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I. Introduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Comprehensive Plan Area</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>R-1D within 200 feet from the Major Public Open Space/ Petroglyph National Monument and R-1B for the remainder</td>
<td>Consistency</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>R-ML</td>
<td>Consistency</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NR-PO-B (Open Space), R-A</td>
<td>Consistency</td>
<td>Parks / Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>R-ML and R-1B</td>
<td>Consistency</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Unincorporated</td>
<td>Unincorporated</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposal

This is a request for a Zone Map Amendment (Zone Change) for all or a portion of Tracts 1 and 2 and a Site Plan – EPC for Tract 2 located on the west side of Woodmont Avenue NW, generally west of Rainbow Boulevard NW, immediately north of Major Public Open Space and south of Paseo del Norte NW.

The first part of the request is to re-zone 0.45 acres of Tract 1 from R-ML to R-1B, and to re-zone 0.58 acres of Tract 2 from R-1B to R-ML, to match the abutting zoning. The proposed roadway does not align with the existing platting or zone boundaries. If approved, the requested zoning will coincide with the parcels to the north and south of the roadway. If the zone change is approved, a re-plat will be necessary to align zone boundaries with lot lines.

The second part of the request is a Site Plan requiring EPC review and approval because the subject site is over 5 acres and adjacent to Major Public Open Space. Compliance with IDO Section 5-2, Site Design and Sensitive Lands is also required. The applicant wishes to re-plat the subject site into single-family lots per the underlying zone requirements.

The subject site is in an Area of Consistency of the Comprehensive Plan and within CPO-12, the Volcano Mesa Character Protection Overlay, and VPO-2, the Northwest Mesa View Preservation Overlay.

The applicant contacted the Westside Coalition of Neighborhood Associations as well as property owners within 100 feet of the property as required. The applicant contacted the Westside Coalition of Neighborhood Associations as well as property owners within 100 feet of the property as required. A Facilitated Meeting occurred on February 1, 2019 where the desire for more open space, limiting two-stories, wider streets, and native plants was expressed.
EPC Role

The EPC is hearing the first part (RZ-2018-00062) because it is a zone change for a property less than 10 acres in an Area of Consistency. The EPC’s responsibility is to determine if the requested change is consistent with applicable policies from the 2017 ABC Comprehensive Plan. This case is a quasi-judicial matter.

The EPC is hearing the second part (SI-2018-00283) because IDO Section 6-6(H)(1)(b)3 requires EPC Site Plan approval prior to any platting action for a site 5 acres or greater adjacent to Major Public Open Space (MPOS). This case is a quasi-judicial matter.

The EPC is the final decision-making body unless the EPC decision is appealed. If so, the Land Use Hearing Officer (LUHO) would hear the appeal and make a recommendation to the City Council. The City Council would make then make the final decision.

History/Background

In 2004, the City Council called for a planning study of what is now known as Volcano Mesa, which includes Volcano Cliffs, Volcano Heights, and Volcano Trails Sector Development Plan areas. The Council recognized the need for a plan that would bring development in line with the West Side Strategic Plan (WSSP), the Northwest Mesa Escarpment Plan (NWMEP), the Albuquerque / Bernalillo County Comprehensive Plan, and other previously established policies. The Planning study forecasted over 100,000 additional residents at final build-out in the Volcano Mesa area and adjoining areas on the Northwest Mesa. The Plan was divided into three separate, but related, Rank III sector development plans in order to address the diverse needs and issues within each planning area.

The Volcano Trails SDP was adopted in 2011 and amended in 2014, and established zoning and land-use strategies that supported area-wide policies with a range of housing densities in order to respond to the area's location and landscape for an area that included the subject site.

On May 17, 2018, the Integrated Development Ordinance (IDO) became effective and converted the subject tracts to R-1D, which represented a lower density than the zoning permitted by the Volcano Trails SDP since the large tracts had not yet be platted. In July of 2018, the EPC voted to recommend approval for a request to re-zone the property to R-1D within 200 feet of the Petroglyph National Monument and R-1B for the remainder of the parcel. The case proceeded to City Council who voted to approve the zone change, and it was enacted November 30, 2018 (No. 0-2018-029). This request is the Site Plan – EPC required to develop Tract 2, which was a part of this re-zone.

Context

The general area is surrounded by vacant land and some residential developments with varying densities. The subject tracts are generally located south of Paseo del Norte NW and west of Rainbow Boulevard NW. The area to the north across Paseo del Norte is zoned R-1A and developed with higher density residential lots. To the east across
Woodmont Avenue NW are large tracts of currently undeveloped land zoned R-ML Multi-Family and R-1B Single Family. To the west is undeveloped land in unincorporated Bernalillo County. To the south is Major Public Open Space known as the Petroglyph National Monument’s Northern Geologic Window.

**Roadway System**

The Long Range Roadway System (LRRS) map, produced by the Mid-Region Council of Governments (MRCOG), identifies the functional classifications of roadways.

The LRRS designates Woodmont Avenue NW as a Minor Arterial. Rainbow Boulevard NW is located to the east of the subject tracts and designated Rainbow a Regional Principal Arterial. Paseo del Norte NW is located to the north of the subject tracts and designated as a Regional Principal Arterial. Woodmont Avenue NW is not yet built-out.

**Comprehensive Plan Corridor Designation**

There are no Comprehensive Plan designated corridors near the subject tracts.

**Trails/Bikeways**

The Long Range Bikeway System 2040 (LRBS) map produced by the Mid-Region Council of Governments (MRCOG) identifies existing and proposed pedestrian and bicycle facilities. The LRBS shows a proposed bicycle lane and a proposed trail along Woodmont Avenue NW. The LRBS shows an existing bicycle lane and a proposed trail along Rainbow Boulevard NW. The LRBS also shows a proposed paved multi-use trail connecting an existing paved multi-use trail from the northeast to the open space.

**Transit**

The nearest transit service is by way of a stop–pair for Commuter Route 162 at Rainbow and Woodmont, approximately 3600 feet southeast of the site. The 162 connects the CNM West Campus to a turn-around at La Orilla and Coors. Connections can be made from this route to three other commuters (92, 94, and 96) and to Fixed Routes 155, 157, and Rapid Ride 790. The site plan for subdivision correctly notes that there is no transit access to the site, and ABQ Ride has no current plans for service west of the Rainbow/Woodmont intersection.

**Public Facilities/Community Services**

Please refer to the Public Facilities Map in the packet for a complete listing of public facilities and community services located within one mile of the subject site.
II. Analysis of City Plans and Ordinances

Integrated Development Ordinance (IDO)

The application for this request was submitted subsequent to the effective date on May 17, 2018 of the Integrated Development Ordinance, which replaced the City’s Zoning Code, and is therefore subject to its regulations.

The applicant is requesting to re-zone 0.45 acres of Tract 1 from R-ML to R-1B, and 0.58 acres of Tract 2 from R-1B to R-ML, to match the abutting zoning, below are zone descriptions.

2-3(B) R-1 Single Family Zone District

The requested Zone Map Amendment is to re-zone 0.45 acres from R-ML to R-1B at the northeast portion of Tract 2 (southern parcel) to align a proposed street alignment.

The purpose of the R-1 zone district is to provide for neighborhoods of single-family homes on individual lots with a variety of lot sizes and dimensions. When applied in developed areas, an additional purpose is to require that redevelopment reinforce the established character of the existing neighborhood. Primary land uses include single-family detached homes on individual lots, with limited civic and institutional uses to serve the surrounding residential area.

The R-1 zone is divided into four sub-zones, R-1A, R-1B, R-1C, R-1D, graduating from smallest lot size to largest lot size respectively. Each R-1 sub-zone requires different minimum lot size, dimensions, and setbacks. All R-1 sub-zones have a maximum building height of 26-feet.

Within Tract 2, the first 200-feet from Major Public Open Space is zoned R-1D, which requires a minimum lot size of 10,000 square feet, a minimum lot width of 70-feet, a minimum front setback of 20-feet, a minimum side setback of 10 feet, and a minimum rear setback of 15-feet.
The remainder of Tract 2 is zoned R-1B, which requires a minimum lot size of 5,000 square feet, a minimum lot width of 37.5-feet, a minimum front setback of 15-feet, a minimum side setback of 5-feet for interior lot lines and 10-feet street-side, and a minimum rear setback of 15-feet.

2-3(E) R-ML Residential Multi-Family Low Density Zone District

The requested Zone Map Amendment is to re-zone 0.58 acres from R-1B to R-ML at the southwest portion of Tract 1 (northern parcel) to align with the new local road. (See criterion d under Zone Map Amendment Analysis below for permitted uses.)

The purpose of the R-ML zone district is to provide for a variety of low- to medium-density housing options. The primary land uses are townhouses and low-density multi-family buildings, as well as civic and institutional uses to serve the surrounding residential area.

The following is a list of all permissive uses of the R-1 and R-ML zones from Table 4-2-1 of the IDO:

**R-1**
- Dwelling, single-family detached
- Dwelling, cluster development
- Dwelling, cottage development
- Dwelling, two-family detached (duplex)
- Community residential facility, small
- Community center or library
- Religious institution
- Community garden
- Residential community amenity
- Solar energy generation
- Utility, electric
- Utility, other major

**R-ML**
- Dwelling, single-family detached
- Dwelling, cluster development
- Dwelling, cottage development
- Dwelling, two-family detached (duplex)
- Dwelling, townhouse
- Dwelling, multi-family
- Assisted living facility or nursing home
- Community residential facility, small
- Community residential facility, medium
- Community center or library
- Elementary or middle school
- Parks and open space
- Religious institution
- Community garden
- Residential community amenity
- Solar energy generation
- Utility, electric
- Utility, other major
Albuquerque / Bernalillo County Comprehensive Plan (Rank 1)

The subject site is located in an Area of Consistency as designated by the Comprehensive Plan which has policies to protect and enhance the character of existing single-family neighborhoods, areas outside of Centers and Corridors, parks, and Major Public Open Space. Applicable policies include:

**Note:** Applicant's justification is in italics. **Staff's comments are in bold italics.**

CHAPTER 5: Land Use

POLICY 5.2.1 Land Uses: Create healthy, sustainable, and distinct communities with a mix of uses that are conveniently accessible from surrounding neighborhoods.

_The change helps to ensure that cohesive zoning is in place for the two distinct development parcels that are now separated by the new roadway furthering this Policy._

_The request will establish the boundaries for the R-1B zone to the south and the R-ML zone to the north to coincide with the expected right-of-way alignment for the new access road, thereby creating the potential for two different and distinct communities, single family to the north and multi-family to south. The request will permit a sustainable or long-term zoning to coincide with the roadway alignment and shape of the new parcels, which will avoid floating zone lines. The request furthers Policy 5.2.1._

POLICY 5.2.1 k) Discourage zone changes to detached single-family residential uses on the West Side.

_This action is furthered by the fact that both zones permit single-family homes, so there is no increase in the allowable detached single-family homes permitted._

_The request will re-zone 0.45 acres to R-1B and 0.58 acres to R-ML, therefore the result is 0.13 acres more converting to R-ML, the multifamily zone, and therefore no increase in detached single-family residential uses on the West Side would occur. The request furthers Policy 5.2.1 k)_

POLICY 5.6.3 Areas of Consistency: Protect and enhance the character of existing single-family neighborhoods, areas outside of Centers and Corridors, parks, and Major Public Open Space.

POLICY 5.6.3 b) Ensure that development reinforces the scale, intensity, and setbacks of the immediately surrounding context.

_The zone map amendment furthers this policy by creating a cohesive single-family development area with consistent zoning. This action is furthered by the zone change since the same regulations will apply to all of the property south of the roadway._

_The subject site is in an Area of Consistency and the request will ensure the proposed development reinforces the scale, intensity, and setbacks of the immediately surrounding context. The request is to re-zone the small remaining parcels of land after the alignment of the access road in order to maintain a cohesive zone for the larger abutting parcels. The request furthers Policy 5.6.3 and 5.6.3 b._
CHAPTER 9: Housing

GOAL 9.1 Supply: “Ensure sufficient supply and range of high-quality housing types that meet current and future needs at a variety of price levels to ensure more balanced housing options.”

POLICY 9.1.1: Housing Options: Support the development, improvement, and conservation of housing for a variety of income levels and types of residents and households.

The proposed zone change cleans up an existing conflict between the tract (zoning) boundaries and a proposed roadway, which will help remove an obstacle to providing a variety of product types and prices.

[The Housing Chapter] speaks to Future Housing Needs and encourages that “Proactive housing planning takes into account existing housing gaps as well as the needs of people who might live in the region in the future”.

The proposed Site Plan for a mixed lot size single family development is designed to meet future housing needs based on demand. The proposed development takes into consideration future residents’ anticipated age, income, and housing preferences. The project is consistent with the existing zoning as “cleaned up” with the associated zone map amendment.

[The Housing Chapter] of the Comprehensive Plan also includes a future housing profile that identifies future units based on need forecasts and population projections. Local and national trends indicate a growing demand for more diverse housing options. Owner-occupied housing is expected to continue to be the housing type desired by most households and therefore needing the highest proportion of housing units. This area has excellent access to parks, trails, schools, and open space. Continuing the zonings desire for lower density homes along a buffered single loaded street adjacent to the MPOS is consistent with the IDO’s provisions for MPOS edges.

The proposed site plan provides for different lot sizes, which will result in a variety of product types and prices.

By aligning the remnant parcels’ zoning with the abutting parcels, the larger tracts can be developed as a cohesive Site Plan under one zone. The resulting larger R-1B and R-ML zoned tracts will ensure sufficient supply and range of housing types that meet current and future needs at a variety of price levels. The request furthers Policy 9.1.1.

GOAL 9.2 Sustainable Design: “Promote housing design that is sustainable and compatible with the natural and built environments.”

POLICY 9.2.1 Compatibility: Encourage housing development that enhances neighborhood character, maintains compatibility with surrounding land uses, and responds to its development context – i.e. urban, suburban, or rural – with appropriate densities, site design, and relationship to the street.

The requested zone change will encourage housing development that enhances neighborhood character and maintains surrounding land uses by re-zoning to housing densities that are similar to the surrounding zones. Since a currently vacant portion of R-ML will become R-1B and a currently vacant portion of R-1B will
become R-ML, very little will change will occur in proposed density. The request furthers Policy 9.2.1.

III. Zone Map Amendment (Zone Change)

Pursuant to section 14-16-6-7(F)(3) of the Integrated Development Ordinance, Review and Decision Criteria, "An application for a Zoning Map Amendment shall be approved if it meets all of the following criteria".

There are several criteria that must be met and the applicant must provide sound justification for the change. The burden is on the applicant to show why a change should be made, not on the City to show why the change should not be made.

Note: Applicant’s justification is in italics. Staff’s comments are in bold italics.

6-7(F)(3)(a) The proposed zone change is consistent with the health, safety, and general welfare of the City as shown by furthering (and not being in conflict with) a preponderance of applicable Goals and Policies in the ABC Comp Plan, as amended, and other applicable plans adopted by the City.

The proposed zone change is consistent with the health, safety, and general welfare of the City, because the proposed zone change will “clean up” a conflict between the existing tract boundaries and a proposed roadway/easement alignment. Having zone boundaries split by roadways and parcels with different zone districts can create problems in the future that are not consistent with the health, safety, and general welfare of the City. The roadway provides a more logical boundary between the two zoning districts. The correction of this zoning situation does not conflict with the Comprehensive Plan, but there are not any specific goals and policies that speak directly to corrections of this nature.

The proposed zone change is consistent with the health, safety, and general welfare of the City as shown by furthering (and not being in conflict with) a preponderance of applicable Goals and Policies in the ABC Comp Plan as shown in the policy analysis under the heading above.

6-7(F)(3)(b) If the proposed amendment is located wholly or partially in an Area of Consistency (as shown in the ABC Comp Plan, as amended), the applicant has demonstrated that the new zone would clearly reinforce or strengthen the established character of the surrounding Area of Consistency and would not permit development that is significantly different from that character. The applicant must also demonstrate that the existing zoning is inappropriate because it meets any of the following criteria:

1. There was typographical or clerical error when the existing zone district was applied to the property.
2. There has been a significant change in neighborhood or community conditions affecting the site.
3. A different zone district is more advantageous to the community as articulated by the ABC Com Plan, as amended (including implementation of patterns of land use, development density and intensity, and connectivity), and other applicable adopted City plan(s).

The property is in an Area of Consistency. Changed conditions (#2) with the new roadway create the need for this action. The existing zoning areas are not appropriate since they will create developments that have two different zoning districts. Responding to this changed condition will reinforce the established zoning in the area and allow all of the property south of the new roadway to be governed by R1 zoning and everything to the north to be governed by the R-ML zone. The east-west roadway was not dedicated at the time the IDO was adopted. This has created a slight disconnect between the tract boundaries and the road alignment. This disconnect will be corrected with this zone map amendment.

The applicant demonstrated that the new zone would clearly reinforce or strengthen the established character of the surrounding Area of Consistency and would not permit development that is significantly different, because the applicant explained that the request will align the remnant parcel zoning with the abutting parcel’s zones, therefore reinforcing the pattern of multi-family north of the local access road, south of Paseo del Norte, and single family south of the local access road. The applicant also demonstrates that the existing zoning is inappropriate because there has been a significant change in neighborhood or community conditions affecting the site, which is the new alignment of the local access road. The applicant states that the local access roadway was not aligned at the time zoning was established by the IDO. Since then, the roadway has been aligned which will create remnant areas and floating zone lines, which this zone change request would remedy if approved.

6-7(F)(3)(c) If the proposed amendment is located wholly in an Area of Change (as shown in the ABC Comp Plan, as amended) and the applicant has demonstrated that the existing zoning is inappropriate because it meets at least one of the following criteria:

1. There was typographical or clerical error when the existing zone district was applied to the property.

2. There has been a significant change in neighborhood or community conditions affecting the site that justifies this request.

