklahoma. He advised that Albuquerque's best economic growth potential for the near term was in secondary homes and retirees. His advice did not track with the premise of the new Comprehensive Plan and IDO that our economic future is best placed to capture millennials and urban densities. The IDO needs to be subject to this type of real world analysis before the IDO is approved.	See LInes 573, 608, 625, 628, 647, 798, and 877.	
934	Wolfley, Jolene	TRNA	4/4/17	C. The IDO needs to be analyzed for potential conflicts with State Law. At least two areas need serious review: proposed changes to "standing" and the methods of doing zoning conversions and compliance with R-270-1980. If the EPC is not carefully attentive to these areas now, it could lead to costly litigation.	The IDO zoning conversion is a legislative not a quasi-judicial matter (see Lines 89, t, 403, 420, 592-594, 759, and 919). See also Lines ii, 616, and 1029.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
935	Wolfley, Jolene	TRNA	4/4/17	1. The IDO makes substantive changes in standing—these are not clarifications, they are serious changes.	The provisions for standing are consistent with previous requirements of the zoning code, state statutes, and case law on standing in New Mexico. The requirement that parties demonstrate their standing in some instances is also consistent with the practices of New Mexico Courts that would review land use appeals. If any party ever disagrees with the City's determination on standing, they can appeal that decision to court. See Lines h, 418, 547, 549, 922, 927, 936, 944, and 992.	
936	Wolfley, Jolene	TRNA	4/4/17	a. There is inconsistency in "standing" between "Who May Appeal" (p.324) and "Parties and Appearance of Record for a Quasi-judicial Hearing" (p. 317). In the "Who May Appeal" section registered neighborhood associations are now burdened with a requirement "Showing of Special and Adverse Impact Required." Staff presentation slides state that they are clarifying 'standing.' This is not a clarification and there appears to be no case law on what this means. Rather case law identifies the relevance of personal interest that could relate to aesthetics or compatibility as well as pecuniary considerations in supporting the appeal rights of those who may be affected by a development.	See Lines h, 418, 547, 549, 922, 927, 935, 944, and 992.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
937	Wolfley, Jolene	TRNA	4/4/17	The IDO language in 5-4.13.C seems to follow state law: "A person or entity that satisfies the body conducting the hearing the he or she or it has a significant personal, pecuniary, or property right or interest in the subject matter of the hearing."	Noted. See Lines h, 418, 547, 549, 922, 927, 935, 936, 944, and 992.	
938	Wolfley, Jolene	TRNA	4/4/17	2. The Zoning Conversion map is laden with sweeping changes to entitlements. The methodology is not clear and is not necessarily grounded in solid legal practice.	See Line 366.	
939	Wolfley, Jolene	TRNA	4/4/17	R-270-1980 states: " The applicant must demonstrate that the existing zoning is inappropriate because; (1) there was an error when the existing zone map pattern was created; or (2) changed neighborhood or community conditions justify the change; or (3) a different use category is more advantageous to the community, as articulated in the Comprehensive Plan or other City master plan even though (1) and (2) above do not apply."	The IDO project is a legislative not a quasi-judicial matter. See Lines 89, t, ii, 403, 420, 592-594, 759, 919.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
940	Wolfley, Jolene	TRNA	4/4/17	One of the big areas of concern we note in the Taylor Ranch area is with regard to current SU-1 zoning along the westside of the Bosque/Rio Grande. This has been predominatly zoned SU-1 because it fits the portion of that zoning definition for land that is unique: "§ 14-16-2-22 SU-1 SPECIAL USE ZONE. This zone provides suitable sites for uses which are special because of infrequent occurrence, effect on surrounding property, safety, hazard, or other reasons, and in which the appropriateness of the use to a specific location is partly or entirely dependent on the character of the site design."	Staff believes that the commenter is referring to the area along the westside of the Bosque *between the Oxbow Marsh (at Namaste Rd) and Alameda Blvd (NM 528).* Note that this area is included in both the proposed Coors Corridor CPO and VPO, drawn from the existing Coors Corridor Plan, with development standards that are complementary to other regulations in the IDO, or supersede them.	
941	Wolfley, Jolene	TRNA	4/4/17	The Zoning Conversion map shows that this land could now be developed as straight zoning and without any public review. While there are some new criteria for developing in this area, we feel that making this land only subject to administrative review is imprudent.	See Lines 61, 100-102, 107, 116, and 534 about the validity of existing site plans. Staff believes that the "new criteria" mentioned by the commenter are in the section on Site Design and Sensitive Lands, see Lines 46 and 512.	
942	Wolfley, Jolene	TRNA	4/4/17	A legal review should be made of whether particularized zoning established in the current SU-1 zones can legally be converted in a citywide process. The approved SU-1 sites in our area are the result of a detailed public process to establish zoning. Our contention is that these SU-1 sites cannot be converted to the new IDO zoning categories without a public review. This is because they are subject to the requirements of R-270-1980 which is based in State Law.	See Lines 89, t, 403, 420, 592-594, 759, 919, 934, and 939.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
943	Wolfley, Jolene	TRNA	4/4/17	The Bosque is one of Albuquerque's most important assets. Staff of the DRB are experts in engineering, but not necessarily in the best development adjacent to the Bosque. They also do not have discretionary authority. Therefore, these sites that are environmentally significant should be reviewed before the multi-disciplinary EPC with the community able to give input. This is the "best practice" for these environmentally significant areas.	The DRB is chaired by a planner and includes members from multiple disciplines. The changes in the IDO are expected to result in the need to add a staff planner, or multiple staff planners, to the DRB. (Revised 4/19/17)	Decision-makers would need to determine whether the area of concern to the commenter warrants a different procedure or whether the IDO standards, including the CPO, VPO, and additional standards protecting the Bosque and other MPOS, are sufficiently clear and comprehensive to be applied administratively. (Revised 4/19/17)
944	Wolfley, Jolene	TRNA	4/4/17	3. The procedures for Declaratory Rulings of the Zoning Ordinance have changed in a way that could prove problematic. It is difficult to find the provisions that cover Declaratory Rulings. Are Declaratory Rulings final if not appealed? A declaratory ruling could occur in one part of the city that sets a precedent that could affect a later development in another parts of the City. For example, TRNA would not get notice if the project is in the NE Heights. But the interpretation would be binding on future projects in Taylor Ranch.	The IDO carries forward the current zoning section 14-16-4-8 Declaratory Rulings verbatim, except for omitting the administrative procedure for transmitting a copy of the declaratory ruling to the Planning Commission and the Planning Director.	Add an administrative procedure and webpage on the Planning Department's website to compile Declaratory Rulings. This will serve to enhance public access to and knowledge of declaratory rulings. This action can occur in the near term and is not reliant on any changes to the IDO.
945	Wolfley, Jolene	TRNA	4/4/17	D. Specific Revisions Requested We request the EPC make these changes to the IDO. Proposed language is underlined:	See Lines 946-950.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
946	Wolfley, Jolene	TRNA	4/4/17	1. Revision on View Protection Overlay- Coors Boulevard Corridor (Section 2-7.4, p. 98) Specific Revisions related to the Coors Corridor View Protection Overlay New requirements for the Overlay: 1. Review by the EPC of site plans for subdivision and building permit is required. 2. Development shall be sensitive to the Bosque environment. Architectural design should contribute to the enhancement of the overall visual environment and not use colors, materials or lighting that detract from the view of the Sandia mountains and Bosque. Buildings must blend with natural surroundings and uses must not compromise Bosque protection.	1. Changing the procedure for site plans in the Coors Blvd Corridor VPO-1 area would need a justification for treating them differently from site plans in other areas, e.g. other VPOs for example. 2. The proposed text sounds like policy language. It is not precise enough to apply to control the design of development, and provides no guidance as to what uses would "compromise Bosque protection." Also, making discretionary changes to existing use entitlements is not within the scope of the IDO. See also Lines 46 and 512. (Revised 4/19/17)	Staff is looking to EPC for direction. Staff would need direction from decision makers to modify the VPO requirements. See Lines XX (other change column responses to Bosque/VPO stuff) (Revised 4/19/17)

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
947	Wolfley, Jolene	TRNA	4/4/17	2. Specific Revisions related to Major Public Open Space (p. 181) <u>Change Properties Abutting Major Public Open Space (Includes all parcels and portions of parcels within ¼ mile of Major Public Open Space).</u> Reasoning: The provisions to make development integrate well with Major Public Open Space should apply to all property within ¼ miles of that open space, regardless of parcel size. There are small and large parcels abutting major open space, so the "abutting" provision is not adequate to insure that buildings and their operations and activities do not harm the Public Open Space. TRNA has worked to secure this compatibility with properties in Taylor Ranch that are very near the Bosque, but do not technically 'abut' it.	1/4 mile (1,320 ft) represents a significant expansion that would affect many properties throughout the city near MPOS, such as along the volcanic escarpment, the Bosque on both sides of the Rio Grande, and the Sandia Foothills. South of Coors and Montano for example, the expansion would affect properties west of Coors Blvd., not just those within the VPO area that have the Bosque as a backdrop.	Staff will provide a condition recommending replacing "abutting" with "adjacent to" MPOS in 4-2.8 on p. 181, which addresses the concern to some degree (see also Definitions of "abut" and "adjacent" on p. 386).
948	Wolfley, Jolene	TRNA	4/4/17	3. Revision to Facilitated Meetings Add to 5.4.4.A "Facilitated Meetings" The applicant must supply the project information it will be submitting to the City to the RNAs at least 7 days prior to the facilitated meeting. Examples are proposed building square footages, heights, layouts, design guidelines, building architecture, parking, and landscaping.	Section 5.4.4.A is on 311 and refers to Table 5-1-1 for policy decisions only. As done currently, the City would determine whether a facilitated meeting is desirable. Given tight timeframes for scheduling facilitated meetings, *requiring* additional project details prior to the meetings seems unrealistic.	On page 311, revise Section 5-4.4.A to remove reference to applications requiring a Policy Decision, so that a facilitated meeting can be required for any approval, at the discretion of the Planning Department.
948 (cont'd)	Wolfley, Jolene	TRNA	4/4/17		The IDO requires applicants to meet with Recognized Neighborhoods for many applications, including site plans.	The Planning Department webpage can include information to recommend what types of information would be helpful to have prepared for neighborhood review based on the type of application, including the Facilitated Meetings and required Neighborhood Meetings.

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
949	Wolfley, Jolene	TRNA	4/4/17	4. Restore the Provisions of the Large Retail Facilities Ordinance We cannot find where these substantial provisions have gone in the IDO. It is particularly important that access provisions be maintained as well as building design features such as articulation, etc.	The building design-related regulations from the Large Retail Facility regulations were carried forward and made citywide for Multifamily, Mixed Use, and Non-residential development in Section 10-4 of the IDO. See also Lines 221 and 382.	Staff will review the IDO to identify where content from the current zoning code Shopping Center Regulations, 14-16-3-2, were carried forward. There was an omission in documenting where this content can be found.
950	Wolfley, Jolene	TRNA	4/4/17	Thank you for your consideration of TRNA requests. It has been very difficult to absorb all the changes that the IDO represents. We would like the opportunity to provide more comments to the EPC in the future.	Staff appreciates your engagment through this drafting and review process. See lines a and z about opportunities for input and revision of the IDO prior to adoption.	
951	Blanc, David		4/4/17	CMP continues to follow the progress and extensive work provided by Staff and the City consultant toward creation of an Integrated Development Ordinance ("IDO") for the City of Albuquerque. We understand the complexity of this undertaking and wish to simply point out those neighborhood concerns which fundamentally provide our Community development initiatives and lifestyle opportunity to further support diversity, good job creation and the economic well- being for our City.	Noted. Staff appreciates all of the public input that has contributed to the draft IDO up to this point.	
952	Blanc, David		4/4/17	Transit corridors and urban lifestyle along city roadways is here to stay and should be made a part of our City's fabric and diversity.	Noted.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
953	Blanc, David		4/4/17	In order to support such transportation and lifestyle environments, the Cityneeds to heed the suggestions of planners and professional place makers who offer a historic perspective of functioning community development in order to successfully attract business, services and youthful employment.	Noted.	
954	Blanc, David		4/4/17	In those close-in neighborhoods to the City Center and those especially along major transit corridors to be established, design limitations should be avoided at all cost. Density, height and design restrictions along transit corridors and near transit centers have successfully occurred in cooperation with neighborhoods and market conditions, not by zoning restrictions.	Noted. The City has made a commitment to carry forward area specific design regulations that have been adopted in Sector Development Plans and Historic Overlays. These regulations are intended to promote a sense of place and cohesive development style and pattern within these historic districts. See Lines 92, 140-144, 276, 282, 314, 331-333, 334-342, 347, d, mm, 361, 366, 389-390, 506, and 730 for various opinions on the important elements of SDPs and how to carry them forward. See also Lines 51, 93-97, 142, 152, 276, 290, 309-315, 327-329, 331, 332, 337, 340, 347, 349, 610, and 660 for various opinions on limitations to development along Premium Transit Corridors and Main Streets.	
955	Blanc, David		4/4/17	The best example of this in our own City might well be the formulation of both the Downtown 2010-2025 Plan and the East Downtown Master Plan (EDo). Both represent the articulation of quality urban plans under form base coding in cooperation between adjacent neighborhoods and planners to deliver quality regulatory documents such as EDo's Urban Conservation Overlay Zone.	Noted. These are two of the areas referenced in Line 954.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
956	Blanc, David		4/4/17	Where quality form base code planning has been established in partnership between these residential neighborhoods and their corridor counterparts, it would be a serious mistake to impose further restrictions on building entitlements as recently suggested by the current version of the IDO.	More information is needed about what specifically should change to address this comment. Staff has worked closely with the Broadway Central Corridors Partnership, Inc. to carry forward all of the effective regulations from the EDo Regulatory Plan into a CPO.	
957	Blanc, David		4/4/17	With the recent implementation of a new transit system along the Central Avenue corridor, it seems logical to further allow more design flexibility and density in the immediate transit station areas in order to help promote the concept of community centers and in order to concentrate local retail and neighborhood trade.	The IDO has carried forward effective design regulations from historic districts to most closely match the current entitlements for property along the Central corridor. In the MX-M and MX-T zones, there have been additional height and density allowed for properties that are within 660' of a Premium Transit Station area.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
958	Krause, Carol		4/4/17	Regarding SBMT building heights. Upon further review of current zoning, our Sector Plan and the New IDO I have found the following discrepancy regarding building heights. A large portion of our community is designated SU-2 with NRC, C2 and C3 designations. According to current zoning building heights for these areas are: R-1 = 26 ft C-1 or NC = 26ft C-2 or Community Commercial = for Residential 26ft and for Commercial it refers to O-1 which is also 26ft or with 45 degree planes for over 26 ft. C-3 current zoning also refers to O-1 and our Sector plan limits height to 26 ft. New zoning designations and heights are: MX-T=30 ft MX-L=35 ft MX-M=45 ft	See Lines 386-392.	See Lines 386-392.

