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Applicant: Vermont Hills Properties LLC

Request: Zone Map Amendment

Legal Description: all or a portion of Tract B, Block 2 (less 27 ft out to R/W), Wells Sandia Manor

Camino de La Sierra NE, between Trimble Blvd. NE and Camino de La Sierra NE

Location: Approx. 4 acres

Existing Zoning: PD

Proposed Zoning: R-1D (for approx. 1 acre)

Staff Recommendation

APPROVAL of Project # 2018-001417 (1003699), Case # RZ-2018-00023 based on the Findings included within this report

Staff Planner: Carol Toffaleti

Summary of Analysis

The request is to rezone 1 acre at the east end of a 4-acre parcel from PD to R-1D. Subject to approval of the zone change, the applicant would replat the property and proposes to develop the 1 acre with a small church. The site is located in the Foothills area near I-40, on the edge of a single-family residential neighborhood and within an Area of Consistency.

The request was deferred from the Sept. 2018 hearing to complete required notice.

The applicant has adequately justified the request per IDO Subsection 14-16-6-7(F)(3). It furthers a preponderance of applicable Comprehensive Plan goals and policies and is more advantageous to the community because it matches adjacent zoning. The remote location and traffic impacts of the proposed permissive use would be mitigated by its smaller scale, off-peak activities, and the good road connectivity within the neighborhood.

Comments from 8 nearby property-owners were received opposing the request, and their issues have been addressed in the staff report for EPC consideration. No comment was received from the Supper Rock NA.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Surrounding zoning, plan designations, and land uses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Comprehensive Plan Area; Applicable Rank II &amp; III Plans</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>PD (Planned Development)</td>
<td>Area of Consistency; none</td>
<td>Vacant, undeveloped land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>R-1D (Residential, Single-family)</td>
<td>Area of Consistency; none</td>
<td>Single-family dwellings, one vacant lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>Area of Consistency; none</td>
<td>NMDOT right-of-way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>R-1D (Residential, Single-family)</td>
<td>Area of Consistency; none</td>
<td>Single-family dwellings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>PD (Planned Development)</td>
<td>Area of Consistency; none</td>
<td>Vacant, undeveloped land</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposal

This is a request to rezone the eastern 1 acre of an approximately 4 acre vacant parcel (Tract B, Block 2 (less 27 ft out to R/W), Wells Sandia Manor) in the Supper Rock neighborhood from PD to R-1D. The applicant, who owns Tract B, wishes to develop the 1 acre portion (the subject site) in the shorter term to build a church of approximately 5,000 sf. The existing congregation that has been meeting at 305 Vermont St. NE for the last 30 years would move to the new location.

The applicant has stated that they are affiliated with this independent Church of Christ, have no development plans for the remainder of the parcel, and will seek to sell the remainder to a residential developer.

The existing PD zone requires that specific land uses be identified and a Site Plan reviewed and approved by the EPC. The proposed R-1D zone district matches the zoning of adjoining properties and the desired use as a Religious institution is permissive in R-1D. Eventual platting and development of the subject site would be handled separately from the zone change request and according to all applicable regulations in the IDO.

The applicant has provided an exhibit in plan view (Exhibit A) showing the approximate dimensions of the 1 acre they wish to remove from Tract B and rezone.
EPC Role

Per IDO Subsection 14-16-6-7(F)(1)(a)(1), the EPC has authority to make a decision on this Zoning Map Amendment request for the subject site. The case is a quasi-judicial matter.

History/Background

The pre-IDO zoning for Tract B and Tract C, the adjacent triangular parcel west of Trimble Blvd., was SU-1/PRD (Planned Residential Development). The zoning generally allowed residential uses and up to 25% of the total gross floor as office or commercial uses, but actual uses were specified in the accompanying site development plan.

In 1996, the EPC approved a site development plan for Tracts B and C, subject to conditions, for a townhouse development with 42 dwelling units and lots (Z-96-25, 4/25/1996). The EPC decision was appealed by neighbors, upheld by City Council, and taken to District Court where the appeal was dismissed.

Final sign-off at the Development Review Board (DRB) was deferred over a period of several years, partly due to discussions with NMDOT, and no development occurred.

In 2005, a site development plan for subdivision for Tracts B and C was approved by the DRB for 27 single-family detached dwellings (Project # 1003699, Case #05DRB-01118, 7/19/2005), i.e. fewer units than in the 1996 plan and detached rather than attached dwellings. The site development plan noted the zoning as “SU-1/PRD, 10 DUs/acre”. Again, no development occurred and the site development plan expired 7 years after approval, per §14-16-3-11(C) in the Zoning Code that was in effect at the time.

The SU-1/PRD zoning indicated in AGIS was converted to PD (Planned Development) under the IDO that went into effect on May 17, 2018. The conversion of the property’s zoning followed conversion Rule 4 (d) because it is vacant and less than 20 acres. See https://abc-zone.com/document/ido-su-1-and-r-d-conversion-table.

Context

Tract B including the subject site is vacant undeveloped land, crossed by informal vehicular tracks, with native vegetation and rock visible in some areas. Tract B generally slopes down from northeast to southwest. The subject site slopes down from an elevation of approximately 5790 ft at its north east corner to 5760 ft at its south west corner (see page 2 of the applicant’s letter.)

An unpaved public alley runs along the north side of Tract B between Camino de la Serra and Trimble Blvd. North of the alley and subject site are a vacant lot and two single-family detached dwellings that face Arcadia Rd.
To the east of the subject site is Camino de la Serra ending in a cul-de-sac and a concrete drainage way that discharges below the subject site. Four single-family detached dwellings face the subject site on the east side of Camino de la Serra. Behind these houses lies the City’s Sandia Foothills Open Space.

South of the subject site is NMDOT right-of-way that includes an old roadway and a tear-drop shaped parcel. (See additional staff information for NMDOT input about this land.) Westbound I-40 and the off-ramp for Tramway Blvd. and Central Ave. (Interchange #167) are a little further south.

To the west of the subject site is the rest of Tract B and Trimble Blvd. that, like Camino de la Serra, is a dead-end street.

The subject property is at the southern edge of the Supper Rock neighborhood located between Tramway Blvd. and the Foothills of the Sandias and accessed off Tramway on Encantado Rd. and Copper Ave. The road network within the neighborhood is fairly dense and well connected.

**Roadway System**

The Long Range Roadway System (LRRS 2040) map, produced by the Mid-Region Council of Governments (MRCOG), identifies the classifications of roadways, from Minor Collectors to Interstates.

Camino de la Serra and other roadways in the vicinity of the subject site are local streets and are not designated in the LRRS.

Encatado Rd. is designated a Minor Collector, eastward up to Mel Smith Dr. within the Supper Rock neighborhood.

Copper Ave. is designated a Minor Collector, eastward up to Turner Dr. within the Supper Rock neighborhood.

**Comprehensive Plan Corridor Designation**

Tramway Blvd., a Commuter Corridor designated in the Comprehensive Plan, is approximately 2/3 mile away.

I-40 and its off-ramp, also a designated Commuter Corridor, are near the subject site, but not accessible from it.

**Trails/Bikeways**

The Long Range Bikeway System (LRBS 2040) map, produced by the Mid-Region Council of Governments (MRCOG), identifies existing and proposed bikeways and trails. There is an existing bike route along Encatado Rd. and Turner Dr. in the northern part of the neighborhood and an existing paved trail along Tramway Blvd. that connects with several bikeways south of I-40.
The 365 Foothills Trail in the Sandia Foothills Open Space is accessible from a bend in Camino de la Serra at a distance of approximately 700 ft from the northeast corner of the subject site. Another trail in the Open Space is accessible from the old road located in NMDOT right-of-way at a distance of approximately 400 ft from the southeast corner of the subject site.

Transit
Refer to Transit Agency comments.

Public Facilities/Community Services
Please refer to the Public Facilities Map near the front of staff report for a complete listing of public facilities and community services located within one mile of the subject site.

II. ANALYSIS of APPLICABLE ORDINANCES, PLANS AND POLICIES

Albuquerque Integrated Development Ordinance

Existing Zoning
The IDO zoning of Tract B, including the subject site, is PD (Planned Development). Per IDO Subsection 14-16-2-6(A), “the purpose of the PD zone district is to accommodate small- and medium-scale innovative projects that cannot be accommodated through the use of other base zone districts, provided that those projects are consistent with the Albuquerque/Bernalillo County Comprehensive Plan (ABC Comp Plan), as amended and include standards that would not otherwise be required of the applicant in order to provide significant public, civic, or natural resource benefits. This zone district is applied on a case-by-case basis to reflect a negotiated agreement for uses and standards with the applicant. Allowable uses are negotiated on a case-by-case basis but may not include any use that is not included in Table 4-2-1.”

Per Subsection 14-16-2-6(A)(3)(a), PD zone district must contain at least 2 but less than 20 contiguous acres. The proposed rezoning of 1 acre of Tract B would leave a PD zone of more than 2 acres, which complies with this IDO regulation.

Future development of the property under PD zoning would require the applicant to propose site-specific uses and standards for EPC review and decision along with a Site Plan, per Subsection 14-16-2-6(A)(3).

Proposed Zoning
The proposed zoning of the subject site is R-1D (Residential – Single-family) like all surrounding properties, with the exception of the remainder of Tract B and Tract C across Trimble Blvd. and under the same ownership. Per IDO Subsection 14-16-2-3(B)(1) “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. …Primary land uses include single-family detached homes on individual lots, with limited civic and institutional uses to serve the surrounding residential area.”

The “D” in R-1D refers to one of the various R-1 lot types (A, B, C, and D). The R-1D zone has the largest minimum lot size, lot width, and setback standards in the R-1 zone as summarized in Table 2-3-3.

All allowable uses in the R-1 zone are listed in Table 4-2-1 and as further specified in any applicable use-specific standard listed in the right-hand column of the table. For example, under the Civic and Institutional Category, a Religious institution is allowed permissively (indicated with a P) in R-1 but is also regulated per Use-Specific Standard 14-16-4-3(C)(9).

There are major differences between the current and proposed zoning. Any uses, use-specific standards, and development standards for the existing PD zone district would remain unknown until an applicant submits a site-specific proposal to the City with all those details for review and decision by the EPC.

On the other hand, the proposed R-1D zone is a base zone district. The allowable uses in R-1D and any use-specific standards are established in IDO Part 14-16-4. Future development would be governed by dimensional standards specific to R-1 and city-wide standards listed in Table 2-3-4. The Site Plan would be reviewed and decided administratively.

Due to the subject site’s location within 330 feet of Major Public Open Space, standards in Subsection 14-16-5-2(H)(1) will apply to future development regardless of the zoning. The controls for colors of structures, landscaping, and location of signage are intended to enhance and protect the MPOS.

If the EPC approves the request, staff recommends a finding about the necessity for a replat to align the zone district with a parcel boundary, as shown approximately on Exhibit A of the application packet.
The subject site is located in an Area of Consistency designated by the Comprehensive Plan. Applicable Goals and Policies include:

Chapter 4: Community Identity

GOAL 4.1 Character: Enhance, protect, and preserve distinct communities.

POLICY 4.1.2 Identity and Design: Protect the identity and cohesiveness of neighborhoods by ensuring the appropriate scale and location of development, mix of uses, and character of building design.

The zone change will protect the identity and cohesiveness of the neighborhood because the proposed zone will provide appropriate character of building design. The site will provide for a cohesive addition to the neighborhood and a transition to the Planned Development uses of the remainder of the lot.

The request furthers Goal 4.1 and Policy 4.1.2 because R-1D zoning will protect the identity and cohesiveness of the surrounding neighborhood, which is predominantly single-family residential, by extending the same IDO standards regarding scale of development and character of building design to the 1-acre site as on adjacent properties zoned R-1D.

Chapter 5: Land Use

GOAL 5.2 Complete Communities: Foster communities where residents can live, work, learn, shop, and play together.

This goal is met by the zone change because the proposed use of the property is community gathering hall for religious activities.

The requested zone change from PD to R-1D furthers Goal 5.2 by facilitating development of 1 acre for allowable uses in R-1D including the proposed church use, which fosters a more complete community.

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

SUBPOLICY 5.2.1 a) Encourage development and redevelopment that brings goods, services, and amenities within walking and biking distance of neighborhoods and promotes good access for all residents.

The proposed zone and use of the property as a church creates a mix of uses that are conveniently accessible from the surrounding neighborhood.
The request partially furthers Policy 5.2.1. and Subpolicy 5.2.1.a by extending R-1D to the subject site and enabling development of uses allowable in the zone district that, in addition to Residential uses, include limited Civic and Institutional uses such as a Religious institution, which would add to the mix of uses in the neighborhood.

However, the location of the subject site is at the southeast corner of the neighborhood and near the eastern edge of the city where I-40 and MPOS are barriers to convenient access from the South and East, which may not promote good access for all residents for Civic and Institutional uses.

Staff believes that the following policy is also applicable to the request:

SUBPOLICY 5.2.1 h) Encourage infill development that adds complementary uses and is compatible in form and scale to the immediately surrounding development.

The request for the R-1D base zone district furthers Subpolicy 5.2.1 h) by facilitating infill development in a form and at a scale that are compatible to the surrounding residential development. The site has remained vacant and undeveloped for over 30 years under the previous SU-1 and now the IDO equivalent PD zoning.

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.