3. A different zone district is more advantageous to the community as articulated by the ABC Comp Plan, as amended (including implementation of patterns of land use, development density and intensity, and connectivity), and other applicable adopted City plan(s).

This criterion does not apply because the property is completely within an Area of Consistency.

The applicant’s response is sufficient.
6-7(F)(3)(d) The zone change does not include permissive uses that would be harmful to adjacent property, the neighborhood, or the community, unless the Use-specific Standards in Section 16-16·4·3 associated with that use will adequately mitigate those harmful impacts.

The proposed zone change does not include permissive uses that would be harmful to the adjacent property, the neighborhood, or the community, because both zone districts are already in place and the request is merely an adjustment to the boundaries of the existing zones to reflect the street alignment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalonia - IDO ZONING ANALYSIS</th>
<th>R-1</th>
<th>R-ML</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R-1 vs. R-ML (differences)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family detached</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster Development</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Family Detached (duplex)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town House- Multi Family</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisted Living/ Nursing Home</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day Care (elderly, adult)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School: Elementary and Middle</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Residential Facility, small</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Residential Facility, medium</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Institution</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed zone map amendment results in a difference of .13 acres changing from R1-B to R-ML. This change is negligible and will not materially impact any change in land use or development patterns in the area. It will prevent a situation where properties could have two different zoning districts on the same parcel, which is discouraged.

The uses that are not permitted in the R-1B zone but are permitted in the R-ML zone are: Dwelling, townhouse, Dwelling, multi-family, Assisted living facility or nursing home, Community residential facility, medium, Elementary or middle school, Parks and open space. The applicant provided the table above, but did not include the multi-family use, which is the more likely use for the property. Given the 0.58 acre portion requested to be re-zoned R-ML will be adjacent to public right-of-way and surrounded by the R-ML zone, staff finds that the additional permissive uses would not be harmful to adjacent property, neighborhood, or the community.

6-7(F)(3)(e) The City's existing infrastructure and public improvements, including but not limited to its street, trail, and sidewalk systems meet 1 of the following requirements:

1. Have adequate capacity to serve the development made possible by the change of zone.

2. Will have adequate capacity based on improvements for which the City has already approved and budgeted capital funds during the next calendar year.
3. Will have adequate capacity when the applicant fulfills its obligations under the IDO, the DPM, and/or an Infrastructure Improvements Agreement.

4. Will have adequate capacity when the City and the applicant have fulfilled their respective obligations under a City-approved Development Agreement between the City and the applicant.

The proposed zone change will not require major and unprogrammed capital expenditures by the City. The properties are in an area with adequate infrastructure, including roadways, water, sewer, and storm water facilities to serve the project. Any required extensions of these services will be the responsibility of the developer.

The applicant has stated that the developer will be responsible for any additional infrastructure improvements.

6-7(F)(3)(f) The applicant's justification for the requested zone change is not completely based on the property's location on a major street.

The property is not located on a major street and that is not the justification for this change.

The applicant's response is sufficient.

6-7(F)(3)(g) The applicant's justification is not based completely or predominantly on the cost of land or economic considerations.

The cost of land or other economic considerations are not the determining factor for this zone change request. As stated previously, the change “cleans up” a minor disconnect between the tract boundaries and the new roadway alignment.

The request is not based completely or predominantly on the cost of land or economic considerations because the applicant is interested in aligning the zoning of the remnant pieces created by the new local road alignment with the abutting zones and the request is furthering a preponderance of Comprehensive Plan policies regarding land use and housing.

6-7(F)(3)(h) The zone change does not apply a zone district different from surrounding zone districts to one small area or one premises (i.e. create a "spot zone") or to a strip of land along a street (i.e. create a "strip zone") unless the change will clearly facilitate implementation of the ABC Comp Plan, as amended, and at least one of the following applies:

1. The area of the zone change is different from surrounding land because it can function as a transition between adjacent zone districts.

2. The site is not suitable for the uses allowed in any adjacent zone district due to topography, traffic, or special adverse land uses nearby.

3. The nature of structures already on the premises makes it unsuitable for the uses allowed in any adjacent zone district.
The proposed zone map amendment does not create a spot zone; it removes the situation where there will be remnant parcels on either side of the new roadway that would be different from the adjacent zone.

The request will not apply a zone district different from surrounding zone districts to one small area of premise, because the request is to align the zoning with the larger abutting parcel, thereby eliminating the remnant zoning.

IV. Site Plan – EPC

Note: Applicant’s justification is in italics. Staff’s comments are in bold italics.

Any application for a Site Plan - EPC shall be approved if it meets all of the following criteria:

6-6(H)(3)(a) The site plan is consistent with the ABC Comp plan, as amended.

The Site Plan is consistent with the Albuquerque and Bernalillo County Comprehensive Plan, adopted March 2017.

The Site Plan – EPC is consistent with the ABC Comp Plan goals and policies especially in an Area of Consistency because the project will protect and enhance the character of the existing surrounding single-family neighborhoods. In addition, the project is consistent with Goal 9.1 because it provides housing types that meet current and future needs. (see policy analysis above)

6-6(H)(3)(b) The Site Plan is consistent with any applicable terms and conditions in any previously approved NR-SU or PC zoning covering the property and any related development agreements and/or regulations.

The Site Plan and associated property is zoned a combination of R1-D and R1-B. The reason that this project is being reviewed by the EPC is due to its location adjacent to MPOS, not as a result of the zoning district designation.

6-6(H)(3)(c) The Site Plan complies with all applicable provisions of thisIDO, the DPM, other adopted City regulations, and any terms and conditions specifically applied to development of the property in a prior permit or approval affecting the property.

The site plan is designed to follow these plans.

6-6(H)(3)(d) The City's existing infrastructure and public improvements, including but not limited to its street, trail, drainage, and sidewalk systems, have adequate capacity to serve the proposed development, and any burdens on those systems have been mitigated to the extent practicable.

The City's existing infrastructure and public improvements have adequate capacity to serve the proposed development.

6-6(H)(3)(e) The application mitigates any significant adverse impacts on the surrounding area to the maximum extent practicable.
The Site Plan mitigates any adverse impacts on the surrounding area using an open
space buffer and single loaded street adjacent to the MPOS. The site plan does not
create any negative impacts to the surrounding properties. The site plan also provides
for a street connection to the west to accommodate future development in the
unincorporated portion of Bernalillo County.

3-4(M) Volcano Mesa Character Protection Overlay, CPO-12

The Volcano Mesa CPO-12 standards apply to low-density residential development in
the mapped area, which includes the subject site. Relevant standards include:
3-4(M)(3), larger setbacks for lots over 10,000 square feet to include front 25-feet, side
15-feet, and rear 15-feet minimums. The front setback line is not clear on the lots
zoned R-1D, and this will be conditioned.
3-4(M)(4), building height is limited to a maximum of 18 feet, but may be increased to
26 feet on a maximum of 50 percent of the building footprint, and this will be
conditioned to be noted on the plans.
3-4(M)(5), the building design must include changes of material or offsets and either a
front porch, a walled courtyard, or 25% of the front façade in windows.
3-4 (M)(5)(b), exterior wall finishes and roof materials are specified.
3-4(M)(5)(c), restrictions apply to garage design for material selection as well as
placement to behind or setback from the front of the house.

A note will be conditioned to be added to the plan that states “Buildings shall comply
with IDO Section 14-16-3-4(M) Volcano Mesa CPO-12 Development Standards
regarding Façade Design, Building Design Standards, Residential Garage Access,
and Residential Garage Design.”

3-6(E) Northwest Mesa Escarpment View Protection Overlay, VPO-2

The subject site is within the Northwest Mesa Escarpment View Protection Overlay,
however it is not within the Height Restriction sub-area. Therefore, buildings in this
area will not be subject to the VPO-2 height restrictions.
3-6(E)(4), exterior colors are limited to avoid very light and very dark colors.
3-6(E)(5), mirrored glass is prohibited.
3-6(E)(6), roof-mounted equipment must not be exposed.

5-1 Development Standards

The subject site is zoned R-1D for 200-feet from the Major Public Opens Space and R-
1B for the remainder of the lot. In the R-1D area, the site plan meets the minimum lot
size of 10,000 square feet, a minimum lot width of 70-feet, and minimum setbacks of
front 20-feet, side 10-feet, and rear 25-feet. In the R-1B area, the site plan meets the
minimum lot size of 5,000 square feet, a minimum lot width of 37.5–feet, and
minimum setbacks of front 15-feet, side 5-feet, and rear 15-feet.
The subject plan complies and this will also be checked at building permit application.

5-2 Site Design and Sensitive Lands

**Note:** Applicant’s justification is in italics. **Staff’s comments are in bold italics.**

This is a request for Site Plan – EPC pursuant to IDO Section 6-6(H), which applies to any development on a site 5 acres or greater adjacent to Major Public Open Space prior to any platting action. The subject site is adjacent to Major Public Open Space and is therefore subject to all of the regulations in IDO Section 5-2(H), Major Public Open Space Edges.

Pursuant to IDO section 5-2(C)(1) Both the subdivision and site design processes shall begin with an analysis of site constraints related to sensitive lands. To the maximum extent practicable, new subdivisions of land and site design shall avoid locating development, except for open spaces and areas that will not be disturbed during the development process, in the following types of sensitive lands:

5-2(C)(1)(a) Floodplains and flood hazard areas

*There are no floodplains or flood hazard areas that impact the property.*

5-2(C)(1)(b) Steep slopes

*There are no steep slopes on the property.*

The City Hydrologist commented concern that there is not enough information to determine accurately whether the plan will have to be revised to avoid issues regarding slopes. It will be conditioned that the site plan is reviewed and approved by the DRB subsequent to EPC approval so that all technical regulations in the DPM are met. If the site plan is required to make significant changes due to grading and drainage, it will be required to return to EPC for review and approval.

5-2(C)(1)(c) Unstable soils

*There are no known unstable soils impacting the property. A detailed geotechnical report will be prepared prior to construction.*

5-2(C)(1)(d) Wetlands

*There are no wetlands on the property.*

5-2(C)(1)(e) Arroyos

*There are no arroyos that cross the property.*

5-2(C)(1)(f) Irrigation facilities (acequias)

*There are no acequias or other irrigation facilities on the property.*

5-2(C)(1)(g) Escarpments

*There are no escarpments on the property.*
5-2(C)(1)(h) Rock outcroppings

There is a small rock outcropping on the property that has been incorporated into a small open space area that will be owned and maintained by the HOA. The applicant explained in an email that the rock outcropping was delineated through a topographic survey, aerial photographs, a site visit, and photographs, which was then used to designate the outcropping and provide an area around it to be preserved. At this time, the survey and photographs have not been submitted to staff.

5-2(C)(1)(i) Large stands of mature trees

There are no stands of mature trees on the property.

5-2(C)(1)(j) Archaeological sites

There are no known archeological sites on the property, the Certificate of No Effect was provided with the application.

5-2(H)) Major Public Open Space Edges

5-2(H)(1) For properties within 330 feet of Major Public Open Space (MPOS), design standards limit colors, materials, landscaping etc. For properties adjacent to MPOS, general design standards apply. A note shall be added to the plan that states “Buildings shall comply with 14-16-5-2 (H), Major Public Open Space Edges.”

The Site Plan has been designed to comply with all of the requirements for lands located adjacent to MPOS. The Site Plan includes specific standards that respond to these requirements, includes a single-loaded street, and an additional (not required) open space buffer along the boundary with MPOS. The Site Plan is being reviewed by the EPC as required by this section of the IDO.

5-2(H)(2) Properties Adjacent to Major Public Open Space

5-2(H)(2)(a)1, be platted and/or designed to incorporate a single-loaded street between the Major Public Open Space and development, with access generally not allowed unless approved by the Open Space Division of the City Parks and Recreation Department. Where a single-loaded street is not desired by the Open Space Division of the City Parks and Recreation Department, a landscape buffer with a minimum width of 20 feet may be substituted as approved by the Open Space Superintendent.

The applicant has provided a single-loaded street near the southern property line except at the southwest corner where a minimum of 20-feet will be provided.

5-2(H)(2)(a)2, 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 rock outcropping area is considered a “private park” which has been deemed different from “on-site open space” per the ZEO on previous projects because it is not required open space. It will be conditioned that the applicant re-zone this area to park zoning, NR-PO-C, Non-City Parks and Open Space.
5-2(H)(2)(a)4, include a landscaped strip between off-street parking and the Major Public Open Space with a minimum width of 6-feet but that varies in width. Plant selection shall include sufficient shrubs or trees to provide a visual barrier.

*The applicant has provided this buffer strip and has shown it to be planted with native species.*

5-2(H)(2)(a)5, site lighting is limited to 20-feet in height.

*The site plan has a note to this effect.*

5-2(H)(2)(a)6, incorporate crime prevention through environmental design.

5-2(H)(2)(b)9, an approved Site Plan must meet conditions deemed necessary by the EPC to further compliance to minimize impact on the MPOS and maximize compatibility of the proposed development prior to the submittal of any request for platting on the property is required.

*The proposed site plan provides for a single loaded street, an additional open space buffer, protection of an existing rock outcropping and a well-connected layout with the adjacent street network.*

5-3 *Access and Connectivity, and 5-4 Subdivision of Land*

5-3(A)(2) Providing adequate street connectivity.

*Access to the subject Tract 2 Catalonia development is from Woodmont Avenue NW to the Catalonia Street entrance or Girona Avenue. Transportation comments state that the developer is responsible for permanent improvements to the transportation facilities adjacent to the proposed site plan, and signal improvements are required at the intersection of Woodmont Avenue NW and Paseo del Norte when Tract 1 develops.*

5-3(A)(3) Supporting a multi-modal transportation network.

*The project connects to bike lanes on Woodmont Avenue NW and an off-street trail system that will connect to parks east of the subject tract.*

5-4(C) Compliance with Zoning Requirements

5-4(C)(5) the general layout of lots, roads, driveways, utilities, drainage facilities, and other services within proposed subdivisions shall be designed to avoid making compliance with the standards of the applicable zone district difficult or infeasible.

*The proposed platting shown on the site would create a floating zone boundary across proposed Lot 32, which would make it subject to R-1B standards on its north side and R-1D standards on its south side. This makes compliance with the applicable dimensional standards difficult and confusing. Lot 32 should be moved or re-zoned to ensure the boundary of the zones (R-1B and R-1D) is on a lot line.*
5-4(E)(3) block lengths shall meet the requirements and comply with standards in the DPM.

Table 5-3-1 states that local streets shall have a block length of approximately 600-feet. The southern block is long and a separation may be needed which would also provide a linkage to the open space. The applicant may have to apply for a variance to this standard at the DRB for the area between Mataro and Tarragano Roads.

5-4(J)(1(a) grading and erosion control practices shall comply with the DPM.

The City hydrologist commented in an email “We typically don’t require an approved G&D Plan prior to EPC approval, but layout changes may be required particularly along the west boundary where grading and drainage impact the open space. If layout changes are required during subsequent DRB and DRC reviews then an amended site plan may have to go back to EPC. If the EPC wants Hydrology approval before the EPC approval then they should make that comment to the applicant.

Prior to DRB approval of the Preliminary Plat and Site Plan a detailed G&D Plan must be submitted to and be approved by the Hydrology Section of the Planning Department. The design of this development will be required to conform to all applicable drainage ordinances and the DPM standards prior to DRB and DRC approvals.”

5-5 Parking and Loading

Table 5-5-1, parking for single-family detached homes is required at a rate of 1 off-street space for dwelling units with 1-2 bedrooms, and 2 off-street spaces for dwelling units with 3 or more bedrooms.

This will be checked upon building permit application for each home. Garage design will be subject to the CPO-12 standards as stated above.

5-6 Landscaping, Buffering, and Screening

5-6(B) Applicability, the provisions of the IDO landscape section do not apply to single family development.

Because this is an EPC-Site Plan, the EPC has some discretion to consider and make conditions based on design elements. Staff has reviewed the plant list and found it to include drought tolerant and a large amount of native species except for the larger trees. Staff does not recommend a revision to the current plant list.

5-7 Walls and Fences and 5-12 Signs

The existing 5-strand smooth wire fence at the southern boundary with Major Public Open Space shall remain. The site plan also shows a wall at the entrance measuring approximately 14-feet 6-inches long and 6-feet high on the face with attached raised metal letters measuring approximately 7 feet long and 1 foot high.

5-8 Outdoor Lighting

5-2(H)(2)(a)5 limit height of site lighting luminaires to 20-feet.
The site plan states all site lighting shall be limited to 20-feet tall as required adjacent to Major Public Open Space.

5-11 Building Design

There are no additional provisions in this section that would affect design of the individual homes; however, the subject site is located in the mapped areas of the CPO-12 and VPO-2, which have building design regulations as described above.

V. Agency & Neighborhood Concerns

Reviewing Agencies

Describe significant comments or outstanding issues that affect the request, otherwise refer to the agency comments at the end of the staff report.

Neighborhood/Public

The applicant notified the Westside Coalition of Neighborhood Associations and property owners within 100 feet of the subject Tracts as required. The applicant attended a facilitated meeting on February 1, 2019 (see attached Project Meeting Report) attended by the Westside Coalition of Neighborhood Associations, the Paradise Hills Civic Association, and the Taylor Ranch Neighborhood Association.

Meeting participants suggested that for this project, the applicant consider: increasing the amount of public space, limiting the amount of two-story development to better protect views, better design of the street width or restricted parking, using plants that are native to the Petroglyph National Monument for landscaping, particularly for the buffer area.