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
959	Krause, Carol		4/4/17	Because a very large portion of our Neighborhood is single family, single story homes despite our mixed use zoning and in some areas inconsistent zoning vs use, changing the building heights to the NEW IDO designations is entirely out of character, consistency and will be a detriment to any neighbor as it would also go against solar rights. Because all current zoning limits height to just 26 ft allowing higher buildings would be restricting the rights of CURRENT property owners and giving undue privilege to new property owners. I ask again with even greater reverence that you reconsider the building heights for such areas as ours.	See Lines 386-392.	See Lines 386-392.
960	Krause, Carol		4/4/17	I have several other concerns but will need time to meet with staff for clarification before submitting them.	Noted. Staff appreciates all of the public input that has contributed to the draft IDO up to this point, and agrees to continue working with stakeholders to respond to their concerns.	
961	Krause, Carol		4/4/17	I would also ask that you give more time before putting the IDO up for final vote as clearly the community has a lot to learn about how the IDO affects us By that I mean a few months NOT 14-16 months. Anyone that is truly concerned about making it better will take the time to study it and ask for amendments that will strengthen their communities rather than stall and block it.	Staff appreciates all of the public input that has contributed to the draft IDO up to this point, and agrees to continue working with stakeholders to respond to their concerns. The remaining time for review and approval by EPC and City Council is intended to allow for additional engagement and identification of changes that should be made. See also Lines a, f, z, nn, 419, 420, 543, 555, 572, 731, 735, 793, 820, 830, 870, 873, 881, 902, and 921.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
962	Nelson, Patsy	Alban Hills NA	4/6/17	In section 551 on page 337, there is an indication the "minor" developments would be administratively approved and would not require public input or involvement. "Minor" is defined as a commercial development with less than 100,000 sq. ft. of space or a residential development with less than 50 dwelling units. The Alban Hills Neighborhood Association strongly opposes the threshold at this level. What this policy allows is the opportunity for developers to keep the public out of almost all developments. Developers could parcel out their proposed plans to stay under the thresholds in order to avoid public involvement. This policy, also, would discourage developers from working with neighborhoods.	See Lines x, y, 417, 541-544, 925, and 987.	
963	Nelson, Patsy	Alban Hills NA	4/6/17	An example of a proposed development for which NO public involvement would be required is the Daskalos Center at Coors and Montano. The current plan shows four commercial buildings with a total of 85,325 square feet.	Citywide building design standards in Section 14-16-4-10 are intended to require high-quality development throughout the city. This approach is part of a larger strategy to build in standards for quality up-front rather than negotiate them on a case-by-case basis. See lines f, h, dd, 221, 224, 511 about neighborhood protections, including Neighborhood Edge provisions, Contextual Standards for residential zones, and Building Design standards intended to result in higher-quality buildings throughout the city. See the Coors Corridor View Protection Overlay zone for additional regulations that apply to development west of Coors, such as the one mentioned in this comment.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
964	Nelson, Patsy	Alban Hills NA	4/6/17	In many instances, when developers and neighborhoods work together, the final product is much better for the City and County and, in fact, may be more successful with neighborhood support.	See Lines f-m, n, q, t, u, 364, and 406.	
965	Nelson, Patsy	Alban Hills NA	4/6/17	We also express our concern for the speed with which the IDO approval process is proceeding. The IDO is a large, complicated document that cannot possibly be understood by the public in a few short weeks. We support the Westside Coalition of Neighborhood Associations Resolution that requests a deferral for 14 – 16 months to allow the public to study, understand and respond to the IDO.	See Lines a, f, z, nn, 419, 420, 543, 555, 572, 731, 735, 793, 820, 830, 870, 873, 881, 902, 921, and 961.	
966	Michie-Maitlin, Susan		4/6/17	Thanks Mikaela - please find attached a report I sent to Councilor Davis after our "Office Hours" meeting about the IDO in January 2017. The highlighted section covers my notes about our discussion of whether 45' would allow a 4-or 3-story building.	Noted. See Line 969.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
967	Michie-Maitlin, Susan		4/6/17	PROHIBITING WALLS OVER 3 FT. IN THE FRONT YARD SET BACK 1) The boundaries for this policy have been limited to the two historic residential areas designated in our sector plan (Monte Vista and College View subdivisions) in the final EPC draft of the IDO. Can that be changed to include all of Nob Hill? PLANNERS RESPONSE: The IDO cannot go beyond what is currently in the existing Sector Plan, thus including all residential areas is not possible at this time. We recommend that you pursue this as a project for future updates of the IDO when the review period for your area comes up within the next 5 years.	The IDO is not proposing to expand the area in Nob Hill for which the prohibition on walls over 3 feet tall in the front yard setback. Staff recommends this be considered as part of the future CPA assessment process. See also Lines 144, 278, 279, and 661	
968	Michie-Maitlin, Susan		4/6/17	PROTECTING SOL AR ACCESS 1) With some minor tweaking that was agreed to by the city planners this policy issue was resolved and will preserve the guidelines in the current zoning codes for the entire city.	Noted. Staff appreciates all of the public input that has contributed to the draft IDO up to this point. See also Lines 57, 381, 387, and 829.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
969	Michie-Maitlin, Susan		4/6/17	BUILDING HEIGHTS 1) Respect 3 story building heights (39') from Girard to Aliso as stated in our sector plan. PLANNERS RESPONSE: Other communities have gotten exceptions for Premium Transit building height bonuses in the MX-M zones. Send a request to EPC with photos of threatened historic buildings like Kelly's, Monte Vista Fire Station, etc. As for the rest of the MX-M zones in Nob Hill, we consider the 45' building height policy to be 3 stories max. NOB HILL RESPONSE: According to the description of the MX-M zones in the IDO (page 25) the recommended building height is written as "4 stories or less". PLANNERS RESPONSE: We will check on that.	See Lines 39, 41, 51, 82, 93-97, 140-143, 150, 152, 210, 276, 290, 309-315, 327-329, 331-333, 336, 337, 339, 340, 347, 349, 386, 389, 390, 610, 660, 62-665, 669, and 954.	
970	Michie-Maitlin, Susan		4/6/17	SIGNAGE 1) Can Nob Hill be added to the section that prevents "Off-premises signs" ? PLANNERS RESPONSE: We will check on that.	See Line XX (Adrian C) (Revised 4/19/17)	(Revised 4/19/17)
971	Michie-Maitlin, Susan		4/6/17	GROUP HOME (p.106) 1) "Large" group homes are now only allowed in the MX-M and MX-H zones as a conditional use. Can there be a cap on the maximum number of residents in this housing type? 2) Why aren't the current rules that prevent clustering of these types of housing in the same area included in the new IDO? PLANNERS RESPONSE: We will check on that.	There is no cap in the zoning code on the number of residents in a large group home facility. Staff would need direction from decision makers to add a Use Specific standard that would cap the number of residents in the MX-M and MX-H zones. See Lines 5, 6, c, and d for additional comments about group homes. These facitilities have to meet the dimensional standards of the zone and the International Building Code. (Revised 4/19/17)	Staff is considering a condition to add distance separation to the Use Specific Standard for Group Homes to reflect existing rules that prevent clustering. (Revised 4/19/17)

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
972	Michie-Maitlin, Susan		4/6/17	LIQUOR SALES AND CONDITIONAL USE A growing body of academic and institutional research shows that alcohol outlet density and agglomeration is significantly related to increases in violent crime. There is evidence of this happening in Nob Hill. 1) If package liquor stores can be a conditional use, can alcohol outlets with no food service be a conditional use? i.e. Bars, Nightclubs. PLANNERS RESPONSE: Current thinking in the city supports the idea that retail outlets are more problematic than full-service dispenser outlets where drinking is limited to on-site consumption.	Liqour retail is Conditional in MX-M and MX-FB and permissive in MX-H. Nightclub is Permissive in all three of those zones. Bar is permissive in all three of those zones, and also conditional in MX-L. The proposed IDO aims at replicating the current entitlements in the zoning code as closely as possible in the new system. There are instances of uses being expanded to new zones, i.e., the taproom and bar are Conditional in the MX-L zone, while there are additional limitations on liquor retail by making it conditional in several zones. See also Lines 87, 282, 284, 466, 644, 973, 974-982, 1027 for additional comments about liquor.	
973	Michie-Maitlin, Susan		4/6/17	2) Currently, the state has no cap on how many dispenser licenses can be transferred (or agglomerate) into one area of the city. Can inter-local transfer of dispenser licenses be limited by number or distance regulations? RESPONSE: Distance between outlets is more typical for zoning rules than limiting the number of license transfers within a certain area.	The IDO addresses clustering of objectionable uses through distance separation requirements. Staff is not aware of any existing rules about separating on-premise alcohol sales (restaurants, bars, tap rooms, or nightclubs) and the IDO does not propose to add one. Staff would need direction from decision makers to add such a distance separation between these uses. (Revised 4/19/17)	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
974	Stoker, Kyla		4/7/16	1. Restaurant Use- Restaurant is showing as permissive in MX-T through NR-LM. This works, however, my question is more clarification on the intent of the Permissive Restaurant. Is the intent to allow Restaurants with or without liquor in each of these zones for on-premises consumption only without restriction of full service liquor/beer & wine (restaurant license)/tap room, etc? If the establishments main source of business is the sale of food, and they have incidental alcohol sales, would all those be Permissive use?	Yes to both questions.	
975	Stoker, Kyla		4/7/16	2. “Liquor Retail” Use- (Chapter 14-16-3: Use Regulations pg. 113 EPC Draft- December 2016) My major concern is that the type of establishments would fall under "Liquor Retail" and what seemingly intends to further restrict one type of liquor retailer. Examples of licensed establishments which utilize a "full package" style license would be a traditional liquor store, grocery store, wholesale box stores, bars which also sell package liquor, convenience stores and gas stations.	See also Lines 87, 282, 284, 466, 644, 972, 973, 974-982, 1027 for additional comments about liquor.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
976	Stoker, Kyla		4/7/16	Why has this been restricted to MX-H zone only as Permissive? This is stricter than the already strict regulation on Liquor Retail (aka package liquor). For example, there are several establishments which are C-2 that have package liquor sales. This restriction seems to be detrimental to future development, such as grocery stores, convenience stores, package liquor stores, box retailers, and more. Many of these types of Liquor Retailers acquire real property years in advance in reliance on the City of Albuquerque to remain consistent with their current zone codes. C-2 (now known as MX-M) has been permissive for this type of use. Furthermore, based on the mapping of the City of Albuquerque, the majority of the major arterials do not have MX-H and this will be detrimental to the growth of our city. Not only will this have a negative impact on the liquor retailers on future expansion, but also on developers and property owners who depend on anchor tenants which utilize the sale of package liquor, such as grocery stores, box stores or convenience stores.	Noted. See Lines 87, 282, 284, 466, 644, 972, 973, 974-982, 1027 for a variety of opinions and perspectives on this use. Staff would need direction from decision-makers to make changes to the Use Table for Liquor Retail.	
977	Stoker, Kyla		4/7/16	3. 1000ft to another Liquor Retail: There is also an additional restriction of another liquor store within 1000 ft of another Liquor Retail. What is the intent of this new restriction? I would also like to know what distance measurement the City of Albuquerque is using from point A to point B.	See the definition of Measurement, Separation of Uses on page 409. The IDO proposes measuring from lot line to lot line. The intent is to discourage clustering of liquor retail outlets based on public concerns. See lines c, bb, 464, 465, and 467 about uses with separation distances. (Revised 4/19/17)	(Revised 4/19/17)

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
978	Stoker, Kyla		4/7/16	This is extremely problematic for many reasons. For example, you have a shopping center that has more than one tenant having package liquor (ie a grocery store with a gas station/convenience store on the pad site in front). Again, damaging the retailer, the property owners, developers, and the consumer. I see no benefit of an addition of yet another liquor restriction for where a liquor license can be placed. This does not include breweries or their sale of liquor for on and off site consumption.	See lines c, bb, 464, 465, 467, and 973 about uses with separation distances. Staff would need direction from decision-makers to make changes to the distance separation regulations proposed in the IDO.	
979	Stoker, Kyla		4/7/16	4. Conditional Use adjacent or abutting R-1: I also would like to see the next paragraph #4 completely stricken. 14-16-3: Commercial Uses .4 3-3.4G -#4 does not specify that this is specific to these type of establishments serving liquor must apply for a conditional use. This is going to become a very burdensome requirement as many of these type of establishments will in fact abut or be adjacent to R-1 districts. This adds an extended time approval to the already burdensome process for the applicant and the landlord/tenant contingency periods. If the zoning of the subject property is proper, what is the benefit of additional restrictions to the licensing process for on premises consumption of liquor? This basically means any major arterial of the City will require a conditional use permit.		Further analysis is needed to respond to this request, which may result in a future Recommended Condition of Approval.