The site is within an Area of Consistency, and the zone change will protect and enhance the character of the neighborhood because the proposed zone will be consistent with the adjacent properties. In this area with predominantly single-family residential uses, a zone change helps align the appropriate zone with existing land uses. The site provides appropriate transitions between uses of different intensity or density and between non-residential uses and single-family neighborhoods to protect the character and integrity of existing residential areas.

The requested R-1D zoning furthers Policy 5.6.3 because it is consistent with the zoning of adjacent properties to the North and East and protects the character of the existing neighborhood.

Staff disagrees that the proposed zone change would provide a transition between uses of different intensity or density and between non-residential uses and single-family neighborhoods, because the juxtaposition of PD and R-1 zone districts would continue to exist and future uses in the PD zone are unknown until a proposal defining the use(s) and an associated Site Plan is submitted to the Planning Department.
SUBPOLICY 5.6.3.b) Ensure that development reinforces the scale, intensity, and setbacks of the immediately surrounding context.

The zone change ensures that development reinforces the scale, intensity, and setbacks of the immediately surrounding context. As a single R-1 lot the site will be developed in a similar manner to the surrounding area in scale and setback. The intensity of the development should have less impact than multiple residential dwellings. The scale of the structure will be similar to a one single family home.

The request for the same zoning on the 1-acre site as the zoning on the immediately surrounding properties furthers Policy 5.6.3.b) by ensuring that future development will be subject to the same standards for scale, intensity, and setbacks.

SUBPOLICY 5.6.3.d): In areas with predominantly single-family residential uses, support zone changes that help align the appropriate zone with existing land uses.

The zone change of this area will bring the site into alignment with the existing land uses.

The requested residential zone furthers Subpolicy 5.6.3.d) because it would bring the zoning of the site into alignment with existing land uses in the surrounding residential area.

POLICY 5.7.2 Regulatory Alignment: Update regulatory frameworks to support desired growth, high quality development, economic development, housing, a variety of transportation modes, and quality of life priorities.

The zone change will minimize the use of Planned Developments and Special Use Permits by establishing by-right zoning for uses that implement the Centers and Corridors vision, and clear design standards for high quality development and adequate transitions and buffers between uses of different intensity and scale.

Policy 5.7.2 was intended to direct the City to update its regulatory framework for land use and development, which has now resulted in the IDO, and therefore does not apply directly to a zone change for one property. Nevertheless, the proposed rezoning from PD, a site-plan controlled and site-specific zone district, to R-1D, a base zone district with a predictable set of allowable uses and development standards, reflects one intended outcome of Policy 5.7.2, that is elaborated in the following Subpolicy:

SUBPOLICY 5.7.2.c) Avoid the use of SU-1 as a tool to negotiate design or use standards between stakeholders and limit its application to uses specified in the SU-1 zone.

The SU-1 zoning that existed in the zoning system prior to the IDO was applied widely--to approximately 1200 properties--and these SU-1 zone districts often referred to base zone districts that allowed common uses rather than specifying a truly “special use”. The recent update of the City’s regulatory framework that resulted in adoption of the IDO document also resulted in a new Official Zoning Map, based on converting the zoning of
all properties to a streamlined set of new zoning districts according to consistent
conversion rules. Most of the former SU-1 zones were converted to base zone districts,
but vacant, undeveloped SU-1/PRD properties such as Tract B converted to PD, the only
remaining "SU-1" type zoning in the IDO in the sense that uses, development standards,
and site design are defined through the EPC review and approval process and controlled
by a property-specific Site Plan rather than by right.

The requested R-1D base zone district partially furthers Subpolicy 5.7.2.c) by reducing
the area of site-plan controlled PD zoning.

Chapter 7: Urban Design

POLICY 7.3.1 Natural and Cultural Features: Preserve, enhance and leverage natural features
and views of cultural landscapes

In Chapter 11 of the Comprehensive Plan, the Sandia Foothills are identified as a
"cultural landscape". The proposed area of the zone change coincides with the Major
Public Open Space Edges regulations which provide for the preservation of natural
features and views. The future development of the site will require the subdivision of the
property and subsequent submittals subject to DRB and administrative approval.

The requested zone change is consistent with Policy 7.3.1 as it would facilitate future
development of a site that is located within 330 ft of MPOS in accordance with
applicable IDO regulations that protect natural features and views of cultural landscapes
such as the nearby Sandia Foothills. The regulations would apply to future development
under the existing PD zoning as well, per IDO Subsection 14-17-2-6(A)(5)(c). However,
development on just a portion of the property is not feasible under PD zoning.

GOAL 7.5 Context Sensitive Site Design: Design sites, buildings and landscape elements to
respond to the high desert environment.

This goal is met by providing for sensitive site design. The building will be comparable
in size to development of a home site, and building placement on a single R-1 lot will
ensure that many of the natural features of the site will be preserved in landscaped and
open areas. Development of the site will include screenings and landscape buffers to
protect the nature of the area. The proposed structure would be located on the southern
portion of the lot and at an elevation that will preserve views for the existing homes.

The request partially furthers Goal 7.5 because the request is a zoning map amendment
not a site plan, but the request would enable development of residential or limited civic or
institutional uses on a 1-acre site, enabling a site design that responds to the high desert
environment through building placement and design and through landscaping.
Criteria for Zoning Map Amendment Applications and Analysis of Applicant’s Justification

Pursuant to Subsection 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 tests 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: the applicant’s justifications are in italics and indented; and staff’s analyses are in plain text and indented.]

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 and not in conflict with applicable Goals and Policies in the ABC Comp Plan, as amended, as shown in the policy analysis [see previous section in this staff report].

Staff agrees.

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 proposed amendment is located in an Area of Consistency. The proposed zone is more advantageous to the community patterns of land use, development density and intensity as articulated by the ABC Comp Plan, as amended, The proposed zone will be consistent with the adjacent and facing lots. The development of the site will
Protect the character and security of the neighborhood. It will provide a buffer and screen of the undesirable conditions that arise from proximity to the interstate highway, and maintain the character of the area with zoning and site design that is comparable to the adjacent properties.

Staff agrees that the proposed zone change would not permit development that is significantly different from the character of the area and would be more advantageous to the community in terms of implementing development density and intensity on a relatively small site of 1 acre that strengthens the established character of the surrounding area.

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 is non-applicable because the proposed amendment is located wholly in an Area of Consistency as shown in the ABC Comp Plan, as amended.

Staff agrees.

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 zone change permits only R-1 uses, and will not be harmful to the adjacent property, the neighborhood, or the community. The zone change will be in accordance with IDO Table 5-1-1.

Staff agrees and would like to clarify that development facilitated by the zone change would be in accordance with dimensional standards in IDO Table 5-1-1 as well as other applicable development standards in the IDO. [italics added for emphasis]

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.

Given the days and times of use, there are minimal impacts to City facilities and the neighborhood with the proposed use. Traffic should be comparable to typical weekday operations of the site developed as single family homes. Peak daily traffic for the site developed as homes under R-1D would generate approximately 38 trips from 4 homes. It is anticipated that the hall will be in use on Sunday and on Wednesday evening. A 5,000 sq.ft. religious institution would generate 45 trips of peak day traffic, but peak traffic days will not coincide with peak weekday traffic. Both conditions of the site would have adequate capacity to serve the development made possible by the change of zone.

Staff generally agrees that roadway capacity is sufficient to accommodate uses allowed in the R-1D zone on the subject site, as this accords with comments from Transportation Development staff in the Planning Department.

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.

Staff agrees.

g) The applicant's justification is not based completely or predominantly on the cost of land or economic considerations.

There are no economic considerations that are being considered in the justifications of the proposed zoning. However, the development of the eastern portion of the site is the only economically viable option for development at this time.

Staff's understanding and opinion are that the justification is not based on the cost of land nor completely based on economic considerations.

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 zoning will be consistent with the surrounding zone districts._

Staff agrees that the zone change does not create a "spot" or "strip" zone.

In conclusion, staff believes that the applicant has provided an adequate justification for the zone change request.

III. AGENCY & NEIGHBORHOOD CONCERNS

_Reviewing Agencies_

Please refer to the agency comments in the staff report.

_Neighborhood/Public_

The applicant sent a letter to the Supper Rock Neighborhood Association (NA) and the East Gateway Coalition of NAs offering them a neighborhood meeting. The applicant also mailed notice to the NA and coalition and to property-owners within 100 ft of Tract B.

Staff was informed that the applicant attended a regular meeting of the Supper Rock NA in spring of 2018 where the request was discussed. The NA did not respond to the offer of a neighborhood meeting.

Comments opposing the request have been received from 8 nearby home-owners. A common concern is about potential traffic and other impacts of the proposed church use rather than about the zone change per se. Nevertheless, all the concerns and questions received by staff prior to Oct. 3rd are summarized and addressed below:

[Note: neighbors’ concerns are in plain text and numbered; and staff responses are in plain text and indented.]

1. The subject site's location at the southeast corner of the neighborhood is inappropriate for the proposed church use. It should be on a major through street.

2. The impact of traffic from the proposed church use will harm the quiet of the neighborhood, pose health and safety risks for people walking or playing in the neighborhood or accessing the Open Space, and will increase crime.

In response to 1 and 2, staff acknowledges that the location is not ideal for a church use in terms of access, but the 1-acre area of the site necessarily limits the size and therefore traffic impacts of the proposed use. There are several alternate
routes to the site through the neighborhood, although all visitors will use the last (southern) segment of Camino de la Serra to access the site.

The applicant stated in an email dated 8/28/2018 (see Application Information in this staff report) that the existing congregation numbers 20-25 families who would meet on Sundays for services, sometimes followed by onsite potlucks and fellowship, with a fewer number meeting on Wednesday evenings. There may be other occasional meetings. The total square footage of the building would be approx. 5,000 sf.

The requested zone change did not meet the threshold for requiring a traffic impact study as part of the application to the City, based on the proposed use as a church and the estimated square footage of the future building (see Application information in this staff report). Planning’s Transportation Development engineer and the applicant met later to discuss traffic generation from potential residential uses as compared to a church use on the 1 acre site. Despite some disagreement about the specifics, the staff engineer’s conclusion is that he does not believe that the proposed church will generate enough traffic to be problematic for the roadway network (see Agency Comments in this staff report).

Staff is not aware of a direct correlation between increased vehicular traffic, specifically traffic generated by a religious institution, and increased crime.

3. The City should purchase the property and keep it as Open Space.

The Parks & Recreation Department commented that the Open Space Advisory Board, responsible for directing property acquisition for Major Public Open Space, considered purchasing this property, but determined that other acquisitions had higher priority due to natural and cultural resource considerations; the Advisory Board was made aware of this zone change request.

4. Potential uses incidental to a church use, including emergency shelter and rental to other potential users of a church building.

The applicant identified in the same email cited above what the uses would be. The applicant has confirmed to staff staff verbally that the facility would not be rented out, and that an outdoor volleyball and horseshoes pitching court would be proposed at the south end of the site. In any case, an Overnight shelter is not allowed in R-1D per IDO Table 4-2-1 (see also definition in Subsection 14-16-7-1).

5. Potential alternative uses in the R-1D zone, including Community Residential Facility, that could be developed on the site.

Small Community Residential Facilities are allowed in R-1D as shown in IDO Table 4-2-1 and as defined in IDO Subsection 14-16-7-1 (Definitions), and per
Use-Specific Standards in IDO Subsection 14-16-4-3(B)(8). One standard requires a minimum separation of 1,500 ft from other such facilities. However, the applicant does not intend to develop the proposed zone for that use. Note that the use could be allowed elsewhere in the neighborhood, subject to applicable standards. Staff notes there is one existing facility on Hilldale shown in AGIS' Advanced Map Viewer.

6. The ground on the site has already been determined to be inconducive for any building construction.

   The applicant has researched the ground conditions of the site (underlying granite shelf) and would site and design the building accordingly, as stated in their application letter.

7. A "waste station" will be required to serve development on the site.

   The applicant is aware that a sewage pump is required, which would be located next to the building and direct flow to a public forced sewer main on Camino de la Serra. The 4 houses facing the site have the same system.

8. Impacts of future construction related to road pavement condition and litter, and to interruption of utility services.

   In response to 5 and 6, these are technical and logistical implications of any future development on the site regardless of zone district. Any development must meet the requirements of the City and of other relevant agencies. Most agencies have no comment for a zone change; PNM is an exception. (See Agency comments).

   Construction is a necessary albeit disruptive phase of any development, but is at least temporary. The equipment used to construct a small church is likely to be the same as for a dwelling/dwellings that would be allowed on the site.

9. An adequate security plan for the proposed church.

   The applicant, in the email cited above, stated that the development would be fenced. No other security feature was mentioned.

10. Post-construction impacts of additional services and associated traffic to operate a church, such as food service, commercial trash pick-up, parking lot maintenance, and security for events.

   The applicant has not addressed this issue directly, but staff believes that the smaller scale of the church, the uses, and times of operations described by the applicant would not generate significant negative operational impacts.

11. Potential effect of the proposed church use on taxes for road maintenance and home values.
Staff believes future development of the proposed community church, which would be facilitated by the zone change, would not directly affect the level of City expenditure on road maintenance.

The assessed value of any properties with existing single-family residential uses would not be affected by the zone change, as described in information obtained by Planning Department staff from the Bernalillo County Assessor’s Office as part of the ABC-Z project to update the Comp Plan and create and implement the IDO. The information is available at: https://abc-zone.com/faq/how-does-zoning-affect-property-taxes.

One commenter asked to meet with the church pastor.

