

Agenda #2

12716 Piru SE
Albuquerque, NM 87123
12/09/18

Environmental Planning Commission
c/o Catalina Lehner, Senior Planner
600 2nd St., NW, 3rd Floor
Albuquerque, NM 87102

Ref: Project #1011083 at 13200 Wenonah Ave, SE in Singing Arrow Park
EPC Public Hearing on Thursday, December 13, 2018 at 8:30 at Plaza del Sol building, 600 2nd,
NW 87102 lower level (basement) hearing room

Dear Mr. Chairman and Members of the Environmental Planning Commission,

I am writing to urge a pause in the advancement of Project #1011083 in order to repair a process that has wearied and angered residents of the East Gateway community and damaged the reputation of the City. This project has gone forward without *substantive* attention to the pleas of residents—that is, without taking seriously the reasoning of those who live here and witness first-hand the changing needs of our cluster of neighborhoods. We are, quite simply, asking the City to engage in sound business practices and good governance, and we ask that EPC take the lead.

As for business logic, first steps are to calculate the habits and desires of potential clientele before committing to a project whose success depends on that very clientele. Lamentably, the 2013 Needs Assessment grounding the project cites not a single human voice whether via interview, survey, or poll. This assessment, and in turn the City, assumes up front that multigenerational centers are de facto and inherently good, regardless of their geographical, demographic, and cultural placement. The City provides no informed, circumspect reasoning on how and why a given community center functions well or does not function well. A legitimate, conjoint (citizen with City) reasoning project—whose outcome was *not* pre-determined—would put renovation of the existing community center squarely on the table, as option. Do not for one moment believe that the facilitated meetings constituted conjoint reasoning by entities with equal weight to their reasonings: they did not.

As for good governance, accountability is fundamental. City responses to citizen concerns about traffic at Wenonah and Tramway, bus charging stations, bus turnarounds, child safety, green space, and archaeological preservation have been weak—perfunctory. The archaeology problem has been answered with promises of a small exhibit. The reduction of green space problem goes unacknowledged. Typically, safety is discussed in terms of shrubbery and lighting. What about street lights in the rest of our very dark neighborhood, where walking at night is unsafe? And children's well-being? What failure of the imagination is responsible for designing after-school care with no option for kids to run around outside—this in a city with 280 days per year of sunshine? Because it is not safe at the proposed location? Agreed. But it *is* safer at the location of the existing Center—which is more protected, which has outdoor space already, which has

experience with outdoor supervision, and which sorely needs upgraded and expanded play equipment.

Albuquerque voters approved funds for *renovating the existing* Singing Arrow Community Center—as we keep saying. On multiple occasions East Gateway residents have requested that the City evaluate the physical condition and current usage of this existing facility. The City presents itself as indifferent to the fate of this building—to its promise as a site potentially well suited to the needs of the community and to its fate with the advent of a new center. *Right now*, we are asking via EPC that the City pause to perform due diligence, as required for good governance and sound business practice, by *studying the available sites*, attending to the viability of an option for renovating the existing Center: propose a budget, commission tentative architectural plans, involve neighbors in all aspects of decision making. This matter of *site* falls under the purview of EPC.

Respectfully,

Susan Romano
19-year resident
12716 Piru Blvd. SE
susan.romano@gmail.com

Henry, Dora L.

From: Wanda Umber <wlumber@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, December 09, 2018 6:54 PM
To: Henry, Dora L.; Lehner, Catalina L.
Cc: Ilena Estrella
Subject: Project #1011083 at 13200 Wenonah Ave, SE in Singing Arrow Park
Attachments: EPC-Umber.pdf

Please accept the following document as part of the file for the above reference project. Unfortunately, we will not be able to attend the hearing.

--

Wanda L. Umber, Ed.D.



Virus-free. www.avast.com

This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.