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
980	Stoker, Kyla		4/7/16	5. No Liquor within 500' from residential zone, a NR-PO District, Religious Institution, an Elementary School or a High School: (Chapter 14-16-3:4 3-3.4.G #3 Use Regulations pg. 129 EPC Draft- December 2016) This seems to indicate that the City of Albuquerque is now proposing that the distance measurement which is governed by the State by the New Mexico Liquor Control Act which currently requires 300' from church, and school be more stringent.	See Line 972. (Revised 4/19/17)	Staff will review the Use Specific Standards for both "Bar, Nightclub, Restaurant, and Tap Room" and "Liquor Retail." If revisions to these sections are necessary to reflect current standards, staff will provide a future Recommended Condition of Approval. (Revised 4/19/17)
981	Stoker, Kyla		4/7/16	In addition, this adds a requirement to be 500' from a residential zone regardless of the type of license. This is currently a requirement only of the off-premises sale of package liquor. The existing Conditional Use process of the City of Albuquerque is very subjective and can be unjustly granted or denied based on public comment. There are certain areas of the City that simply want no liquor and will object and oppose all liquor licenses. When a conditional use process is added to the already existing Statutory process of the issuance of a liquor license, you are adding an additional layer of burden upon the applicant. This adds time and sometimes substantial delay to the liquor license process which costs all parties monetarily.	The zoning code has distance separation requirement off-premise alcohol sales within 500' of a Residential Zone. See 14-16-2-17(A)(13)(a)(1) on page 2-69 of the zoning code. The IDO carries forward this distance separation requirement for liquor retail. See LInes 972 and 980. See also the Supplemental Staff Report for the April 24th EPC hearing. (Revised 4/19/17)	See Line 980. (Revised 4/19/17)

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
982	Stoker, Kyla		4/7/16	I respectfully re-submit my comments to the City of Albuquerque for their consideration. These above comments are much more extensive than they may seem on the surface. This will cause the growth, expansion and tax dollars of New Mexico to suffer. It is important that all sides of this equation are carefully considered before these changes are made.	Noted. Staff appreciates all of the public input that has contributed to the draft IDO up to this point.	
983	Contreras, Michael		4/7/17	This letter shall serve as further conversation for the EPC Hearing held yesterday April *6,* 2017 at the Vincent E. Griego City Council Chambers located in the Basement City Hall discussing the proposed zoning for the above mentioned property [7226 Central SW] under the upcoming IDO Zoning Ordinance. Since there continues to be many changes occurring with the plan and conversion maps, I would hope that you will continue to take comments to further refine the document as it proceeds to approval. I am in favor of the City's pursuit and approval of the proposed IDO, appreciate the hard work and professionalism you, your staff, and consultants have put into this endeavor, and look forward to its adoption in the coming months.	See Lines a, z, nn, 365, 403, 411, 419, 420, 554, 572, 575, 581, 584, 588, 591, 592, 604, 651, and 812 about continued opportunities for input and revision of the IDO prior to adoption. Comments submitted after any EPC deadlines for written comments will be collected by staff and forwarded as part of the transmittal package for Council review.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
984	Contreras, Michael		4/7/17	The West Route 66 Sector Development Plan under 2. a Policy, states that *C-1, C-2,* and SU-1 for uses permissive in the C-2 or 0-1 zones and Planned Residential Development (PRD) 20 dwelling units per acre. The owners of the property feel the zoning of their property should be MX-H,or MX-M to maintain the current zoning and development trends in the immediate area, and would like to see the criteria of the 660' (1/8 mile) radius distance from a transit station criteria be changed to 1,980' (3/8 mile) linear distance from a transit station if properties have frontage on Central Avenue. Their property is located approximately 1,729' from the Central & Coors transit station, they have approximately 585' frontage, thus the need for the 1,980' distance change request. This would encourage more mixed use development located close to commercial nodes and transit stations, and keep said mixed use developments located along a major transit corridor. The argument for the proposed NR-C zoning designation was to encourage employment in the area, Central Ave. being a retail and transit corridor may not be the best location for additional employment centers, there are large tracts of land located close but just outside the transit corridor, and if this property was zoned MX-H, or MX-M, it would give the opportunity and latitude for developers to find the uses that the market will command.	Extending the radius from a Premium Transit Station to 3/8 mile for stations that are 1/2 mile to 1 mile apart would undermine the intent of focusing denser, more intense development within a walkable distance to/from the stations. See Lines 53, 355-6, and 567-568.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
985	Horvath, Rene	WSCONA	4/7/17	1) The current zone code is undergoing a monumental change into a new regulatory document known as the IDO. This will include new permissive use regulations, dimensional standards, design regulations, overlay zones, zone maps with new zone categories. These changes are not well understood by the community at large.	See Lines 17, 36, 151, 223, 241, 371, a, f, z, nn, 419, 420, 543, 555, 572, 600, 731, 735, 793, 820, 830, 870, 873, 881, 902, 921, and 961.	
986	Horvath, Rene	WSCONA	4/7/17	2) The Neighborhoods need more time to study and provide input so that Neighborhood recommendations can be implemented into the IDO.	See Lines a, f, z, nn, 419, 420, 543, 555, 572, 731, 735, 793, 820, 830, 870, 873, 881, 902, 921, and 961.	
987	Horvath, Rene	WSCONA	4/7/17	3) All zone changes of less than 10 acres will only go to the EPC with no ability to appeal to City Council. EPC will be the final decision authority. This would affect a large portion of the zoning cases.	This comment is based on an apparent misunderstanding. Zone changes (officially: Amendments to Zoning Map) of less than 10 acres are currently decided by the EPC and can be appealed to the Council via the LUHO. The IDO does not change this procedure (see Policy Decisions, p. 299).	
988	Horvath, Rene	WSCONA	4/7/17	4) The IDO makes sweeping shifts of power from the EPC to the Planning Director and staff. The Planning Department's DRB would review all site plans for projects under 100,000 s.f. (This is almost all site plans). This much change is not justified. The DRB is made up of mostly engineers who would be making most of the site planning decision in Albuquerque.	See Lines 148, 162, 213, 215, 221, 224, f, h, dd, 370, 511, 542, 597, 615, and 923. See also Lines x, y, 417, 541-544, 925, and 987.	
989	Horvath, Rene	WSCONA	4/7/17	5) The Administrative Deviations give the Planning Department too much latitude to make rule changes.	See Lines p, w, 499, and 926.	
990	Horvath, Rene	WSCONA	4/7/17	6) The Board of Appeals is eliminated in the IDO. We need this citizen body.	See Lines 545, 927, and 990.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
991	Horvath, Rene	WSCONA	4/7/17	7) An Economic Impact Analysis, of the proposed zoning districts and the dramatic change in densification to most parts of the City, is needed.	See Lines 546 and 932.	
992	Horvath, Rene	WSCONA	4/7/17	8) The IDO changes neighborhood standing as to who can enter an appeal and what they must prove.	See Lines h, 418, 547, 549, 922, 927, 935-937, 944, 1132, and 1133.	
993	Horvath, Rene	WSCONA	4/7/17	9) The Zoning Conversion map is laden with sweeping changes to entitlements. It allows easy rezoning from SU-1 site plans to straight zoning. This will put mostly engineers in charge of deciding if development is compatible with surrounding neighborhoods and sensitive areas such as the Bosque and the Escarpment.	Re. SU-1 conversions, see Line 9. Re. site plan review, the IDO calls out the range of City or agency staff that would be involved in Administrative Decisions depending on the type of application (p. 300, Note 1) and make up the DRB (p. 301, 5-2.4). The IDO builds in standards for quality development up-front to protect neighborhoods and MPOS such as the Bosque and Escarpment: see Lines 46, 221, 224, f, h, dd.	
994	Horvath, Rene	WSCONA	4/7/17	10) The new procedures for Declaratory Rulings of the Zoning Ordinance are problematic.	See Lines 549, 944, 1132, and 1133.	
995	Horvath, Rene	WSCONA	4/7/17	11) Generally facilitated meetings are eliminated and replaced with neighborhood meetings before a project is filed. There is no requirement as to what materials must be provided to the neighborhood. There is no strong incentive for developers to incorporate ideas/comments from the neighborhoods.	The IDO is *adding* the requirement for early neighborhood meetings for most application decisions that require public meetings or hearings, which gives neighborhoods a longer lead time to review proposals and prepare their input for decision-makers. Facilitated meetings will continue to be provided by the City on a case-by-case basis, as they are today. See Lines 37, 58, 59, h, I, k-m, hh, jj, kk.	
996	Horvath, Rene	WSCONA	4/7/17	12) The Large Retail Facilities Ordinance is not carried forward.	See lines 89, 111, 306, 307, 430, and 431 about size thresholds for large retail. See Line 221 about outdoor gathering space. See Line 382 about building design standards.	See line 949.