The applicant has stated verbally to staff that, if their zone change request is approved, they would be willing to meet with neighbors in due course to discuss development of the church.

No supporting comments have been received.

No comments have been received to date from the Supper Rock NA or the East Gateway Coalition.

**IV. CONCLUSION**

The request is to rezone 1 acre at the east end of a 4-acre parcel from PD to R-1D. Subject to approval of the zone change, the applicant would replat the property and proposes to develop the 1 acre with a small church of approximately 5,000 sf, off-street parking, and landscaping. The site is located in the Foothills area near I-40, at the southeast corner of the Supper Rock neighborhood and within an Area of Consistency.

The applicant has adequately justified the request per IDO Subsection 14-16-6-7(F)(3). It is consistent with a preponderance of applicable Comprehensive Plan goals and policies for Land Use and Urban Design and is more advantageous to the community because it matches adjacent zoning.

The remote location and traffic impacts of the proposed permissive use would be mitigated by its smaller scale, off-peak activities, and the good road connectivity within the neighborhood.

Comments from 8 nearby property-owners were received opposing the request, but their issues have been addressed by the applicant and/or staff in this report for the EPC’s consideration. No comment has been received to date from the Supper Rock NA or East Gateway Coalition.

If EPC approves the zone change, staff recommends a finding that Tract B will need to be subdivided into 2 parcels with the boundary of the new 1-acre parcel on Camino de la Serra (as shown conceptually in Exhibit A) aligned with the new R-1D zone district.
FINDINGS, Zoning Map Amendment

Project # 2018-001417 (1003699), Case # RZ-2018-0014107

1. This is a request to rezone the eastern 1 acre of an approximately 4 acre parcel (Tract B, Block 2 (less 27 ft out to R/W), Wells Sandia Manor) from PD (Planned Development) to R-1D (Residential, single-family). Tract B is located in the Foothills area, on Camino de la Serra near I-40, in the southeast corner of the Supper Rock neighborhood.

2. The applicant, who owns Tract B, wishes to develop the 1 acre portion (the subject site) to provide a new church of approximately 5,000 sf for a small independent congregation that has been meeting at 305 Vermont St. NE for the last 30 years.

3. Prior to the Integrated Development Ordinance (IDO) that went into effect on May 17, 2018, the zoning of Tract B was SU-1/PRD (Planned Residential Development). It was converted to PD (Planned Development) under the IDO according to conversion Rule 4 (d), because it is vacant and less than 20 acres. See https://abc-zone.com/document/ido-su-1-and-r-d-conversion-table.

4. Tract B and Tract C, the adjacent 1-acre parcel west of Trimble Blvd., have the same zoning, are under the same ownership, and are both vacant. There have been two proposals in the past to develop the parcels, but neither was implemented: a proposal for 42 townhouses (Z-96-25, 4/25/1996); and one for 27 single-family detached dwellings (Project #1003699, Case #05DRB-01118, 7/19/2005). The 2005 site development plan has since expired.

5. The requested zone change did not meet the threshold for requiring a traffic impact study as part of the application to the City, based on the proposed use as a church and the estimated square footage of the future building.

6. Tract B would need to be subdivided into 2 parcels with the boundary of the new 1-acre parcel on Camino de la Serra (as shown conceptually in Exhibit A) aligned with the new R-1D zone district.

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

8. The subject site is within an Area of Consistency of the Comprehensive Plan. The request furthers the following applicable goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan:
Chapter 4: Community Identity

GOAL 4.1 Character: Enhance, protect, and preserve distinct communities.

POLICY 4.1.2 Identity and Design: Protect the identity and cohesiveness of neighborhoods by ensuring the appropriate scale and location of development, mix of uses, and character of building design.

The requested R-1D zoning will protect the identity and cohesiveness of the surrounding neighborhood, which is predominantly single-family residential, by extending the same IDO standards regarding scale of development and character of building design to the 1-acre site as on adjacent properties zoned R-1D.

Chapter 5: Land Use

GOAL 5.2 Complete Communities: Foster communities where residents can live, work, learn, shop, and play together.

The requested zone change from PD to R-1D will facilitate development of 1 acre for allowable uses in R-1D including the proposed church use, which fosters a more complete community.

SUBPOLICY 5.2.1 h) Encourage infill development that adds complementary uses and is compatible in form and scale to the immediately surrounding development.

The request for the R-1D base zone district will facilitate infill development in a form and at a scale that are compatible to the surrounding residential development. The site has remained vacant and undeveloped for over 30 years under the previous SU-1 and now the IDO equivalent PD zoning.

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.

The requested R-1D zoning is consistent with the zoning of adjacent properties to the North and East and protects the character of the existing neighborhood.

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

The request for the same zoning on the 1-acre site as the zoning on the immediately surrounding properties will ensure that future development will be subject to the same standards for scale, intensity, and setbacks.
SUBPOLICY 5.6.3.d): In areas with predominantly single-family residential uses, support zone changes that help align the appropriate zone with existing land uses.

The requested residential zone would bring the zoning of the site into alignment with existing land uses in the surrounding residential area.

9. The request partially furthers the following applicable goals and policies of the 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.

SUBPOLICY 5.2.1 a) Encourage development and redevelopment that brings goods, services, and amenities within walking and biking distance of neighborhoods and promotes good access for all residents.

The request will extend R-1D to the subject site enabling development of uses allowable in the zone district that include limited Civic and Institutional uses such as a Religious institution as well as Residential uses, which would add to the mix of uses in the neighborhood.

However, the location of the subject site is at the southeast corner of the neighborhood and near the eastern edge of the city where I-40 and MPOS are barriers to convenient access from the South and East, which will not promote good access for Civic and Institutional uses for all residents.

SUBPOLICY 5.7.2.c) Avoid the use of SU-1 as a tool to negotiate design or use standards between stakeholders and limit its application to uses specified in the SU-1 zone.

The requested R-1D base zone district will reduce the area of site-plan controlled PD zoning (the IDO equivalent of previous SU-1 zoning) and is therefore consistent with an objective of the recent update of the City’s regulatory framework that resulted in the IDO, i.e. provide a predictable set of uses and higher-quality standards city-wide that are associated with base zone districts.

GOAL 7.5 Context Sensitive Site Design: Design sites, buildings and landscape elements to respond to the high desert environment.

The request is a zoning map amendment not a site plan, but it would enable development of Residential or Limited civic or institutional uses on a 1-acre site, enabling a site design that responds to the high desert environment through building placement and design, and through landscaping.

10. The applicant has adequately justified the request pursuant to the Integrated Development Ordinance (IDO) Section 6-7(F)(3)-Review and Decision Criteria for Zone Map Amendments, as follows:
a) The proposed zone change is consistent with the health, safety, and general welfare of the City as shown by furthering a preponderance of applicable Goals and Policies in the ABC Comprehensive Plan, as shown in the policy analysis (see 6 and 7 above), and does not significantly conflict with them.

b) The proposed amendment is located in an Area of Consistency. The proposed zone change would not permit development that is significantly different from the character of the area and would be more advantageous to the community in terms of implementing development density and intensity on a relatively small site of 1 acre that strengthens the established character of the surrounding area.

c) This criterion is non-applicable because the proposed amendment is located wholly in an Area of Consistency as shown in the ABC Comprehensive Plan.

d) The zone change permits only R-1 uses, and will not be harmful to the adjacent property, the neighborhood, or the community. Future development facilitated by the zone change will be in accordance with dimensional standards in IDO Table 5-1-1 as well as other applicable development standards in the IDO.

e) The City's existing roadway infrastructure has adequate capacity to serve future development on the 1 acre subject site that will be made possible by the change of zone for uses allowed in the proposed R-1D zone.

f) This criterion is non-applicable because the property is not located on a major street.

g) While economic considerations are a factor, the applicant’s justification is not completely or predominantly based on the cost of land or economic considerations.

h) The zone change does not create a "spot" or "strip" zone because it will be consistent with adjacent zone districts.

11. The applicant sent a letter to the Supper Rock Neighborhood Association (NA) and the East Gateway Coalition of NAs offering them a neighborhood meeting, as required. No response was received to the letter. The proposal was discussed earlier in spring of 2018 at regular meeting of the Supper Rock NA.

12. The applicant mailed the required notice to the Supper Rock Neighborhood Association (NA), the East Gateway Coalition of NAs, and to property-owners within 100 ft of Tract B.

13. Written comments from 8 nearby property-owners were received expressing concern and/or opposition to the potential impacts, especially traffic, of the proposed use as a Religious institution, rather than to the zone change per se.

RECOMMENDATION

APPROVAL of Project # 2018-001417 (1003699), Case # RZ-2018-00023, a request for a Zoning Map Amendment from PD to R-1D for the eastern 1 acre of all or a
portion of Tract B, Block 2 (less 27 ft out to R/W), Wells Sandia Manor, based on the preceding Findings.

Carol Toffaleti
Senior Planner

Notice of Decision cc list:

Vermont Hills Properties LLC, 4601 Cumberland Rd NW, ABQ, NM 87120
The Group, 300 Branding Iron Rd SE, Rio Rancho, NM 87124
Kathleen Schindler-Wright, Supper Rock NA, 407 Monte Largo Dr. NE, ABQ, NM 87123
Ken O’Keefe, Supper Rock NA, 600 Vista Abajo Dr. NE, ABQ, NM 87123
James Andrews, East Gateway Coalition, 13121 Nandina Ln SE, ABQ, NM 87123
Michael Brasher, East Gateway Coalition, 216 Zena Lona NE, ABQ, NM 87123
Ron Montbrand, 14300 Arcadia Pl NE, ABQ, NM 87123
Janet C de Baca, 100 Camino De La Sierra NE, ABQ, NM 87123
Kevin Morrow kmorrow@cabq.gov
Kathy Berglund kberglund@cabq.gov
Lynn Barr, 14106 Arcadia Rd NE, Albuquerque, NM 87123
Chuck Bell, 14112 Arcadia Rd. NE, Albuquerque, NM 87123
Theresa De Vargas, Arcadia Rd. NE, tresadeva@hotmail.com
Jack Freedman, 130 Camino de la Sierra NE, Albuquerque, NM 87123
John and Debbie Gilstrap, 14408 Arcadia Rd NE, Albuquerque, NM 87123
Gracie and Richard Martinez, 14409 Windsor Pl. NE, Albuquerque, NM 87123
Kathy Richter-Sand and Bob Richter-Sand, 14514 Hilldale Road NE, Albuquerque 87123
V. AGENCY COMMENTS

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Zoning Enforcement
No adverse comments.

Office of Neighborhood Coordination

Long Range Planning
The site is within an Area of Consistency as designated by the ABC Comprehensive Plan. The applicant will need to make sure that the development reinforces the scale and intensity of the immediately surrounding residential uses.

It is unclear what the access to this property will be. Since the proposed use is non-residential, there is potential for more traffic generation than surrounding uses. The nearest access point to this site would be Encatado Rd. The site would then be accessed from three different local streets. Access seems problematic for this use and would need to be coordinated carefully with Transportation and perhaps the Neighborhood Traffic Management Program.

Parking onsite will need to be generous to minimize overflow parking on residential streets.

In general, the ABC Comprehensive Plan supports protecting the identity and cohesiveness of neighborhoods. While this request would match nearby neighborhood R-1D zoning, the EPC will need to carefully consider whether the permissive use allowed in this zone, Religious Institution, will be detrimental to the surrounding single-family uses, particularly given the access on multiple local streets. While access seems problematic, the site is large enough to meet and even exceed off-street parking requirements, if the 5,000 square foot religious hall is built, as proposed.

The ABC-Z effort generally tried to minimize the amount of PD zoning (site plan controlled), and this request would aid in that effort.

Metropolitan Redevelopment Agency

CITY ENGINEER

Transportation Development
[see attached email exchange]

Hydrology Development
The Open Space Advisory Board, responsible for directing property acquisition for Major Public Open Space, considered purchasing this property, but determined that other acquisitions had higher priority due to natural and cultural resource considerations; the Advisory Board was made aware of this zone change request. However, the Open Space Division is interested in working with the property owner to access the nearby Foothills Open Space via the section of old Route 66 that runs along the south side of the parcel should maintenance needs arise

City Forester

POLICE DEPARTMENT/Planning
No comments for Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED)

SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT DEPARTMENT

Refuse Division
No Comment

FIRE DEPARTMENT/Planning

TRANSIT DEPARTMENT
Not on a Corridor. Not on a route. Site is very remote from any transit routes in a residential subdivision where no service is planned. No comment.
BERNALILLO COUNTY

ALBUQUERQUE METROPOLITAN ARROYO FLOOD CONTROL AUTHORITY

No objections.

ALBUQUERQUE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

This will have no adverse impacts to the APS District.

MID-REGION COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

No adverse comments.

MIDDLE RIO GRANDE CONSERVANCY DISTRICT

PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF NEW MEXICO

1. An existing electric transmission line is located along the south side of the subject property and an overhead electric distribution line is located on the north and east sides of the property. It is the applicant’s obligation to abide by any conditions or terms of these easements.

2. It will be necessary for the developer to contact the PNM New Service Delivery Department to coordinate electric service regarding this project when the community church project moves forward. Contact:

   Andrew Gurule
   PNM Service Center
   4201 Edith Boulevard NE Albuquerque, NM 87107
   Phone: (505) 241-0589

3. When the community church project moves forward the following requirement for ground-mounted equipment screening will be necessary. Ground-mounted equipment designed to allow for access to utility facilities. All screening and vegetation surrounding ground-mounted transformers and utility pads are to allow 10 feet of clearance in front of the equipment door and 5-6 feet of clearance on the remaining three sides for safe operation, maintenance and repair purposes. Refer to the PNM Electric Service Guide at www.pnm.com for specifications.