12520 Pisu SE
Albuquerque, NM 87123
December 9, 2018.

Environmental Planning Committee
Catalina Lefner, Senior Planner
P.O. Box 12915
Albuquerque, NM 87103
cln@nm.gov
cln@nm.gov

Re: Request #1014083 at 13200 Wendenhall Ave. SE in Singing Arrow Park
EPC Public Hearing on Thursday, December 13, 2018 at 8:30 at Plaza del Sol building,
500 2nd NW 87102 (room 700) (environment) hearing room

Dear Mr. Chairman and Members of the Environmental Planning Commission,

We urge you to disapprove this request for a site plan approval based on the recent expansion of the scope which was just publicly announced at the most recent meeting. At that meeting, it was announced that funding from the City Council for development of an Archaeological site and interpretive signage was rolled into the aforementioned project. I believe this is partially due to criticism leveled at Family & Community Services because they have repeatedly stated that the proposed project has no planned programs or services beyond the Before & After School Program which will be moving from the existing facility to the new facility. In attempting to find a purpose to justify this facility, the proposed expansion of scope to include an Archaeological Interpretive Center and signage is, in my opinion, inappropriate for the following reasons.

- Family & Community Services is not an entity in the development of archaeological interpretive centers and signage nor are they funded or staffed to deal with the operation, upkeep, and maintenance of such a project.
- An interpretive center would most likely be accessed by visitors during evenings and weekends, times when the proposed Community Center is likely to be closed.

This last-minute expansion of scope is the reason that we believe any construction or development in this park should be delayed until a comprehensive master plan can be developed for this area.

The Singing Arrow Park contains unique facilities managed by different City departments, and there is a lack of a coordinated look and feel to the various components: Picnic Shelter & Playground in the Park, existing Singing Arrow Community Center with public basketball court, the Rancho de Casate Archaeological Site, the Open Space, and the proposed new Community Center. These disparate elements already provide a rather disjointed look and feel, and the addition of yet another building with a different purpose will just add to the confusion. I think this has the potential of negative impacts which have not been fully addressed and can only be addressed by a comprehensive master plan which should be completed prior to approval of the above referenced project.

Respectfully submitted,

Wanda L. Umber
Wanda L. Umber & Rogger L. Umber

505-275-1780
wumber@gmail.com

Henry, Dora L.

From: Walt Punke <waltpunke@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, December 08, 2018 4:55 PM
To: Henry, Dora L.
Subject: Fwd: Project #1011083 (2nd SACC) 13200 Wenonah Ave, SE (Singing Arrow Park)-EPC Public Hearing 12-13-18

From:

to me



I am out of the office Monday and Tuesday December 10 and 11, 2018. I will return on Wednesday, December 12. If you need immediate assistance, please call the receptionist at 505-924-3860. If you are sending a comment for an EPC case via email, please send it to dhenry@cabq.gov and cc me. Thank you.

Forwarded to D. Henry per Ms. Lehner's request:

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Walt Punke <waltpunke@gmail.com>
Date: Sat, Dec 8, 2018 at 4:39 PM
Subject: Project #1011083 (2nd SACC) 13200 Wenonah Ave, SE (Singing Arrow Park)-EPC Public Hearing 12-13-18
To: <clehner@cabq.gov>

610 Meadow Green Ct. SE
Albuquerque, NM 87123
12/8/2018

Environmental Planning Commission
% Ms. Catalina Lehner, Senior Planner
clehner@cabq.gov
P.O. Box 1293
Albuquerque, NM 87103

Re: Project #1011083 (2nd SACC) 13200 Wenonah Ave, SE (Singing Arrow Park)
EPC Public Hearing on Thursday, December 13, 2018

Dear Chairman/Members of the Environmental Planning Commission:

Please join a majority of the residents of SE ABQ in opposing the expenditure of \$5.5 million of approved bond funds originally intended to renovate and expand the existing Singing Arrow Community Center. The bond money was diverted from the referenda approved purpose to be earmarked for construction of a second center at the above address.