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
997	Horvath, Rene	WSCONA	4/7/17	14) Revisions have been made to the View Protection Overlay- of the Coors corridor plan.	More specifics are needed to enable Staff to respond.	
998	Horvath, Rene	WSCONA	4/7/17	We request that the EPC allow more time for public comment and written comment. In fact, staff needs to return to the neighborhood coalitions and thoroughly explain and justify all the changes. WSCONA requests that the proposed Integrated Development Ordinance be deferred for 14 – 16 months to allow time for review and implementation of Neighborhood recommendations on the items outlined in this resolution.	See Lines a, f, z, nn, 365, 403, 411, 419, 420, 543, 554, 555, 572, 575, 581, 584, 588, 591, 592, 604, 651, 731, 735, 793, 812, 820, 830, 870, 873, 881, 902, 921, and 961.	
999	Nelson, Patsy	Alban Hills NA	4/8/17	I find it very interesting that it appears that the EPC decided to change the rules at the beginning of its meeting. I could not attend that meeting nor can I attend the April 10 meeting. I must say that there seems to be a decidedly active effort to keep the public out of these discussions as well as out of any further involvement in developments in Albuquerque. It is going to be very difficult to obtain public support for the City's agendas when this kind of action is promoted and allowed.	The EPC has discretion to organize their review of cases to allow time for both public input and their consideration of the input received.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
1000	Schwartz, Alan		4/9/16	I'm a little confused about the use of the MX-T zone. The predominant zoning in my neighborhood, Rancho Sereno, is R-LT and will change to R-T. A small strip of homes across from the City Open Space at the southeast corner of Golf Course and Calle Nortena, currently zoned SU-1, is changed to MX-T. Likewise for homes across from two other sides of the Open Space. MX-T is described as a transition from residential to more intensive commercial use. Why is that being applied here and around other Open Space areas?	(Revised 4/19/17)	The Riverview SDP zoning for the land surrounding the Open Space references both the R-2 and SU-1/PRD zones. The SU-2 conversion table originally proposed MX-T as the closest conversion in the IDO zones. Staff believes PD would be a better fit, to match other SU-1/PRD zones that are not within a SDP. Eventually, Staff would like to review the approved site plans for all of the land in the City zoned R-D and SU-1 for PRD to determine the best base zone for each part of the development. This analysis may have to occur after adoption of the IDO during the community assessment process. (Revised 4/19/17)
1001	Eyster, Gary		4/9/16	Spencer and I recently developed the following comment on the IDO: In College View a number of the original houses were built as duplexes or triplexes. They were concentrated in the southern third of College View between Copper and Grand. Many, however, were seeded randomly from Grand to Lomas. The 2007 Sector Plan identified many of those seeded structures and rezoned them RT-HD (Residential Townhouse- Historic District) which will now be R-T. However, it missed quite a few. It would save CABQ and the property owners time and trouble in the future if those that have been missed were to be identified and incorporated into the IDO at this time. Spencer made the list below. If you could take it on he and I could be sure it is complete.	See Line 1002.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
1002	Eyster, Gary		4/9/16	Here is a little extract form a letter I found that I had written in 2006 to the city about the Sector plan they were then considering. From 2006: I did a quick survey of one small area bounded by Carlisle, Washington, Central, and Lomas. . . . Here are some addresses of duplex, triplex, etc. residences. . . 300 Hermosa NE, 302/304 Hermosa NE, 346/348 Hermosa NE, 400 Hermosa NE, 404/406 Hermosa NE, 409/411 Hermosa NE, 416/418 Hermosa NE, 420/422 Hermosa NE, 213/215 Solano NE, 217/219 Solano NE, 220 Solano NE, 230 Solano NE, 223 Solano NE, 225 Solano NE, 244/246 Solano NE, 304 Solano NE, 308/310 Solano NE, 312/314 Solano NE, 345 Solano NE, 200/202 Aliso NE, 204/206 Aliso NE, 401 Aliso NE, 205/207 Morningside NE, 231/233 Morningside NE, 235/237 Morningside NE, 239/241 Morningside NE, 400 Morningside NE, 500 Morningside NE	Thank you for getting these comments into the record. Discretionary zone changes are not within the scope of this project. This property can be considered in a future action to make discretionary zone changes. All properties that are zoned SU-2/MRHD have been converted to R-T, which allows duplexes and townhouses. All properties that are zoned SU-2/SFHD have been converted to R-1B, which is the closest match to the current zoning entitlements. See line 366 about discretionary rezonings. See line 439 about uses that become nonconforming with adoption of the IDO.	
1003	Smith, Chris	Nob Hill Main Street	4/10/17	This letter is provided as support from the Board of Directors of Nob Hill Main Street for the attached letter dated January 20, 2017 from Geltmore LLC.	Noted. See Lines 285-290 for the original comments from Geltmore, LLC.	
1004	Smith, Chris	Nob Hill Main Street	4/10/17	Additional comments from Nob Hill Main Street Board of Directors:	See Lines 1005-1007.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
1005	Smith, Chris	Nob Hill Main Street	4/10/17	Aaron Sussman, Board Member - "I support this letter and believe that it is consistent with a number of our objectives, including creating additional housing in east Nob Hill. I also happen to believe this is good public policy. Preventing the application of the premium transit station area bonus only makes sense along areas of high cultural or historical value, and frankly I don't think Nob Hill east of Carlisle deserves that special treatment."	The Nob Hill CPO limits heights and densities that would normally be allowed through the Premium Transit and Main Street Standards, as well as the Work Force Housing height bonus. These regulations were carefully crafted to parallel the current height entitlements in the Nob Hill/Highland SDP, instead of allowing taller buildings in this area. This has been done in response to numerous stakeholder comments. See lines 140, 141, 143, 276, 331, 333, 336, 337, 339, and 340 about reducing building height in the IDO. Staff would need direction from decision-makers to change the current CPO regulations in the Nob Hill area to allow taller buildings and TOD.	
1006	Smith, Chris	Nob Hill Main Street	4/10/17	Robert Munro, Board Member - "Central Avenue from Carlisle to Aliso should not be included in the Character Protection Overlay for Nob Hill. The great majority of properties in that stretch are at best non-contributing to the historic value of Nob Hill and in some cases functionally obsolescent. There is currently little consistency in scale, proportion, building style, or historic value to this stretch of properties.	The Nob Hill CPO is based on currently approved design regulations in the CCR-1 and CCR-2 zones in the Nob Hill Sector Development Plan. The intent of the SDP and the CPO regulations is to create consistency and high design quality that contributes to the Main Street character and pedestrian orientation for new development and redevelopment. See Lines 148, 225, 282, 318, ff, and 806.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
1007	Smith, Chris	Nob Hill Main Street	4/10/17	It is vital for the health and historic protection of Lower Nob Hill (from Girard to Carlisle) that it has as direct an adjacency as possible to dense Transit Oriented Development (TOD). The reason that East Nob Hill has the opportunity to be the first true TOD in Albuquerque is because of its location along ART, its available properties for redevelopment, and most importantly - its direct adjacency to one of the few pedestrian friendly retail, service, and restaurant districts in New Mexico. A thriving TOD in East Nob Hill is critical to the long term viability of lower Nob Hill. Leaving a dead zone of properties that can't be developed between Carlisle and Aliso cuts off that vital walk-ability of the district and will be counterproductive if one wants to promote TOD in East Nob Hill."	Staff would need direction from decision-makers to make changes to further enhance opportunities for TOD in the Nob Hill area beyond what is proposed in the IDO. See See Lines 39, 41, 51, 82, 93-97, 140-143, 150, 152, 210, 276, 290, 309-315, 327-329, 331-333, 336, 337, 339, 340, 347, 349, 386, 389, 390, 610, 660, 62-665, 669, 954, and 969.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
1008	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	Martineztown Work Group (MWG)	4/10/17	This is a letter of record and complaint to the many years of injustice that the residents of Martineztown/Santa Barbara have endured by the City of Albuquerque. I am writing to you to express the following concerns provided by the Martineztown Work Group (MWG). MWG is tired of being ignored by Albuquerque City Council and City of Albuquerque Planning Staff. Of predominant concern is the City's continued lack of understanding of our sentiments concerning our beloved Martineztown/ Santa Barbara Neighborhood. The City of Albuquerque does not value nor respect the historical significance of the neighborhood in which our ancestors established and that their descendants currently choose to reside in. The residents love the historic character and family friendly neighborhood in which they live and want it to remain "as is, residential"	See line 366 about the approach to the zoning conversion rules. The IDO aims to most closely match the permissive uses allowed by existing zoning. Staff is aware that the permissive uses allowed by existing zoning do not always match the way that development has occurred on the ground, and a process to address those mismatches and propose discretionary zone changes is intended to be part of the CPA assessment process after IDO adoption.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
1009	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	Martineztown Work Group (MWG)	4/10/17	MWG requests to be part of the "City Sector Plan Review Team" The group would like to assist the City in finding the best qualified planner for the sector plan zone map correction for Martineztown/Santa Barbara Neighborhood. In this proposed review team for the zone map correction, the neighborhood leaders should be present and involved in the decision process from its inception to its completion. MWG would like to provide our input in the development of the Scope of Work which follows through with the objective of the Martineztown/ Santa Barbara Sector Plan, 1990, "To promote on-going involvement in the City planning process." As required by law, the residents of Martineztown/Santa Barbara neighborhood should be included in the community planning of our residential area.	The City looks forward to working with Martineztown residents and stakeholders during the CPA process to better align the current zoning with existing land uses.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
1010	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	Martineztown Work Group (MWG)	4/10/17	After the zoning has been established for the majority residential area, then the commercial property owners can come forward and provide their reasons for wanting to continue their commercial zone realizing that the sector plan outlined goals are "To promote the preservation and enhancement of a traditional community; Eliminate conditions which are detrimental to public, health, safety and welfare; Conserve, improve and expand housing availability to all families." The property owners who want to keep their residential property to be incorporated as commercial zone must adhere to the requirements necessary to meet the criteria of the zoning which include but are not limited to the following: provide parking spaces on their business property, meet adopted landscaping criteria, follow environmental laws, and other requirements such as proper grading and drainage. Additionally, these residents that want commercial will also need to inform Bernalillo County of their proposed commercial use and follow all Commercial Tax Laws and pay all commercial taxes to Bernalillo County as required by law.	See Lines 360, 366, 919, and 920 about the IDO conversion approach and future discretionary rezoning.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
1011	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	Martineztown Work Group (MWG)	4/10/17	MWG would like to be included in the selection process for a qualified professional planner and the group has several that they are able to recommend for the job. MWG invites for the zonechange process to begin now so that the R-1 zone is established and completed prior to the IDO's approval. According to the Planning Department Staff, the IDO will take a year to be approved. If this is the case, the review team which includes the neighborhood leaders will have plenty of time to work with you to ensure that this process is done correctly and on a timely basis.	A discretionary rezoning of Martineztown, as suggested in this comment would need to be a separate project sponsored by City Council. That project would be able to proceed independently of the IDO. See Lines 360, 366, 919, 920, 1008, and 1012 about the IDO conversion approach and future discretionary rezoning.	
1012	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	Martineztown Work Group (MWG)	4/10/17	The objective on page 8 of the Martineztown/Santa Barbara SDP states the following, "Promote on-going neighborhood involvement in the City planning process." Throughout the process to update both the sector plan and the Comp Plan, the City of Albuquerque has refused to listen to residential property owners to stabilize land use patterns and resolve land use zoning conflicts and agree to the majority of the neighborhood requests to zone their properties R-1, single family dwellings. There has also been no attempt by the City “to eliminate conditions which are detrimental to public health, safety, and welfare."	See Lines 360, 366, 919, 920, 1008, and 1011 about the IDO conversion approach and future discretionary rezoning. Currently, the Martineztown/Santa Barbara Sector Development Plan allows a broad range of residential and industrial uses, with no built-in buffers or protections. There are also no design standards for new development or redevelopment to retain a similar character to existing structures. The IDO propses both regulations that require buffering, landscaping, and enhanced design standards for all new development. See lines 148, 162, 213, 215, 221, 224, f, h, dd, 511, 542, 597, 615, and 923 about higher quality development standards.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
1013	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	Martineztown Work Group (MWG)	4/10/17	In order to follow the goal of preserving Martineztown/Santa Barbara Neighborhood, MWG began working with UNM Students on designating the neighborhood as a historic district and historic overlay through the State of New Mexico. MWG was informed by the State Cultural Affairs that a historian submitted paperwork without informing or involving the neighborhood residents nor requesting our consent to proceed with the application at the State level. In fact through the years, the City has worked hard to stop any historical preservation by allowing architecture that is incompatible with the historic neighborhood.	Noted. If a Historic Overlay is adopted prior to the IDO, it could be added as a new HPO. Otherwise, it would need to be developed as a separate project independent of the IDO. See also Line 1012.	
1014	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	Martineztown Work Group (MWG)	4/10/17	Under the Nuisance Abatement Program, the City demolished Old Historic Adobe homes rather than rehabilitate them. Also, the City continues to unstablize and destroy the historic residential land use by allowing incompatible land uses such as The New Mexico Department of Labor, Embassy Suites and Tri-Core to be built in the neighborhood. The neighborhood would have been better served with construction of traditional mom and pop stores that the residents desperately need.	Noted.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
1015	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	Martineztown Work Group (MWG)	4/10/17	It should be noted, that there has been no attempt by the City of Albuquerque to preserve the social fabric of our Martineztown/Santa Barbara community. It is of the opinion of many that not only has the City failed our neighborhood residents, but rather has failed all the residents of the entire city of Albuquerque by allowing continued destruction of one of its iconic areas of town. The community cannot allow Martineztown/Santa Barbara to fall just like the Alvarado Hotel was allowed to do. Now all we can do is lay back and reminisce about what was once a charming part of our city, this majestic historic beautiful hotel.	Noted.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
1016	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	Martineztown Work Group (MWG)	4/10/17	After countless meetings, Site Southwest created the map, (see attached) that was worked on by the neighborhood residents. This map called for the preservation of our neighborhood and was to be submitted for approval by City Council, but was tabled and ignored before the Comp Plan was ever considered to be updated. MWG plans for this map to still remain the same, and that is for it to be taken before our City Counselors for approval. MWG wishes for our Council to revisit the contract with Site Southwest and deal with the error of zoning the historical residential land use commercial zone which is the current zone map created for the Martineztown/Santa Barbara Neighborhood. This will insure that the predominant residential property owners who have expressed their voices are heard and on record through written letters, petitions, emails and are shared at City Hearings. These residents would like their residential neighborhood to remain zoned and or changed to R-1, (when zoned incorrectly) which is MWG's preference as we continue to advocate for our community. MWG would like our child, family friendly neighborhood to remain intact for decades or even centuries to come.	Noted.	
1017	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	Martineztown Work Group (MWG)	4/10/17	The City must immediately cease and desist permissive uses in the current zone categories which are harmful to the neighborhood and protect the health, safety and welfare of our residents	See Lines 360, 366, 919, 920, 1008, and 1011, 1012 about the IDO conversion approach and future discretionary rezoning.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
1018	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	Martineztown Work Group (MWG)	4/10/17	After review of the SanBourne Maps and the City Historical Land Use Maps, the City of Albuquerque, should bear the responsibility for all costs to correct the current zone map of Martineztown/Santa Barbara to R-1 as the error was created by the City and not by the property owners. This detrimental zoning error only occurred for Martineztown/Santa Barbara Neighborhood and all other historic neighborhoods in the Central Urban Area of Albuquerque were excluded from this disastrous decision to destroy one of the oldest neighborhoods in the city. To further emphasize, MWG is not interested in any piecemeal planning. MWG would like attached 2009 map by Sites Southwest to establish the work with a professional planner that knows community planning and reviewed and approved the "City Sector Plan Review Team" mentioned above.	See Lines 360, 366, 919, 920, 1008, and 1011, 1012 about the IDO conversion approach and future discretionary rezoning.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
1019	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	Martineztown Work Group (MWG)	4/10/17	MWG does not agree with the following statement by Andrew Webb, City Planner in which he stated in the email dated November 22, 2016; "I understand that this project may fall short of your desire for community-based planning in the area, but I hope you can also see the opportunity here for residents to have a say in how their own properties will be used now and in the future." MWG understands that Community Planning is a legal process provided by the City and is given to all neighborhoods. Individual neighborhoods should not be selectively excluded from this process. This destructive approach is discriminatory, unjust and illegal under our United States Constitution!	Noted.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
1020	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	Martineztown Work Group (MWG)	4/10/17	Furthermore, MWG disagrees with the statement by Andrew Webb, which stated; "Several attempts to make wholesale zoning changes in Martineztown over the years have demonstrated that some residents see the mixed-use zoning established in the 1970s as contributing to the value of their properties." On the contrary, many of the neighborhood residents have experienced a loss of value to their property. It should be noted that according to a qualified appraiser in 2010, he explained to a resident that he valued a property in Martineztown less than what it should have been valued in 2010 due to the commercial property next door to their home which had significant adverse environmental hazards that negatively impacted their residential property.	Noted.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
1021	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	Martineztown Work Group (MWG)	4/10/17	Also, according to the Bernalillo County Assessor's Office any property that is zoned as a commercial use property, is taxed at a higher tax rate therefore the owner must pay higher property taxes. Today, many of our Martineztown/Santa Barbara residents are poor and struggle to pay the property taxes. These residents should not be forced to have their property taxes increased because of the historical residential land use is incorrectly valued as commercial zone land use. This is a form of gentrification. Additional evidence of gentrification in our neighborhoods has been described by some of our property owners who have expressed concern that certain banks are unwilling to provide mortgage loans because of the commercial zoning on the historic single family dwellings in which they reside in the Martineztown/Santa Barbara Neighborhood.	Noted. Much of Martineztown remains classified by the City's records as residential uses.	
1022	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	Martineztown Work Group (MWG)	4/10/17	In conclusion, Chair Hudson, MWG respectfully asks that you listen to the residents of Martineztown/Santa Barbara Neighborhood and zone our properties appropriately, by following the recommendations above to improve our residential quality of life.	Noted.	
1023	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	Martineztown Work Group (MWG)	4/10/17	Martineztown Work Group requests that the approval of the IDO Code include the following for Martineztown Satna Barbara neighborhood.	See Lines 1024-1035.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
1024	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	Martineztown Work Group (MWG)	4/10/17	1. Updated Martineztown/Santa Barbara Sector Plan draft completed by Site Southwest in 2009 done by Site be approved prior to the approval of IDO and include design guidelines and provide setbacks on all development.	See Lines 360, 366, 919, 920, 1008, 1011, and 1012 about the IDO conversion approach and future discretionary rezoning.	
1025	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	Martineztown Work Group (MWG)	4/10/17	2. R-1 Zoning in the predominant historical residential area is established prior to the approval of IDO.	See Lines 359, 360, 361, 366, and 890.	
1026	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	Martineztown Work Group (MWG)	4/10/17	3. Eliminate any MX zoning in Martineztown/Santa Barbara established in the current sector plan. Instead support diverse housing stock which can encourage the long-term use and reuse of the community by people of different ages and backgrounds. This type of housing development allows people to remain in the community at different stages of their lives. The MX allows industrial uses near predominantly historic residential land use in the neighborhood. These types are of uses are incompatible because of pollution, noise, and truck traffic that affect health, safety and welfare of the residents.	See Lines 360, 366, 919, 920, 1008, 1011, and 1012 about the IDO conversion approach and future discretionary rezoning.	
1027	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	Martineztown Work Group (MWG)	4/10/17	4. Tap bars, liquor stores, and night clubs, sexually oriented businesses and strip clubs shall not be allowed in boundary of Martineztown/Santa Barbara neighborhood. These types of uses bring crime and moral and other social problems to a neighborhood.	See Lines 360, 366, 919, 920, 1008, 1011, and 1012 about the IDO conversion approach and future discretionary rezoning.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
1028	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	Martineztown Work Group (MWG)	4/10/17	5. Preserve the historic residential with zoning, historic district designation by the city, design guidelines, to preserve, protect, and enhance its neighborhood friendly character of single family dwellings.	See Lines 1012 and 1013 about protecting the historic character of this neighborhood. See Lines 360, 366, 919, 920, 1008, 1011, and 1012 about the IDO conversion approach and future discretionary rezoning.	
1029	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	Martineztown Work Group (MWG)	4/10/17	6. Keep the current Resolution-270-1980	See Lines ii and 616. R-270-1980 has been incorporated into the decision-making criteria for land use decisions. More information is needed about what elements of R-270-1980 have not been incorporated into the EPC Draft IDO	Staff will review and revise the IDO to ensure consistency with R-270-1980.
1030	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	Martineztown Work Group (MWG)	4/10/17	7. Keep the current Neighborhood Ordinance	O-92, the Neighborhood Ordinance, will remain in effect. Section 5-3.4 of the IDO refers to O-92 as the guiding regulatory document for neighborhood recognition and communications between the City and recognized neighborhoods	
1031	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	Martineztown Work Group (MWG)	4/10/17	8. Keep the current public process and strengthen it so neighborhoods have more input in the development of their neighborhood – renters should also have a say in their community	See lines 37, 58, 59, h, I, k-m, hh, jj, kk, 598, 599 about neighborhood notification and required meetings. See lines f-m, n, q, t, u, 364, 406 about neighborhood involvement.	
1032	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	Martineztown Work Group (MWG)	4/10/17	9. Provide the Martineztown/Santa Barbara a community center and amenities and services to create a sense of place for the families in the neighborhood.	The IDO does not impact Capital Investments. This is done through the City's CIP process primarily. The CPA process will provide an avenue for identifying area priorities to better advocate for those investments.	
1033	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	Martineztown Work Group (MWG)	4/10/17	10. Provide an Environmental Impact Review on the increase incompatible uses and industrial uses.	Environmental Impact Assessments are required for projects that use federal funding. There is not currently a parallel city process.	See Lines bb, 563, and 785 about asking EPC for direction to add distance separations for industrial uses with air quality permits.