As discussed under the Landscaping heading above, the plant palette shows a majority of native species. The buffer area is shown to remain undisturbed during construction to the extent possible and disturbed areas to be revegetated consistent with existing conditions. The Landscape Plan also shows the addition of some small native trees to this area to include Desert Willow, New Mexico Olive, and Piñon Pine. Participants also said that there is not enough of a requirement for documentation of analysis and plans, e.g., of a plan to preserve the rock outcrop, which is discussed under the Site Design and Sensitive Lands heading above.

Meeting participants said that they have increasing concerns how they are discovering that they are receiving less information about projects under the IDO. Per IDO requirements, the neighborhoods were notified and participate in a facilitated meeting with the developer as evidenced here. The previous Sector Development Plan was incorporated into the IDO in the form of the CPO-12 and VPO-2 regulations. Although elevations are not required, the new homes will be subject to the building design regulations as described above.
VI. Conclusion

This is a request for a Zone Map Amendment (Zone Change) for all or a portion of Tracts 1 and 2 and a Site Plan – EPC for Tract 2 located on the west side of Woodmont Avenue NW, generally west of Rainbow Boulevard NW, immediately north of Major Public Open Space and south of Paseo del Norte NW.

The zone change request is to re-zone 0.45 acres of Tract 1 from R-ML to R-1B, and to re-zone 0.58 acres of Tract 2 from R-1B to R-ML, to match the abutting zoning. The existing plat does not align with the new east-west roadway (Girona Road NW). If approved, the requested zoning will coincide with the parcels to the north and south of the roadway; therefore, the re-plat will be a condition of approval for this zone change.

The site plan request is for a Site Plan - EPC review and approval because the subject site is over 5 acres and adjacent to Major Public Open Space. Compliance with IDO Section 5-2, Site Design and Sensitive Lands is also required. The applicant wishes to re-plat the subject site into single-family lots per the underlying zone requirements.

The subject site is in an Area of Consistency of the Comprehensive Plan and within CPO-12, the Volcano Mesa Character Protection Overlay, and VPO-2, the Northwest Mesa View Preservation Overlay.

The applicant contacted the Westside Coalition of Neighborhood Associations as well as property owners within 100 feet of the property as required. A Facilitated Meeting occurred on February 1, 2019 where the desire for open space, limiting two-stories, wider streets, and native plants were expressed.

Applicable Comprehensive Plan policies are furthered by the zone change and site plan requests, and the site plan meets the majority of applicable IDO regulations. There is some concern regarding grading and drainage for the project, however, there has not been sufficient time to make all discoveries. Therefore, staff recommends DRB review and approval of the site plan if approved by the EPC. Staff recommends EPC approval with conditions as outlined in this report.
Findings, Zoning Map Amendment (Zone Change)

Project #: 2018-001198, RZ: 2018-00062

1. This is a request for a Zone Map Amendment (Zone Change) for all or a portion of Tract 1 and Tract 2, Bulk Land Plat of The Trails, Unit 3A located on Woodmont Avenue NW, between Paseo del Norte NW and Major Public Open Space and containing approximately 20.5 acres.

2. This is a request to re-zone 0.45 acres of Tract 1 from R-ML to R-1B, and to re-zone 0.58 acres of Tract 2 from R-1B to R-ML, to match the abutting zones. The existing plat does not align with the new east-west roadway (Girona Road NW). The requested zoning will coincide with the parcels to the north and south of the roadway.

3. In July of 2018, the EPC voted to recommend approval for a request to re-zone Tract 2 R-1D within 200 feet of Major Public Open Space and R-1B for the remainder of the tract. The case proceeded to City Council who voted to approve the zone change, and it was enacted November 30, 2018 (No. 0-2018-029).

4. The subject site is in an Area of Consistency of the Comprehensive Plan, within the Volcano Mesa Character Protection Overlay (CPO-12), and the Northwest Mesa View Preservation Overlay (VPO-2).

5. The Albuquerque/Bernalillo County Comprehensive Plan and the City of Albuquerque Integrated Development Ordinance (IDO) are incorporated herein by reference and made part of the record for all purposes.

6. The subject site is within an Area of Consistency as designated by the Comprehensive Plan and the following policies apply:

   a) The request furthers Policy 5.2.1 because it will establish the boundaries for the R-1B zone to the south and the R-ML zone to the north to coincide with the expected right-of-way alignment for the new access road, thereby creating the potential for two different and distinct communities, single family to the north and multi-family to south. The request will permit a sustainable or long-term zoning to coincide with the roadway alignment and shape of the new parcels, which will avoid floating zone lines.

   b) The request furthers Policy 5.2.1 k) because it will re-zone 0.45 acres to R-1B and 0.58 acres to R-ML, therefore the result is 0.13 acres more converting to R-ML, the multifamily zone, and therefore no increase in detached single-family residential uses on the West Side would occur.

   c) The request furthers Policy 5.6.3 and 5.6.3 b) because the subject site is in an Area of Consistency and the request will ensure the proposed development reinforces the scale, intensity, and setbacks of the immediately surrounding context. The request is to re-zone the small remaining parcels of land after the alignment of the access road in order to maintain a cohesive zone for the larger abutting parcels.
d) The request furthers Policy 9.1.1 because it will align the remnant parcels’ zoning with the abutting parcels, the larger tracts can be developed as a cohesive Site Plan under one zone. The resulting larger R-1B and R-ML zoned tracts will ensure sufficient supply and range of housing types that meet current and future needs at a variety of price levels.

e) The request furthers Policy 9.2.1 because it will encourage housing development that enhances neighborhood character and maintains surrounding land uses by re-zoning to housing densities that are similar to the surrounding zones. Since a currently vacant portion of R-ML will become R-1B and a currently vacant portion of R-1B will become R-ML, very little will change will occur in proposed density.

7. Pursuant to section 14-16-6-7(F)(3) of the Integrated Development Ordinance, Review and Decision Criteria, "An application for a Zoning Map Amendment shall be approved if it meets all of the following criteria”.

a) The proposed zone change is consistent with the health, safety, and general welfare of the City as shown by furthering (and not being in conflict with) a preponderance of applicable Goals and Policies in the ABC Comp Plan as shown in the policy analysis under the heading above.

b) The applicant demonstrated that the new zone would clearly reinforce or strengthen the established character of the surrounding Area of Consistency and would not permit development that is significantly different, because the applicant explained that the request will align the remnant parcel zoning with the abutting parcel’s zones, therefore reinforcing the pattern of multi-family north of the local access road, south of Paseo del Norte, and single family south of the local access road. The applicant also demonstrates that the existing zoning is inappropriate because there has been a significant change in neighborhood or community conditions affecting the site, which is the new alignment of the local access road. The applicant states that the local access roadway was not aligned at the time zoning was established by the IDO. Since then, the roadway has been aligned which will create remnant areas and floating zone lines, which this zone change request would remedy if approved.

c) This criterion does not apply because the property is completely within an Area of Consistency.

d) The uses that are not permitted in the R-1B zone but are permitted in the R-ML zone are: Dwelling, townhouse, Dwelling, multi-family, Assisted living facility or nursing home, Community residential facility, medium, Elementary or middle school, Parks and open space. The applicant provided the table above, but did not include the multi-family use, which is the more likely use for the property. Given the 0.58 acre portion requested to be re-zoned R-ML will be adjacent to public right-of-way and surrounded by the R-ML zone, staff finds that the additional permissive uses would not be harmful to adjacent property, neighborhood, or the community.
e) The proposed zone change will not require major and unprogrammed capital expenditures by the City. The properties are in an area with adequate infrastructure, including roadways, water, sewer, and storm water facilities to serve the project. Any required extensions of these services will be the responsibility of the developer.

f) The property is not located on a major street and that is not the justification for this change.

g) The request is not based completely or predominantly on the cost of land or economic considerations because the applicant is interested in aligning the zoning of the remnant pieces created by the new local road alignment with the abutting zones and the request is furthering a preponderance of Comprehensive Plan policies regarding land use and housing.

h) The request will not apply a zone district different from surrounding zone districts to one small area of premise, because the request is to align the zoning with the larger abutting parcel, thereby eliminating the remnant zoning.

8. The applicant contacted the Westside Coalition of Neighborhood Associations as well as property owners within 100 feet of the property as required.

9. A Facilitated Meeting occurred on February 1, 2019 where the desire for open space, limiting two-stories, wider streets, and native plants were expressed.

10. The Planning Department has not received any public comments for this request.

Recommendation

APPROVAL of Project #: 2018-001198, RZ-2018-00062, a request for Zoning Map Amendment from R-ML to R-1B, and from R-1B to R-ML for all or a portion of Tract 1 and Tract 2, Bulk Land Plat of The Trails, Unit 3A based on the preceding Findings.

Conditions Of Approval

Project #: 2018-001198, RZ-2018-001198, Zoning Map Amendment - EPC

1. The applicant shall coordinate with the staff planner to ensure that all Conditions of Approval are met.

2. Replat of the site per the accompanying Site Plan – EPC (SI-2018-00283) to create lot lines that correspond to all Zone Boundaries.
Findings, Site Plan - EPC

Project #: 2018-001198, SI 2018-00283

1. This is a request for a Site Plan - EPC for all or a portion of Tract 1 and Tract 2, Bulk Land Plat of The Trails, Unit 3A located on Woodmont Avenue NW, between Paseo del Norte NW and Major Public Open Space and containing approximately 20.5 acres.

2. This request is the Site Plan – EPC required to develop Tract 2, because the subject site is over 5 acres and adjacent to Major Public Open Space. The applicant wishes to re-plat the subject site into single-family lots per the underlying zone requirements. Compliance with IDO Section 5-2, Site Design and Sensitive Lands is required.

3. The subject site for the request, Tract 2, is currently zoned R-1D within 200 feet from Major Public Open Space and R-1B for the remainder, which both permit the proposed single-family use.

4. The rock outcropping area is considered a “private park” which is different from “on-site open space” and may remain in the proposed location.

5. The subject site is in an Area of Consistency of the Comprehensive Plan, within the Volcano Mesa Character Protection Overlay (CPO-12), and the Northwest Mesa View Preservation Overlay (VPO-2).

6. The Albuquerque/Bernalillo County Comprehensive Plan and the City of Albuquerque Integrated Development Ordinance (IDO) are incorporated herein by reference and made part of the record for all purposes.

7. The subject site is within an Area of Consistency as designated by the Comprehensive Plan and the following policies apply:

   i) The request furthers Policy 5.6.3 b) because it will ensure that development reinforces the scale, intensity, and setbacks of the immediately surrounding context.

   j) The request furthers Policy 5.6.3 and 5.6.3 b) because the subject site is in an Area of Consistency and the request will ensure the proposed development reinforces the scale, intensity, and setbacks of the immediately surrounding context.

   k) The request furthers Policy 9.1.1 because it will align the remnant parcels’ zoning with the abutting parcels, the larger tracts can be developed as a cohesive Site Plan under one zone. The resulting larger R-1B and R-ML zoned tracts will ensure sufficient supply and range of housing types that meet current and future needs at a variety of price levels.

   l) The request furthers Policy 9.2.1 because it will encourage housing development that enhances neighborhood character and maintains surrounding land uses by re-zoning to housing densities that are similar to the surrounding zones.
8. The Site Plan has been evaluated for conformance with applicable goals and policies in the Comprehensive Plan and the IDO.

9. The applicant contacted the Westside Coalition of Neighborhood Associations as well as property owners within 100 feet of the property as required.

10. A Facilitated Meeting occurred on February 1, 2019 where the desire for open space, limiting two-stories, wider streets, and native plants were expressed.

11. The Planning Department has not received any public comments for this request.

12. Applicable Comprehensive Plan policies are furthered by the zone change and site plan requests, and the site plan meets the majority of applicable IDO regulations.

13. This Site Plan may require a Variance - DRB to specific standards of 14-16-5-4(E)(3) for the area between Mataro and Tarragano Roads.

14. There is some concern regarding grading and drainage for the project, however, there has not been sufficient time to make all discoveries; therefore, staff recommends DRB review and approval of the site plan if approved by the EPC.

Recommendation

APPROVAL of Project #: 2018-001361, SI #: 2018-00283, a request for a Site Plan - EPC for all or a portion of Tract 1 and Tract 2, Bulk Land Plat of The Trails, Unit 3A, based on the preceding Findings and subject to the following Conditions of Approval.

Conditions Of Approval

Project #: 2018-001198, SI-2018-00283, Site Plan - EPC

1. The applicant shall coordinate with the staff planner to ensure that all Conditions of Approval are met and then submit it to the DRB for final review and sign-off, including review and approval of technical issues/requirements.

2. The proposed lot layout shown on the site, including but not limited to Lot 32 and other nearby lots, shall be adjusted to ensure that all Zone Boundaries correspond to a lot line.

3. The Site Plan shall maintain a minimum 20-foot buffer from Major Public Open Space at the southwest corner of the development, where there is not a single-loaded street, per 14-16-5-2(H)(2)(a)1.

4. Submit evidence of delineation of the rock outcropping for the record to include the topographic survey, aerial photographs, and site visit photographs.
5. A note shall be added to the plan that states “Buildings shall comply with IDO Section 14-16-3-4(M) Volcano Mesa CPO-12 Development Standards regarding Façade Design, Building Design Standards, Residential Garage Access, and Residential Garage Design.”

6. Conditions of Approval from other Departments and Agencies:
   - HYDROLOGY
     - This Site Plan shall go to the DRB to verify that this development conforms to applicable drainage ordinances and DPM standards.
     - Prior to DRB approval of the Preliminary Plat and Site Plan a detailed G&D Plan must be submitted separately to the Hydrology Section of the Planning Department.
   - TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT
     - Developer is responsible for permanent improvements to the transportation facilities adjacent to the proposed development site plan, as required by the Development Review Board (DRB)
     - Infrastructure and/or ROW dedications may be required at DRB.
     - Signal improvements are required at the intersection of Woodmont and Paseo del Norte.
   - SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT DEPARTMENT
     - Do not plant anything that will create an overhang for refuse truck access/exit-Sheet #2 (Landscape Plan).
   - ABC WATER UTILITY AUTHORITY (ABCWUA)
     - The property resides within pressure zone 5W. Currently, there is no infrastructure in place to serve Pressure Zone 5W. New metered water service to the property would most likely be provided contingent upon a developer funded project to construct major infrastructure to serve pressure Zone 5W including, but not limited to, reservoirs, pump stations and transmission lines. The developer will be responsible for a Water Authority approved Master Plan for Water and Sanitary Sewer which will identify the infrastructure needs to serve not only the subject development, but the entire Pressure Zone 5W. The Master Plan shall also identify the non-potable and sanitary sewer infrastructure needs. Water service will only be sold in conjunction with sanitary sewer service.
     - The proposed utility plan provided with the submittal indicates proposed extension of 4W infrastructure extended to service the site. The proposed extension of 4W infrastructure is prohibited as the subject development is within 5W.
     - Request for water service shall include a City Fire Marshal approved Fire 1 Plan, a zone map showing the site location, and proposed utility plan.

7. The Site Development Plan shall comply with all applicable Regulations of the IDO.
Notice of Decision cc list:
List will be finalized subsequent to the EPC hearing on February 14, 2019

Agency Comments

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Long Range Planning

Comments for Zone Map Amendment:

The site is adjacent to Major Public Open Space on the south side. The site contains a portion of Tract 1 on the north side (.45 acres) and most of Tract 2 (approximately 20 acres). This undeveloped site is within an Area of Consistency and is located within CPO-12 Volcano Mesa and VPO-2 Northwest Mesa Escarpment (not included in the Height Restriction Sub-area). There is a proposed east-west roadway (Girona Rd NW) that will leave remnant parcels on reach side of the roadway. Surrounding zones include R-ML to the north and east, R-1B to the south, NR-PO-C farther to the east, and NR-PO-B farther to the south. The property is adjacent to unincorporated Bernalillo County land to the west, zoned A-1 or agricultural.

This request is for a zone map amendment to move zone boundaries of R-ML and R-1B to follow the geography of the road proposed on the associated site plan. Very little, if any, R-ML acreage would be converted to a single-family zone. In order not to create a floating zone line on two parcels, Long Range recommends that the zone map amendment be conditioned on the approval of a platting action (i.e. “subdivision” approval by the Development Review Board) to amend these parcels to create the appropriate zoning boundaries.

Comments for Site Plan:

This request is for approval of a 78-lot single-family residential subdivision. The subdivision includes a portion of R-1D (southernmost 200 feet of the tract) and the
remainder is zoned R-1B. Because the site is greater than 5 acres and adjacent to Major Public Open Space, EPC must review and decide the site plan. The proposed private street, Tarragano Rd. along the southern border, is single-loaded and has a 5-strand smooth wire fence as a boundary between the development and open space. The lots along the southern border of the site also have lot sizes ranging from 10,000 SF to 12,953 SF which is consistent with R-1D zoning. The size of the R-1 B lots are not noted on the site plan. EPC should confirm that they meet the minimum lot size and minimum lot width for R-1B in Table 5-1-1.

Applicable Policies

- ABC Comprehensive Plan Policy 5.2.1 Land Uses: Create healthy, sustainable, and distinct communities with a mix of uses that are conveniently accessible from surrounding neighborhoods.
  k) Discourage zone changes to detached single-family residential uses on the West Side.
  m) Discourage zone changes to single land uses on site larger than ten acres.

- ABC Comprehensive Plan Policy 5.6.3 Areas of Consistency: Protect and enhance the character of existing single-family neighborhoods, areas outside of Centers and Corridors, parks, and Major Public Open Space.
  b) Ensure that development reinforces the scale, intensity, and setbacks of the immediately surrounding context.