Legally isn't it appropriate for this \$5.5 million dollars to go for the stated purpose on the bond referendum approved by voters? Specifically, renovate and expand the existing community center or replace it in place with a new structure. Reassigning our bond approval (tax dollars) for another purpose an official desires is a devious diversion of funds from the original East Gateway EPC revitalization plan.

If the original intend for the bond funds is drastically altered from the project approved by voters wouldn't it be reasonable to hold another vote to approve or negate this alternate expenditure?

Why shouldn't there be compliance with the projects proposed in the Metropolitan Redevelopment Plan?

Thank you for your careful consideration of the original intent and the redirection of this project and opposing this alternate project.

Respectfully submitted,

Walt Punke
296-4508
waltpunke@gmail.com

=====
This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.

12724 Piru SE
Albuquerque, NM 87123
12/8/18

Environmental Planning Commission
% Catalina Lehner, Senior Planner
600 2nd St., NW, 3rd Floor 87102
P.O. Box 1293
Albuquerque, NM 87103
clehner@cabq.gov
505.924.3935

Ref: Project #1011083 at 13200 Wenonah Ave, SE in Singing Arrow Park
EPC Public Hearing on Thursday, December 13, 2018 at 8:30 at Plaza del Sol building,
600 2nd, NW 87102 lower level (basement) hearing room

Dear Mr. Chairman and Members of the Environmental Planning Commission,

I strongly urge you to reconsider this project because it is clear that there has not been adequate consideration given to this site plan. Although conditional use approval did not require the following impact studies: traffic, economic, environmental, historic preservation, current needs assessment, inappropriate land locked placement with only 25% street visibility, and child center placement appropriateness], myself and other community members have carefully researched these and other areas, and strongly believe there is compelling evidence to warrant further well thought out planning before proceeding forward. We believe that the factors of liability for the city of the revised 2nd community center next to the current community are pronounced. We are invested heavily in safety first and foremost for the members of our community, and secondly for the city's financial welfare. As my mother always taught me, "An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure."

We believe that this project which was reappropriated from renovating and expanding the current community center to building a 2nd 15,000 sq. ft. just a few 100 feet from the current community center is not in the best interest of the community at large.

I have consistently voted for renovating and expanding the current community center. I strongly believe that this initial plan of renovating and expanding the current community center or replacing the current community center with a new 15,000 sq. foot Pueblo style community center in alignment with the East Gateway Metropolitan Redevelopment Plan would be in the best interest of the community at large, as evidenced by the public vote before funding was reappropriated.

Thank you so very much for serving our community in this capacity. Many, many thanks!

Respectfully submitted,

Sandy Hays
505-298-3295
Sandyhays79@comcast.net

12724 Piru SE
Albuquerque, NM 87123
12/8/18

Environmental Planning Commission
% Catalina Lehner, Senior Planner
600 2nd St., NW, 3rd Floor 87102
P.O. Box 1293
Albuquerque, NM 87103
clehner@cabq.gov
505.924.3935

Ref: Project #1011083 at 13200 Wenonah Ave, SE in Singing Arrow Park
EPC Public Hearing on Thursday, December 13, 2018 at 8:30 at Plaza del Sol building,
600 2nd, NW 87102 lower level (basement) hearing room

Dear Mr. Chairman and Members of the Environmental Planning Commission,

I strongly urge you to reconsider this project because it is clear that there has not been adequate consideration given to this site plan. Although conditional use approval did not require the following impact studies: traffic, economic, environmental, historic preservation, current needs assessment, inappropriate land locked placement with only 25% street visibility, and child center placement appropriateness], myself and other community members have carefully researched these and other areas, and strongly believe there is compelling evidence to warrant further well thought out planning before proceeding forward. We believe that the factors of liability for the city of the revised 2nd community center next to the current community are pronounced. We are invested heavily in safety first and foremost for the members of our community, and secondly for the city's financial welfare. As my mother always taught me, "An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure."