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
1034	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	Martineztown Work Group (MWG)	4/10/17	11. All buildings in the Martineztown/Santa Barbara Sector Plan boundaries and the historic neighborhoods are no higher than two stories	Noted.	
1035	Naranjo-Lopez, Loretta	Martineztown Work Group (MWG)	4/10/17	12. Current businesses in the predominant single family residential area need to be in compliance with the current zone code. These businesses are in violation of the building code. The businesses are in violation of the Environmental Health Department requirements and need to be compliance prior to any approval of the zone code. The violators are not working inside an enclosed building and environmentally impacting the neighborhood. The cars are parked along streets.	Noted. Code Enforcement actions are not within the scope of this legislative project.	
1036	Black, John		4/10/17	Added references to the Coors Corridor IDO plan that I met with IDO staff about earlier to the zoning comments I made on April 3: Also, 100 foot buffer west of Corrales Main Canal should be taken out of Coors Corridor plan north of Paseo del Norte to Alameda. All of those properties were approved for development in the City and County using the 100 ft right of way of the Corrales Main Canal as the only buffer due to physical constraints and elevation changes west of the Canal in that area. The Planning Staff should know about both of these changes to the original IDO plan in this area abutting Coors Blvd. NW.	See Line 383 for April 3 comments.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
1037	Dann, Jennifer	NM State Forestry	4/11/17	Thank you to the City of Albuquerque Planning Department for their outstanding effort in revising the Comprehensive Plan and the Integrated Development Ordinance, and their outreach efforts to build community consensus and buy-in through this whole process. I had a few additional comments on the proposed IDO:	Noted. Staff appreciates all of the public input that has helped shape the current draft of the IDO. See Lines 1038-1041. See also Lines 603-604.	See Line 23.
1038	Dann, Jennifer	NM State Forestry	4/11/17	Throughout 14-6-4-6, Landscaping, Buffering, and Screening, specifically 4-6.3.L and P • The term “invasive vegetation” and “non-invasive vegetation” is used in several locations. New Mexico technically does not have an invasive plant species list, but instead a noxious weed list. Recommend adding a definition for the term “invasive vegetation”.		In Section 14-16-4-6, revise references to "invasive vegetation" to "noxious weeds" and reference the noxious weed list. Further analysis is needed to respond to this request, which may result in a future Recommended Condition of Approval.
1039	Dann, Jennifer	NM State Forestry	4/11/17	14-6-6-6.3.L Existing Vegetation Credit and Bonus • Section 1 indicates that only non-invasive and non-prohibited existing vegetation may be used as credit. I am concerned that large established shade trees that are invasive/prohibited (e.g., Siberian elm, Tree of Heaven, Mulberry, etc.) may need to be removed to meet the requirements. Ecosystem service assessments for Albuquerque show that these trees provide a significant percentage of the overall urban forest benefit in air quality and storm water services. Can an accommodation be made to allow them to remain?		Further analysis is needed to respond to this request, which may result in a future Recommended Condition of Approval.

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
1040	Dann, Jennifer	NM State Forestry	4/11/17	14-16-4-6.4 Street Frontage and Front Yard Landscaping, A. Required Street Trees • Footnote 877 indicates that the maintenance standard was moved to the maintenance section. I did not see a Maintenance Section in the IDO – does this refer to another document?	The maintenance section of the IDO is Section 4-12, beginning on page 294.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
1041	Dann, Jennifer	NM State Forestry	4/11/17	5-2 Review and Decision-Making Bodies • I'd like to suggest the establishment of a community-based board or committee whose focus is on the strategic use of natural infrastructure in the city. The Comprehensive Plan and the proposed IDO provide a sound basis for advancing the use of natural infrastructure in Albuquerque, but there is much collaborative work to be done to maximize the many great initiatives and opportunities related to the use of trees, plants, soil, and other components of the environment to address our many needs – from urban heat island effects to creating community sense of place. Community-based boards can help coordinate across city, county, non-profit and private organizations to evaluate needs and set goals, and perhaps most importantly provide a means for the public to be more involved in community natural infrastructure issues. If you are interested in exploring this concept and its structure more, there are many great existing resources that we could adapt and use. As Albuquerque is New Mexico's biggest urban area and a great trendsetter for statewide efforts, New Mexico State Forestry would be glad to collaborate and partner on the development of such a community-based board.	Staff would need direction from decision makers to create a new community-based board or commission.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
1042	Lopez, Christopher		4/11/17	The new IDO zoning incorrectly shows a majority of High Desert changing from basic residential to R-T and only one section changing to R-1A, R-1B. R-1C, R-1D (see attached maps). High Desert has a total of 25 separate villages (all with different building standards) and only 3, maybe 4 of them can be considered townhomes; the rest are single family and detached . We are opposed to the new zoning of R-T in the areas that are not townhomes.	See full comments for a map of the area in question.	
1043	Quinones, Alicia	Oso Grande NA	4/11/17	This is our third request to the ABC-Z Planning Team regards a 3-acre parcel of land on Juan Tabo between Montgomery and Spain that we believe requires further attention from the zoning team due to errors in the map, as well as a rezoning that appears to be inappropriate. Other residents have sent in similar requests for information which also have gone unanswered. The text of our two email requests to you is found directly below.	The copied text of the originial emails send to staff showed that the staff email address used was incorrect, so staff did not receive the original messages.	
1044	Quinones, Alicia	Oso Grande NA	4/11/17	We are requesting both correction and reconsideration to two land parcels located inside Bear Canyon Arroyo and adjacent to Oso Grande NA. If you are not the correct individual to address our issue, then please let us know who will address this issue. CABQ's 12/2016 version of the Conversion Map showing zoning proposals for the City of Albq. are incorrect. Our association is located between Morris and Juan Tabo (East / West boundaries), and Osuna / Spain (North/ South boundaries).	The IDO Zoning Conversion map has been updated in this area to incorporate all land that is City-owned as NR-PO-B.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
1045	Quinones, Alicia	Oso Grande NA	4/11/17	There is one piece of property that is misdesignated on the zoning map, and one piece of property that apparently has not received attention in the new zoning designations. The first is a 7-acre parcel directly east of Oso Grande park. It is currently designed as a large-lot residential property. This 7-acres is actually owned by both CABQ Parks & Rec. and ABCWUA as important utility infrastructure. It is also a City owned Pollinator Habitat which is an existing significant remediated property and public park which is 3-yrs. old. It is geographically part of the Bear Canyon Open Space and Rec. Area. And, it should be colored green on the zoning map as is all surrounding Bear Canyon Arroyo property. It is also a flood control property utilized by ABCWUA to channel flooding during storm. It is not privately owned residential property.	This comment refers to two parcels of land west of Juan Tabo and south of Osuna. The westernmost parcel, adjacent to the park is owned by ABCWUA, and needs to maintain the direct conversion from R-1 to R-1 zoning, despite being in the floodplain and spillway. The two parcels east of this are privately owned. One is currently zoned R-1, and the other is zoned C-1. All three parcels need to maintain the direct conversion according to the IDO conversion rules. The parcels that are publicaly owned and managed as open space have been changed to a zoning conversion to the NR-PO zone. See also Lines 359, 360, 361, 366, and 890 about mismatches between zoning and land use and future discretionary rezoning of land.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
1046	Quinones, Alicia	Oso Grande NA	4/11/17	The second property we are contesting. It is a 3-acre parcel directly west of Juan Tabo between Osuna and the CNM/AMAFCA flood channel {incidentally this important flood control channel owned by AMAFCA is not represented on the conversion map either}. This 3-acre parcel is shown on the conversion map to be mixed use (presumably commercial property). While this parcel is privately owned, it should be designated as Open Space/ Rec property, or sensitive use property as is all surrounding Bear Canyon Parks & REC property. This parcel is currently designated by FEMA as flood zone (1 to 2 feet of water during storm). It is also important to surrounding housing as mitigation for property damage during flood. It is home to several species of important wildlife as is the surrounding Bear Canyon corridor. And is currently used extensively by pedestrians, bikers, naturalists, wildlife, track, sports, school teams, movie/filming, and other public events. It's zoning designation should reflect its actual usage…..open space for city infrastructure, flood, and recreational/ habitat use for humans and animals.	See line 1044 about the parcel that is currently zoned C-1. Engineering studies and approvals are required prior to building in a floodplain, which will continue to be required. See also Lines 359, 360, 361, 366, 890, and 1045 about mismatches between zoning and land use and future discretionary rezoning of land.	
1047	Quinones, Alicia	Oso Grande NA	4/11/17	Oso Grande NA has requested twice in 2016 consideration of both these parcels as Open Space. The Conversion Map is both incorrect and improperly designated. Please respond to our request and reply to this email.	An email was sent to the commenter on April 12, 2017 in response to similar comments posted on the IDO Conversion Map webpage.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
1048	Eyster, Gary		4/12/17	1. R-T Zone; Front Setback 15 ft. Page 15, and Table 4-1-1, page 166…The draft proposes rezoning the MR-HD (Multi-Residential Historic District) to R-T. This area is in the Monte Vista and College View Historic in which the front setback has been 20 ft. from its platting in 1926 until the present. The traditional 20 ft. front setback is crucial to preserving the historic integrity of association and integrity of design of this national register historic district. The historic/current front setback of 20 ft. should be stated in the final document on pages 15 and 166.	(Revised 4/19/17)	Staff will review the Contextual Standards Section 4-1.3.B on page 167-8 and develop a condition for EPC to consider that revises the setback provisions and the types of dwellings that the standards apply to. (Revised 4/19/17)
1049	Eyster, Gary		4/12/17	2. 5-5.2 B, page 342, CONDITIONAL USE APPROVAL states: "The ZHE shall approve a conditional use if the ZHE determines that…….it will not create significantly adverse impacts to the adjacent property, the neighborhood, or community." The current ordinance states…"will not be injurious to the adjacent property, to the neighborhood, or the community." The standard in the draft "significantly adverse impacts" would make conditional use easier to grant than today. We caution against language that would create more conditional uses that are more negative in their impact than those allowed in the ordinance today. I support the standard in the current ordinance: will not be injurious	This language was modified to be more objective. Staff would need direction from decision makers to change the language. (Revised 4/19/17)	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
1050	Eyster, Gary		4/12/17	3. Page 252, Exception to Maximum Height (of fences and walls) allows exceptions for walls up to 6 ft. high in front setbacks. These diminish streetscape and community safety (eyes on the street) diminishing quality of life and property value. Please substitute "all of the following" for "one of the following" in referring to the three conditions that follow.	See Lines 144, 278, 279, 661, and 967.	See Lines 144 and 278. Staff is revising Section 4-6.9 for clarity.
1051	Gallagher, Pat		4/12/17	The following areas should be addressed, clarified or modified to make the VPO workable, fair and consistent:	See Lines 1052-1058.	
1052	Gallagher, Pat		4/12/17	An architect or developer attempting to design a building in the overlay zone must look in three very separate places to get the needed information. The intent is articulated in the Comp Plan, the important definitions are on pages 392-394 and the regulatory language is shown on pages 98-101. For a regulation of this kind it would be very helpful to have all three parts in one place in the IDO. This may require repeating the *intent* from the Comp Plan, but it helps to clarify the reasoning behind the regulation.	The IDO summarizes the purpose of all VPOs in 2-7.4.A and identifies the specific views being protected in the Coors Corridor VPO in 2-7.4.B.1.b (see p. 98).	
1053	Gallagher, Pat		4/12/17	All site plans that are in the VPO should go before the EPC. This will insure that the view preservation analysis is transparent and able to be replicated by any interested or affected parties.	See Line 943. See also Lines 46, 512, and 946-947.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
1054	Gallagher, Pat		4/12/17	Under definitions, page 393, the illustration of the View Area, needs to be modified. The positioning of the two View Frames is misleading and historically unusual. The View Frames will normally cross the Sighting Lines at the front of the building, since this is where the highest point usually is. This is important because it affects the width of the View Frame. It makes it definable in a geometrically consistent manner. It is probably adequate to say in the text that more than one View Frame may be necessary to encompass the whole building or site and thus delete the picture of the two frames in this illustration.		Staff will consider deleting the illustration of the View Area on p. 393, retaining the text and adding a cross-reference to the View Frame definition.
1055	Gallagher, Pat		4/12/17	In the same illustration page 393, one of the Sighting Lines is shown emanating from the corner of the property. This could cause confusion and should be shifted left or right.		See Line 1054.
1056	Gallagher, Pat		4/12/17	The next illustration, page 394, places the View Frame from corner to corner of the property. This is misleading and confusing and never likely to happen. As mentioned above, the likely view frame would be at the front of the building (90° to the Sighting Line) and intersecting the property lines at two much different places. If the View Frame is to be projected against the mountain as shown it should be precisely parallel to the chosen View frame to avoid any confusion about the projection.		Staff will consider revising the illustration of View Frame on p. 394 by shifting the left and right vertical edges of the View Frame away from the corners of the property.