4. Any potential encroachment to existing rights-of-way must be reviewed by PNM for compliance with National Electric Safety Code (NESC) requirements, as well as PNM access for maintenance or future use.

5. Coordination with PNM is necessary to minimize any potential effects from development on existing electric transmission infrastructure. PNM will review all technical needs, issues and safety clearances for its electric power systems.

6. It is necessary to coordinate with PNM New Service Delivery Department with the applicant regarding proposed sign location and height, and lighting height in order to ensure sufficient safety clearances. PNM requires that the maximum total height of parking lot light poles within the electric transmission line easement does not exceed 14’ above ground.

7. It is required that the developer contact PNM’s New Service Delivery Department if modifications to the
existing electric service are necessary. Any relocation, changes or realignment regarding existing electric utilities will be the developer’s expense. In some cases, relocation or changes to existing facilities may not be feasible due to physical, use or safety clearance constraints. PNM will review all technical needs, issues and safety clearances for its electric power systems.

8. It is necessary that the applicant coordinate with PNM regarding proposed tree species, the height at maturity and tree placement in order to ensure sufficient safety clearances to avoid interference with the existing electric transmission and/or distribution lines along the project site. PNM’s standard is for trees to be planted outside the PNM easement.
Toffaleti, Carol G.

From: Armijo, Ernest M.
Sent: Tuesday, September 11, 2018 2:49 PM
To: Toffaleti, Carol G.
Cc: Michel, Racquel M.; Patz, Logan W.
Subject: RE: EPC RZ-2018-001417, Camino de la Sierra

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Carol,
I just met with Mr. Ron Hensley, the engineer who prepared the letter on this case, and discussed my comments to his letter. He was concerned that the number of peak hour trips I stated for the church was unrealistically high as the equation I used from the ITE manual has a low confidence level. I conceded that the number I quoted may have been high, but at the same time I got him to concede that homes and the church should not be compared in this way since the church will generate its traffic in a short burst while homes generate traffic slowly over time.
I promised him that I would follow up with you to let you know of our discussion and to let you know that, even though I do not agree with the comparison he used, I do not believe the proposed church will generate enough traffic to be problematic for the roadway network, even with the higher number I came up with.

ERNEST ARMIJO, P.E.
senior engineer
o 505.924.3633
e earmijo@cabq.gov
cabq.gov/planning

From: Toffaleti, Carol G.
Sent: Tuesday, September 04, 2018 4:00 PM
To: Armijo, Ernest M.
Cc: Michel, Racquel M.; Patz, Logan W.
Subject: RE: EPC RZ-2018-001417, Camino de la Sierra

Ernest,
Thanks very much for reviewing and analyzing the agent’s comparison of traffic impacts for the church vs 4 SF houses. I will discuss your comments with him.
Your expertise is much appreciated!
Best,
Carol
Hi Carol,

The numbers used in the letter are close to what the Trip Generation Manual gives for average weekday traffic (they may be using an older version) with 4 single family houses generating 53 trips and a 5000 sf church generating about 48, but these numbers are also deceiving. When determining impact on the roadway network peak hour traffic is used, the numbers they gave are closest to total weekday traffic. When looking at the peak hour traffic 4 homes generate 4 to 5 trips while a 5000 sf church (on a Sunday peak) generates about 105 trips. Granted that the peak for a house and a church typically do not hit at the same time, though the letter did state that the church would be in use on Wednesday evenings.

In my opinion the numbers they give are not equivalent primarily because homes don’t generate highly concentrated trips as a church would. They can argue that the church would not create undo impact to the existing infrastructure, but not that it is equivalent to 4 homes.
To: Armijo, Ernest M.
Subject: EPC RZ-2018-001417, Camino de la Sierra

Hello Ernest,

I’m the case planner for this zone change to R-1D for a 1-acre property on Camino de la Sierra NE. The agent sent a revised application letter (att.).

I’d appreciate your feedback on something in the letter (p. 6 and below). It compares the traffic impacts of the proposed use—a 5000 sf church—and 4 SF houses, either of which would be allowed on 1 acre. (Minimum lot size in R-1D is 10k sf).

Traffic should be comparable to typical weekday operations of the site developed as single family homes. Peak daily traffic for the site developed as homes under R-1D would generate approximately 38 trips from 4 homes. It is anticipated that the hall will be in use on Sunday and on Wednesday evening. A 5,000 sq.ft. religious institution would generate 45 trips of peak day traffic, but peak traffic days will not coincide with peak weekday traffic. Both conditions of the site would have adequate capacity to serve the development made possible by the change of zone.

Is this comparison correct? I’ll need to address the issue in the staff report. The case is being deferred to the Oct 11th EPC hearing, so it’s not urgent.

Feel free to call me or I can come down and chat with you briefly.

Thanks,
Carol

CAROL TOFFALETI
long range senior planner
o 505.924.3345
e cgtoffaleti@cabq.gov
cabq.gov/planning
Toffaleti, Carol G.

From: Kubiak, Peter, NMDOT <Peter.Kubiak@state.nm.us>
Sent: Monday, August 27, 2018 9:18 AM
To: Toffaleti, Carol G.
Cc: Patterson, Wade
Subject: RE: Sept EPC case - Camino de la Serra
Attachments: R-W Control Number I-040-3(1)163.pdf

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Carol,

I am showing this to be NMDOT R/W as of Control Number I-040-3(1)163. We are only as good as the records saved. I would recommend having the area surveyed to be 100% sure. Also NMDOT Bicycle/Pedestrian/Equestrian Coordinator was unable to verify any trail in the targeted area. I concur with Mr. Patterson’s observation as listed below in reference to the trail situation.

From: Patterson, Wade <wpatterson@cabq.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, August 22, 2018 10:38 AM
To: Toffaleti, Carol G. <cgtoffaleti@cabq.gov>
Cc: Kubiak, Peter, NMDOT <Peter.Kubiak@state.nm.us>
Subject: RE: Sept EPC case - Camino de la Serra

Hi Carol,

Looking at Street View from the end of Trimble in the cul-de-sac, this appears to be a stormwater conveyance and not a trail. Access is blocked by a guardrail and there is no curb there, allowing water to flow into the conveyance. This also does not appear on any of my maps as being owned or maintained by the City. In fact, it doesn’t appear as a trail owned or maintained by any entity (the files I have include even soft-surface Open Space trails, so I would expect it to show up as a trail regardless of ownership)

I will get out there tomorrow morning (Thursday) and confirm to let you know for certain, but from what I can tell, I do not believe this is a trail.

You also identified a small sliver of Open Space that connects to Camino de la Sierra between some homes. Again, if I look at Street View, there is no connection there. If I look at Bernco’s parcel maps, that sliver seems to actually include part of the adjacent house. I will look at this when I am out there tomorrow morning as well, but from what I can tell, there is no existing trail or open connection between Camino de la Sierra and City Open Space at that location.

I will e-mail you confirmation of all this tomorrow AM.

Thanks,

Wade
Figure 1: Looking east across Tract B, from Trimble Blvd. NE.

Figure 2: Looking west at the 1 acre site and Tract B, from Camino de la Serra.

Figure 3: Looking east, from the eastern edge of the larger tract. Note the drainage run-down.
Figure 4: Looking south, from the NMDOT right-of-way south of Tract B.

Figure 5: Looking north, up the drainage run-down, from the south end of Camino de la Sierra.

Figure 6: Looking northwest, at the 1 acre site and the alley, from Camino de la Sierra.
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD
ACTION SHEET

Plaza del Sol Hearing Room, Basement, Plaza del Sol Building

July 13, 2005
9:00

MEMBERS:
Sheran Matson, AICP, DRB Chair
Claire Senova, Administrative Assistant
Wilfred Gallegos, Transportation Development
Brad Bingham, Alternate City Engineer
Roger Green, Utility Development
Christina Sandoval, Parks & Recreation

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

NOTE: UNLESS ANNOUNCED DURING THE MEETING, THE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD WILL NOT TAKE A LUNCH BREAK.

NOTE: INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES WHO NEED SPECIAL ASSISTANCE TO PARTICIPATE AT THIS MEETING SHOULD CONTACT CLAIRE SENOVA, PLANNING DEPARTMENT, AT 924-3948. HEARING IMPAIRED USERS MAY CONTACT HER VIA THE NEW MEXICO RELAY NETWORK BY CALLING TOLL-FREE: 1-800-659-8331.


A. Call to Order 9:00 A.M.
B. Changes and/or Additions to the Agenda
C. New or Old Business

CASES WHICH REQUIRE PUBLIC NOTIFICATION
MAJOR SUBDIVISIONS, VACATIONS, SIA EXTENSIONS AND SITE DEVELOPMENT PLANS

1. Project # 1000614
   05DRB-00982 Major-Two Year SIA
   TIERRA WEST LLC agent(s) for DEVELOPMENT SERVICES LTD. CO. request(s) the above action(s) for LA CUEVA OESTE UNIT 2 & 4, zoned R-D, located on HOLLY AVE NE, between LOUISIANA BLVD NE and SAN PEDRO DR NE containing approximately 37 acre(s). [REF: 04DRB-00913] (C-18) [A TWO-YEAR EXTENSION] OF THE SIA WAS APPROVED.
9. Project # 1000965
05DRB-01025 Major-Vacation of Public Easements

BOHANNAN HUSTON INC agent(s) for ANDALUCIA DEVELOPMENT CO., INC. request(s) the above action(s) for all or a portion of Tract(s) I, LANDS OF RAY GRAHAM III (to be known as ANDALUCIA AT LA LUZ), zoned SU-1, located on COORS BLVD NW, between NAMASTE RD NW and LA BIENVENIDA PL NW containing approximately 85 acre(s). [REF: 05DRB-00124] (F-11) THE VACATION AS SHOWN ON EXHIBIT B IN THE PLANNING FILE WAS APPROVED.

SITE DEVELOPMENT PLANS (EPC FINAL SIGN-OFF) AMENDED PLANS AND MASTER DEVELOPMENT PLANS (CITY COUNCIL FINAL SIGN-OFF)
NOTE: IF THE APPLICANT/AGENT IS NOT PRESENT WHEN THEIR REQUEST IS CALLED, THEN THE REQUEST MAY BE INDEFINITELY DEFERRED ON A NO SHOW.

10. Project # 1001946
05DRB-01047 Minor-SiteDev Plan BldPermit

DEKKER PERICH SABATINI agent(s) for OFFICE DEPOT request(s) the above action(s) for all or a portion of Tract(s) A-1-D, LOS ANGELES CENTER, zoned M-1, located on PASEO DEL NORTE NE, between SAN PEDRO NE and INTERSTATE 25 containing approximately 3 acre(s). [REF: DRB-97-224, DRB-97-372; Z-1534] [Deferred from 6/29/05] (D-18) DEFERRED AT THE AGENT’S REQUEST TO JULY 20, 2005.

11. PROJECT #1003699
(DRB-97-165 - V-97-507)
05DRB-00118-SiteDev Plan for Subd

TIERRA WEST DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT SERVICES, agents for TIM EICHENBERG, request Vacation (volding) of Public Power Line Easement, Site Development Plan Final Sign Off (for EPC) plus Sketch Plat Review and Comment for Tracts B and C, Blocks 2 and 7, WELLS SANDIA MANOR, zoned SU-1/PRD (City) and located on Trimble Blvd NE and Camino de la Sierra NE between I-40 and Arcadia Rd NE containing approximately 4.90 acres. [FIRST TIME ON THE AGENDA 5/6/97] [Z-96-25] DEFERRED FROM 5/24/00, DEFERRED AT THE AGENT’S REQUEST FROM 7/26/00 TO 9/13/00 TO WORK WITH STATE HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT WHICH HAS BEEN AN ONGOING PROCESS SINCE 5/6/97 [DEFERRED AT THE AGENT’S REQUEST FROM 9/13/00 TO 9/20/00 TO WORK WITH THE STATE HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT, DEFERRED AT THE APPLICANT’S REQUEST FOR ONE-YEAR FROM
MINOR PLATS, FINAL (MAJOR) PLATS, AMENDED PLATS AND PLANS

12. Project # 1000985
    05DRB-00883 Minor-SiteDev Plan Subd
SMPC ARCHITECTS agent(s) for ASPEN INVESTMENTS request(s) the above action(s) for all or a portion of Lot(s)
1A, Block(s) 12, NORTH ALBUQUERQUE ACRES TRACT A UNIT A, (to be known as PALOMAS PLAZA) zoned SU-2/C-1, located on SAN PEDRO NE, between PALOMAS NE and SAN BERNADINO NE containing approximately 3 acre(s). [Deferred from 6/1/05] [REF: DRB96-412] (D-18)
THE SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN WAS APPROVED WITH DELEGATION TO CITY ENGINEER FOR SIA, AND TO UTILITIES FOR FIRE MARSHALL APPROVAL, FLOW CALCULATION FOR FIRE, AND REVISE UTILITY PLAN.