We believe that this project which was reappropriated from renovating and expanding the current community center to building a 2nd 15,000 sq. ft. just a few 100 feet from the current community center is not in the best interest of the community at large.

I have consistently voted for renovating and expanding the current community center. I strongly believe that this initial plan of renovating and expanding the current community center or replacing the current community center with a new 15,000 sq. foot Pueblo style community center in alignment with the East Gateway Metropolitan Redevelopment Plan would be in the best interest of the community at large, as evidenced by the public vote before funding was reappropriated.

Thank you so very much for serving our community in this capacity. Many, many thanks!

Respectfully submitted,

Gary Hays
505-298-3295
Ghays67@hotmail.com

Henry, Dora L.

From: Lynn Wilson <bon.lyn@hotmail.com>
Sent: Friday, December 07, 2018 12:47 PM
To: Lehner, Catalina L.
Cc: Henry, Dora L.
Subject: Ref: Project #1011083 at 13200 Wenonah Ave, SE in Singing Arrow Park: EPC Public Hearing on Thursday, December 13, 2018

Dear Mr. Chairman and Members of the Environmental Planning Commission,

I would like to express my opposition to the above project because

- 1) it does not represent the will of the majority of folks voting for the bond issue;
- 2) the demographics of the population this facility would serve is west of the existing community center;
- 3) the project fails to meet six of the required criteria specified in the adopted East Gate Metropolitan Redevelopment program;
- 4) citing access to transit on Wenonah ABQ Ride bus stops is not a plus in that bus traffic is heavy making the area hazardous to pedestrians and there is no known data supporting community members riding a bus to and from the proposed center;
- 5) the Long Range Plan for Community Facilities also likes community centers located near public libraries and schools which the proposed center isn't;
- 6) a reason given for not selecting the current center location was that the facility is in poor condition and requires significant repairs thus it does not follow that this facility will continue in use with some internal modifications;
- 7) building the center on the east end of Singing Arrow Park significantly decreases the usable open space used by many older citizens of the immediate community for exercise and walking their dogs;
- 8) the fencing of the archaeological site was erected following repeated damage by vandals and that threat continues as evidenced by current graffiti in the park;
- 9) while an existing parking lot is listed as a reason for location of a new center, the existing center has available parking for several dozen cars;
- 10) as a tax payer I strongly object to paying for operational and maintenance costs for two centers serving Singing Arrow when just one can serve the the community;
- 11) finally, during the first presentation to the community by the architects, the presenter said the intended use was for 18 to 64 year old community members because of a dearth of recreational facilities in this area, which the study that justifies the new center also says. The presenter was "corrected" by Councilor Harris saying it was also for kids programs (before/after school and summer) which can easily be handled from the existing center (by our count, the number of students attending before and after school programs ranged from 8 to 16).

I really believe our community would be better served by utilizing the existing location and incorporating the basketball court in the design. Ideally, move the existing structures (modules?) or destruct and replace them. The infrastructure exists (but not at the proposed site for the new center).

Lynn Wilson
501 Eugene Court SE
Albuquerque, NM

This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.



Memorandum

To: Angela Behrens, City Planning
From: Jim Strozier, Consensus Planning, Inc. 
Date: December 10, 2018
Re: PR-2018-001759, Inspiration

The purpose of this memo is to respond to and to request removal of proposed Condition 3 as stated on page 19 of the Staff Report. This memo is provided in compliance with the EPC's 48-hour rule. The following outlines our rationale for this request:

1. The property is zoned PC and is regulated by the Westland Master Plan and Western Albuquerque Land Holdings Sector Plan. The Master Plan provides specific open space policies that provided support for the plan at the time of adoption (Page 8):

Bullet 4 states "Planning and implementation of a system of neighborhood parks and community open areas shall be undertaken to meet a range of needs at different scales."

This policy anticipated both open areas and neighborhood parks within neighborhoods.