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
1057	Gallagher, Pat		4/12/17	The first illustration shown on page 99 is one of three in the Coors Corridor Plan. All three should be included. The multi-story reference in the original was and should be deleted since 30' buildings can be a single story.	Staff believes it is unrealistic to include the 2nd illustration on p. 109 of the existing Coors Corridor Plan because it suggests that building heights between 4 - 10 feet are viable.	Staff will consider adding text to state that where a site elevation is significantly lower than 10 feet below the elevation of Coors Blvd., buildings can be designed to fall below the view plane.
1058	Gallagher, Pat		4/12/17	Massing analysis (called Bulk in the IDO) should be done View Frame-by-View Frame in order to conduct a consistent and repeatable analysis. Each View Frame should pass the 50% test.	More specifics are needed about when more than one View Frame is necessary (to encompass the site and/or buildings?), to enable Staff to respond. See also Line 1054	
1059	Gallagher, Pat		4/12/17	View Preservation Text for the Proposed Coors Corridor Plan Modification	See Lines 1060-1068.	
1060	Gallagher, Pat		4/12/17	4.1 Definitions The following definitions explain the terms used in the regulations for view compliance. In general, the key relationships between definitions are these: Sight Lines form the basis for view analysis View Frames are based on Sight Lines View Areas are based on a collection of adjacent View Frames	See IDO Definitions beginning on p. 392.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
1061	Gallagher, Pat		4/12/17	Sight Lines Sight Lines begin at the edge of the roadway and extend to the mountains. In the plan view they are drawn at a 45˚ angle to the Coors ROW looking approximately Northeast. Sight Lines are chosen to intersect with the highest features of a proposed building. As many sight lines can be chosen as necessary to capture all of the highest features of the building or group of buildings. The distance between any two adjacent sight lines shall be no more than 450'.	The IDO definition is very similar. A rationale for the 450 foot distance between sighting lines would be needed to enable staff to respond.	Clerical: Correct typo (repeated phrase) in last line of Sighting Lines definition on p. 392.
1062	Gallagher, Pat		4/12/17	Sight Lines in the section view start at a point 4'above the current Coors roadway at the east edge of the east most driving lane. Each sight line extends to the ridgeline of the Sandia mountains	A rationale for this addition is needed to enable staff to respond. The proposed language is not in the existing Coors Corridor Plan.	
1063	Gallagher, Pat		4/12/17	View Frame A View Frame is a vertical rectangular frame drawn 90˚ to a given sight line (in the plan view) at the highest point on the proposed building. The top of the view frame is established by the highest point of the Sandia ridgeline in the view frame. The bottom of the view frame is the elevation of the Coors ROW where the sight line begins. The left and right edges of the view frame are an upward projection of the property lines where the view frame crosses the property lines. If the distance between the left and right edges of the view frame is greater than 450', then additional sight lines will be added.	Re. distance between sighting lines, see also Line 1061.	Staff will consider whether the more detailed language proposed by the commenter will add clarity to the definition on p. 393.

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
1064	Gallagher, Pat		4/12/17	View Area View Area is the collection of the view frames used in the analysis.	The IDO definition on p. 393 is more complete.	
1065	Gallagher, Pat		4/12/17	Horizontal View Plane Horizontal View Plane is used in section views to establish building height limits. The plane is at an elevation 4' above the current (at the time of application) Coors ROW where the sight line begins; see Sight Line definition above. It extends across the entire property toward the mountains	The IDO definition is very similar. "At the time of application" seems an unnecessary addition in relation to the elevation of the Coors Blvd. right-of-way.	
1066	Gallagher, Pat		4/12/17	View Window A View Window is a vertical rectangular portion of the View Area that provides an unobstructed view of the mountains above the View Plane. It applies only to properties north of Paseo del Norte	This term is not used in the existing Coors Corridor Plan and is not proposed in the IDO.	
1067	Gallagher, Pat		4/12/17	Mass Building mass is the relationship between a proposed building and its surroundings in a given View Frame(s). Mass is measured as a proportion of the projected area of the building to the total area of the relevant View Frame(s).	The Coors Blvd Corridor VPO addresses "mass" in a regulation (p. 99, 2-7.4.B.e.ii). The VPO carries over the term "bulk" from the existing Coors Corridor Plan.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
1068	Gallagher, Pat		4/12/17	4.3 Structure Height and Mass i) Exceptions… ii) On sites south of Paseo del Norte a. Height 1. No more than 33% of the total height of a structure may penetrate above the Horizontal View Plane… 2. No portion of the structure, including but not limited to parapet, building mounted sign and rooftop equipment, may extend above the Sandia mountain ridgeline. b. Mass 1. No more than 30% of an individual structure's width (as seen in the View Area) shall penetrate above the Horizontal View Plane. 2. All structures on the development site shall obscure no more than 50% of the View Area as observed from each Sight Line location on Coors ROW.	It is unclear how the proposed language relates to the content of the Coors Blvd Corridor VPO. More information is needed to enable staff to respond.	
1069	Davis, Kalvin	Geltmore, LLC	4/12/17	Re: Amendment to "Official EPC Comments on the Integrated Development Ordinance EPC Draft December 2016 with emphasis on the Premium Transit development height bonus" submitted on January 20, 2017 Please consider this letter as an amendment to the "Map" section of the letter submitted on January 20, 2017.	See Lines 285-290 for January 20 letter.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
1070	Davis, Kalvin	Geltmore, LLC	4/12/17	After a careful re-read of the Nob Hill CPO in the December 2016 EPC Draft of the IDO, we realized that our understanding of the rules was incomplete. With that said, we are more confused than ever as to the reasoning behind limiting building height bonuses within the EPC draft. The following language that relates directly to building height bonuses in the Nob Hill CPO reads exactly as follows [from page 79, Section 2-7.5(5)(d)(i)(b)]: "b. On properties abutting Central from Girard Blvd. to Aliso Ave., height and density bonuses associated with the Main Street designation or Workforce Housing are not applicable. Bonuses associated with Premium Transit are only available within one block of a Premium Transit station."	Noted. See Lines 1071-1075 for the commenters review. (Revised 4/19/17)	
1071	Davis, Kalvin	Geltmore, LLC	4/12/17	Using this information, we have drawn a map of the applicable bonus areas within the Emerging Nob Hill area (between Carlisle and Washington). See map in comment. It took a very careful read of the rules (combined with a look at the proposed IDO zoning categories and a city parcel map) to create the map above. It is our opinion that the rules are arbitrary and capricious, especially the language "properties abutting Central" and the language "only available within one block of a Premium Transit station."	Noted. Staff appreciates the public's engagement and analysis of the provisions in this draft of the IDO. (Revised 4/19/17)	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
1072	Davis, Kalvin	Geltmore, LLC	4/12/17	The first issue is the language "properties abutting Central." This language reads such that it seems properties which do not have frontage or access from Central, yet have MX zoning with any of the bonuses available, will be able to take advantage of those bonuses. See the impact of this language between Carlisle and Aliso, on the south side of Central. It appears that the property "abutting Central" does not qualify for the Workforce Housing bonus, but the properties that abut Carlisle, Hermosa, Solano, or Aliso do qualify.	(Revised 4/19/17)	Further analysis is needed to respond to this request, which may result in a future Recommended Condition of Approval.
1073	Davis, Kalvin	Geltmore, LLC	4/12/17	It is also unclear if the second sentence [of Section 2-7.5(5)(d)(i)(b)] applies to only those properties "abutting Central" or if it is a general statement that applies to all properties that have the Premium Transit bonus available. If this sentence only applies to those properties "abutting Central" then the Premium Transit bonus should be applied the same as the Workforce Housing bonus, meaning that property not "abutting Central" is eligible for two bonuses, yet the property "abutting Central" is eligible for only one (or neither if between Carlisle and Hermosa). This means the property not "abutting Central," which is more near to the neighborhood could build a building up to 77' tall [(MX-M) 45' + (PT) 20' + (WFH) 12']. It seems like the form of the bonuses is working backwards, allowing taller buildings closer to the neighborhoods rather than closer to Central.	See Line 1072. (Revised 4/19/17)	Further analysis is needed to respond to this request, which may result in a future Recommended Condition of Approval.

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
1074	Davis, Kalvin	Geltmore, LLC	4/12/17	As seen by the red hatch marks on the map, the Premium Transit bonus is available to all ofthe properties between Carlisle and Washington within 660' of a station except for the block immediately east of Carlisle (between Carlisle and Hermosa). This occurs because the "within one block" language appears to only apply up to Aliso, meaning that properties to the east of Aliso, yet within 660' of a station are still eligible for the bonus. It seems illogical and unfair to those property owners between Carlisle and Hermosa to restrict their property rights as compared to other properties between Hermosa and Washington.	(Revised 4/19/17)	Further analysis is needed to respond to this request, which may result in a future Recommended Condition of Approval.
1075	Davis, Kalvin	Geltmore, LLC	4/12/17	The language in Section 2-7.5(5)(d)(i)(b) appears to have been drafted to protect the Historic Core area (between Girard and Carlisle) and we think that it is well designed to do so. Although, as it is currently written we think it will have a negative impact on the Emerging Nob Hill area, especially the transition between the Historic Core and Emerging Nob Hill in the blocks just east of Carlisle.	Noted. (Revised 4/19/17)	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
1076	Davis, Kalvin	Geltmore, LLC	4/12/17	The restrictions in Section 2-7.2(5)(d)(i)(b) arbitrarily and capriciously singles out and affects a one block area in the Emerging Nob Hill area directly east of Carlisle and abutting Central. Emerging Nob Hill needs new development, especially mixed-use development with both residential and commercial uses, and the few blocks to the east of Carlisle will be a key component to the success of the area. The Nob Hill CPO should not restrict new development in this area. The language in Section 2-7.5(5)(d)(i)(b) should be rewritten so as to only apply between Girard and Carlisle, which would best allow for Emerging Nob Hill to succeed.	(Revised 4/19/17)	Further analysis is needed to respond to this request, which may result in a future Recommended Condition of Approval.
1077	Dickinson, Marianne		4/12/17	In reviewing the new use category “Daytime Gathering Facility," I noted that one type of service not listed in this type of “facility” is ambulatory medical service, such as clinical services provided by Health Care for the Homeless. Is that an oversight, or an exclusion for a reason?	The services listed in the definition of Daytime Fathering Facility “include but are not limited to” the services listed.	Further analysis is needed to respond to this request, which may result in a future Recommended Condition of Approval.
1078	Dickinson, Marianne		4/12/17	I do applaud the creating of this type of zoning use, to allow these services to be provided in clearly defined settings and stop the criminalizing of people gathering to make use of these necessary services and aid.	Noted.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
1079	Balizer, Ken		4/12/17	I am the owner of an undeveloped parcel (1.4 acres) zoned RA2 in the North Valley. Approximately 18 months ago a colleague and I submitted a request to rezone the property to provide cottage housing incorporating new single family detached units limited to 1000 sq ft each along with two existing dwellings (approximately 1700 and 1100 sq ft) and one duplex. The clustered layout included approximately 1/3 acre of community gardens, use of the adjacent acequia and a 20 ft landscaped setback along the access street, Rio Grande Blvd.	Noted. See Lines s and 559-561.	
1080	Balizer, Ken		4/12/17	The proposal, SU for PRD, was well received by the Planning Department and the EPC approved the request unanimously. One neighborhood associations appealed the project to the LUHO on the grounds it was a spot zone; density not appropriate (two high) and clustering not supported in parcels under two acres. Unfortunately, the appeal was upheld.	Noted.	
1081	Balizer, Ken		4/12/17	The applicants argued that the density proposed was actually less of an impact than the likely construction would produce if the land was developed into the large lots and houses allowable under the current zoning.	Noted	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
1082	Balizer, Ken		4/12/17	The IDO in making Cluster, Co-housing and Cottage Development permissive in the RA and R zones will allow most of the development previously proposed. Allowing these types of development as a permissive use is a significant advance for our community in providing housing for small working families, elders and those who value rural character and community. A few questions remain to determine to what degree the IDO actually fulfills on that promise and the benefits of the new proposed uses.	See Lines 1083-1084.	
1083	Balizer, Ken		4/12/17	1. The Cottage Development does not provide for clustering of dwellings yet that would be beneficial in creating open space, reducing infrastructure costs, creating animal habitat and meeting goals of the North Valley Area Plan to maintain rural character. Is there any reason that clustering could not be included at the discretion of the developer? It would be wise to include such in the text.	Cottage development is not constrained by having to subdivide the land. There is nothing in the Cottage development Standards that prohibits clustering of dwellings in this zone. (Revised 4/19/17)	
1084	Balizer, Ken		4/12/17	2. There are two existing dwelling units on the property (non-conforming uses) approximately 1700 and 1100 sq ft. Is it possible under the Cottage Development to allow these to remain in the new cottage development assuming the development as a whole remains under the maximum sq. ft. density as computed in the IDO?	A cottage development regulates the total square footage that can be built in relation to the number of dwellings that could have be developed within that zone. The two existing homes could remain as non-conforming, but the remainder of dwellings would necessarily have to be smaller than 1,000 feet maximum dwelling size to off-set the existing dwellings that are larger. (Revised 4/19/17)	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
1085	Balizer, Ken		4/12/17	3. Is it possible to include one or more attached units?	The definition of Dwelling, Cottage housing refers to individual homes. The Use Specific Standards for Cottage Development is silent on the allowable dwelling types. (Revised 4/19/17)	Staff will review the language in both the definition (Section 6-1 on page 397) and Use Specific Standard (Section 3-3.2.E on page 122) for Cottage Development and Co Housing Development and revise to clarify what dwelling types are permitted. (Revised 4/19/17)
1086	Balizer, Ken		4/12/17	Questions and Concerns regarding the Development Standards Chapter 14-16-4-1-B Contextual Residential Development In Areas of Consistency.	See Lines 1086-1092.	
1087	Balizer, Ken		4/12/17	The prescriptive definitions of allowable development included in the Cluster, Co-housing and Cottage Developments required setbacks and landscaped buffers in the Development Standards provides more than adequate protection to the context of existing development. The addition of this section adds uncertainty as to what is really required, contradicts the Development permissive uses in so far as lot sizes and is, to my mind, entirely redundant.	Contextual Standards were incorporated into the IDO in order to preserve the fabric of existing neighborhoods. Currently the IDO is unclear about how these standards apply to Cluster, Cottage, and Co-Housing developments and how they apply where blocks patterns and street frontages are irregular. (Revised 4/19/17)	Further analysis is needed to respond to this request, which may result in a future Recommended Condition of Approval. Staff will review and revise the Contextual Standards (Section 4-1.3.B on page 167) to clarify if and how they apply to Cluster, Cottage, and Co-Housing, Development. (Revised 4/19/17)
1088	Balizer, Ken		4/12/17	At my meeting with City planners to better understand the impact of IDO on my particular parcel of land it was suggested that I could avoid the contextual requirements entirely by considering the block created within the development itself as the context. Given the 100ft width of the parcel this alternative is not possible while still producing a community oriented housing layout.	(Revised 4/19/17)	Staff will review and revise the Dimensional Standards and the definition of Lot Line, Front in the IDO to clarify how they apply in relationship to private roads and front yard setbacks. (Revised 4/19/17)