13. Project # 1001182
    05DRB-01069 Major-Final Plat Approval
RIO GRANDE ENGINEERING agent(s) for VISION DEVELOPMENT request(s) the above action(s) for all or a portion of Tract(s) B, WESTRIDGE MOBILE HOME PARK, zoned R-D/R-LT, located on BLUEWATER NW, between 98th ST NW and 90th ST NW containing approximately 8 acre(s). (K-9) THE FINAL PLAT WAS APPROVED WITH DELEGATION TO PARKS FOR OPEN SPACE TABLE AND CASH IN LIEU, AND TO CITY ENGINEER FOR AGIS DXF AND FOR LABELING OF ALL EASEMENTS OF RECORD.
Site Date
Size: 4.9 acres
Zoning: BU-1 MSD, 100 feet
Maximum Number of Dwelling Units: 27
Maximum Lot Size: 11,800 square feet
Minimum Lot Size: 8,000 square feet
Minimum Dwelling Size: 1,800 square feet
Maximum Building Height (Single Story): 17 feet
Minimum Building Height (Two Story): 28 feet
Yard Requirements
Minimum Yard Set Back:
- Front Yard: 18 feet, garages shall be set back 20 feet to provide for a minimum of 2 off-street parking spaces.
- Side Yard: Conventional - 6 feet
- Side Yard Zero Lot Line/Pete Monoc - On property line (zero feet) on one side and 10 feet on opposite side.
- Rear Yard: 15 feet
Pedestrian and Vehicular Access and Egress: Vehicular access to South Pointe is from Camino de la Sierra NE and Trinitas Boulevard NE. Pedestrian access is from existing sidewalks along Camino de la Sierra NE and Trinitas Boulevard NE, which will connect to sidewalks within the subdivision.

Notes:
1. Residential development in South Pointe shall be subject to the requirements of the Santa Fe Valley Area Plan.
2. Lots containing existing homes along the northern property line of the subdivision shall be restricted to single story only with a maximum height of 10 feet (lots 1-14).
3. Access to Lots 15 and 24 shall be from the road connecting Camino de la Sierra and Trinitas Blvd. NE.

SOUTH POINTE
SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR SUBDIVISION
Prepared by:
Jodi Buce
3913 22nd St NE
Albuquerque, NM 87107

Prepared by:
Consencia Planning, Inc
924 Park Avenue NW
Albuquerque, NM 87107

Scale 1" = 80' July 1, 2005
OFFICIAL NOTIFICATION OF DECISION

FILE: Z-96-25
LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Tract C of Block 7 and Tract B of Block 2 of Wells Sandia Manor Subdivision, zoned SU-1/PRU, located south of Arcadia Road NE between Trimble Boulevard NE and Camino de la Sierra NE, containing approximately 4.95 acres (L-23). KYM DICOME, STAFF PLANNER

On April 25, 1996, the Environmental Planning Commission voted to approve Z-96-25, a site development plan based on the following Findings and subject to the following Conditions:

FINDINGS:

1. The only issue before the Environmental Planning Commission at this time is the review of a site development plan; the density for this site was established by case number Z-78-3 which was appealed to the Land Use Planning and Zoning Commission of the City Council and unanimously upheld.

2. This site is zoned SU-1 PRU with a density cap of 10 du/acre, for R-T uses.

3. Modifications are required to the landscaping, building elevations and parking calculations.

4. With these modifications, the site development plan meets the requirements of the City adopted plans and policies including the Sandia Foothills Area Plan.

CONDITIONS:

1. The building elevation sheet shall include the traditional and southwestern architecture, the materials (Stucco and/or brick), and the two types of roofs (flat or pitched). The building design needs modifications and shall be delegated to DRB.

2. The proposed color range of the buildings shall be more specifically listed.

3. The utility system (layout and type) shall be coordinated and approved by Utilities Development Division prior to final sign-off.

4. The landscape calculations shall be revised to subtract all individual yard areas.

5. The required usable open space (750 square feet) shall be specified on the plan.

6. The materials, colors, and heights of the interior yard walls shall be specified on the plan.

7. The maintenance of the common landscaped areas, driveways, and streets shall be the responsibility of a Home Owner's Association and the covenants shall be approved by the DNRE prior to site plan sign-off.
8. The materials and colors of the proposed signs shall be added to the plan.

9. Transportation Division comments as listed in the staff report shall be met.

10. Refuse Division shall approve the plan prior to final sign-off.

11. All requirements of the Sandia Foothills Area Plan shall apply to this site and those restrictions shall be listed on the site plan.

12. The site development plan shall identify significant thickets on site and endeavor to preserve them in the cluster design.

IF YOU WISH TO APPEAL THIS DECISION, YOU MUST DO SO BY MAY 10, 1996, IN THE MANNER DESCRIBED BELOW. A NON-REFUNDABLE FILING FEE OF $50 IS REQUIRED AT THE TIME THE APPEAL IS FILED.

Appeal to the City Council: Persons aggrieved with any determination of the Environmental Planning Commission acting under this ordinance and who have legal standing as defined in Section 14-16-4-4.B.2 of the City of Albuquerque Comprehensive Zoning Code may file an appeal to the City Council by submitting written application on the Planning Division form to the Planning Division within 15 days of the Planning Commission's decision. The date the determination in question is issued is not included in the 15-day period for filing an appeal, and if the fifteenth day falls on a Saturday, Sunday or holiday as listed in the Merit System Ordinance, the next working day is considered as the deadline for filing the appeal. The City Council may decline to hear the appeal if it finds that all City plans, policies and ordinances have not been properly followed. If it decides that all City plans, policies and ordinances have not been properly followed, it shall hear the appeal. Such appeal, if heard, shall be heard within 45 days of its filing.

YOU WILL RECEIVE NOTIFICATION IF ANY OTHER PERSON FILES AN APPEAL. IF THERE IS NO APPEAL, YOU CAN RECEIVE BUILDING PERMITS AT ANY TIME AFTER THE APPEAL DEADLINE QUOTED ABOVE, PROVIDED ALL CONDITIONS IMPOSED AT THE TIME OF APPROVAL HAVE BEEN MET. SUCCESSFUL APPLICANTS ARE REMINDED THAT OTHER REGULATIONS OF THE CITY MUST BE COMPLIED WITH, EVEN AFTER APPROVAL OF THE REFERENCED APPLICATION(S).

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Ronald N. Short, AICP
Planning Director

RNS/HG/ac/1313

cc: Tierra West Development Management Services, 4421 McLeod Road NE, Suite D, Albuquerque, NM 87109
   Carol Lee O'Keefe, Supper Rock Neigh. Assoc., 600 Vista Abajo NE, Albuquerque, NM 87123
   Roger Ekland, Supper Rock Neigh. Assoc., 44315 Sipadan St NE, Albuquerque, NM 87119
   Joe Mai, 14005 Encantado Rd NE, Albuquerque, NM 87112
   Ken Washington, 14004 Arcadia Rd NE, Albuquerque, NM 87112
   John Reilly, 213 Trimmble Blvd NE, Albuquerque, NM 87112
   Tom Edwards, 113 Lawrence Dr NE, Albuquerque, NM 87123
   Alan Christner, 803 Monte Alto Dr NE, Albuquerque, NM 87123
   Ken Newendorf, 14009 Arcadia NE, Albuquerque, NM 87123
   Don Soderstrom, 14214 Arcadia NE, Albuquerque, NM 87123
   E. Talbert, 14325 Windsor Pl NE, Albuquerque, NM 87123
APPLICATION INFORMATION
July 24, 2018

Mr. Derek Bohannan, Chairman  
Environmental Planning Commission  
City of Albuquerque  
600 2nd Street NW  
Albuquerque, NM  87102

RE: Zone Change Request, Lot B Block 2 (less 27 ft. out to R/W) Wells Sandia Manor

The purpose of this letter is to provide justification for a request to change the zoning on approximately 1 acre of a 3.8 acre property located between Trimble Blvd. and Camino de La Sierra north of I-40. THE Group, agent for Vermont Hills Properties LLC (the applicant) is requesting a Zone Map Amendment (ZMA) for approximately 1 acre of a property legally described as. Lot B Block 2 (less 27 ft. out to R/W) Wells Sandia Manor. The current zoning is PD as shown below on Figure 1. The applicant’s request is to change the zoning to R-1D with a planned use of a neighborhood religious hall. The proposed zoning will allow uses consistent with the properties directly adjacent to and facing the subject site.

As shown above, the additional R-1D zoning use will fit appropriately with the surrounding area.
Background

Due to the shape and site constraints, the lot was undeveloped parcel that was zoned SU-1 under the previous zoning code. The current zoning under the IDO is PD-Planned Development. The topography and ground conditions have made improvement of the site difficult. The site resides on a granite outcrop from the mountain. The minimal soil on the rock surface constrains the development and extension of utilities into the site. The topography, as shown below, of the site includes a significant change in elevation between the frontage streets of approximately 30 feet. However, to a depth of 200 feet (approx. 1 acre) along the frontage on Camino de La Sierra the elevation of the street and site are comparable.

Proposed Zoning

The applicant is requesting R-1D zoning to conform to the surrounding neighborhood. The proposed zoning is appropriate for the proposed community church.

We request the zone map amendment based on the following review and decision criteria as listed in IDO Part 14-16-6-7(F)(3).

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 amended, and other applicable plans adopted by the City.”

The proposed zone change are consistent and not in conflict with applicable Goals and Policies in the ABC Comp Plan, as amended, as shown in the following policy analysis:
Albuquerque & Bernalillo County Comprehensive Plan, 2017

- **Policy 4.1.2 Identity and Design:** Protect the identity and cohesiveness of the neighborhoods by ensuring the appropriate scale and location of development, mix of uses and character of building design.

  The zone change will protect the identity and cohesiveness of the neighborhood because the proposed zone will provide appropriate character of building design. The site will provide for a cohesive addition to the neighborhood and a transition to the Planned Development uses of the remainder of the lot.

- **Goal 5.2 Complete Communities:** Foster communities where residents can live, work learn, shop, and play together.

  This goal is met by the zone change because the proposed use of the property is community gathering hall for religious activities.

- **Policy 5.2.1 Land Uses:** Create healthy, sustainable, and distinct communities with a mix of uses that are conveniently accessible from surrounding neighborhoods. Encourage development and redevelopment that brings goods, services, and amenities within walking and biking distance of neighborhoods and promotes good access for all residents.

  The proposed zone and use of the property as a church creates a mix of uses that are conveniently accessible from surrounding neighborhood.

- **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.

  The site is within an Area of Consistency, and the zone change will protect and enhance the character of the neighborhood because the proposed zone will be consistent with the adjacent properties. The zone change ensures that development reinforces the scale, intensity, and setbacks of the immediately surrounding context. In this area with predominantly single-family residential uses, a zone change helps align the appropriate zone with existing land uses. The site provides appropriate transitions between uses of different intensity or density and between non-residential uses and single-family neighborhoods to protect the character and integrity of existing residential areas.

- **Policy 5.6.3 Areas of Consistency (b):** Ensure that development reinforces the scale, intensity, and setbacks of the immediately surrounding context.

  As a single R-1 lot the site will be developed in a similar manner to the surrounding area in scale and setback. The intensity of the development should have less impact than multiple residential dwellings. The scale of the structure will be similar to a one single family home.
• **Policy 5.6.3 Areas of Consistency (d):** In areas with predominantly single-family residential uses, support zone changes that help align the appropriate zone with existing land uses.

  *The zone change of this area will bring the site into alignment with the existing land uses.*

• **Policy 5.7.2 Regulatory Alignment:** Update regulatory frameworks to support desired growth, high quality development, economic development, housing, a variety of transportation modes, and quality of life priorities.

  *The zone change will minimize the use of Planned Developments and Special Use Permits by establishing by-right zoning for uses that implement the Centers and Corridors vision, with Permits by establishing by-right clear design standards for high quality development and adequate transitions and buffers between uses of different intensity and scale.*

• **Policy 7.3.1 Natural and Cultural Features:** Preserve, enhance and leverage natural features and views of cultural landscapes

  *In Chapter 11 of the Comprehensive Plan, the Sandia Foothills are identified as a “cultural landscape”. The proposed area of the zone change coincides with the Major Public Open Space Edges regulations which provide for the preservation of natural features and views. The future development of the site will require the subdivision of the property and subsequent submittals subject to DRB and administrative approval.*
Goal 7.2 Context Sensitive Site Design: Design sites, buildings and landscape elements to respond to the high desert environment.

This goal is met by providing for sensitive site design. The building will be comparable in size to development of a home site, and building placement on a single R-1 lot will ensure that many of the natural features of the site will be preserved in landscaped and open areas. Development of the site will include screenings and landscape buffers to protect the nature of the area. As depicted above, the proposed structure would be located on the southern portion of the lot and at an elevation that will preserve views for the existing homes.

Criteria 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 the neighborhood or community conditions affecting the site.
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).”

The proposed amendment is located in an Area of Consistency. The proposed zone is more advantageous to the community patterns of land use, development density and intensity as articulated by the ABC Comp Plan, as amended (including implementation of patterns of land use, development density and intensity, and connectivity). The proposed zone will be consistent with the adjacent and facing lots. The development of the site will protect the character and security of the neighborhood. It will provide a buffer and screen of the undesirable conditions that arise from proximity to the interstate highway, and maintain the character of the area with zoning and site design that is comparable to the adjacent properties.

Criteria 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 the neighborhood or community conditions affecting the site.
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 to this site.

This criterion is non-applicable because the proposed amendment is located wholly in an Area of Consistency as shown in the ABC Comp Plan, as amended.