- ABC Comprehensive Plan Policy 6.2.1 Complete Networks: Design and build a complete, well-connected network of streets and trails that offer multiple efficient and safe transportation choices for commuting and daily needs.
  d) Discourage dead ends in order to improve pedestrian and bicycle access to transit and other destinations and reduce congestion by dispersing automobile traffic.

- ABC Comprehensive Plan Policy 6.2.3 Pedestrian & Bicycle Connectivity: Provide direct pedestrian and bicycle access to and circulation within Centers, commercial properties, community facilities, and residential neighborhoods.
  e) Design subdivisions to provide multiple vehicular and pedestrian access points.
  f) Design pedestrian and bicycle circulation systems within private developments to fit the character of the site and minimize conflicts with vehicular traffic.

- ABC Comprehensive Plan Policy 6.3.2 Pedestrians: Improve safety for pedestrians through street design.

- ABC Comprehensive Plan Policy 6.3.3 Cyclists: Improve safety for cyclists through street design.

- ABC Comprehensive Plan Policy 6.8.1.c Encourage “Scenic Corridors” and/or single-loaded streets as the preferred edges for Major Public Open Space and the Petroglyph National Monument.

- ABC Comprehensive Plan Policy 7.3.1.a Minimize alteration of existing vegetation and topography in subdivision and site design.
- ABC Comprehensive Plan Policy 9.1.1 Housing Options: Support the development, improvement, and conservation of housing for a variety of income levels and types of residents and households.
- ABC Comprehensive Plan Policy 9.1.2 Affordability: Provide for mixed-income neighborhoods by encouraging high-quality, affordable and mixed income housing options throughout the area.
  b) Encourage a diversity of housing types, such as live/work spaces, stacked flats, townhouses, urban apartments, lofts, accessory dwelling units, and condominiums.
  e) Encourage mixed-use development that includes non-residential uses and the opportunity for access to services.

**Hydrology**

- This Site Plan should go to the DRB to verify that this development conforms to applicable drainage ordinances and DPM standards.
- Prior to DRB approval of the Preliminary Plat and Site Plan a detailed G&D Plan must be submitted separately to the Hydrology Section of the Planning Department.

**Transportation Development Services**

- Developer is responsible for permanent improvements to the transportation facilities adjacent to the proposed development site plan, as required by the Development Review Board (DRB)
- Infrastructure and/or ROW dedications may be required at DRB.
- All work within the public ROW must be constructed under a COA Work Order.
- Signal improvements are required at the intersection of Woodmont and Paseo del Norte.

**Open Space Division**

The Open Space Division approves of the site plan for subdivision based on the single loaded street along the southern boundary adjacent to Major Public Open Space, the landscaped buffer along the same boundary, and the addition of a high tensile five-strand fence. Please ensure all developed drainage flows will not enter Major Public Open Space. The retention pond on the NR-PO-C parcel shall not flow south onto the Major Public Open Space.

**DEPARTMENT OF MUNICIPAL DEVELOPMENT (DMD), TRANSPORTATION SECTION**

The information contained in the application referenced the property having excellent access with primary access being from Woodmont Ave, which will continue north to a signalized intersection with Paseo Del Norte, however there is currently no existing connection from the property north to Paseo Del Norte and the intersection is not signalized. The site plan does not call for work at the intersection or provide for a temporary road to connect to the proposed new section of Woodmont Ave. from Paseo Del Norte to the proposed Girona Ave.
It is DMDs position that a traffic signal at the intersection of Paseo Del Norte and Woodmont Ave. is warranted per traffic engineering. DMD requests that the developer install a traffic signal at Paseo del Norte and build, at minimum, a temporary road to make the connection on Woodmont Ave. from Paseo del Norte.

SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT DEPARTMENT
Do not plant anything that will create an overhang for refuse truck access/exit-Sheet #2 (Landscape Plan).

TRANSIT DEPARTMENT
The nearest transit service is by way of a stop -pair for Commuter Route 162 at Rainbow and Woodmont, approximately 3600 feet southeast of the site. The 162 connects the CNM West Campus to a turn-around at La Orilla and Coors. Connections can be made from this route to three other commuters (92, 94, and 96) and to Fixed Routes 155, 157, and Rapid Ride 790. The site plan for subdivision correctly notes that there is no transit access to the site, and ABQ Ride has no current plans for service west of the Rainbow/Woodmont intersection.

ABC WATER UTILITY AUTHORITY (ABCWUA)
- The property resides within pressure zone 5W. Currently, there is no infrastructure in place to serve Pressure Zone 5W. New metered water service to the property would most likely be provided contingent upon a developer funded project to construct major infrastructure to serve Pressure Zone 5W including, but not limited to, reservoirs, pump stations and transmission lines. The developer will be responsible for a Water Authority approved Master Plan for Water and Sanitary Sewer which will identify the infrastructure needs to serve not only the subject development, but the entire Pressure Zone 5W. The Master Plan shall also identify the non-potable and sanitary sewer infrastructure needs. Water service will only be sold in conjunction with sanitary sewer service.
- The proposed utility plan provided with the submittal indicates proposed extension of 4W infrastructure extended to service the site. The proposed extension of 4W infrastructure is prohibited as the subject development is within 5W.
- Currently there is an existing board approved settlement agreement which encompasses the subject property which provides the conditions for service.
- Once service is desired please request an Availability Statement. Requests can be made at the link: http://www.abcwua.org/Availability_Statements.aspx
- Request shall include a City Fire Marshal approved Fire 1 Plan, a zone map showing the site location, and proposed utility plan.

ALBUQUERQUE PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Residential development has direct impacts on the Albuquerque Public Schools. The site is located within one-quarter mile to one mile of Tierra Antigua Elementary School, Tony Hillerman Middle School, and Volcano Vista High School. Should the
proposed zone map amendment be approved, the application proposes the building of 78 single family residential units. A residential development at this location will have impacts to Tierra Antigua Elementary School, Tony Hillerman Middle School, and Volcano Vista High School. At present, all three schools, Tierra Antigua Elementary School, Tony Hillerman Middle School, and Volcano Vista High School are over-capacity, and development will be a strain on the schools. The number of dwelling units at build-out of this development is estimated at 78.

- Residential Units: 78
- Est. Elementary School Students: 20
- Est. Middle School Students: 9
- Est. High School Students: 9
- Est. Total # of Students from Project: 38

*The estimated number of students from the proposed project is based on an average student generation rate for the entire APS district.

### School Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>2018-2019 40th Day Enrollment</th>
<th>Facility Capacity</th>
<th>Space Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tierra Antigua Elementary School</td>
<td>928</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>-268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Hillerman Middle School</td>
<td>1207</td>
<td>1180</td>
<td>-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volcano Vista High School</td>
<td>2223</td>
<td>2202</td>
<td>-21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To address overcrowding at schools, APS will explore various alternatives. A combination or all of the following options may be utilized to relieve overcrowded schools.

- **Provide new capacity (long term solution)**
  - Construct new schools or additions
  - Add portables
  - Use of non-classroom spaces for temporary classrooms
  - Lease facilities
  - Use other public facilities

- **Improve facility efficiency (short term solution)**
  - Schedule Changes
    - Double sessions
    - Multi-track year-round
  - Other
    - Float teachers (flex schedule)

- **Shift students to Schools with Capacity (short term solution)**
  - Boundary Adjustments / Busing
- Grade reconfiguration
- Combination of above strategies

All planned additions to existing educational facilities are contingent upon taxpayer approval.

ALBUQUERQUE METROPOLITAN ARROYO FLOOD CONTROL (AMAFCA)

AMAFCA will need to review and approve the drainage report prior to DRB.

AMAFCA would like to comment that the temporary offsite ponds and Pond A5 & B appear to be on separate tracts/parcels which will require easements on those parcels and/or owner concurrence prior to DRB.

MID-REGION COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS (MRCOG)

- Woodmont Ave NW is identified in the Long Range Roadway System to be a Minor Arterial.
- Woodmont Ave NW is identified in the Long Range Bikeway System to include a proposed Bike Lane and Paved Trail.

NEW MEXICO DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (NMDOT)

NMDOT has no comments.
View of the subject site looking south from Paseo del Norte NW.

View of the subject site looking north from Woodmont Avenue NW.
View of the subject site looking west from Woodmont Avenue NW.

View of the subject site looking northwest from the end of Woodmont Avenue NW.
City of Albuquerque

DEVELOPMENT REVIEW APPLICATION
Effective 5/17/18

Please check the appropriate box and refer to supplemental forms for additional requirements. All fees must be paid at the time of application.

**Administrative Decisions**
- Historic Certificate of Appropriateness – Major (Form L)
- Wireless Telecommunications Facility Waiver (Form W2)
- Archaeological Certificate (Form P3)
- Historic Design Standards and Guidelines (Form L)
- Policy Decisions
- Historic Certificate of Appropriateness – Minor (Form L)
- Master Development Plan (Form P1)
- Alternative Signage Plan (Form P3)
- Site Plan – EPC including any Variances – EPC (Form P1)
- WTF Approval (Form W1)
- Site Plan – DRB (Form P2)
- Minor Amendment to Site Plan (Form P3)
- Subdivision of Land – Minor (Form S2)
- Site Plan – ZHE (Form ZHE)
- Subdivision of Land – Major (Form S1)
- Site Plan – ZHE (Form ZHE)
- Decision by EPC, LC, DRB, ZHE, or City Staff (Form A)

**APPLICATION INFORMATION**
Applicant: PV Trails Albuquerque, LLC
Phone: (505) 243-3949
Address: 303 Roma Avenue NW
City: Albuquerque
State: NM
Zip: 87102
Professional/Agent (if any): Consensus Planning, Inc.
Phone: (505) 764-9801
Address: 302 8th Street NW
City: Albuquerque
State: NM
Zip: 87102
Proprietary Interest in Site: Owner
List all owners: PV Trails Albuquerque, LLC.

**BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF REQUEST**
Zone Map Amendment to reflect new east-west street alignment.
Site Plan EPC (adjacent to HPO5) for a 78 lot single-family subdivision.

**SITE INFORMATION** (Accuracy of the existing legal description is crucial! Attach a separate sheet if necessary.)
Lot or Tract No.: A,15 acres portion of Tract 1 Land 2
Block: 3A
Subdivision/Addition: The Trails
MRGCD Map No.: UPC Code: 10080694837910202
Zone Atlas Page(s): C-08
Existing Zoning: R-HL and R-1B
Proposed Zoning: R-HL and R-1B
# of Existing Lots: 2
# of Proposed Lots: 78
Total Area of Site (acres): 20.4

**LOCATION OF PROPERTY BY STREETS**
Site Address/Street: Woodworth
Between: Petroglyph National Monument and: Pasco del Norte

**CASE HISTORY** (List any current or prior project and case number(s) that may be relevant to your request.)

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**
Case Numbers
Action
Fees
Meeting/Hearing Date:
Staff Signature:

Fee Total:
Date: Project #
FORM P1: SITE PLAN – EPC

Please refer to the EPC hearing schedule for public hearing dates and deadlines. Your attendance is required.

A single PDF file of the complete application including all plans and documents being submitted must be emailed to PLNDRS@cabq.gov prior to making a submittal. Zipped files or those over 9 MB cannot be delivered via email, in which case the PDF must be provided on a CD.

□ INFORMATION REQUIRED FOR ALL SITE PLAN – EPC AND VARIANCE – EPC APPLICATIONS

✓ Interpreter Needed for Hearing? If yes, indicate language:
✓ Letter of Authorization from the property owner if application is submitted by an agent
✓ Zone Atlas map with the entire site clearly outlined and labeled
✓ Required notices with content per IDO Section 14-16-6-4(K)(6)
✓ Office of Neighborhood Coordination notice inquiry response, notifying letter, and proof of first class mailing
✓ Proof of emailed notice to affected Neighborhood Association representatives
✓ Buffer map and list of property owners within 100 feet (excluding public rights-of-way), notifying letter, and proof of first class mailing
✓ Sign Posting Agreement
✓ Signed Traffic Impact Study (TIS) Form
✓ Completed Site Plan Checklist

□ SITE PLAN – EPC

□ MASTER DEVELOPMENT PLAN

□ MAJOR AMENDMENT TO SITE PLAN – EPC OR MASTER DEVELOPMENT PLAN

□ EXTENSION OF SITE PLAN – EPC OR MASTER DEVELOPMENT PLAN

✓ Proof of Pre-Application Meeting with City staff per IDO Section 14-16-6-4(B)
✓ Proof of Neighborhood Meeting per IDO Section 14-16-6-4(C)
✓ Sites 5 acres or greater: Archaeological Certificate in accordance with IDO Section 14-16-6-5(A)
✓ Justification letter describing, explaining, and justifying the request per the criteria in IDO Sections 14-16-6-6(H)(3) or 14-16-6-6(F)(3), as applicable
✓ Explanation of requested deviations, if any, in accordance with IDO Section 14-16-6-4(O)
✓ Scaled Site Plan or Master Development Plan and related drawings (10 copies, 24" x 36" folded)
Master Development Plans should include general building and parking locations, as well as design requirements for buildings, landscaping, lighting, and signage.
✓ Site Plan or Master Development Plan and related drawings reduced to 8.5" x 11" format (1 copy)
✓ Landfill disclosure statement on the plat per IDO Section 14-16-5-2(G) if site is within a designated landfill buffer zone

□ VARIANCE – EPC

In addition to the above requirements for the Site Plan – EPC or Master Development Plan the proposed variance request is related to, please describe, explain, and justify the variance per the criteria in IDO Section 14-16-6-6(M)(3).

Note: Any variance request from IDO Standards in Sections 14-16-5-3 (Access and Connectivity), 14-16-5-4 (Subdivision of Land), 14-16-5-5 (Parking and Loading), or DPM standards shall only be granted by the DRB per IDO Section 14-16-6-6(L) See Form V.

I, the applicant or agent, acknowledge that if any required information is not submitted with this application, the application will not be scheduled for a public meeting or hearing, if required, or otherwise processed until it is complete.

Signature: [Signature]
Printed Name: [Printed Name] Date: [Date]

□ Applicant or [Agent]

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Project Number: [Project Number]
Case Numbers [Case Numbers]

Staff Signature:
Date:

Effective 5/17/18
Form Z: Policy Decisions

Please refer to the EPC hearing schedule for public hearing dates and deadlines. Your attendance is required.

A single PDF file of the complete application including all plans and documents being submitted must be emailed to PLNDRS@cabc.gov prior to making a submittal. Zippered files or those over 9 MB cannot be delivered via email, in which case the PDF must be provided on a CD.

☑ INFORMATION REQUIRED FOR ALL POLICY DECISIONS (Except where noted)
  ✔ Interpreter Needed for Hearing? ☑ no if yes, indicate language: __________________________
  ✔ Proof of Pre-Application Meeting with City staff per IDO Section 14-16-6-4(B)
  ✔ Letter of authorization from the property owner if application is submitted by an agent
  ✔ Traffic Impact Study (TIS) form (not required for Amendment to IDO Text)
  ✔ Zoning Atlas map with the entire site/plan amendment area clearly outlined and labeled (not required for Amendment to IDO Text) NOTE: For Annexation of Land, the Zoning Atlas must show that the site is contiguous to City limits.

☐ ADOPTION OR AMENDMENT OF COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

☐ ADOPTION OR AMENDMENT OF FACILITY PLAN
  ______ Plan, or part of plan, to be amended with changes noted and marked
  ______ Letter describing, explaining, and justifying the request per the criteria in IDO Sections 14-16-6-7(A)(3) or 14-16-6-7(B)(3), as applicable
  ______ Required notices with content per IDO Section 14-16-6-4(K)(6)
  ______ Office of Neighborhood Coordination notice inquiry response, notifying letter, and proof of first class mailing
  ______ Proof of emailed notice to affected Neighborhood Association representatives
  ______ Buffer map and list of property owners within 100 feet (excluding public rights-of-way), notifying letter, and proof of first class mailing

☐ AMENDMENT TO IDO TEXT
  ______ Section(s) of the Integrated Development Ordinance to be amended with changes noted and marked
  ______ Justification letter describing, explaining, and justifying the request per the criteria in IDO Section 14-16-6-7(D)(3)
  ______ Required notices with content per IDO Section 14-16-6-4(K)(6)
  ______ Office of Neighborhood Coordination notice inquiry response, notifying letter, and proof of first class mailing
  ______ Buffer map and list of property owners within 100 feet (excluding public rights-of-way), notifying letter, and proof of first class mailing

☑ ZONING MAP AMENDMENT – EPC

☑ ZONING MAP AMENDMENT – COUNCIL
  ✔ Proof of Neighborhood Meeting per IDO Section 14-16-6-4(C)
  ✔ Letter describing, explaining, and justifying the request per the criteria in IDO Section 14-16-6-7(F)(3) or Section 14-16-6-7(G)(3), as applicable
  ✔ Required notices with content per IDO Section 14-16-6-4(K)(6)
  ✔ Office of Neighborhood Coordination notice inquiry response, notifying letter, and proof of first class mailing
  ✔ Proof of emailed notice to affected Neighborhood Association representatives
  ✔ Buffer map and list of property owners within 100 feet (excluding public rights-of-way), notifying letter, and proof of first class mailing
  ✔ Sign Posting Agreement

☐ ANNEXATION OF LAND
  ______ Application for Zoning Map Amendment Establishment of zoning must be applied for simultaneously with Annexation of Land.
  ______ Petition for Annexation Form and necessary attachments
  ______ Letter describing, explaining, and justifying the request per the criteria in IDO Section 14-16-6-7(E)(3)
  ______ Board of County Commissioners (BCC) Notice of Decision

I, the applicant or agent, acknowledge that if any required information is not submitted with this application, the application will not be scheduled for a public meeting or hearing, if required, or otherwise processed until it is complete.