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
1089	Balizer, Ken		4/12/17	In order to understand, a better description of this parcel and its development options is in order. Frontage along the public access road is 100 ft. the lot is 600+ft back to the irrigation ditch. Logical development would make the 100ft segment along the access street to be the front of the development with a 20ft setback. The rear setback runs along the ditch and fits with the community open space and the side setbacks run the 600+ feet and provides a 10ft setback and buffer. Access off the main road is along the 600+ft north boundary but only long enough to serve parking, fire and garbage truck turnaround but ends prior to new cottage units. The cottage units are built each side of a community path and open space access way. The limiting factor is the 100 ft width of the land parcel and the desire to create a community layout of the housing and gardens.	See Line 1088. (Revised 4/19/17)	See Line 1088. (Revised 4/19/17)
1090	Balizer, Ken		4/12/17	The guidelines for these new development types in the Use Regulations are easy to understand and interpretation and confusion is minimal. With the Contextual Residential Development, front setback can be derived from adjacent structures and setbacks but the prescribed setback of 20 ft. is allowed and is workable. The lot size determination is confusing at best.	See Lines 1087 and 1088. (Revised 4/19/17)	See Lines 1087 and 1088. (Revised 4/19/17)

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
1091	Balizer, Ken		4/12/17	The problem is the lot size. These are to be no less than 75% of adjacent lots on the block. For the lot in question, adjacent on one side is a platted and built R-1 on the other side is one house on 1.5 acres or more. On the block there is similar variety and on the block and across the street are town houses as well as large lot development. The trend of the neighborhood is tear down of modest single-family homes on large lots and development of residential on R-1, townhouses, and quarter acre lots with large, 2500 sq ft plus homes. People of modest means can no longer afford the area.	See Lines 1087 and 1088. (Revised 4/19/17)	See Lines 1087 and 1088. (Revised 4/19/17)
1092	Balizer, Ken		4/12/17	The addition of the contextual method of computing lot size leaves confusion as to what is allowed and how to determine that. The IDO starts out well in providing a means of determining allowable units and square feet in the definition of Cottage, Co-housing and Cluster Developments but then reverts to an archaic and confusing method abandoning what it just provided in terms of flexibility, creative layout and community style housing. It is important to get this right for the Valley context of rural and to create small subdivisions that appeal to a desire for community, sense of safely and affordability for working families, starter families and seniors.	Noted. Staff appreciates the public engagement with the current draft of the IDO. See Lines 1087 and 1088. (Revised 4/19/17)	See Lines 1087 and 1088. (Revised 4/19/17)

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
1093	Carver, Adrian	Nob Hill NA	4/12/17	At our regular Board meeting on April 11th, 2017, the Nob Hill Neighborhood Association considered a number of statements on the Integrated Development Ordinance EPC Draft dated December 29, 2016. While there is much the Board likes in the draft, the Board is greatly concerned with some details in the IDO that would, if passed as written, detrimentally affect our neighborhood. The Board considered some of the most problematic sections and voted on specific changes to the following clauses of the IDO text. The format of the document includes those changes in language, some reasoning to explain our intent, and the vote of our board (i.e., in favor, against, abstentions).	See also Lines 334-342. Some of the comments below were included in the first letter received from NHNA on March 19.	
1094	Carver, Adrian	Nob Hill NA	4/12/17	Current IDO Draft Language *Proposed Additions* ~~Proposed language to be struck~~ Note: it is implied that if no comment is made on specific language, the NHNA supports that language, as guided by Editorial Comments listed below recommendations.	Noted.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
1095	Carver, Adrian	Nob Hill NA	4/12/17	I. 2-4.1: Mixed-Use Transition Zone (MX-T) C. District Standards *i. For the Nob Hill Highland Area, as mapped below, the Building Standard for the Height, principal Building, max. ft. shall be 26 ft.* Reasoning: The 2007 NHHSDP allows max height 26 feet, consistent with the original residential nature of the buildings in this zone in Nob Hill. (NHHSDP, pg. 89) The character of this neighborhood must be maintained. Recommended by the NHNA BOD, March 6. (11 for, 1 against, 0 abstain)	Staff does not believe there is an appreciable difference between 26 and 30 feet, allowed by MX-T.	See Line 140. Staff is working on a Condition to add maximum stories, in addition to the building heights in each zone. MX-T would be limited to a maximum of 2-stories.
1096	Carver, Adrian	Nob Hill NA	4/12/17	II. 2-7.2.B.5 Nob Hill Highland-CPO-5 Proposed language: d. Building Standards-i. Building heights-b. On properties abutting Central from Girard Blvd. to Aliso Ave., height and density bonuses associated with the Main Street designation, Premium Transit, or Workforce Housing are not applicable. *i. For MX-M Zone Districts in this area, building heights in this area shall be restricted to 39 feet.* Reasoning: The community hammered out a 39 foot building height for this area through the sector plan process in 2007. (NHHSDP pg. 89) Neighbors allowed a lot so others could get the heights up to 39 feet from where they had been. The purpose of a CPO is to recognize unique character that is worthy of preservation and preserve it. The district creates city wide value from its historic character. Recommended by the NHNA BOD, March 6. (9 for, 2 against, 1 abstain)	See Lines 82, 95-97, 140, 142, 152, 232, 276, 290, 309, 311-315, 327-331, 337-340, 660, 662-663, 665-670, and 698-708, and 969 for discussion of building heights in Nob Hill.	See Line 140.

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
1097	Carver, Adrian	Nob Hill NA	4/12/17	III. 2-7.2.B.5. Nob Hill Highland-CPO-5 Proposed language: d. Building Standards-i. Building heights c: On properties abutting Central from Aliso Ave. to Graceland Dr., bonuses associated with the Main Street Designation *or Premium Transit* do not apply. *ii. For MX-M Zone Districts in this area, building heights in this area shall be restricted to 54 feet.* Reasoning: Addition of non-applicability of the Premium Transit station to this section clarifies how bonuses can be applied in this area. Typical Premium Transit bonuses are available within two blocks. Because a Premium Transit Station is located within one block of Aliso Ave., one could interpret the bonus to be available on the block between Aliso. and Morningside Ave. This language clarifies that this bonus would not apply on this block. The 54 foot height was agreed upon in the NHHSDP in 2007, pg. 89. Recommended by the NHNA BOD, March 6. (12 for, 0 against, 0 abstain)	See Lines 339, 340, 660, and 669.	See Line 660 and 669.

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
1098	Carver, Adrian	Nob Hill NA	4/12/17	IV. 4-5.6.B.1 Carports Proposed language: b. Carports *in the front setback* for single-family, two-family detached dwellings and attached dwellings, *and townhouse dwellings* are prohibited in the following mapped areas. Reasoning: Addition of "townhouse dwellings" includes the 3 and 4 plex dwellings in the mapped area. Recommended by the NHNA BOD, March 6. (10 for, 1 against, 1 abstain)	See LInes 145, 277, 296, 325-326, 341, and 661.	
1099	Carver, Adrian	Nob Hill NA	4/12/17	V. 4-6.9.B.6 Fence and Wall Standards: Maximum Height Proposed language: b. Walls, fences and retaining walls greater than three feet are not allowed in the front setback area of parcels with single-family detached dwellings, two-family detached dwellings, and townhouse dwellings in the mapped areas shown. *Exceptions do not apply in the mapped areas shown.* Reasoning: This language clarifies that the Exception to Maximum Height (4-6.9.C) do not apply in the mapped area. Recommended by the NHNA BOD, April 11. (11 for, 0 against, 1 abstain)		This was the intent of provision 4-6.9.B.6. Staff will revise Section 4-6.9 for clarity to better communicate that exceptions do not apply for single-family detached dwellings, two-family detached dwellings, and attached townhouse dwellings in the Monte Vista and College View Historic District area, consistent with the Nob Hill Highland SDP.

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
1100	Carver, Adrian	Nob Hill NA	4/12/17	VI. 4-10.3 Residential Development Proposed language: Second story additions to existing buildings shall incorporate a minimum horizontal stepback of six feet from the front façade. When there is an existing porch, the step-back is measured starting at the *front façade of the structure, excluding* the porch. Reasoning: This language encourages a small step-back of the building in order to maintain character of homes in the mapped areas. Recommended by the NHNA BOD, April 11. (9 for, 0 against, 1 abstain)	This standard from the Nob Hill Highland Sector Development Plan can be found in Section 4-10.2 and 3.	On page 268, revise Section 4-10.3 to refer only to the mapped areas in Section 4-10.2.C.
1101	Carver, Adrian	Nob Hill NA	4/12/17	VII. 4-11.7.A Off-Premises Signs, Locations 1. Off-premises signs are not permitted in the following mapped areas, unless otherwise stated below. *f. CPO-5 Nob Hill Highland CPO Zone* *Reasoning:* *This language brings the IDO in compliance with the Nob Hill Highland Sector Development Plan, as negotiated with neighbors in 2007.* *Recommended by the NHNA BOD, April 11. (11 for, 0 against, 0 abstain)*	Signs in the CCR zones are regulated the SDP General Regulations on page 103 of the Nob Hill Highland SDP. In the OR zones, the SDP refers to the sign regulations in the zoning code. Neither location has a prohibition for off-premises signs. Section D of the SDP General Signage Regulations lists allowable types of signage, and does not mention off-premises signs. Free-standing pole-mounted signs are allowed only where they meet the CAN DOZ qualifying criteria. Staff believes that this comment conflates free-standing signs (a sign type) with off-premises signs (sign content). The rule about pole signs from the Nob Hill Highland SDP has been carried forward and applied citywide in Section 4-11.6 - Table 4-11-2 (page 279). (Revised 4/19/17)	On page 279, in Table 4-11-2 Mixed-Use and Non-Residential Sign Standards, revise the text in the Freestanding Sign section to prohibit monument and pylon signs in the Nob Hill CPO-5. Revise footnote 1051 To refer to the Nob Hill Highland SDP. (Revised 4/19/17)

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
1102	Carver, Adrian	Nob Hill NA	4/12/17	VIII. 4-8.2.A Neighborhood Edges, Applicability 2. Share a side or rear lot line with, or are located across a street from: a. A lot in the R-A, R-1, R-MC, or R-T zone district that contains a Household living use (as shown in Table 3-2-1)~~ other than a live-work dwelling of multifamily dwelling use~~; or Reasoning: Neighborhood edges is intended to preserve the residential neighborhood character of established low-density homes in residential areas from tall buildings in the MX zones. However the draft denies that protection for live work dwellings or multi family dwellings which will leave much of Nob Hill without neighborhood edge protection. In the College View addition, for example, many of the structures in the southern end are historic duplexes and one is an old folks home. Indeed, when it was developed in 1926 this portion of the Monte Vista and College View national register historic district was devoted to construction of duplexes. Furthermore, the neighborhood edges provision protects the first dozen or two dozen properties that border on the mixed use zones, not just the first one or two. Recommended by the NHNA BOD, April 11. (8 for, 0 against, 3 abstain)	See Line 664. (Revised 4/19/17)	See Line 664. (Revised 4/19/17)

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
1103	Wolfley, Jolene		4/12/17	We offer the following detailed revisions for you to consider for the IDO. Notes: 1. Those items in black (with red underline to show suggested revisions) follow from the TRNA Board approved letter of April 4, 2017. 2. Those items in purple (with red underline to show suggested revisions) are currently under review of the TRNA Board.	Noted. We appreciate all the comments and participation by stakeholders to review and comment on the IDO.	
1104	Wolfley, Jolene		4/12/17	2-7.4 View Protection Overlay Zone We offer the following detailed revisions for you to consider for the IDO. Notes: A. Purpose: The purpose of the VPO district is to preserve areas with unique and distinctive views and to have buildings in the foreground blend with the view of the natural features. ~~that are worthy of conservation.~~ View Preservations Overlays must meet the standards of Major Public Open Space. Reason: The Coors Corridor Plan and the Westside Strategic Plan promote policy that would protect the views and require buildings to blend with the natural environment.	Comments proposing detailed revisions, and the reasons for them, are much appreciated by staff and decision-makers. The purpose of the VPO should be kept general to accommodate different types of views.	Staff is looking for direction from decision-makers about whether to write a Condition that would make MPOS standards apply in VPO zones. Staff is working on a condition revising the purpose of the VPOs and adding language about buildings blending with the natural environment.

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
1105	Wolfley, Jolene		4/12/17	B. Regulations Applicable to Specific Areas. 1. Coors Boulevard Corridor – VPO-1 a. Applicable Area Standards apply in the mapped area shown below. Where the boundary crosses a lot line, the entire lot is subject to the VPO-1 standards and guidelines. Review of Site plans for subdivision and building permit by the EPC is required. ……b. Views protected by this VPO are from Coors Boulevard, along the segment between Western Trail/NamasteRoad and Alameda Boulevard, looking toward the Rio Grande Bosque and the Sandia Mountains. c. Structures built in this area shall predominantly use the browns and greens of the Bosque. Reason: The Coors Corridor Plan and the Westside Strategic Plan promote policy that would protect the views and require buildings to blend with the natural environment.	Re. comment 1.a. See Line 943	Re. comment 1.c: Consider inserting a new regulation in the Coors Blvd. Corridor VPO that requires the exterior color of structures to predominantly use the browns and/or greens of the Bosque environment. See Line 767.
1106	Wolfley, Jolene		4/12/17	2-7.4.C Definitions (Coors VPO): Recommend that the actual definitions be brought into this section (and that the regulatory definitions not be separated, in the back of the IDO). Supportive of Pat Gallagher suggested modifications to graphics on p. 393) to properly illustrate view frames and sight lines.	See Lines 1054-1056.	Staff is working on a Condition to move the definitions into the Coors VPO.