Criteria D “The zone change does not include permissive uses that would be harmful to the 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 zone change permits only R-1 uses, and will not be harmful to the adjacent property, the neighborhood, or the community. The zone change will be in accordance with IDO Table 5-1-1.

Criteria 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.”

Given the days and times of use, there are minimal impacts to City facilities and the neighborhood with the proposed use. Traffic should be comparable to typical weekday operations of the site developed as single family homes. Peak daily traffic for the site developed as homes under R-1D would generate approximately 38 trips from 4 homes. It is anticipated that the hall will be in use on Sunday and on Wednesday evening. A 5,000 sq.ft. religious institution would generate 45 trips of peak day traffic, but peak traffic days will not coincide with peak weekday traffic. Both conditions of the site would have adequate capacity to serve the development made possible by the change of zone.

Criteria 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.

Criteria G “The applicant’s justification for the requested zone change is not completely or predominantly on the cost of land or economic considerations.”

There are no economic considerations that are being considered in the justifications of the proposed zoning. However, the development of the eastern portion of the site is the only economically viable option for development at this time.
Criteria 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 zoning will be consistent with the surrounding zone districts.

Thank you for your consideration on this matter.

Sincerely,

Ron E. Hensley P.E.
Agent / Engineer
Please check the appropriate box and refer to supplemental forms for submittal requirements. All fees must be paid at the time of application.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Decisions</th>
<th>Historic Certificate of Appropriateness – Major (Form L)</th>
<th>Wireless Telecommunications Facility Waiver (Form W2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ Archaeological Certificate (Form P3)</td>
<td>☐ Historic Design Standards and Guidelines (Form L)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Historic Certificate of Appropriateness – Minor (Form L)</td>
<td>☐ Master Development Plan (Form P1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Alternative Signage Plan (Form P3)</td>
<td>☐ Site Plan – EPC including any Variances – EPC (Form P1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ WTF Approval (Form W1)</td>
<td>☐ Site Plan – DRB (Form P2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Minor Amendment to Site Plan (Form P3)</td>
<td>☐ Subdivision of Land – Minor (Form S2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Annexation of Land (Form Z)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Decisions</th>
<th>Historic Certificate of Appropriateness – Major (Form L)</th>
<th>Wireless Telecommunications Facility Waiver (Form W2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ Historic Certificate of Appropriateness – Minor (Form L)</td>
<td>☐ Master Development Plan (Form P1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Adoption or Amendment of Comprehensive Plan or Facility Plan (Form Z)</td>
<td>☐ Adoption or Amendment of Historic Designation (Form L)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Amendment of IDO Text (Form Z)</td>
<td>☐ Subdivision of Land – Major (Form S1)</td>
<td>Amendment to Zoning Map – EPC (Form Z)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Master Development Plan (Form P1)</td>
<td>☐ Amendment to Zoning Map – Council (Form Z)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Adoption or Amendment of Historic Designation (Form L)</td>
<td>☐ Variance – DRB (Form V)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Subdivision of Land – Minor (Form S2)</td>
<td>☐ Amendment to Zoning Map – Council (Form Z)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Annexation of Land (Form Z)</td>
<td>☐ Decision by EPC, LC, DRB, ZHE, or City Staff (Form A)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decisions Requiring a Public Meeting or Hearing</th>
<th>Historic Certificate of Appropriateness – Major (Form L)</th>
<th>Wireless Telecommunications Facility Waiver (Form W2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ Subdivision of Land – Major (Form S1)</td>
<td>☐ Variance – ZHE (Form ZHE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Subdivision of Land – Minor (Form S2)</td>
<td>☐ Amendment to Zoning Map – EPC (Form Z)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Conditional Use Approval (Form ZHE)</td>
<td>☐ Amendment to Zoning Map – Council (Form Z)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Vacation of Easement or Right-of-way (Form V)</td>
<td>☐ Decision by EPC, LC, DRB, ZHE, or City Staff (Form A)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Demolition Outside of HPO (Form L)</td>
<td>☐ Variance – ZHE (Form ZHE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Decision by EPC, LC, DRB, ZHE, or City Staff (Form A)</td>
<td>☐ Amendment to Zoning Map – Council (Form Z)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appeals</th>
<th>Historic Certificate of Appropriateness – Major (Form L)</th>
<th>Wireless Telecommunications Facility Waiver (Form W2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ Subdivision of Land – Major (Form S1)</td>
<td>☐ Variance – ZHE (Form ZHE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Variance – DRB (Form V)</td>
<td>☐ Amendment to Zoning Map – Council (Form Z)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Decision by EPC, LC, DRB, ZHE, or City Staff (Form A)</td>
<td>☐ Amendment to Zoning Map – Council (Form Z)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPLICATION INFORMATION</th>
<th>Historic Certificate of Appropriateness – Major (Form L)</th>
<th>Wireless Telecommunications Facility Waiver (Form W2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant: Vermont Hills Properties LLC</td>
<td>☐ Historic Certificate of Appropriateness – Major (Form L)</td>
<td>☐ Wireless Telecommunications Facility Waiver (Form W2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone:</td>
<td>☐ Historic Certificate of Appropriateness – Major (Form L)</td>
<td>☐ Wireless Telecommunications Facility Waiver (Form W2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address: 4601 Cumberland Rd. N.W.</td>
<td>☐ Historic Certificate of Appropriateness – Major (Form L)</td>
<td>☐ Wireless Telecommunications Facility Waiver (Form W2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City: Albuquerque</td>
<td>☐ Historic Certificate of Appropriateness – Major (Form L)</td>
<td>☐ Wireless Telecommunications Facility Waiver (Form W2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State: NM</td>
<td>☐ Historic Certificate of Appropriateness – Major (Form L)</td>
<td>☐ Wireless Telecommunications Facility Waiver (Form W2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zip: 87120</td>
<td>☐ Historic Certificate of Appropriateness – Major (Form L)</td>
<td>☐ Wireless Telecommunications Facility Waiver (Form W2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional/Agent (if any): THE Group</td>
<td>☐ Historic Certificate of Appropriateness – Major (Form L)</td>
<td>☐ Wireless Telecommunications Facility Waiver (Form W2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone: 505410-1622</td>
<td>☐ Historic Certificate of Appropriateness – Major (Form L)</td>
<td>☐ Wireless Telecommunications Facility Waiver (Form W2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address: 300 Branding Iron Rd. SE</td>
<td>☐ Historic Certificate of Appropriateness – Major (Form L)</td>
<td>☐ Wireless Telecommunications Facility Waiver (Form W2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City: Rio Rancho</td>
<td>☐ Historic Certificate of Appropriateness – Major (Form L)</td>
<td>☐ Wireless Telecommunications Facility Waiver (Form W2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State: NM</td>
<td>☐ Historic Certificate of Appropriateness – Major (Form L)</td>
<td>☐ Wireless Telecommunications Facility Waiver (Form W2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zip: 87124</td>
<td>☐ Historic Certificate of Appropriateness – Major (Form L)</td>
<td>☐ Wireless Telecommunications Facility Waiver (Form W2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proprietary Interest in Site: N/A</td>
<td>☐ Historic Certificate of Appropriateness – Major (Form L)</td>
<td>☐ Wireless Telecommunications Facility Waiver (Form W2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF REQUEST</th>
<th>Historic Certificate of Appropriateness – Major (Form L)</th>
<th>Wireless Telecommunications Facility Waiver (Form W2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zone Map Amendment from PD to R-1D</td>
<td>☐ Historic Certificate of Appropriateness – Major (Form L)</td>
<td>☐ Wireless Telecommunications Facility Waiver (Form W2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE INFORMATION (Accuracy of the existing legal description is crucial! Attach a separate sheet if necessary.)</th>
<th>Historic Certificate of Appropriateness – Major (Form L)</th>
<th>Wireless Telecommunications Facility Waiver (Form W2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot or Tract No.: B</td>
<td>☐ Historic Certificate of Appropriateness – Major (Form L)</td>
<td>☐ Wireless Telecommunications Facility Waiver (Form W2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block: 2</td>
<td>☐ Historic Certificate of Appropriateness – Major (Form L)</td>
<td>☐ Wireless Telecommunications Facility Waiver (Form W2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit:</td>
<td>☐ Historic Certificate of Appropriateness – Major (Form L)</td>
<td>☐ Wireless Telecommunications Facility Waiver (Form W2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subdivision/Addition: Wells Sandia Manor</td>
<td>☐ Historic Certificate of Appropriateness – Major (Form L)</td>
<td>☐ Wireless Telecommunications Facility Waiver (Form W2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRGCD Map No.:</td>
<td>☐ Historic Certificate of Appropriateness – Major (Form L)</td>
<td>☐ Wireless Telecommunications Facility Waiver (Form W2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPC Code: 102305630037010101</td>
<td>☐ Historic Certificate of Appropriateness – Major (Form L)</td>
<td>☐ Wireless Telecommunications Facility Waiver (Form W2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone Atlas Page(s): L-23</td>
<td>☐ Historic Certificate of Appropriateness – Major (Form L)</td>
<td>☐ Wireless Telecommunications Facility Waiver (Form W2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Zoning: PD</td>
<td>☐ Historic Certificate of Appropriateness – Major (Form L)</td>
<td>☐ Wireless Telecommunications Facility Waiver (Form W2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Zoning: R-1D</td>
<td>☐ Historic Certificate of Appropriateness – Major (Form L)</td>
<td>☐ Wireless Telecommunications Facility Waiver (Form W2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Existing Lots: 1</td>
<td>☐ Historic Certificate of Appropriateness – Major (Form L)</td>
<td>☐ Wireless Telecommunications Facility Waiver (Form W2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Proposed Lots: 2</td>
<td>☐ Historic Certificate of Appropriateness – Major (Form L)</td>
<td>☐ Wireless Telecommunications Facility Waiver (Form W2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Area of Site (acres): 3.8</td>
<td>☐ Historic Certificate of Appropriateness – Major (Form L)</td>
<td>☐ Wireless Telecommunications Facility Waiver (Form W2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION OF PROPERTY BY STREETS</th>
<th>Historic Certificate of Appropriateness – Major (Form L)</th>
<th>Wireless Telecommunications Facility Waiver (Form W2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Address/Street: Camino de La Sierra</td>
<td>☐ Historic Certificate of Appropriateness – Major (Form L)</td>
<td>☐ Wireless Telecommunications Facility Waiver (Form W2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between: Trimble Blvd and: Camino de La Sierra</td>
<td>☐ Historic Certificate of Appropriateness – Major (Form L)</td>
<td>☐ Wireless Telecommunications Facility Waiver (Form W2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASE HISTORY (List any current or prior project and case number(s) that may be relevant to your request.)</th>
<th>Historic Certificate of Appropriateness – Major (Form L)</th>
<th>Wireless Telecommunications Facility Waiver (Form W2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signature: Ron E. Hensley P.E.</td>
<td>☐ Historic Certificate of Appropriateness – Major (Form L)</td>
<td>☐ Wireless Telecommunications Facility Waiver (Form W2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date: 7/30/18</td>
<td>☐ Historic Certificate of Appropriateness – Major (Form L)</td>
<td>☐ Wireless Telecommunications Facility Waiver (Form W2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printed Name: Ron E. Hensley P.E.</td>
<td>☐ Historic Certificate of Appropriateness – Major (Form L)</td>
<td>☐ Wireless Telecommunications Facility Waiver (Form W2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Applicant or ☐ Agent</td>
<td>☐ Applicant or ☐ Agent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY</th>
<th>Historic Certificate of Appropriateness – Major (Form L)</th>
<th>Wireless Telecommunications Facility Waiver (Form W2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case Numbers</td>
<td>☐ Historic Certificate of Appropriateness – Major (Form L)</td>
<td>☐ Wireless Telecommunications Facility Waiver (Form W2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>☐ Historic Certificate of Appropriateness – Major (Form L)</td>
<td>☐ Wireless Telecommunications Facility Waiver (Form W2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees</td>
<td>☐ Historic Certificate of Appropriateness – Major (Form L)</td>
<td>☐ Wireless Telecommunications Facility Waiver (Form W2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting/Hearing Date:</td>
<td>☐ Historic Certificate of Appropriateness – Major (Form L)</td>
<td>☐ Wireless Telecommunications Facility Waiver (Form W2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Signature:</td>
<td>☐ Historic Certificate of Appropriateness – Major (Form L)</td>
<td>☐ Wireless Telecommunications Facility Waiver (Form W2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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@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 POLICY DECISIONS (Except where noted)

- Interpreter Needed for Hearing? _____ 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)
- Zone 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 Zone 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
  - 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: 7/30/18
Printed Name: Ron E. Hensley P.E. ☑ 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>
</tbody>
</table>

Staff Signature: ___________________________ Date: ____________

Effective 5/17/18
PRE-APPLICATION REVIEW TEAM (PRT) MEETING NOTES

PA# 18-189 Date: July 3 Time: 2 p.m.

Address: 

AGENCY REPRESENTATIVES AT MEETING:
Planning: Maggie Gould
Code Enforcement: Ricardo Uribe
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: 
possible zone change

SITE INFORMATION:
Zone: PO
Size: 3.8 acres
Use: Religious Institution
Overlay Zone: 
Comp Plan Area Of: Consistency
Comp Plan Corridor: Sandia Foothills
Comp Plan Center: 
Parking: Table 5-5-1
MR Area: 
Landscaping: See Section 5-6
Street Trees: 
Use Specific Standards: 4-3 (C)(9) religious institution
Dimensional Standards: For PO plan of underlying zone

*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: DRB - Replat Zone Change EPSC if choosing zone change
Review and Approval Body: DRB
Is this PRT a requirement? 2 for zone change
The applicant can develop under the existing PD Zone or request a zone change to a different zone. The PD Zone requires a site plan. The site plan must comply with ZDO unless a different requirement is approved by the EPC. Religious Institution is allowed in the R-1 Zone. The zoning of the parcels adjacent to the site.