Signature: __________________________ Date: 12/27/2018
Printed Name: James K. Strozier, FAICP
☐ Applicant or ☑ Agent

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Case Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staff Signature: __________________________ Date: __________________________

Effective 5/17/18
October 8, 2018

City of Albuquerque
Planning, Engineering, and Building Departments
P.O. Box 1293
Albuquerque, NM 87102

Albuquerque Bernalillo County Water Utility Authority
One Civic Plaza NW
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87102

Re: Letter of Authorization for Entitlement and Permit Applications – Unit 3A of The Trails

To Whom It May Concern:

PV Trails Albuquerque, LLC ("PV Trails"), hereby authorizes Bohannan Huston, Inc. ("BHI"), Consensus Planning ("CP"), and Price Land & Development Group ("PLDG") to obtain information, submit and process entitlements, permits and all related applications, and act as an agent for PV Trails for the purpose of entitling, zoning, permitting, platting and subdividing the properties known as Tract H Durango Unit 1, Tract C Valle Prado Unit 3 and Tracts 2 through 6 The Trails Unit 3A located within the City of Albuquerque (the "Property"). Any other acts with respect to the Property shall require a separate authorization letter.

Sincerely,

PV Trails Albuquerque, LLC,
a Nevada limited liability company

By: its Manager
PV General Partner, LLC,
a Delaware limited liability company

By:  

Name: Andrew Kaplan
Its: Manager
For more details about the Integrated Development Ordinance visit: http://www.cabq.gov/planning/codes-policies-regulations/integrated-development-ordination
January 30, 2019

Mr. Derek Bohannan, Chair
Environmental Planning Commission
City of Albuquerque
600 Second Street NW
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87102

RE: The Trails Tract 2 - Request for Zone Map Amendment and Site Plan – EPC

Dear Mr. Chairman:

The purpose of this letter is to request approval of a Zone Map Amendment and Site Plan - EPC on behalf of PV Trails Albuquerque, LLC. The subject site is located west of Woodmont Avenue NW and north of the Major Public Open Space (MPOS) - see location exhibit below. The existing zoning of the property is R1-D, R1-B, and R-ML. The project is comprised of a small portion of Tract 1 (.45 acres) and most of Tract 2 (approximately 20 acres) within The Trails subdivision. The property is legally described as “A portion of Tracts 1 and 2 Bulk Land Plat of The Trails Unit 3A”. The site is currently undeveloped.

Figure 1. Subject site (in red) and area context
The platted parcels do not take into account the proposed alignment of a new east-west roadway (Girona Road NW), which leaves small remnant parcels on each side of the roadway. The zone map amendment included with this submittal cleans up that situation.

The property falls within Section 14-16-3-4(M) the Volcano Mesa Character Preservation Overlay (CPO) 12 and Section 14-16-3-6(E) the Northwest Mesa View Preservation Overlay (VPO) 2 (not included in the Height Restriction Sub-Area). All regulations of the CPO and VPO apply and have been addressed with the Site Plan.

Since the property is located adjacent to MPOS, special provisions also apply including a requirement that all Site Plans be reviewed by the Environmental Planning Commission. These requirements are found in Section 14-16-5-2(H) Major Public Open Space Edges. Once again, these requirements are addressed with the Site Plan.

The property falls within the Northwest Mesa Community Planning Area and is designated as an “Area of Consistency” in the Albuquerque/Bernalillo County Comprehensive Plan.

The following is a summary of the two-part request:

**Zone Map Amendment:** This request is for a change for a .58-acre property (north of Girona Avenue NW) from R1-B to R-ML and a companion change for a .45 acre property (south of Girona Avenue NW) from R-ML to R-1B. As detailed below, this request for zone change complies with criteria outlined in section 14-16-6-7(F)(3) of the Integrated Development Ordinance (IDO).
Site Development Plan for Building Permit: The request is for approval of a Site Plan for a 78-lot single-family residential subdivision. The subdivision includes a portion of R1-D and R1-B zoned land. As detailed below, this request is consistent with the Site Plan criteria in section 14-16-6-6(H)(3) of the Integrated Development Ordinance (IDO).

SITE CONDITIONS

Land Use
The subject site was a part of a pre-IDO Sector Plan called The Trails and subsequently the Volcano Trails Sector Plan. The property had custom zoning designations. Some of these special considerations have been carried over in the Volcano Mesa CPO. At the time of the IDO conversion, many of the undeveloped single family zoned tracts were incorrectly converted to R1-D. A zone map amendment was approved by the City Council more closely reflecting the previous Sector Plan zones. This process resulted in the southernmost 200 feet of Tract 2 being designated R1-D and the balance zoned R1-B. The attached Site Plan is consistent with this zoning. Unfortunately, the City’s AGIS mapping has not been updated to reflect the correct zoning.

The following table summarizes the surrounding land use and zoning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1. Surrounding Zoning &amp; Land Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NORTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Access & Public Transit
The property has excellent access with the primary access being from Woodmont Avenue NW, which will continue north to a signalized intersection with Paseo del Norte, a limited access principal arterial. The subdivision will also provide a new east-west street, Girona Avenue, which will have several additional access points into the neighborhood. Girona will provide future access to currently undeveloped land in the unincorporated portion of Bernalillo County.

Public Amenities & Schools
The project is well located with community services and schools in the surrounding area. Just to the south of The Trails are Tierra Antigua Elementary School, Tony Hillerman Middle School, and Volcano Vista High School. The area contains numerous parks, trail, and open space.

REQUEST JUSTIFICATION

Zone Map Amendment
This request for a Zone Map Amendment complies with the criteria outlined in section 14-16-6-7(F)(3) of the Integrated Development Ordinance (IDO) as follows:
6-7(F)(3)(a) The proposed zone change is consistent with the health, safety, and general welfare of the City as shown by furthering (and not being in conflict with) a preponderance of applicable Goals and Policies in the ABC Comp Plan, as amended, and other applicable plans adopted by the City.

**Applicant’s Response:** The proposed zone change is consistent with the health, safety, and general welfare of the City, because the proposed zone change will “clean up” a conflict between the existing tract boundaries and a proposed roadway/easement alignment. Having zone boundaries split by roadways and parcels with different zone districts can create problems in the future that are not consistent with the health, safety, and general welfare of the City. The roadway provides a more logical boundary between the two zoning districts. The correction of this zoning situation does not conflict with the Comprehensive Plan, but there are not any specific goals and policies that speak directly to corrections of this nature.

**Policy 5.2.1 Land Uses:** Create healthy, sustainable, and distinct communities with a mix of uses that are conveniently accessible from surrounding neighborhoods.

**Applicant’s Response:** The change helps to ensure that cohesive zoning is in place for the two distinct development parcels that are now separated by the new roadway furthering this Policy.

**k) Discourage zone changes to detached single-family residential uses on the West Side.**

**Applicant’s Response:** This action is furthered by the fact that both zones permit single-family homes, so there is no increase in the allowable detached single-family homes permitted.

**Policy 5.6.3 Areas of Consistency:** Protect and enhance the character of existing single-family neighborhoods, areas outside of Centers and Corridors, parks, and Major Public Open Space.

**Applicant’s Response:** The zone map amendment furthers this policy by creating a cohesive single-family development area with consistent zoning.

**b) Ensure that development reinforces the scale, intensity, and setbacks of the immediately surrounding context.**

**Applicant’s Response:** This action is furthered by the zone change since the same regulations will apply to all of the property south of the roadway.

**Goal 9.1 Supply:** “Ensure sufficient supply and range of high-quality housing types that meet current and future needs at a variety of price levels to ensure more balanced housing options.”

**Applicant’s Response:** The proposed zone change cleans up an existing conflict between the tract (zoning) boundaries and a proposed roadway, which will help remove an obstacle to providing a variety of product types and prices.
Site Plan Criteria 6-6(H)(3)(d) The City's existing infrastructure and public improvements, including but not limited to its street, trail, drainage, and sidewalk systems, have adequate capacity to serve the proposed development, and any burdens on those systems have been mitigated to the extent practicable.

Applicant’s Response: The proposed zone change will also further this IDO Criteria by better utilizing the existing infrastructure and public improvements and ensure that new infrastructure (developer funded) will serve the proposed development.

6-7(F)(3)(b) If the proposed amendment is located wholly or partially in an Area of Consistency (as shown in the ABC Comp Plan, as amended), the applicant has demonstrated that the new zone would clearly reinforce or strengthen the established character of the surrounding Area of Consistency and would not permit development that is significantly different from that character. The applicant must also demonstrate that the existing zoning is inappropriate because it meets any of the following criteria:

1. There was typographical or clerical error when the existing zone district was applied to the property.
2. There has been a significant change in neighborhood or community conditions affecting the site.
3. A different zone district is more advantageous to the community as articulated by the ABC Com Plan, as amended (including implementation of patterns of land use, development density and intensity, and connectivity), and other applicable adopted City plan(s).

Applicant’s Response: The property is in an Area of Consistency. Changed conditions (#2) with the new roadway create the need for this action. The existing zoning areas are not appropriate since they will create developments that have two different zoning districts. Responding to this changed condition will reinforce the established zoning in the area and allow all of the property south of the new roadway to be governed by R1 zoning and everything to the north to be governed by the R-ML zone. The east-west roadway was not dedicated at the time the IDO was adopted. This has created a slight disconnect between the tract boundaries and the road alignment. This disconnect will be corrected with this zone map amendment.

6-7(F)(3)(c) If the proposed amendment is located wholly in an Area of Change (as shown in the ABC Comp Plan, as amended) and the applicant has demonstrated that the existing zoning is inappropriate because it meets at least one of the following criteria:

1. There was typographical or clerical error when the existing zone district was applied to the property.
2. There has been a significant change in neighborhood or community conditions affecting the site that justifies this request.
3. A different zone district is more advantageous to the community as articulated by the ABC Com Plan, as amended (including implementation of patterns of land use, development density and intensity, and connectivity), and other applicable adopted City plan(s).
**Applicants Response:** This criterion does not apply because the property is completely within an Area of Consistency.

6-7(F)(3)(d) The zone change does not include permissive uses that would be harmful to adjacent property, the neighborhood, or the community, unless the Use-specific Standards in Section 16-16-4-3 associated with that use will adequately mitigate those harmful impacts.

**Applicant’s Response:** The proposed zone change does not include permissive uses that would be harmful to the adjacent property, the neighborhood, or the community because both zone districts are already in place and the request is merely an adjustment to the boundaries of the existing zones to reflect the street alignment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R-1</th>
<th>Catalonia - IDO ZONING ANALYSIS</th>
<th>R-LM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Single Family detached</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Cluster Development</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Two Family Detached (duplex)</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Town House- Multi Family</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Assisted Living/ Nursing Home</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Day Care (elderly, adult)</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>School: Elementary and Middle</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Community Residential Facility, small</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Community Residential Facility, medium</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Religious Institution</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed zone map amendment results in a difference of .13 acres changing from R1-B to R-ML. This change is negligible and will not materially impact any change in land use or development patterns in the area. It will prevent a situation where properties could have two different zoning districts on the same parcel, which is discouraged.

6-7(F)(3)(e) The City's existing infrastructure and public improvements, including but not limited to its street, trail, and sidewalk systems meet 1 the following requirements:

1. Have adequate capacity to serve the development made possible by the change of zone.
2. Will have adequate capacity based on improvements for which the City has already approved and budgeted capital funds during the next calendar year.
3. Will have adequate capacity when the applicant fulfills its obligations under the IDO, the DPM, and/or an Infrastructure Improvements Agreement.
4. Will have adequate capacity when the City and the applicant have fulfilled their respective obligations under a City approved Development Agreement between the City and the applicant.

**Applicant’s Response:** The proposed zone change will not require major and unprogrammed capital expenditures by the City. The properties are in an
area with adequate infrastructure, including roadways, water, sewer, and storm water facilities to serve the project. Any required extensions of these services will be the responsibility of the developer.

6-7(F)(3)(f) The applicant’s justification for the requested zone change is not completely based on the property’s location on a major street.

**Applicant’s Response:** The property is not located on a major street and that is not the justification for this change.

6-7(F)(3)(g) The applicant’s justification is not based completely or predominantly on the cost of land or economic considerations.

**Applicant’s Response:** The cost of land or other economic considerations are not the determining factor for this zone change request. As stated previously, the change “cleans up” a minor disconnect between the tract boundaries and the new roadway alignment.

6-7(F)(3)(h) The zone change does not apply a zone district different from surrounding zone districts to one small area or one premises (i.e. create a “spot zone”) or to a strip of land along a street (i.e. create a “strip zone”) unless the change will clearly facilitate implementation of the ABC Comp Plan, as amended, and at least one of the following applies:

1. The area of the zone change is different from surrounding land because it can function as a transition between adjacent zone districts.
2. The site is not suitable for the uses allowed in any adjacent zone district due to topography, traffic, or special adverse land uses nearby.
3. The nature of structures already on the premises makes it unsuitable for the uses allowed in any adjacent zone district.

**Applicant’s Response:** The proposed zone map amendment does not create a spot zone; it removes the situation where there will be remnant parcels on either side of the new roadway that would be different from the adjacent zone.

**Site Plan**
The submitted Site Plan complies with the criteria for Site Plan – EPC approval as outlined in section 14-16-6-6(H)(3) of the Integrated Development Ordinance (IDO):

6-6(H)(3)(a) The Site Plan is consistent with the ABC Comp Plan, as amended.

**Applicant’s Response:** The Site Plan is consistent with the Albuquerque and Bernalillo County Comprehensive Plan, adopted March 2017. Section 9.1.2.3 speaks to Future Housing Needs and encourages that “Proactive housing planning takes into account existing housing gaps as well as the needs of people who might live in the region in the future”.

The proposed Site Plan for a mixed lot size single family development is designed to meet future housing needs based on demand. The proposed development takes into consideration future residents’ anticipated age, income, and housing preferences. The project is consistent with the existing zoning as “cleaned up” with the associated zone map amendment.
Section 9.1.2.3 of the Comprehensive Plan also includes a future housing profile that identifies future units based on need forecasts and population projections. Local and national trends indicate a growing demand for more diverse housing options. Owner-occupied housing is expected to continue to be the housing type desired by most households and therefore needing the highest proportion of housing units. This area has excellent access to parks, trails, schools, and open space. Continuing the zonings desire for lower density homes along a buffered single loaded street adjacent to the MPOS is consistent with the IDO’s provisions for MPOS edges.

Applicant’s Response: The proposed Site Plan also meets the following Comprehensive Plan Housing Chapter Goals:

Goal 9.1 Supply: “Ensure sufficient supply and range of high-quality housing types that meet current and future needs at a variety of price levels to ensure more balanced housing options.”

Applicant’s Response: The proposed site plan provides for different lot sizes, which will result in a variety of product types and prices.

Goal 9.2 Sustainable Design: “Promote housing design that is sustainable and compatible with the natural and built environments.”

Applicant’s Response: The proposed site plan provides for a single loaded street, an additional open space buffer, protection of an existing rock outcropping and a well-connected layout with the adjacent street network.

6-6(H)(3)(b) The Site Plan is consistent with any applicable terms and conditions in any previously approved NR-SU or PC zoning covering the property and any related development agreements and/or regulations.

Applicant’s Response: The Site Plan and associated property is zoned a combination of R1-D and R1-B. The reason that this project is being reviewed by the EPC is due to its location adjacent to MPOS, not as a result of the zoning district designation.

6-6(H)(3)(c) The Site Plan complies with all applicable provisions of this IDO, the DPM, other adopted City regulations, and any terms and conditions specifically applied to development of the property in a prior permit or approval affecting the property.

Applicant’s Response: The site plan is designed to follow these plans.

14-16-5-2(C) Avoidance of Sensitive Lands, Section 5-2(C)(1)(h) Rock Outcropping is the only listed sensitive land that applies to this request.

Applicant’s Response: The only item in the list of sensitive lands applicable to this property is an existing rock outcropping located near the main entry to the subdivision and is included in a small private open space to be owned and maintained by the Homeowner’s Association. This open space is distinct from that required in response to 5-2(H)(2) regarding properties adjacent to MPOS.
14-16-5-2(H) Major Public Open Space Edges

Applicants Response: The Site Plan has been designed to comply with all of the requirements for lands located adjacent to MPOS. The Site Plan includes specific standards that respond to these requirements, includes a single-loaded street, and an additional (not required) open space buffer along the boundary with MPOS. The Site Plan is being reviewed by the EPC as required by this section of the IDO.

6-6(H)(3)(d) The City’s existing infrastructure and public improvements, including but not limited to its street, trail, drainage, and sidewalk systems, have adequate capacity to serve the proposed development, and any burdens on those systems have been mitigated to the extent practicable.

Applicant’s Response: The City’s existing infrastructure and public improvements have adequate capacity to serve the proposed development.

6-6(H)(3)(e) The application mitigates any significant adverse impacts on the surrounding area to the maximum extent practicable.

Applicant’s Response: The Site Plan mitigates any adverse impacts on the surrounding area using an open space buffer and single loaded street adjacent to the MPOS. The site plan does not create any negative impacts to the surrounding properties. The site plan also provides for a street connection to the west to accommodate future development in the unincorporated portion of Bernalillo County.

IV. CONCLUSION

On behalf of PV Trails Albuquerque, LLC, we respectfully request that the Environmental Planning Commission approves this request for a Zone Map Amendment and Site Plan – EPC for the subject site.

Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

James K. Strozier, FAICP
Principal
CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE
TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDY (TIS) FORM

APPLICANT: PV Trails Albuquerque, LLC  DATE OF REQUEST: 12/26/2018  ZONE ATLAS PAGE(S): C-08

CURRENT:
ZONING R-1-B and R-1-D
PARCEL SIZE (AC/SQ. FT.) 20.4 ac.