Bullet 5 states "Developing areas shall have neighborhood parks and open areas located to serve the population being accommodated in the developing area."

This policy also anticipates both functions within neighborhoods and the central location of the proposed park meets this policy very effectively.

These policies are carried forward throughout the plan in that it discusses open space, trails, and parks as a system designed to serve the residents of the development.

In addition, the proposed site plan is consistent with and furthers ABC Comprehensive Plan policies 10.3.5 and 11.3.4 as evidenced by the letter from the NPS Superintendent. Policy 11.3.1 is also furthered by the edge treatment along the MPOS as proposed. The development is significantly below the MPOS property to minimize drainage issues and visual impact from the proposed development on the MPOS and from the City as well. Policy 11.4.4. is also furthered since the property has completed a phase 3 archeological survey along with required data gathering. None of these policies are negatively impacted by the inclusion of the private park in the location proposed.

2. The Site Plan is consistent with that approved by both the National Park Service, City Open Space Superintendent, and the Open Space Advisory Board. The Project Team spent a lot of time and effort working with the Open Space staff, NPS staff, and the OSAB in reviewing the site plan. The following are statements in support of this effort:

- The Project Team presented the site plan to the OSAB at their meeting on November 27th, at which time they thoroughly discussed the site plan in general and specifically regarding issues of the edges regarding the edges of the project and voted unanimously to support the site plan.
- After several meetings with both Open Space and NPS staff, we organized a site visit where we walked the property edges with the draft site plan as our guide.
- Following the site visit, the NPS Superintendent provided a letter of support.
- The City Open Space superintendent provided a memo supporting the project and the allowance for the use of the landscape buffer adjacent to the four lots located in the southwest corner of the project.
- The requirement to relocate the proposed private park was never discussed with these entities.

It is clear from these meetings and discussions that the required landscape buffer (in lieu of a single loaded street), the additional open space buffers between the single loaded street and the MPOS, and the private park were reviewed as distinct site plan elements. The private park is proposed in addition to and separate from both the landscape buffers and the open space areas.

3. The open space that has been provided between the single loaded street and the Atrisco Terrace is not required by the IDO. The IDO does not require additional on-site open space, but states that if you provide it, then you shall "Locate on-site open space to be contiguous with the Major Public Open Space, with access generally not allowed unless approved by the Open Space Division of the City Parks and Recreation Department".

The site plan has clearly complied with and gone above and beyond this requirement. By providing additional (not required) open space buffer along the edge of the MPOS, the site plan is meeting the intent of this regulation.

4. The IDO differentiates between different types of Open Space as provided for in the definitions section. The definitions for both Landscape Buffers and Open Space refer to those areas "required" by various methods in the IDO. Private Open Space is also defined to be those areas zoned NR-PO-C. None of these definitions, other than the Landscape Buffer (which is required to meet the requirements in lieu of a single loaded street) apply to those areas being proposed and created by this site plan.

5. Park is defined by the IDO separately from Open Space and is defined as follows:

"Publicly or privately-owned land that is maintained for active or passive recreational use and for the use and enjoyment of the general public or the residents or occupants of a development. This use includes areas consisting of vegetative landscaping and/or areas improved for outdoor sports and recreation. Structural improvements are generally limited to those that facilitate the use of the land as a park. Incidental uses include, but are not limited to, playgrounds, maintenance facilities, swimming pools, restrooms and dressing rooms, concessions, caretaker's quarters, and parking."

The proposed private park meets this definition and therefore should not be considered "on-site open space" in the context of the MPOS edge treatment requirements. It should also be noted that the location of the private park is incorporated into the overall grading plan and cannot be moved to the north.

We appreciate your consideration of these arguments and respectfully request that staff support and recommend that the EPC remove condition 3 from the recommended conditions of approval for this project.

c: Russell Brito, Division Manager, Urban Design & Development
EPC Commissioners
Project Team