Can Subdivide the lot through the Development Review Board.

See Section G-1-1 for notice requirements.

Previous site plan for subdivision 1003699 has expired. See handout for zone change and subdivision.

If submitting for zone change must confer meeting with Neighborhood Association must have meeting or proof that meeting was.

See 5-2-(H)(1)
Vermont Hills Properties LLC
4601 Cumberland Rd NW
Albuquerque, NM
July 10, 2018

City of Albuquerque
Planning Department
600 2nd St. N.W.
Albuquerque, NM

RE: Church Site on Camino de la Sierra NE, Lot B Block 2, Sandia Manor

To whom it may concern,

Please allow this letter to serve as formal notification that THE Group, represented by Ron Hensley, P.E. is hereby authorized to act as agent on behalf of Vermont Hills Properties LLC in order to submit information and applications for any necessary planning and building actions needed for the above referenced project.

Should you have any questions, please contact me.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Aulvie Yarbrough
Authorized Agent
CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE
TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDY (TIS) FORM

APPLICANT: THE Group

DATE OF REQUEST: 07/30/2018

ZONE ATLAS PAGE(S): L-23

CURRENT:
ZONING
PD
PARCEL SIZE (AC/SQ. FT.) 1 ac. +/-

LEGAL DESCRIPTION:
LOT OR TRACT # B
BLOCK # 2
SUBDIVISION NAME Wells Sandia Manor

REQUESTED CITY ACTION(S):
ANNEXATION [ ]
ZONE CHANGE [X]: From PD To R-1
SECTOR, AREA, FAC, COMP PLAN [ ]
AMENDMENT (Map/Text) [ ]

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

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF ACTION:
# OF UNITS: 1 CHURCH
BUILDING SIZE: 5,000 (sq. ft.)

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

APPLICANT OR REPRESENTATIVE Ron E. Henley

DATE 7/30/18

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

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 07-30-18

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
Ron Hensley <ron@thegroup.cc>

Thursday, August 30, 2018 12:02 PM

FW: Answers for the city.

From: Duane Cogburn [mailto:cogduane48@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 28, 2018 9:27 AM
To: Ron Hensley
Cc: AJ Yarbrough; Chad Cogburn; Rob Croft; Ben Kirby; Walen Mickey; Nathan Alter; Kyle Lewis
Subject: Answers for the city.

Ron, Sorry for the delay in getting these answers back to you. Please review and edit as you see need.

Duane

1. The future Church is The Church of Christ, not associated with United Church of Christ, or any regional or national affiliation. We are a small independent Church and are currently meeting at 305 Vermont St NE for the last 30 years. We make all our own decisions here with the local members. We formed an LLC (Vermont Hills Properties, LLC) that is made up of the two Elders and the Finance director of the congregation to find and purchase a property to build a new building that will accommodate our needs better. After the new building is complete, ownership will be in the name of the church, Ute St. Church or Christ, Inc. (which is a New Mexico registered non-profit corporation). The general membership decided it would be better not to be in the development business, hence the LLC was formed to buy and subdivide this property.

2) The traffic in and out of the neighborhood will be significantly less than almost any other use. We currently have about 20-25 families and meet on Sunday mornings and then about 10-15 families that meet Wednesday evenings. There will be other occasional meetings, but nothing else is scheduled regularly. Our traffic is primarily in the off-peak hours.

While we are sympatric to the plight of the homeless, we do not plan to offer services or meals for the homeless from this property. We do plan to fence the property to discourage wandering strangers.

3) We selected this property primarily to have some visibility from I-40. The impact on the neighborhood is minimized due to our locating the building away from the residences and closer to the freeway. Our building is not much larger than some of the bigger residences, and will have a stucco finish to compliment homes nearby.

There is another Church within the neighborhood as well as some office buildings, so the use is similar in the area.

4) We discussed the Church with city planners before we bought this property and were told the SU- PRD zone would allow for a Church to be built on up to 25% of the total area of land, so we went forward with the purchase. Since the zone code has been changed, we feel it is easier to accomplish our building plans to separate the one acre we need and then sell the remainder at a later date to a developer for single family homes. Due to the granite shelf under this one acre site, is will be more conducive to build a single 5000 sf structure than multiple homes.

5. We currently meet Sunday 9:00 to about noon, Wednesdays at 7:00 pm. With the larger building that has more space, we may meet earlier on Wednesdays for Bible Studies, and may stay later on Sundays for onsite potlucks and fellowship. We have been going to city parks for potlucks, so it would be nice to have a facility with bathrooms and indoor seating area.
NOTIFICATION & NEIGHBORHOOD INFORMATION
Ron Hensley

From: Quevedo, Vicente M. <vquevedo@cabq.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, July 11, 2018 2:30 PM
To: ron@thegroup.cc
Subject: Neighborhood Meeting Inquiry_Arcadia Rd and Camino de La Sierra_EPC
Attachments: ZAP L-23.pdf; Neighborhood Meeting Inquiry_Arcadia Rd and Camino de La Sierra_EPC.xlsx; Neighborhood Mtg Inq Instruction Sheet_5_21_18.pdf

Ron,

See list of affected associations below and attached related to your scheduling of a Neighborhood Meeting. Please also review the attached instruction sheet.

<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>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supper Rock NA</td>
<td>Kathleen</td>
<td>Schindler-Wright</td>
<td><a href="mailto:baasch1@comcast.net">baasch1@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>407 Monte Largo Drive NE</td>
<td>Albuquerque</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>87123</td>
<td>5052752710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supper Rock NA</td>
<td>Ken</td>
<td>O'Keefe</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cnkokeefe@msn.com">cnkokeefe@msn.com</a></td>
<td>600 Vista Abajo Drive NE</td>
<td>Albuquerque</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>87123</td>
<td>5052969075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Gateway Coalition</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Andrews</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jamesw.andrews01@gmail.com">jamesw.andrews01@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>13121 Nandina Lane SE</td>
<td>Albuquerque</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>87123</td>
<td>5052969700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Gateway Coalition</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Brasher</td>
<td><a href="mailto:eastgatewaycoalition@gmail.com">eastgatewaycoalition@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>216 Zena Lona NE</td>
<td>Albuquerque</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>87123</td>
<td>5053822964</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respectfully,

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

Website: www.cabq.gov/neighborhoods
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
   Ron Hensley

Telephone Number
   5054101622

Email Address
   ron@thegroup.cc

Company Name
   THE Group

Company Address
   300 Branding Iron Rd. SE

City
   Rio Rancho

State
   Ne

ZIP
   87124

Legal description of the subject site for this project:
   Lot B Block 2, Sandia Manor

Physical address of subject site:
   Camino de la Sierra NE

Subject site cross streets:
   ARCADIA RD / CAMINO DE LA SIERRA

Other subject site identifiers:

This site is located on the following zone atlas page:
   L-23

============================================================================
RE: Proposed Zoning Change from Planned Development to Residential

Dear Mr. Andrews, Mr. Brasher and the East Gateway Coalition

Per the City of Albuquerque’s process, I am writing you today to make you aware that our Client, the Owner of Lot B Block 2 in Sandia Manor, is pursuing a change of zoning for a portion of his property with frontage on Camino de la Sierra NE.

Prior to filing an application with the Planning Department for approval of this change through the Environmental Planning Commission (EPC) we are required to request a meeting with any affected neighborhood and/or homeowner associations.

The following is a description of the action being requested:

1. **Subject Property:** Eastern 1 acre of Lot B Block 2 in Sandia Manor at Camino de la Sierra NE
2. **Legal Description:** LOT B BLOCK 2 (LESS 27 FT OU TO R/W) WELLS, SANDIA MANOR, CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE, BERNALILLO COUNTY, NEW MEXICO
3. **Physical Description:** The property exists along I-40 between Trimble Blvd. and Camino de la Sierra.
4. **Action Requested:** Convert the eastern 1 acre of the 3.96 acres to R-1 zoning from the existing PD zoning. Subsequent to acceptance of the zone change, the owner will seek division of the 1 acre parcel from the remainder. The lot would then be developed as a community church.

If you wish to accept a meeting to discuss the project, please contact me within 15 days to schedule a meeting of the East Gateway Coalition.

Sincerely,
Kathleen Schindler-Wright
407 Monte Largo Drive NE
Albuquerque, NM  87123
Baasch1@comcast.net

Ken O’Keefe
600 Vista Abajo Drive NE
Albuquerque, NM  87123
cnkokeefe@msn.com

RE: Proposed Zoning Change from Planned Development to Residential

Dear Ms. Schindler-Wright, Mr. O’Keefe and the Supper Rock NA

Per the City of Albuquerque’s process, I am writing you today to make you aware that our Client, the Owner of Lot B Block 2 in Sandia Manor, is pursuing a change of zoning for a portion of his property with frontage on Camino de la Sierra NE.

Prior to filing an application with the Planning Department for approval of this change through the Environmental Planning Commission (EPC) we are required to request a meeting with any affected neighborhood and/or homeowner associations.

The following is a description of the action being requested:

1. **Subject Property:** Eastern 1 acre of Lot B Block 2 in Sandia Manor at Camino de la Sierra NE
2. **Legal Description:** LOT B BLOCK 2 (LESS 27 FT OU TO R/W) WELLS, SANDIA MANOR, CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE, BERNALILLO COUNTY, NEW MEXICO
3. **Physical Description:** The property exists along I-40 between Trimble Blvd. and Camino de la Sierra.
4. **Action Requested:** Convert the eastern 1 acre of the 3.96 acres to R-1 zoning from the existing PD zoning. Subsequent to acceptance of the zone change, the owner will seek division of the 1 acre parcel from the remainder. The lot would then be developed as a community church.

If you wish to accept a meeting to discuss the project, please contact me within 15 days to schedule a meeting of the Supper Rock Neighborhood Association.

Sincerely,
Ron E. Hensley P.E.
Your message

To: jamesw.andres01@gmail.com; eastgatewaycoalition@gmail.com
Cc: ron@thegroup.cc; cogduane48@yahoo.com; Rick Bennett
Subject: Proposed Zoning Change from Planned Development to Residential on Camino de la Sierra
Sent: 7/13/2018 11:35 AM

was read on 7/13/2018 11:35 AM.
Ron Hensley

From: Ron Hensley <ron@thegroup.cc>
To: 'Ron Hensley'
Sent: Friday, July 13, 2018 11:36 AM
Subject: Read: Proposed Zoning Change from Planned Development to Residential on Camino de la Sierra

Your message

To: baasch1@comcast.net; cnkokeefe@msn.com
Cc: ron@thegroup.cc; cogduane48@yahoo.com; Rick Bennett
Subject: Proposed Zoning Change from Planned Development to Residential on Camino de la Sierra
Sent: 7/13/2018 11:29 AM