REQUESTED CITY ACTION(S):
ANNEXATION [ ]
ZONE CHANGE [V] From R-1-B to R-1-HL
SECTOR, AREA, FAC, COMP PLAN [ ]
AMENDMENT (Map/Text) [ ]

SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN:
SUBDIVISION* [V] AMENDMENT [ ]
BUILDING PERMIT [ ] ACCESS PERMIT [ ]
BUILDING PURPOSES [ ] OTHER [ ]
*includes platting actions

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:
NO CONSTRUCTION/DEVELOPMENT [ ]
NEW CONSTRUCTION [ ]
EXPANSION OF EXISTING DEVELOPMENT [ ]
.48 ac. from R-1-HL to R-1-B, and .58 ac. from R-1-B to R-1-HL to reflect east-west road way alignment.

Note: changes made to development proposals / assumptions, from the information provided above, will result in a new TIS determination.

APPLICANT OR REPRESENTATIVE

(To be signed upon completion of processing by the Traffic Engineer)

DATE 12/26/2018

Planning Department, Development & Building Services Division, Transportation Development Section -
2nd Floor West, 600 2nd St. NW, Plaza del Sol Building, City, 87102, phone 924-3994

TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDY (TIS) REQUIRED: YES [ ] NO [X] BORDERLINE [ ]

THRESHOLDS MET? YES [ ] NO [X] MITIGATING REASONS FOR NOT REQUIRING TIS: PREVIOUSLY STUDIED: [ ]

Notes:

If a TIS is required: a scoping meeting (as outlined in the development process manual) must be held to define the level of analysis needed and the parameters of the study. Any subsequent changes to the development proposal identified above may require an update or new TIS.

TRAFFIC ENGINEER

DATE 12/26/2018

Required TIS must be completed prior to applying to the EPC and/or the DRB. Arrangements must be made prior to submittal if a variance to this procedure is requested and noted on this form, otherwise the application may not be accepted or deferred if the arrangements are not complied with.

TIS SUBMITTED [ ]
FINALIZED [ ]
TRAFFIC ENGINEER

DATE

Revised January 20, 2011
City of Albuquerque  
P.O. Box 1293  Albuquerque, New Mexico  87103  
Planning Department  

Martin J. Chavez, Mayor  
Richard Dineen, Director  

Interoffice Memorandum  

November 8, 2007  

Subject:  Albuquerque Archaeological Ordinance—Compliance Documentation  

Project Number(s):  
Case Number(s):  
Agent:  
Applicant:  Longford Homes, Inc.  
Legal Description:  The Trails Unit 3  
Acreage:  165.59 acres  
Zone Atlas Page:  C-9  

CERTIFICATE OF NO EFFECT:  Yes _X_  No ____  

CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL:  Yes ____  No ____  

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION:  
NIAF submitted by TRC Solutions dated February 2007 (NMCRIS# 103624)  
Note: LA 49629“likely destroyed by recent construction activity.”"  

SITE VISIT:  n/a  

RECOMMENDATION(S):  

- CERTIFICATE OF NO EFFECT IS ISSUED (ref O-07-72 Section 72 Section 4B(1)—no significant sites in project area; 4B(2)—land disturbance; and 4B(3), information potential exhausted for LA 49629).  

SUBMITTED:  
Matthew Schmader, PhD  
Superintendent, Open Space Division  
Acting City Archaeologist
PRE-APPLICATION REVIEW TEAM (PRT) MEETING NOTES

PA#: 18-3/6, 18-3/7, 18-3/18 Date: Nov. 5, 2018 Time: 2:00, 2:30, 3:00

Address: ________________________________

AGENCY REPRESENTATIVES AT MEETING:
Planning: ________________________________
Code Enforcement: ________________________
Fire Marshall: ____________________________
Transportation: __________________________
Other: ________________________________

PRT DISCUSSIONS ARE FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES ONLY!
THEY ARE NON-BINDING AND DO NOT CONSTITUTE ANY KIND OF APPROVAL.
Additional research may be necessary to determine the exact type of application and/or process needed.
Factors unknown at this time and/or thought of as minor could become significant as the case progresses.

REQUEST: ________________________________

SITE INFORMATION:
Zone: P-1-D, P-1-B Size: ________________________________
Use: ___________________________________________________
Overlay Zone: ____________________________________________
Comp Plan Area Of: _______________________________________
Comp Plan Corridor: _______________________________________ 
Comp Plan Center: _______________________________________
MPDOS or Sensitive Lands: ______________________________
Parking: ______________________________________________
MR Area: ______________________________________________
Landscaping: __________________________________________ 
Street Trees: __________________________________________
Use Specific Standards: ________________________________
Dimensional Standards: _________________________________

*Neighborhood Organization/s: ________________________________
*This is preliminary information only. Neighborhood Organization information is only accurate when obtained from the Office of Neighborhood Coordination (ONC) at www.cabq.gov/neighborhoods/resources.

PROCESS:
Type of Action: __________________________________________
Review and Approval Body: __________________________________
Is this PRT a requirement? Yes
PRE-APPLICATION REVIEW TEAM (PRT) MEETING NOTES

PA# 19-09, 19-31 7E-78  Date: 02/05/2018 Time: 

Address: 

NOTES: (See attached)
Tracts 6 and C

What is the relationship between the approved site plan and the base zoning? Can we submit preliminary plats that follow the approved site plan?

Can we amend the site plan to allow smaller lot sizes with a different layout provided that the lot size is consistent with the previous VTSL zoning? No, the VTSL zoning no longer exists.

The site plan references the VTSL zone. What does that mean for lot standards?

If we are held to the new R-1 B IDO standards, is there a way to request a lot size variance? If so, what is the process?

- As of City Council's vote today, 11-5-2018, lots 6 and C will be zoned R-1B, with a minimum lot size of 5,000 sf. (7 yrs from IDO) (exp not expired)
- If the approved Site Development Plan for Subdivision has not expired, you may develop with that plan under Prior Approvals 1-10A. What is the lot size of the approved plan?
- You may request a Minor Amendment if 10% or less of total SP for Subdivision area. Per Table 6-4-5, otherwise Major Amendment from DRB.
- It is possible to pursue a Variance to lot size per Section 6-6(N) but it must be justified, and it does not seem exceptional at this time.
- The zoning will be R-1B, which means minimum lot size of 5,000 square feet.

Tract 2

A portion of the proposed site plan encroaches into the R-ML zone because the project follows the roadway alignment. Because R-ML allows single family is this an issue?

Please confirm Site Plan EPC review for this project.

How is the Open Space Advisory Board involved and what are the City's expectations for the applicant to coordinate with the OSAB?

Depending on the City Council vote on the ZMA, when can we make an application?

- R-ML is not an issue.
- Site Plan EPC because it is over 5 acres and adjacent to MPOS. Could fix zone line at same time.
- Discuss with Michael regarding floating zone line and whether this is allowed.
• The OSAB advises the OSD but it is not required to coordinate with them. The OSD may meet with the OSAB in order to determine their recommendations as required in the IDO for MPOS. It is recommended that the applicant stays in contact and discuss the project with the OSAB, but it is not required. It is also recommended that the applicant contact MPOS to see if they would like to review the Site Plan as soon as possible.

**Tract H – Durango**

Please confirm that despite the existing ZMA request, that preliminary plat is the appropriate next step provided it follows the approved site plan.

• 1 year extension of preliminary plat approved in July of 2019. Last extension, therefore, plat needs to be finalized by next summer.

  • Infrastructure – talk to them downstairs
  • Per approved site plan
    • Separate Units 3, 4, 5 – never had pre-plat
    • Never analyzed pre-plat
  • Site Plan for Subdivision valid for 7 years from
    IDO effective date - May 2018

• Per IDO standards – for design standards including setbacks.
  • Site Plan shows building pad w/ setbacks from Sector Plan ZEO which is more advantageous to developer than
    IDO setbacks per CPO-12 p. 105
  • ZEO will make determination whether building pads sufficient.

  p. 105 – longer than 10,000 ft² is setback per CPO
  It’s equal to 10,000 ft² – setbacks per IDO

  8" curb & 55" curbs – than 3 carryovers
SITE PLAN CHECKLIST

Project #: ______________________ Application #: ______________________

This checklist will be used to verify the completeness of site plans submitted for review by the Planning Department. Because development proposals vary in type and scale, there may be submittal requirements that are not specified here. Also there may additional requirements if a site is located in CPO, HPO, and/or VPO or if located in DT-UC-MS or PT areas. See the IDO or AGIS for boundaries. Nonetheless, applicants are responsible for providing a complete submittal. Certification as specified below is required.

I CERTIFY THAT THE SUBMITTED SITE PLAN IS COMPLETE AND ACCURATE, AND THAT ALL APPLICABLE INFORMATION AS SPECIFIED IN THIS CHECKLIST IS PROVIDED. FURTHER, I UNDERSTAND THAT THIS APPLICATION IS BEING ACCEPTED PROVISIONALLY AND THAT INACCURATE AND/OR INCOMPLETE INFORMATION MAY RESULT IN THE SUBSEQUENT REJECTION OF THE APPLICATION OR IN A DELAY OF ONE MONTH OR MORE IN THE DATE THE APPLICATION IS SCHEDULED FOR PUBLIC HEARING.

Applicant or Agent Signature / Date

Site plan packets shall be composed of the following plan sheets (unless otherwise approved in writing prior to submittal by the Planning Department):

1. Site Plan (including utilities and easements)
2. Landscaping Plan
3. Grading and Drainage Plan
4. Utility Plan
5. Building and Structure Elevations
6. Previously approved Development Plan (if applicable)

The electronic format must be organized in the above manner.

The following checklist describes the minimum information necessary for each plan element. The Applicant must include all checklist items on their site plan drawings and confirm inclusion by checking off the items below. Non-applicable items must be labeled “N/A.” Each non-applicable designation must be explained by notation on the Checklist.

NOTE: There may be additional information required if site is located with a CPO, VPO or HPO and/or any other special areas as defined by the IDO.

NOTE: If there requests for deviations (Section 14-16-6-4(O), they must be clearly labelled on the site plan (Sheet 1) as well as addressed in the application letter made with the submittal.

SHEET #1 - SITE PLAN

A. General Information

✓ 1. Date of drawing and/or last revision

✓ 2. Scale: 1.0 acre or less 1" = 10'
   1.0 - 5.0 acres 1" = 20'
   Over 5 acres 1" = 50'

   Over 20 acres 1" = 100'
SITE PLAN CHECKLIST

3. Bar scale
4. North arrow
5. Legend
6. Scaled vicinity map
7. Property lines (clearly identify)
8. Existing and proposed easements (identify each)
9. Phases of development, if applicable

B. Proposed Development

1. Structural
   A. Location of existing and proposed structures (distinguish between existing & proposed) and include any accessory structures
   B. Square footage of each structure
   C. Proposed use of each structure
   D. Signs (freestanding) and other improvements
   E. Walls, fences, and screening: indicate height, length, color and materials
   F. Dimensions of all principal site elements or typical dimensions
   G. Loading facilities
   H. Site lighting (indicate height & fixture type)
   I. Indicate structures within 20 feet of site
   J. Elevation drawing of refuse container and enclosure, if applicable
   K. Existing zoning/land use of all abutting properties

2. Parking, Loading and Internal Circulation
   A. Parking layout with spaces numbered per aisle and totaled
   1. Location and typical dimensions, including motorcycle spaces, bicycle spaces, ADA accessible spaces, and compact spaces
   2. Calculations: spaces required and proposed (include any reduction calculations) for motorcycle, bicycle, compact and ADA spaces
   3. On street parking spaces
   B. Bicycle parking & facilities
   1. Bicycle racks – location and detail
   2. Other bicycle facilities, if applicable
   C. Vehicular Circulation (Refer to DPM and IDO)
   1. Ingress and egress locations, including width and curve radii dimensions
   2. Drive aisle locations, including width and curve radii dimensions
   3. End aisle locations, including width and curve radii dimensions
   4. Location & orientation of refuse enclosure, with dimensions
   5. Loading, service area, and refuse service locations and dimensions
   D. Pedestrian Circulation
   1. Location and dimensions of all sidewalks and pedestrian paths (including ADA connection from ROW to building and from ADA parking to building)
SITE PLAN CHECKLIST

1. Location and dimension of drive aisle crossings, including paving treatment
2. Location and description of amenities, including patios, benches, tables, etc.
3. Location and dimensions of all off-street loading areas
4. Location and dimensions of vehicle stacking spaces and queuing lanes
5. Landscaped buffer area if drive-through lanes are adjacent to public R/W
6. Striping and Sign details for one-way drive through facilities

NA E. Off-Street Loading
No off-street loading.

NA F. Vehicle Stacking and Drive-Through or Drive-Up Facilities
No drive through.

3. Streets and Circulation

A. Locate and identify adjacent public and private streets and alleys.
   1. Existing and proposed pavement widths, right-of-way widths and curve radii
   2. Identify existing and proposed turn lanes, deceleration lanes and similar features related to the functioning of the proposal, with dimensions
   3. Location of traffic signs and signals related to the functioning of the proposal
   4. Identify existing and proposed medians and median cuts
   5. Sidewalk widths and locations, existing and proposed
   6. Location of street lights
   7. Show and dimension clear sight triangle at each site access point
   8. Show location of all existing driveways fronting and near the subject site.

B. Identify Alternate transportation facilities within site or adjacent to site
   1. Bikeways and bike-related facilities
   2. Pedestrian trails and linkages
   3. Transit facilities, including routes, bus bays and shelters existing or required

NA A. Proposed phasing of improvements and provision for interim facilities. Indicate phasing plan, including location and square footage of structures and associated improvements including circulation, parking and landscaping.

NA B. Proposed phasing of improvements and provision for interim facilities. Indicate phasing plan, including location and square footage of structures and associated improvements including circulation, parking and landscaping.

4. Phasing

NA A. Proposed phasing of improvements and provision for interim facilities. Indicate phasing plan, including location and square footage of structures and associated improvements including circulation, parking and landscaping.

5. Existing and proposed easements

6. Identify nature of ground cover materials
   A. Impervious areas (pavement, sidewalks, slope pavings, curb and gutters, etc.)
   B. Pervious areas (planting beds, gravel areas, grass, ground cover vegetation, etc.)
   C. Ponding areas either for drainage or landscaping/recreational use
SITE PLAN CHECKLIST

7. Identify type, location and size of plantings (common and/or botanical names).
   A. Existing, indicating whether it is to preserved or removed. Site mostly denuded.
   B. Proposed, to be established for general landscaping.
   C. Proposed, to be established for screening/buffering. No buffering required.

8. Describe irrigation system – Phase I & II . . .

9. Planting Beds, indicating square footage of each bed

10. Turf Area - only 20% of landscaped area can be high water turf; provide square footage and percentage. No turf proposed.

11. Responsibility for Maintenance (statement)

12. Landscaped area requirement; square footage and percent (specify clearly on plan)

13. Landscaped buffer areas provided; dimensions, label clearly that it is a landscape buffer, square footage and percent (specify clearly on plan) No buffers required.

14. Planting or tree well detail

15. Street Trees (only trees from the Official Albuquerque Plant Palette and Sizing list or 8 inch caliper or larger will be counted)

16. Parking lot edges and interior – calculations, dimensions and locations including tree requirements No parking dots.

17. Show Edge Buffer Landscaping (14-16-5-6(D)) – location, dimensions and plant material No buffering required.

SHEET #3 – GRADING AND DRAINAGE PLAN
A separate grading and drainage plan (and drainage report) must be submitted to the DRS Hydrology Section prior to the DRB submittal for a site plan (See DRWS Form).

A. General Information

1. Scale - must be same as Sheet #1 - Site Plan
2. Bar Scale
3. North Arrow
4. Property Lines
5. Existing and proposed easements
7. Location of Retaining walls No retaining walls required.

B. Grading Information

1. On the plan sheet, provide a narrative description of existing site topography, proposed grading improvements and topography within 100 feet of the site.
2. Indicate finished floor elevation and provide spot elevations for all corners of the site (existing and proposed) and points of maximum cut or fill exceeding 1 foot.
3. Identify ponding areas, erosion and sediment control facilities.
4. Cross Sections No grade changes in excess of 4 feet.
   Provide cross section for all perimeter property lines where the grade change is greater than 4 feet at the point of the greatest grade change. Provide one additional cross section in each direction within no more than 100 feet of the reference point.
SITE PLAN CHECKLIST

SHEET #4 - UTILITY PLAN

☐ A. Fire hydrant locations, existing and proposed. (or submit signed off Fire One Plan)
☐ B. Distribution lines
☐ C. Right-of-Way and easements, existing and proposed, on the property and adjacent to the boundaries, with identification of types and dimensions.
☐ D. Existing water, sewer, storm drainage facilities (public and/or private).
☐ E. Proposed water, sewer, storm drainage facilities (public and/or private)

SHEET #5 - BUILDING AND STRUCTURE ELEVATIONS

Home elevations not provided

A. General Information

☐ A. Scale
☐ B. Bar Scale
☐ C. Detailed Building Elevations for each facade
  ☐ 1. Identify facade orientation
  ☐ 2. Dimensions of facade elements, including overall height and width
  ☐ 3. Location, material and colors of windows, doors and framing
  ☐ 4. Materials and colors of all building elements and structures
  ☐ 5. Location and dimensions of mechanical equipment (roof and/or ground mounted)

B. Building Mounted Signage

☐ 1. Site location(s)
☐ 2. Sign elevations to scale
☐ 3. Dimensions, including height and width
☐ 4. Sign face area - dimensions and square footage clearly indicated
☐ 5. Lighting
☐ 6. Materials and colors for sign face and structural elements.
☐ 7. List the sign restrictions per the IDO
PUBLIC NOTIFICATION & COMMENT
Jane,

See list of associations below and attached regarding your EPC submittal. In addition, we have included web links below that will provide you with additional details about the new Integrated Development Ordinance (IDO) requirements. The web links also include notification templates that you may utilize when contacting each association. Thank you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Association Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Address Line 1</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip</th>
<th>Mobile Phone</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Westside Coalition of Neighborhood Assn.</td>
<td>Rene</td>
<td>Harvath</td>
<td><a href="mailto:abaro10@juno.com">abaro10@juno.com</a></td>
<td>5515 Palomino Drive NW</td>
<td>Albuquerque</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>87120</td>
<td>5058982214</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westside Coalition of Neighborhood Assn.</td>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>Hendricks</td>
<td><a href="mailto:thenn@comcast.net">thenn@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>13992 Rio del Sol NW</td>
<td>Albuquerque</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>87114</td>
<td>5052121003</td>
<td>5058903481</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IDO – Public Notice Requirements & Template: [https://www.cabq.gov/planning/urban-design-development/public-notice](https://www.cabq.gov/planning/urban-design-development/public-notice)


Respectfully,

Vicente M. Quevedo, MCRP
Neighborhood Liaison
Office of Neighborhood Coordination
City of Albuquerque – City Council
(505) 768-3332

Website: [www.cabq.gov/neighborhoods](http://www.cabq.gov/neighborhoods)

Confidentiality Notice: This email, including all attachments, is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender and destroy copies of this message.