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
1107	Wolfley, Jolene		4/12/17	2/7.4.D Deviations (VPO): Administrative deviations from View Protection Overlays are not allowed. Variations from these standards are only available pursuant to Section 4-16-5.2.K (Development Standard Variance), which requires a public hearing before the EPC. The applicant is required to demonstrate that the deviation provides either greater civic benefit or greater natural benefit than the standard. Reason: Brings forward the provisions from the Coors Corridor Plan.	Several topics are implicated in this comment: 1) Including the proposed language in the VPO would be confusing and inconsistent with the organization of the IDO. See Lines 17, 36, 151, 223, 241. 2) The IDO distinguishes minor Administrative Deviations that are reviewed as part of a site plan application from the more significant Variances to standards that are decided separately by the ZHE.	Staff is working on a Condition to add criteria to Section 5-5.2.F.1 for EPC to grant exceptions to IDO zoning standards for developments with exceptional design that provide positive civic and/or environmental benefits.
1107 (cont'd)	Wolfley, Jolene		4/12/17		Note that the Coors Corridor Plan (p. 111) sets out criteria for granting exceptions to view preservation regulations but does not specify that EPC is the decision-making body. The role devolved to the EPC through practice, and it has been reviewed as part of developing the IDO, along with other City processes. 3) Re. review of site plans by EPC, see Lines 942 and 966. Also note that applicability for EPC decisions includes developments where the applicant requests EPC review. See Section 5-5.2.F.1.b on page 348.	
1108	Wolfley, Jolene		4/12/17	Permissive Use Table -Motor Vehicle-related permissive uses – Light vehicle repair. Remove light vehicle repair as a permissive use in the MX-L zone.	Light vehicle repair is currently a permissive use in C-1, which converts to MX-L. (Revised 4/19/17)	
1109	Wolfley, Jolene		4/12/17	Permited Use Table-Offices and Services-Indoor Self Storage Need to make new designations for self storage accessed from the outside. There is a much more impact if the storage is outdoor than indoor	The IDO addresses indoor vs. outdoor in use-specific standard in Section 3-3.4.X on page 136.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
1110	Wolfley, Jolene		4/12/17	Permitted Use Table-Retail Sales-Adult Retail Remove adult retail as a permitted use in N R-C zone. The Westside of Abq should not be the more open to adult retail than the east side.	Adult retail is regulated per Use Table 3-2-1 on page 112. It is allowed permissively in MX-H and NR-C (the conversions for C-3). The only MX-H on the West Side is Volcano Heights. The east side has MX-H in Centers and Corridors. For these reasons, the east side and west side are being treated similarly.	
1111	Wolfley, Jolene		4/12/17	General Retail, small, medium, large Support the square footages as shown.	See Lines 89, 111, 306, 307, 430, 431, and 726-727.	
1112	Wolfley, Jolene		4/12/17	Drive throughs 5. The order board shall be less than xx square feet. Reason: Order boards can create a great amount of visual clutter	Order boards are mentioned in the Use Specific Standard for Drive-through windows in Section 3-3.6.D on page 148.	Staff is working on a condition specifying the maximum size of order boards.
1113	Wolfley, Jolene		4/12/17	Drive throughs ~~5.~~6. This use is prohibited in the following mapped areas, as noted below. This use is also prohibited within 330 feet of Major Public Open Space. Reaon: Drive throughs conflict with environmental values and animal activities in MPOS		Staff is looking for direction from EPC about whether to write a Condition prohibiting drive-throughs within 330 feet of MPOS to add to Section 3-3.6.D on page 148.
1114	Wolfley, Jolene		4/12/17	Table 4-1-2 Summary of Max density/ intensity MX-L ~~30~~ 20 du/acre MX-M ~~75~~ 40 du/acre Reason: Densities were increased 100-400% from existing zones.	Staff feels the densities are appropriate. 30 du/acre is the existing density in R-2, which MX-L would allow as multi-family. 75 du/acre is the existing density allowed per the C-1/C-2/C-3 Ordinance adopted by Council in 2012.	
1115	Wolfley, Jolene		4/12/17	Tables 4-1-3 Summary of NR Zone District Dimensional Standards Max. building height NR-C Other Areas: ~~65~~ 35 ft. Reason: Height increase was over 200 percent of existing zone	C-3 allows unlimited building height within angle planes via the O-1 height provisions.	See Line 791.

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
1116	Wolfley, Jolene		4/12/17	4-2.5.E.2.a Fences and Walls Residential Opaque walls with at least 20% view fencing are only permitted along arroyo edges with lots in Residential zone districts. View fencing has been used abutting many arroyos on the Westside to improve the negative look of a solid wall.	The IDO requires view fencing along arroyos in MX and NR zones (see Section 4-2.5.E.2.b on page 177). The IDO allows opaque walls in Residential zones to allow for more privacy, but does not prohibit view fencing. (Revised 4/19/17)	Staff is working on a Condition for revisions to Sections 4-2.5.E, 4-2.8.A, and 4-6.9 for clarity and will consider this comment.
1117	Wolfley, Jolene		4/12/17	4-2.8 Properties Abutting Major Public Open Space Properties ~~Abutting~~ Within 330 feet of Major Public Open Space. These standards and guidelines apply to development ~~abutting~~ within 330 feet of the Major Public Open Space to enhance the development and protect the Major Public Open Space. If any portion of the parcel is within 330 feet of MPOS, the entire parcel is subject to the MPOS standards. Reason: A transition is needed adjacent to MPOS to make sure environmental values are preserved.	This comment is a revised version of one dated 4/4/17. See comment and response on Line 947. In addition, any expansion of the applicable area only makes sense relative to a few of the site design standards listed in 4-2.8.A, including location of uses in a mixed use development. Most of them are only pertinent to immediate adjacency, such as the wall standard.	Staff is looking for direction from EPC about whether to extend MPOS standards to properties within 330 feet of MPOS boundaries. See Line 947.
1118	Wolfley, Jolene		4/12/17	4-2.8 Properties Abutting Major Public Open Space 4. Have a 6 foot maximum height for fences and walls in Residential and Mixed-use districts along the Major Public Open Space, constructed of natural or earth tone colors. View fencing atop of base of 3 feet is encouraged. Reason: The wall or fence is an important design transition from the MPOS.	See Line 1116. (Revised 4/19/17)	See Lines 947 and 1116. Staff is considering a recommended condition that would apply wall standards similar to the arroyo standards to development abutting MPOS. (Revised 4/19/17)

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
1119	Wolfley, Jolene		4/12/17	4-3 Access and Connectivity Need to bring provisions of the LRF forward that require LRF larger than xx to have primary access to an arterial street.		Staff is reviewing LRF standards to ensure that all is carried over. See Line 949.
1120	Wolfley, Jolene		4/12/17	3.3.C.1.a Driveways and access general Every lot shall have sufficient access to afford a reasonable means of ingress ….for those needing to access the property for its intended use. Reason: Vague. Driveway limitations should be tied to the street's functional classification, i.e, principal arterial (fewest drivewas, etc.)	Specific provisions are spelled out in the DPM and are tied to functional classifications and Comp Plan corridors.	
1121	Wolfley, Jolene		4/12/17	5.E.2 Parking Maximums In areas of the City outside the Downtown, Urban Center, and Main Street areas, additional parking up to 10 percent over the maximum parking requirement may be approved by the Planning Director if the Planning Director determines that additional surface parking may be necessary due to unusual site or use characteristics….<u>Providing additional parking adjacent to entry points to major public open space qualifies as an unusual use characteristic.</u> Reason: Parking is often limited near MPOS. Extra public parking is needed. Sagebrush Church near Coors/LaOrilla built over parking required, but signed some of that parking as 'public' to accommodate this public entrance to the Bosque.		Staff is working on a Condition for this request.
1122	Wolfley, Jolene		4/12/17	5.9.B Drive Throughs Stacking Lane Design Add criteria to reduce the visual clutter of menu boards.	See Lines 191 and 1113	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
1123	Wolfley, Jolene		4/12/17	6.9.B Wall Maximum Height - Residential wall height Is residential wall height maximum 8 feet? That height is very tall for residential to residential walls	This carries forward the existing regulation for walls in Section 14-16-3-3(A)(4)(a).	
1124	Wolfley, Jolene		4/12/17	6.9.4.a Wall materials Rework: Combination of wall materials is problem in existing areas where people haphazardly raise wall heights with a different material than the original wall		Staff is considering revisions to 4-6.9 and will look into addressing the proposed language as part of that task.
1125	Wolfley, Jolene		4/12/17	6.9.4.b Wall materials Barbed wire/razor wire is allowed in most non residential areas. Allowing barbed wire in NR-C is a problem.	The IDO prohibits razor wire abutting Residential zones. More information is needed about the problem caused by barbed wire in NR-C.	
1126	Wolfley, Jolene		4/12/17	6.9.4.c Wall materials Chain link fencing allowed in residential districts? Confusing: two uses of 'except' in same sentence.	Staff believes the language, which appears on page 255, is clear, if awkward. Yes, chain link is allowed in residential areas.	
1127	Wolfley, Jolene		4/12/17	6.9.8 Bicycle access "shall provide access points in walls….to the maximum extent practicable." How will "maximum extent practicable" be applied?	It will be interpreted by the decision-making body associated with the project approval.	
1128	Wolfley, Jolene		4/12/17	4-10.5A Building Facades Downtown, Urban Center, Activity Center, and Premium Transit and Major Transit areas Reason: Enhanced pedestrial level amenities are needed in more areas of the City. Building façade and articulation standards are important parts of the IDO.	Major Transit is less appropriate for façade standards, since local buses serve almost every block. Transit-oriented development needs some gravity pulling to some areas but not all. PT standards are tied to locations within 660 feet of transit stations, which are planned for every 1/2 mile and therefore more appropriate for design standards that emphasize TOD.	Staff is looking for direction from EPC on whether to include requirements for building façades in Activity Centers in Section 4-10.5.A.

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
1129	Wolfley, Jolene		4/12/17	4.10.6.b.2.a &d Seating and Gathering Areas a.Each required seating and gathering area shall be at least 40 square feet in size for each ~~60,000~~ 50,000 square feet of gross floor area;…. d. The seating and gathering area shall be linked to the main entrance of the principal structure and the public sidewalk or internal driveway or adjacent to or with views to public or private open space. Reason: Enhance outdoor seating in more areas. Near Public Open Space is consistent with WSSP.		Staff will work on a Condition to accommodate this request.
1130	Wolfley, Jolene		4/12/17	5-2.9.D.3 EPC Membership In making the recommendation, the Mayor shall attempt to appoint members with experience in neighborhood or community planning, architecture, landscape architecture, urban design, real estate development, transportation, civil engineering, and/or real estate finance. The Mayor shall attempt to promote a balance of member backgrounds to create a balanced perspective. Reason: Worthy candidates to the EPC may come from more backgrounds than those listed.	This comment is a revised version of the one dated 4/4/17. See comment and response on Line 928.	Staff will work on a Condition to add the requested language to 5-2.9.D.3 on page 305.

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
1131	Wolfley, Jolene		4/12/17	5.4.3.A Neighborhood Meeting ...the applicant shall have at least one meeting with ~~a~~ any Recognized Neighborhood Associations (RNA) whose boundaries include the project before filing the application. Seven days prior to the meeting, the applicant shall provide the RNAs with the analysis of avoidance of sensitive areas. The applicant should make every attempt to also provide the scope of uses with general square footages, general site layout, design guidelines, architectural style and/or conceptual elevations, and conceptual landscaping. Reason: Current facilitated meetings are most effective when applicant has project details for neighbors to review.	This comment is a revised version of a comment about facilitated meetings dated 4/4/17. See comment and response on Line 948. The proposed change from "a" to "any" does not clarify the language appreciably. The types of information that are relevant to an application will vary from case to case. Singling out sensitive areas over other possible types of information could result in omitting important aspects of the project and skewing the discussion with NAs.	Staff will work on a Condition adding language to 5-4.3.A on page 311 about the applicant providing essential information about the request to NAs, and preferably prior to the neighborhood meeting to maximize mutual understanding and the effectiveness of the actual discussion.
1132	Wolfley, Jolene		4/12/17	5.4.20.A Finality of Decisions "A decision on a matter by any entity shown in Table 5-1-1 is final unless appealed, in which case it is not final until the appeal has been decided by the last appeal body." Problem as applied to declaratory rulings which citizens may be unaware of or new circumstances present.	This is a revised version of the comment dated 4/4/17. See Lines 549, 944, and 994.	See Line 944.

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
1133	Wolfley, Jolene		4/12/17	5.4.21.B.1.c Who may appeal? "An RNA ~~whose boundaries include~~ located partially or completely within one-quarter (1/4) miles of the subject property that can demonstrate the showing of impact required by subsection 2 below; or..." RNA should maintain current standing rights and no increased burden of justification	The provisions for standing are consistent with previous requirements of the zoning code, state statutes, and case law on standing in New Mexico. The requirement that parties demonstrate their standing in some instances is also consistent with the practices of New Mexico Courts that would review land use appeals. If any party ever disagrees with the City's determination on standing, they can appeal that decision to court.	Staff is looking for direction from EPC about whether to write a Condition changing the draft IDO language to include NAs within 1/4 mile of the subject property.
1134	Wolfley, Jolene		4/12/17	5-5.1.F Site Plan – Administrative Threshold 1. Applicability…. b. All new civic, institutional, commercial, or industrial development with less than ~~100,000~~75,000 square feet of gross floor area.	If the EPC considers a reduction valid, the new number should be consistent with any IDO standards that control the scale of development (gross floor area and/or other measurements) involving the use categories listed. See also Lines x, y.	Staff is looking for direction from EPC about whether to write a Condition changing the threshold for Site Plan - Administrative.
1135	Wolfley, Jolene		4/12/17	5-5.3.B Amendment to Zoning Map – EPC Threshold a. That would amend the Zoning Map to change less than 10 gross acres of land ~~located wholly or partially in an Area of Consistency, (as shown in the adopted Comprehensive Plan), or less than 20 gross acres of land in a zone district located entirely in an Area of Change (as shown in the adopted Comprehensive Plan)~~ to a different zone district: Reason: Council should be the final authority for all rezonings greater than 10 acres.	Allowing the EPC to decide zone map amendments up to 20 acres in an Area of Change is one way the IDO proposes to help implement the Comp Plan's vision for growth.	

No.	Name	Representing	Date	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change / Explanation	Change
1136	Wolfley, Jolene		4/12/17	5-5.3.B.3 and other similar places R270-1980 A different ~~zone district~~use category is more ~~consistent with the~~advantageous to the community, as articulated Comprehensive Plan ~~than the current zone category.~~or other City master plan even though (1) and (2) above do not apply. Reason: Need to preserve the language of R270-1980 which is based in state law.	Referring to changes in zone districts seems to be more appropriate than referring to use categories. R-270-1980 was the outgrowth of a court case, not state law.	Staff is considering revisions to 5-5.3.B, including putting the language about advantageous to the community back in.
1137	Wolfley, Jolene		4/12/17	We express deep appreciation to the Planning Department for their skilled and tireless work in managing this project. We appreciate the work of the EPC to review the IDO and all the community input. Any one section of the IDO could take a City a year to produce and review. Doing all these sections at once, with a zoning conversion map, show take as much time as need to avoid unintentional consequences for the City or the public.	The project team is grateful for all the participation of stakeholders during this process. The IDO has been drafted and reviewed over the last two years, beginning in October 2015, in three Modules to allow discussions of each chapter and as a whole beginning in October 2016. See Line 731, 735, 764, and 870.	