From: webmaster-cabq.gov@maligun.erg (emailwebmaster-cabq.gov@maligun.erg); On Behalf Of webmaster-cabq.gov
Sent: Tuesday, October 30, 2018 10:47 AM
To: Office of Neighborhood Coordination (cabq.gov)
Cc: Neighborhood Meeting Inquiry Sheet Submission

Neighborhood Meeting Inquiry For:
Environmental Planning Commission
If you selected “Other” in the question above, please describe what you are seeking a Neighborhood Meeting Inquiry for below.

Contact Name
Jaime Jaramillo
Telephone Number
5053649801
Email Address
jaramillo@comerseplanning.com
Company Name
Comerse Planning
Company Address
302 8th Street NW 87104, Paseo del Norte and Woodmont Avenue
City
Albuquerque
State
NM
ZIP
87102

Legal description of the subject site for this project:
TR 2 BULK LAND PLAT OF THE TRAILS UNIT JA (BEING A REPLAT OF TRACTS 1 THRU 8, OS-1 & OS-2 THE TRAILS UNIT 3 & TRACT 12 THE TRAILS UNIT 2) CONT 20 2878 AC

TR 1 BULK LAND PLAT OF THE TRAILS UNIT JA (BEING A REPLAT OF TRACTS 1 THRU 8, OS-1 & OS-2 THE TRAILS UNIT 3 & TRACT 12 THE TRAILS UNIT 2) CONT 13 903 AC

Physical address of subject site
Subject site cross streets
Paseo del Norte and Woodmont Avenue
Other subject site identifiers
This site is located on the following zone atlas page:
C-08

**********************************************************************************************************************************************

This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
Dear Ms. Horvath, Mr. Hendriksen, and the Westside Coalition of Neighborhood Associations,

In accordance with the procedures of the City of Albuquerque’s Integrated Development Ordinance (IDO) Subsection 14-16-6-4(C) Neighborhood Meeting, we are providing you an opportunity to discuss a Site Plan – EPC and Zone Map Amendment per Table 6-1-1 proposed in or near your neighborhood before we submit an application. This would be an informal meeting where the project team will present the proposal, and we could discuss any ideas or concerns you may have.

Contact Information
Jaime Jaramillo 505-764-9801 or jaramillo@consensusplanning.com

Project or Development Proposal
The site is located generally near Paseo del Norte and Woodmont Avenue, see the attached Zone Atlas page. Consensus Planning, Inc. is the agent representing the requests. The application will be a Site Plan – EPC and a Zone Map Amendment that will include a site that is approximately 20 acres with approximately 77 residential single family lots. EPC review is required since the project is adjacent to Major Public Open Space (the southern edge of the project) and the IDO provides for special design requirements and includes the small zone map amendment (at the northeast corner of the property).

Per the IDO, you have 15 days from November 17, 2018 to respond, by either 1) requesting a meeting or 2) declining the meeting. If you do not respond within 15 days, you are waiving the opportunity for a Neighborhood Meeting, and we can submit our application anytime thereafter. We anticipate submitting our application to the EPC on December 28, 2018.

If you would like to meet, please let us know when your next regular WSCONA meeting is scheduled or provide a few alternative dates that fall within 30 days of your response to this email. Before submitting our application, we will send Mailed and/or Emailed Public Notice as required by IDO Table 6-1-1 to make you aware of the public hearing at which the project will be reviewed and decided by the City.

Useful Links
Integrated Development Ordinance (IDO):

IDO Interactive Map
https://tinyurl.com/IDOzoningmap

Sincerely,
Delivery to these recipients or groups is complete, but no delivery notification was sent by the destination server:

hlhen@comcast.net (hlhen@comcast.net) <mailto:hlhen@comcast.net>

Subject: IDO Pre-Application Notification - EPC Site Plan and Zone Map Amendment
Delivery to these recipients or groups is complete, but no delivery notification was sent by the destination server:

aboard10@juno.com (mailto:aboard10@juno.com)
Updated 100' Property Owner Buffer Map

Legend
- City Parcels
- Primary Streets
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  - Local Streets
- BN and SF Railroad
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Notes
Prepared 1/22/2019

The City of Albuquerque ("City") provides the data on this website as a service to the public. The City makes no warranty, representation, or guaranty as to the content, accuracy, timeliness, or completeness of any of the data provided at this website. Please visit http://www.cabq.gov/abq-data/abq-data-disclaimer-1 for more information.

THIS MAP IS NOT TO BE USED FOR NAVIGATION
Public Notice Inquiry For:

Environmental Planning Commission

If you selected "Other" in the question above, please describe what you are seeking a Public Notice Inquiry for below:

Contact Name

James Strozier

Telephone Number

5057649801

Email Address

cp@consensusplanning.com

Company Name

Consensus Planning, Inc.

Company Address

302 8th Street NW

City

Albuquerque

State

NM

ZIP

87102

Legal description of the subject site for this project:

A .45 acre portion of TR 1 and all of TR 2 BULK LAND PLAT OF THE TRAILS UNIT 3A (BEING A REPLAT OF TRACTS 1 THRU 8, OS-1 & OS-2 THE TRAILS UNIT 3 & TRACT 12 THE TRAILS UNIT 2) CONT 20.2878 AC

Physical address of subject site:

302 8th Street NW

Subject site cross streets:

South of Paseo del Norte and west of Woodmont Avenue

Other subject site identifiers:

This site is located on the following zone atlas page:

C-08
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UPC</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Owner Address</th>
<th>Owner Address 2</th>
<th>SITUS Address 2</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100806443346510201</td>
<td>WOODMONT PASEO LLC</td>
<td>2219 CHATSWORTH CT</td>
<td>HENDERSON NV 89074-5310</td>
<td>ALBUQUERQUE</td>
<td>13.9033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100906403546422301</td>
<td>WOODMONT PASEO LLC</td>
<td>2219 CHATSWORTH CT</td>
<td>HENDERSON NV 89074-5310</td>
<td>ALBUQUERQUE</td>
<td>29.3345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100906407742422302</td>
<td>TRAILS COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION INC (THE)</td>
<td>3077 E WARM SPRINGS RD</td>
<td>LAS VEGAS NV 89120-3752</td>
<td>ALBUQUERQUE</td>
<td>8.8106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100806435543010114</td>
<td>TP PASEO DEL NORTE LLC C/O THOMAS PROPERTIES</td>
<td>340 E BERGER ST</td>
<td>SANTA FE NM 87505-2669</td>
<td>ALBUQUERQUE NM</td>
<td>39.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100806451634510203</td>
<td>TRAILS COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION INC (THE)</td>
<td>3077 E WARM SPRINGS RD</td>
<td>LAS VEGAS NV 89120-3752</td>
<td>ALBUQUERQUE</td>
<td>1.0744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100806445837410202</td>
<td>WOODMONT PASEO LLC</td>
<td>2219 CHATSWORTH CT</td>
<td>HENDERSON NV 89074-5310</td>
<td>ALBUQUERQUE NM</td>
<td>20.2878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100806432826640111</td>
<td>NGUYEN TRINH T T &amp; DUC H LE</td>
<td>2828 PALO ALTO DR NE</td>
<td>ALBUQUERQUE NM 87112</td>
<td>ALBUQUERQUE</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100806450530440127</td>
<td>CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE</td>
<td>PO BOX 1293</td>
<td>ALBUQUERQUE NM 87103</td>
<td>ALBUQUERQUE</td>
<td>5.1542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100806441730540121</td>
<td>CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE</td>
<td>PO BOX 1293</td>
<td>ALBUQUERQUE NM 87103</td>
<td>ALBUQUERQUE</td>
<td>4.9212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100806446130440122</td>
<td>CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE</td>
<td>PO BOX 1293</td>
<td>ALBUQUERQUE NM 87103</td>
<td>ALBUQUERQUE</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
December 27, 2018

Property Owner:

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING
Notice is hereby given that the City of Albuquerque Environmental Planning Commission will hold a Public Hearing on Thursday, February 14, 2019 at 8:30 a.m., in the Plaza del Sol Hearing Room, Lower Level, Plaza del Sol building, 600 2nd St. NW, Albuquerque, NM to consider the following item:

EPC RULES OF CONDUCT OF BUSINESS
A copy of the Rules of Conduct is posted on the Planning Department’s website at http://www.cabq.gov/planning/boards-commissions/environmental-planning-commission and printed copies are available in the Planning Department office on the third floor of the Plaza del Sol Building, 600 Second Street NW. For more information, please contact Russell Brito, Current Planning Division Manager, at (505) 924-3337 or at rbrito@cabq.gov.

Staff reports and supplemental materials are posted on the City website, https://www.cabq.gov/planning/boards-commissions/environmental-planning-commission/epc-staff-reports, on Thursday, January 3, 2019.

REQUEST
Consensus Planning, agent for PV Trails Albuquerque, LLC., requests a Zone Map Amendment and Site Plan - EPC for portions of Tracts 1 and 2, Unit 3A, The Trails subdivision. The property is zoned R1-D, R1-B, and R-ML. The property is west of Woodmont Avenue NW and south of Paseo del Norte. The project area is approximately 21 acres. The request is for two offsetting zone changes, one from R1-B to R-ML and the other from R-ML to R1-B to “clean up” the zoning on either side of the proposed east-west roadway separating the two and a Site Plan to allow for a 78-lot, single-family subdivision. The project includes a single loaded street and open space buffer adjacent to the Major Public Open Space to the south.

If you have questions or need additional information regarding this request contact Mr. Russell Brito, City Planning at (505) 924-3337 or at rbrito@cabq.gov.

Sincerely,

Consensus Planning, Inc.
December 27, 2018

Westside Coalition of Neighborhood Associations
Harry Hendrickson
10592 Rio del Sol NW
Albuquerque, NM 87114

Rene Horvath
5515 Palomino Drive NW
Albuquerque, NM 87120

Dear Neighborhood Association Representatives:

This letter is notification that Consensus Planning has submitted an application for a Zone Map Amendment and Site Plan to the Environmental Planning Commission (EPC) on behalf of the property owner, PV Trails Albuquerque, LLC. The applicant is proposing a single-family subdivision consisting of 78 homes on lots ranging from a minimum of 10,000 square feet adjacent to the Petroglyph National Monument and approximately 6,500 square feet for the balance of the lots.

The properties proposed for the zone change are zoned R1-B and R-ML. The purpose of the zone change is to align the zoning district boundaries with the proposed east-west roadway. The single-family homes are a permissive use in the R-ML, but it is preferred to not have any lots with two zoning districts. The portion north of the roadway is proposed to change from R1-B to R-ML for the same reason. The properties affected by the zone change total 1.03 acres, .45 acres from R-ML to R1-B and .58 acres from R1-B to R-ML.

The site plan is for the portion of the property south of the east-west roadway. The layout includes the required single loaded street and additional open space buffering adjacent to the Monument boundary. There is also a small rock outcropping near the main entry to the subdivision that will be preserved within a small pocket park. The total site plan area is approximately 20.4 acres.

The project will be heard by the EPC on Thursday, February 14 beginning at 8:30 am in the basement of the Plaza Del Sol Building, located at 600 2nd Street NW.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions, would like to meet, or desire any additional information. Under the IDO, anyone may request, and the City may require an applicant to attend a City-sponsored facilitated meeting with Neighborhood Associations, based on the complexity and potential impacts of a proposed project (IDO Section 14-16-6-4(D)). Visit: https://www.cabq.gov/planning/urban-design-development/facilitated-meetings-for-proposed-development/ to view and download the Facilitated Meetings Criteria. If you wish to request a Facilitated Meeting regarding this project, contact the Planning Department at devhelp@cabq.gov or 505.924.3955.

Per IDO Section 14-16-6-6-4(D)(2), “If a facilitated meeting is required by the City, the City shall assign a facilitator, who shall attempt to schedule the facilitated meeting within 15
consecutive days. The meeting shall occur within a period of 7 consecutive days prior to the next scheduled hearing or meeting of the decision-making body.”

I am attaching a pdf of the site plan, landscape plan, and a zoning exhibit. If you wish to review a full size printed copy, please contact Russell Brito at the Planning Department to make arrangements to review the file. He can be reached at (505) 924-3860 or rbrito@cabq.gov. You may also contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

James K. Strozier, FAICP
Principal

c: Site Plan and Landscape Plan (11 x 17)
Zone Change Exhibit\
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Project #: 2018-001198
Property Description: All or a portion of Tract 1 & Tract 2, Bulk Land Plat of The Trails, Unit 3A, zoned R-ML and R1B to R-ML and R-1B, located at Woodmont Ave., NW, between Petroglyph National Monument and Paseo del Norte NW., containing 20.4 acres.

Date Submitted: February 1, 2019
Submitted By: Philip Crump

Meeting Date/Time: January 30, 2019; 6:00 PM
Meeting Location: Paradise Hills Community Center
5901 Paradise Blvd. NW

Facilitator: Philip Crump
Co-facilitator: Jessie Lawrence

Parties (individual names and affiliations of attendees are listed at the end of the report):
- Applicant:
  o PV Trails Albuquerque LLC
- Agent:
  o Consensus Planning
- Affected Neighborhood Associations (*per CABQ notification requirements):
  o *Westside Coalition of Neighborhood Associations (WSC)
  o Paradise Hills Civic Association (PHCA)
  o Taylor Ranch Neighborhood Association (TRNA)

Background/Meeting Summary:
Applicant requests Environmental Planning Commission (EPC) approval of a zone map amendment and site development plan for property located at Tract 1 & Tract 2, Bulk Land Plat of The Trails, Unit 3A, zoned R-ML and R1B to R-ML and R-1B, located at Woodmont Ave., NW, between Petroglyph National Monument and Paseo del Norte NW., containing 20.4 acres. Applicant intends to develop a 78-lot single-family residential subdivision. This is within the larger Trails development.

Meeting participants in attendance had many questions about the project and asked for the applicant to consider a number of ideas to improve the quality of life in the area, including more trail and public space amenities and preservation of the views and natural features. There were concerns about the widths of internal streets and whether they would be wide enough to accommodate parking on both sides of the street.

There were several suggestions voiced by the participants, including:
- preserve more land,
• design the development to better protect the views,
• create more park space,
• limit the amount of two-story construction, and
• use decorative plants native to the Petroglyph National Monument in the landscaping rather than using non-native plants.

Several people said they thought a more complete traffic analysis should be done, as the analysis that was originally done for the Trails is dated and regional traffic is likely to increase through the area.

Meeting participants also expressed concerns about the Integrated Development Ordinance (herinafter, “IDO”) and how its implementation is affecting the information that neighbors and the public receive about planned projects. They noted that they are getting less information than they did in the past, and don’t see visual depictions of architectural or design elements that may have a large impact on how a project will affect their community. They also had concern that there was not sufficient documentation of the protection of the rock outcrops, and there should be requirements for more documentation and public information generally.

As a follow up item, the project agent said that he would clarify the capacity of the nearby schools; at the meeting, it was unclear whether the schools have available capacity or are currently over capacity.

A complete summary of questions and concerns is included in the Meeting Specifics.

Outcomes:
- **Areas of Agreement**
  o None noted among all meeting participants.
- **Unresolved Issues & Concerns**
  o Meeting participants suggested that for this project, the applicant consider:
    ▪ Increasing the amount of public space.
    ▪ Limiting the amount of two-story development to better protect views.
    ▪ Better design of the street width or restricted parking.
    ▪ Using plants that are native to the Petroglyph National Monument for landscaping, particularly for the buffer area.
  o Meeting participants also said that there is a need for more park space in the larger area and a need for an updated complete traffic analysis.
- **Other Key Points**
  o Meeting participants said that they have increasing concerns how they are discovering that they are receiving less information about projects under the IDO. They also said that there is not enough of a requirement for documentation of analysis and plans, e.g., of a plan to preserve the rock outcrop.

Meeting Specifics:
All questions and comments from neighbors and other meeting participants in attendance are indicated with a Q. Answers are provided by various members of the applicant team, and the
CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE LAND USE FACILITATION PROGRAM
PROJECT MEETING REPORT 2018-001198

individual answering is identified if it is necessary for clarity. Q1, Q2, Q3, etc. indicate different neighbors discussing a common question or comment.

1) Overview of Proposed Project
    a) Jim Strozier, Principal at Consensus Planning and Agent, provided the overview of the project requests to the EPC.
    b) The zone map amendment request is to clean up the zoning so there is consistent zoning on either side of the planned east-west roadway.
        i) After the change, the zoning on the north side of the roadway will be R-ML, and the zoning on the south side of the roadway will be R1-B.
            (1) Without the change, there are small pieces of land with inconsistent zoning.
        ii) Slightly more property, .13 acres, is changed to R-ML than what is changed to R1-B.
    c) The site plan requires EPC review because it is adjacent to major public open space.
        i) There are 78 home sites.
        ii) All of the lots will be single-family.
        iii) A southern strip of approximately 200 feet of the property has R1-D zoning.
            (1) These will be larger lots, 10,000 square feet to 14,996 square feet.
        iv) R1-B zoning makes up the balance of the property.
            (1) These lots will range from 6,612 square feet to over 11,000 square feet.
            (2) The smallest lots are larger than the minimum required by the zoning.
        v) The largest lot is at the northeast corner of Manresa Dr. and Tarragano Rd.
        vi) Because of the adjacency to Petroglyph National Monument, there is a single-loaded street along the south boundary.
            (1) There is also an open space buffer between the street and the monument.
                (a) Agent stated that he believed the buffer ranged from approximately 20 feet to more than 60 feet.
        vii) There is a small rock outcropping near the entry, which will be preserved with about .25-acre private open space owned and maintained by the HOA.
        viii) Petroglyph National Monument has just finished its visitor user management plan, indicating that there will be no direct access into the monument from this edge.
        ix) The land adjacent to the southeast corner of the site is zoned NR-PO-C, and is private open space owned and maintained by the Trails community association which connects to the open space network that runs through the Trails development as a whole.

2) Questions and Concerns about Street Width
    a) Agent stated that Woodmont has a 98-foot right of way and 60 feet from curb face to curb face, with bike lanes and an eight-foot trail on the northeast side.
        i) Girona Avenue is a 51-foot right of way and 30 feet from curb face to curb face.
        ii) The internal residential streets are 47-foot right of way and 28 feet from curb face to curb face.
    b) Q: Is there sidewalk circulation within the community?
        i) There are sidewalks on all of the streets.
        ii) Woodmont has a sidewalk on the southwest side and a trail on the northeast side, and has bike lanes.
    c) Q: How wide are the sidewalks in the community?
i) Four feet, meeting the city standard.

d) Q: Will parking be single loaded or restricted?
   i) 28 feet allows parking on both sides.
      (1) There was disagreement from neighbors about whether this is the case.

e) Q: We’re seeing more narrowing of streets as a trend, and we’re seeing that the streets are more crowded because of it.
   i) Those are the City standards for residential streets.
   ii) Within the last 5-7 years, the City widened the right of way for residential streets to 47 feet.

3) Questions and Concerns about Open Space, View Preservation, and Trails Connections

a) Q: How wide is the NR-PO-C open space adjacent to the site?
   i) About 150 feet.
   ii) The open space widens and narrows throughout the open space network.

b) Q: On a prior map of the Trails it looks like the trail system heads toward a park, but there’s no park there now.
   i) There was supposed to be a park on the south side of Oak Ridge north of the Cantata development, but the City said they did not want that and it was rezoned to multi-family.
   ii) There is a public park at the southwest corner of Rainbow and Tree Line.
      (1) The trail system connects to that park and will be extended to this property.

c) Q: Is there a trail to the schools at all?
   i) There’s a trail along Rainbow that goes to Tony Hillerman MS, but there isn’t information about the internal circulation at the schools.

d) Q: What is the landscaping plant material immediately adjacent to Petroglyph National Monument?
   i) E.g., desert willow and New Mexico olive
   ii) Q: Is the Montecito Estates landscaping a good comparison?
      (1) Yes, that’s a good comparison.
      iii) Q2: The plant selection adjacent to the edge should be consistent with the native species within the monument. The monument has completed a pretty extensive biological diversity study and there are many decorative plants that would be appropriate. Bringing in non-native species is a problem.
         (1) We can look into that.

e) Q: Have you analyzed the rock outcrops and figured out how to preserve them?
   i) It will be a private open space and natural area and designed to be maintained in its natural condition.
   ii) Q: IDO says there should be analysis of site constraints related to sensitive lands.
      This should be documented for the public process and documented for future users of the land to understand how to treat it.

f) Q: The 2-3 lots to the south of the rock outcrop and the lots across the street could be used to make something more park-like and a trail connection to the open space, connecting it to the trail that leads eastward.

g) Q: This area is unique because of Petroglyph National Monument. There are a lot of petroglyphs in that geological window. I do think you need more amenities, more
preservation of natural resources to blend in. People enjoy that, they enjoy trail connections, and they also need parks. The density has to be balanced with amenities and preservation of natural features. This is a spectacular view area, and protect those views. And also consider traffic. You want to consider quality of life.

4) **Questions and Concerns about Building Heights**
   a) Buildings will have 26-foot height limits and can be either single or two-story.
   b) Q: Isn’t there some rule about only a portion of a house being as tall at 26 feet? Along the escarpment edge with the overlay?
      i) Portions of the overlay zones do have height restrictions, but this is not within that part of the overlay.
      ii) There are character protection overlay requirements that will need to be followed, including color, reflectivity, and roof-mounted equipment, and references to those requirements are noted on the site plans.
   c) Q: There should be consideration to limit the amount that can be built as two stories to protect the views for everyone, rather than just those adjacent to the monument.

5) **Questions and Concerns about Density**
   a) Q: In Paradise Hills, there is a long history of subdivisions being replatted and lot sizes getting smaller. How can we have confidence that won’t happen here?
      i) Our intent is to get the necessary approvals and then build houses.
      ii) If something happened and someone else came in, anyone who wanted to do something different would have to go through the approval process unless it was a minor change.
   b) Q: The trend has been for lots to get smaller, and we’re looking for more neighborhood amenities, because as we get more dense, the idea is to preserve more.
      i) Sometimes we’ll do a project with small lots and more open space; in this case, we have lots that are larger than the minimum required.
   c) Q: The IDO is forcing density in places where it makes little ecological sense. Here, if you had less density and more opportunities to view the monument, it could increase the land value of the properties.
      i) We’re hearing that consumers want to live in this area because of the schools and because of the sidewalks and trails.
      (1) Q2: Because you have families, if you had parkland as an amenity, I think it would be valuable.

6) **Questions and Concerns about School Capacity**
   a) Agent provided student generation numbers from APS that indicated that Tony Hillerman MS and Volcano Vista HS were slightly over capacity and Tierra Antigua ES was greatly over capacity. He said those numbers might be incorrect and would follow up with clarification.
      i) The project is estimated to generate 38 new students across all grades.
   b) Q: These schools are already at capacity, and this wouldn’t add a tremendous number of students, but these are already some of the largest schools in APS.
7) **Questions and Concerns about Traffic**
   a) Agent stated that the project does not meet the threshold for a Traffic Impact Study.
      i) The project is coordinating with the City regarding the Woodmont extension and the intersection at Paseo del Norte.
      ii) The builders would pay impact fees.
   b) Q: Traffic changes over time. Traffic engineers haven’t looked at new capacity studies because of these changes?
      i) This application does not warrant further analysis. If there is multi-family or more density, those projects will likely meet the threshold.
   c) Q: Much of the traffic coming through this area might be coming from areas that are not under the jurisdiction of the City, and there should be more regional overview.
   d) Q: This is in an area where right now there is no other traffic being generated.
   e) Q: You are building Woodmont?
      i) Yes. It’s already dedicated right of way.

8) **Questions and Concerns about Drainage**
   a) Agent stated that there is a grading and drainage plan that includes street drainage and a storm drain and will go into a series of ponds, including temporary ponds to the north and to the west.
      i) There is no water allowed to drain into Petroglyph National Monument.
   b) Q: How are you designing the ponds? Some look nice, and some are really ugly.
      i) They will be similar in character to others in the Trails open space.
      ii) They will need to meet the standards of the existing Trails HOA, and the HOA will maintain them.
   c) Q: Does the street along the open space help with stormwater runoff?
      i) It helps, but the only water going along that boundary is water generated along the south edge.
      ii) Water is primarily draining north or east.

9) **Questions and Concerns about HOA Responsibilities**
   a) Q: Is this community going to be part of The Trails?
      i) Yes. It will be annexed into the Trails community association.
   b) Q: Will the streets, water, and sewer be city services?
      i) Yes, there will be public streets and public utilities.
      ii) The landscaped areas, buffer, and rock outcrop area will be maintained by the HOA.

10) **Other Questions and Concerns**
    a) Q: Who is the landowner?
      i) The landowner is PV Trails LLC.
      ii) Q: Is that a private local LLC?
         (1) It is owned by a private equity firm based on San Diego.
         (2) There is a team of local consultants to help develop about 110 acres that they own, most of the balance of the planned Trails development.
         (3) The property that they own is most of the balance of the undeveloped Trails property, up to Paseo del Norte and to the city limits.
b) Q: It used to be, when a site plan like this came to the EPC, there would be design guidelines and graphics that would be part of the approval process. I see that you’re still supposed to do that. Where is it?
i) The new site plan process does not include all of the requirements that were on the old Site Plan for Subdivision checklist.
ii) We’re addressing things on the plan and in the letter to the City and making reference to the IDO requirements.
iii) Q1: Why are there not site design guidelines any more that show how the rules from the IDO are being implemented?
   (1) When the rules are in the IDO, they aren’t requiring them to be repeated on the site plan.
   (2) EPC will review the site plan and staff will review the individual building permit applications and make sure they’re consistent with the IDO.
iv) Q1: I think the information is getting too reduced in the site planning process. There are certain reasons why this goes to the EPC and not administrative review. There are a lot of provisions for a site adjacent to or within 300 feet of major public open space, and we’re not seeing those provisions. All of these details need to be more transparent.
   (1) I believe that staff is trying to make things more consistent, and seeking consistency with the specific regulations within the IDO.
v) Q2: You have an ordinance and an ability to express yourself within that ordinance, and people with an investment in the community want to see how you’re expressing yourself within the ordinance.
vii) Q2: When there is a provision for public input at facilitated meetings, the public needs enough information to understand the plan. A verbal expression is not the same as being able to see a picture on paper.

c) Q: Do the possibilities for fencing along Petroglyph National Monument include wrought iron?
i) There is an existing post and wire fence, and we’re leaving the existing fence and not adding another fence.
ii) Q: Those fences are often cut, and it’s a very porous boundary, especially with a subdivision.
   (1) We hope the people living there will help monitor the area.

d) Q: Do you have a builder for the site?
i) Not yet.
ii) Q: I’ve seen some subdivisions with custom looks and lots of architectural detail, and some subdivisions where all the houses look alike. What are we looking at here?
   (1) It’s market driven, and it’s important to recognize that we need housing at all price points and with different levels of customization.
   (2) The IDO carried over the architectural guidelines from the Volcano Trails Sector Development Plan.
   (3) There are also design guidelines in place for the Trails master association, and any builder would also have to comply with those guidelines.
iii) Q: Are you in the Volcano Mesa Character Protection Overlay?
   (1) Yes.

Application Hearing Details:
1) The Environmental Planning Commission (EPC) is an appointed, 9-member, volunteer citizen board with authority on many land use and planning issues. The EPC was formed in 1972 per City of Albuquerque Ordinance #294-1972. Members:
   • Derek Bohannan, Chair, Council District 5
   • Bill McCoy III, Vice Chair, Council District 9
   • Dan Serrano, Council District 1
   • Richard Meadows, Council District 2
   • Joseph Cruz, Council District 3
   • Robert Stetson, Council District 4
   • Maia Mullen, Council District 6
   • David Shaffer, Council District 7
   • Karen Hudson, Chair, Council District 8
2) Hearing Time:
   i. The hearing is scheduled for February 14, 2019.
   ii. The Commission will begin hearing applications at 8:30 a.m.
   iii. The actual time this application will be heard by the Commission will depend on the applicant’s position on the Commission’s schedule.
3) Hearing Process:
   i. Comments from facilitated meetings will go into a report which goes to the City Planner.
   ii. The facilitated meeting report is included in the staff report and may be used to recommend conditions.
   iii. The Commission will make a decision and parties have 15 days to appeal the decision.
4) Comment Submission:
   i. Comments may be sent to:
      Cheryl Somerfeldt, Staff Planner
      600 2nd Street NW, Third Floor
      Albuquerque, NM 87102
      csomerfeldt@cabq.gov
      (505) 924-3860
      OR
      Derek Bohannan, Chair, EPC
      Bill McCoy III, Vice Chair, EPC
      c/o Planning Department
Names and Affiliations of All Attendees:

- Garret Price  
  Price Land Development Group
- Scott Steffen  
  Price Land Development Group
- Jim Strozier  
  Consensus Planning
- Elizabeth Haley  
  Paradise Hills Civic Assn
- Pete Reser  
  Paradise Hills Civic Assn
- René Horvath  
  Taylor Ranch NA, Westside Coalition
- Jolene Wolfley  
  Taylor Ranch NA
- Becky Johnson  
  Area Resident
SITE PLANS
LANDSCAPE CONCEPT

PLANNING AND PROVIDING OF LANDSCAPING FOR CATALONIA WILL BE IN CONFORMANCE WITH THE CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE ZONING CODE, POLICY ORDINANCE, AND THE WATER/CONSERVATION LANDSCAPING AND WATER SAVE ORDINANCE. IN GENERAL, WATER CONSERVATIVE, ENVIRONMENTALLY SOUND LANDSCAPE PRINCIPLES WILL BE FOLLOWED IN DESIGN AND INSTALLATION.

STREET TREE ORDINANCE REQUIREMENTS

STREET TREE ORNAMENTAL HEDGE, STREET TREE, AND AS SUCH FALLS UNDER THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE STREET TREE ORDINANCE, STREETS WITHIN CATALONIA ARE CLASSIFIED AS LOCAL STREETS AND DO NOT FALL UNDER THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE STREET TREE ORDINANCE.

Landscape Planting Notes

LANDSCAPE PLANTING NOTES

A. THE WATER RETENTION BASIN SHALL BE TWICE THE PLANTING PIT DIAMETER, FORMED WITH NO OBTRUSIVE EDGES.

B. THE EDGES OF THE WATER RETENTION BASIN SHALL BE SMOOTHLY NOTED:

   6' OR 8'

C. REMOVE ROPE AND BURLAP AFTER PLANTING.

PLANT TREE ROOT COLLAR 12"-15" LONG MIN., NOTCH 10' FOR TALL COLUMNAR (8' FOR MULTI OR CANOPY, 1"-2" ABOVE FINISH GRADE)

REMOVE AIR POCKETS BACKSIDE OF POLY TUBING.

STAKES DRIVEN AT ANGLE STRESS POINT OF TREE.

3" LAYER OF ROCK MULCH (ROCK OUTCROP)

4" WATER RETENTION BASIN

5/8" BLACK POLY TUBING, 5/8" BLACK POLY TUBING

5-STRAND SMOOTH WIRE WITH OPEN SPACE, TYP. FENCE AT BOUNDARY

PRIVATE YARD LANDSCAPE NOTES:

1. TREES: 2 INCH CALIPER MEASURED 6 INCHES ABOVE GRADE, OR 10 TO 12 FEET IN HEIGHT.

2. SHRUBS AND EVERGREENS: 1 GALLON

3. GROUND COVER AND TURF GRASSES: PROVIDE GENERAL COVERAGE WITHIN 1 GROWING SEASON AFTER INSTALLATION.

4. PLANTS: (6) 5-GALLON SHRUB/GRASSES; AND (5) 1-GALLON GROUNDCOVERS.

GENERAL PLANTING NOTES:

1. PLANTS; (6) 5-GALLON SHRUB/GRASSES; AND (5) 1-GALLON GROUNDCOVERS.

MAINTENANCE

MAINTENANCE OF THE STREET TREES ALONG MOONLIGHT, THE LANDSCAPE WHICH IS LOCATED IN THE PRIVATE OPEN SPACE TRACTS (INCLUDING ASSOCIATED PARKWAY STRIPS); SHALL BE MAINTAINED BY THE THE TRAILS COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION.

MAINTENANCE OF THE STREET TREES ALONG WOODMONT, AND THE LANDSCAPE WHICH IS LOCATED IN THE PRIVATE OPEN SPACE TRACTS (INCLUDING ASSOCIATED PARKWAY STRIPS); SHALL BE MAINTAINED BY THE TRAILS COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION. MAINTENANCE OF THE PLANTINGS WITHIN THE PARKWAY STRIP AND FRONT YARDS, SHALL BE THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE INDIVIDUAL LOT OWNER.

PLANT PALETTE

- 15-GALLON EVERGREEN TREE; (1) 5-GALLON SHRUB; (3) 5-GALLON ACCENT

- 2 INCH CALIPER MEASURED 6 INCHES ABOVE GRADE, OR 10 TO 12 FEET IN HEIGHT.

- 1 GALLON

- PROVIDE GENERAL COVERAGE WITHIN 1 GROWING SEASON AFTER INSTALLATION.

- (6) 5-GALLON SHRUB/GRASSES; AND (5) 1-GALLON GROUNDCOVERS.

- PLANTS; (6) 5-GALLON SHRUB/GRASSES; AND (5) 1-GALLON GROUNDCOVERS.

- (ROCK OUTCROP)

- DESERT SAGE (L)

- DESERT PURPLE SAGE (L+)

- WHITE ROCK SODIUM 4 X 4 MIN.

- NATURAL AREA TO BE PERMANENTLY UNGRADED DURING CONSTRUCTION TO THE EXTENT POSSIBLE. UNGRADED AREAS SHALL BE MAINTAINED IMAGE CONFORM IN THE EXISTING CONDITIONS.

Prepared By: Consensus Planning, Inc. Bohannan Huston, Inc.

Prepared For: PV Trails Albuquerque, LLC