was read on 7/13/2018 11:35 AM.
<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>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supper Rock NA</td>
<td>Kathleen</td>
<td>Schindler-Wright</td>
<td><a href="mailto:baasch1@comcast.net">baasch1@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>407 Monte Largo Drive NE</td>
<td>Albuquerque</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>87123</td>
<td>5052752710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supper Rock NA</td>
<td>Ken</td>
<td>O’Keefe</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cnkokeefe@msn.com">cnkokeefe@msn.com</a></td>
<td>600 Vista Abajo Drive NE</td>
<td>Albuquerque</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>87123</td>
<td>5052969075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Postal Service™ CERTIFIED MAIL® RECEIPT</td>
<td>U.S. Postal Service™ CERTIFIED MAIL® RECEIPT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>For delivery information, visit our website at <a href="http://www.usps.com">www.usps.com</a>.</strong></td>
<td><strong>For delivery information, visit our website at <a href="http://www.usps.com">www.usps.com</a>.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OFFICIAL USE</strong></td>
<td><strong>OFFICIAL USE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Certified Mail Fee</strong></td>
<td><strong>Certified Mail Fee</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3.45</td>
<td>$3.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extra Services &amp; Fees (check box, and fee as appropriate)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Extra Services &amp; Fees (check box, and fee as appropriate)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return Receipt (hardcopy)</td>
<td>Return Receipt (hardcopy)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return Receipt (electronic)</td>
<td>Return Receipt (electronic)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certified Mail Restricted Delivery</td>
<td>Certified Mail Restricted Delivery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Signature Required</td>
<td>Adult Signature Required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Signature Restricted Delivery</td>
<td>Adult Signature Restricted Delivery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Postage</strong></td>
<td><strong>Postage</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0.50</td>
<td>$0.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Postage and Fees</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total Postage and Fees</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4.95</td>
<td>$4.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sent To:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VALERIO RICAHRD A &amp; MONTOYA-VALERIO JESSICA L</th>
<th>KEILMAN EDNA R TRUSTEE KEILMAN FAMILY RVT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>116 CAMINO DE LA SIERRA NE</td>
<td>34467 HIGHVIEW DR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALBUQUERQUE NM 87123-2452</td>
<td>PINE CO 80470</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sent To:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANDOLPH LEOPOLDO S &amp; CLAUDIA L</th>
<th>CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5617 WAYNE RD NW</td>
<td>PO BOX 1293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALBUQUERQUE NM 87120-1622</td>
<td>ALBUQUERQUE NM 87103-2248</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sent To:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supper Rock NA</th>
<th>Supper Rock NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Schindler-Wright</td>
<td>Ken O’Keefe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>407 Monte Largo Drive NE</td>
<td>600 Vista Abajo Drive NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albuquerque, NM 87123</td>
<td>Albuquerque, NM 87123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Postal Service™ CERTIFIED MAIL® RECEIPT</td>
<td>U.S. Postal Service™ CERTIFIED MAIL® RECEIPT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>For delivery information, visit our website at <a href="http://www.usps.com%E2%84%A2">www.usps.com™</a>.</strong></td>
<td><strong>For delivery information, visit our website at <a href="http://www.usps.com%E2%84%A2">www.usps.com™</a>.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALBUQUERQUE NM 87123</td>
<td>ALBUQUERQUE NM 87123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Certified Mail Fee</strong> $3.45</td>
<td><strong>Certified Mail Fee</strong> $3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>17</em></td>
<td><em>17</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra Services &amp; Fees (check box, add fee if applicable)</td>
<td>Extra Services &amp; Fees (check box, add fee if applicable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return Receipt (hardcopy)</td>
<td>Return Receipt (hardcopy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return Receipt (electronic)</td>
<td>Return Receipt (electronic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certified Mail Restricted Delivery</td>
<td>Certified Mail Restricted Delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Signature Required</td>
<td>Adult Signature Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Signature Restricted Delivery</td>
<td>Adult Signature Restricted Delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Postage</strong> $0.50</td>
<td><strong>Postage</strong> $0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Postage and Fees</strong> $6.70</td>
<td><strong>Total Postage and Fees</strong> $6.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sent To:</td>
<td>Sent To:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATHIS SCOTT LOGIE</td>
<td>GROSSMAN HERBERT M ETUX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14318 ARCADIA RD NE</td>
<td>13309 CHICO RD NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALBUQUERQUE NM 87123-2401</td>
<td>ALBUQUERQUE NM 87123-2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>U.S. Postal Service™ CERTIFIED MAIL® RECEIPT</th>
<th>U.S. Postal Service™ CERTIFIED MAIL® RECEIPT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>For delivery information, visit our website at <a href="http://www.usps.com%E2%84%A2">www.usps.com™</a>.</strong></td>
<td><strong>For delivery information, visit our website at <a href="http://www.usps.com%E2%84%A2">www.usps.com™</a>.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALBUQUERQUE NM 87123</td>
<td>ALBUQUERQUE NM 87123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Certified Mail Fee</strong> $3.45</td>
<td><strong>Certified Mail Fee</strong> $3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>17</em></td>
<td><em>17</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra Services &amp; Fees (check box, add fee if applicable)</td>
<td>Extra Services &amp; Fees (check box, add fee if applicable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return Receipt (hardcopy)</td>
<td>Return Receipt (hardcopy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return Receipt (electronic)</td>
<td>Return Receipt (electronic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certified Mail Restricted Delivery</td>
<td>Certified Mail Restricted Delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Signature Required</td>
<td>Adult Signature Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Signature Restricted Delivery</td>
<td>Adult Signature Restricted Delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Postage</strong> $0.50</td>
<td><strong>Postage</strong> $0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Postage and Fees</strong> $6.70</td>
<td><strong>Total Postage and Fees</strong> $6.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sent To:</td>
<td>Sent To:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GILSTRAP JOHN W &amp; DEBRA E</td>
<td>C DE BACA JANET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14408 ARCADIA RD NE</td>
<td>100 CAMINO DE LA SIERRA NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALBUQUERQUE NM 87123</td>
<td>ALBUQUERQUE NM 87123-2452</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>U.S. Postal Service™ CERTIFIED MAIL® RECEIPT</th>
<th>U.S. Postal Service™ CERTIFIED MAIL® RECEIPT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>For delivery information, visit our website at <a href="http://www.usps.com%E2%84%A2">www.usps.com™</a>.</strong></td>
<td><strong>For delivery information, visit our website at <a href="http://www.usps.com%E2%84%A2">www.usps.com™</a>.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALBUQUERQUE NM 87123</td>
<td>ALBUQUERQUE NM 87123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Certified Mail Fee</strong> $3.45</td>
<td><strong>Certified Mail Fee</strong> $3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>17</em></td>
<td><em>17</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra Services &amp; Fees (check box, add fee if applicable)</td>
<td>Extra Services &amp; Fees (check box, add fee if applicable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return Receipt (hardcopy)</td>
<td>Return Receipt (hardcopy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return Receipt (electronic)</td>
<td>Return Receipt (electronic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certified Mail Restricted Delivery</td>
<td>Certified Mail Restricted Delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Signature Required</td>
<td>Adult Signature Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Signature Restricted Delivery</td>
<td>Adult Signature Restricted Delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Postage</strong> $0.50</td>
<td><strong>Postage</strong> $0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Postage and Fees</strong> $6.70</td>
<td><strong>Total Postage and Fees</strong> $6.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sent To:</td>
<td>Sent To:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIEST GERALD VINCENT PSC BOX 196</td>
<td>METZGER RONALD A &amp; ELIZABETH A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2050 A 2ND ST SE</td>
<td>14416 ARCADIA RD NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIRTLAND AFB NM 87117-5524</td>
<td>ALBUQUERQUE NM 87123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RANDOLPH LEOPOLDO S & CLAUDIA L
5617 WAYNE RD NW
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87120-1622

BOBBERTS FREDERIC J
13815 SERENITY HILLS CT SE
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87123

RETURN TO SENDER
UNCLAIMED
UNABLE TO FORWARD

RETURN TO SENDER
NOT DELIVERABLE AS ADDRESSED
UNABLE TO FORWARD
September 4, 2018

Properly Owner:

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING
Notice is hereby given that the City of Albuquerque Environmental Planning Commission will hold a Public Hearing on Thursday, October 11, 2018 at 8:30 a.m., deferred from September 11, 2018, 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-committees/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, Division Manager of the Urban Design and Development Division, at (505) 924-3337 or at rbrito@cabq.gov.

Staff reports and supplemental materials are posted on the City website.

REQUEST
THE Group, agent for Vermont Hills Properties LLC (the applicant) is requesting a Zone Map Amendment (ZMA) for approximately 1 acre of a 3.1 acre property legally described as Lot B Block 2 (less 27 ft. out to R/W) Wells Sandia Manor. The property located between Trimble Blvd. and Camino de La Sierra north of I-40. The request is for a Zone Map Amendment (ZMA) for approximately 1 acre from the current zoning of PD to R-1D to allow for the construction of a church.

If you have questions or need additional information regarding this request please contact Russell Brito, Division Manager of the Urban Design and Development Division, at (505) 924-3337 or at rbrito@cabq.gov.

Sincerely,

THE Group
U.S. Postal Service™
CERTIFIED MAIL® RECEIPT
Made in USA

For delivery information, visit our website at www.usps.com®.

FREEDMAN JACK E & EVELYN JEAN
TOPPASS CO-TRUSTEES FREEDMAN
FAMILY RVT
130 CAMINO DE LA SIERRA NE
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87123-2452

VERMONT HILLS PROPERTIES LLC
4601 CUMBERLAND DR NW
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87120

Certified Mail Fee: $3.45
Extra Services & Fees (check box, and fill in amount): $2.75
Postage: $0.50
Total Postage: $6.70

09/04/2018
01/24/14
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SENDER: COMPLETE THIS SECTION</th>
<th>COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>■ Complete Items 1, 2, and 3.</td>
<td>A. Signature □ Agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ Print your name and address on the reverse so that we can return the card to you.</td>
<td>□ Addressee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ Attach this card to the back of the mailpiece, or on the front if space permits.</td>
<td>B. Received by (Printed Name)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VERMONT HILLS PROPERTIES LLC
4601 CUMBERLAND DR NW
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87120

9590 9402 3452 7275 9179 70

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Article Number (Transfer from service label)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E62C H6F6 0000 860 7207</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Service Type

□ Adult Signature
□ Adult Signature Restricted Delivery
□ Certified Mail®
□ Collector Mail Restricted Delivery
□ Collect on Delivery
□ Collect on Delivery Restricted Delivery
□ Insured Mail
□ Insured Mail Restricted Delivery (over $500)

□ Priority Mail Express
□ Registered Mail
□ Registered Mail Restricted Delivery
□ Return Receipt for Merchandise
□ Signature Confirmation
□ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

4. Date of Delivery

5. Is delivery address different from item 1? □ Yes

6. If YES, enter delivery address below: □ No

国内返信領収票

PS Form 3811, July 2016 PSN 7630-02-000-3053
1. Article Addressed to:
FREEDMAN JACK E & EVELYN JEAN
TOPPASS CO-TRUSTEES FREEDMAN
FAMILY RVT
130 CAMINO DE LA SIERRA NE
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87123-2452

2. Article Number: Transfer from service label
842T 16E6 0000 0000 2T02

3. Service Type
- Adult Signature
- Adult Signature Restricted Delivery
- Certified Mail®
- Certified Mail Restricted Delivery
- Collect on Delivery
- Collect on Delivery Restricted Delivery
- Insured Mail
- Insured Mail Restricted Delivery
- Priority Mail Express®
- Registered Mail™
- Registered Mail Restricted Delivery
- Return Receipt for Merchandise
- Signature Confirmation™
- Signature Confirmation
- Restricted Delivery

A. Signature

Agent
Address

B. Received by (Printed Name)

C. Date of Delivery

D. Is delivery address different from item 1?
   Yes
   No

If YES, enter delivery address below:

9590 9402 3572 7305 5240 65

PS Form 3811, July 2015 PSN 7530-02-000-8029
Domestic Return Receipt
PUBLIC COMMENTS
From: Somerfeldt, Cheryl
Sent: Wednesday, September 12, 2018 4:11 PM
To: RON MONTBRAND; Toffaleti, Carol G.
Subject: FW: Zoning Change # RZ-2018-00023
Attachments: Listing of possible objections concerning Case.doc

Dear Mr. Montbrand,

I am forwarding your email to the Staff Planner for this case, Carol Toffaleti, who will include your comments as part of the staff report. It is my understanding that the case is deferred for 30 days to the October 11, 2018 EPC public hearing, which means that it will not be heard tomorrow September 13, and the completed staff report with neighborhood comments will be posted to the EPC webpage by end-of-business on Thursday October 4, 2018.

Thank you for your comments,

CHERYL SOMERFELDT
current planner
o 505.924.3357
e csomerfeldt@cabq.gov
cabq.gov/planning

From: RON MONTBRAND [mailto:rmontbrand@comcast.net]
Sent: Wednesday, September 12, 2018 4:00 PM
To: Somerfeldt, Cheryl
Subject: Zoning Change # RZ-2018-00023

Dear Cheryl,

I am attaching a concerns document regarding the Vermont Hills Properties LLC proposal to request a Zone Map Change #RZ-2018-00023.

Very respectfully,

Ron Montbrand

This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
Listing of possible objections concerning Case: RZ-2018-00023

The land that Vermont Hills Properties LLC
4601 Cumberland Dr NW
Albuquerque, NM 87120
Legal Description: LT B BLK 2 (less 27 Ft our to R/W) Wells Sandia Manor CONT 3.80 AC +- ACRES: 3.8

The request is for a Zone Map Amendment (ZMA) for approximately 1 acre from the current zoning of PD to R-1D to allow for the construction of a church.

Upon review of the city map UPC: 102305630037010101

This parcel of land is the most south east corner of Wells Sandia Manor. The entrance to this property requires traffic to flow, from Google Maps, From Central and Tramway heading north:

Turn right onto Encantado Rd NE
427 ft
Turn right onto Avital Dr NE
0.2 mi
Turn left onto Skyline Rd NE
0.2 mi
Turn right onto Lawrence Dr NE
0.1 mi
Turn left onto Arcadia Rd NE
0.5 mi
Turn right onto Camino de la Sierra NE
0.2 mi
Property on right

The concept of building a church that travels exclusively though a neighborhood of homes to get to a piece of property that lies at the absolute farthest south/east corner seems unreasonable to the occupants of the neighborhood. If 50 people attended church twice on Sunday, this would result in a possible 100 cars a day. If there is 25 children attending day care weekly, another 25 cars twice a day, 50 cars additional per day. If Bible study twice a week of 20 people, 40 additional cars. This traffic drives in and out. Assuming no people from neighborhood initially attend, that is an additional traffic burden of 190 cars per week, not including special events, bazaars, weddings, funerals, etc. Churches do not pay taxes? The road maintenance would fall to the already high property taxes in the area. This project is likely to expand into the adjacent property once precedent is set, resulting in more traffic. It is my understanding that a maximum building for a development like this is 40,000 square feet. This will not fit on one acre, but additional buildings that a church would build in the future could expand into the additional acreage resulting into even more traffic. Additional services needed to support a church, i.e. Food services, commercial trash pickup, parking lot maintenance, security
for events, etc. would further increase traffic. Because of the location of this property, I as a tax paying, voting, home owner concerned about my home value, and as my property is adjacent to this proposed development, cannot support this plan.

Perhaps an existing vacant building on Central, such as the old motorcycle building, Furr’s old store which is vacant with a sizeable parking lot could be utilized as a church. Wide streets such as Central are designed to handle large amounts of concentrated traffic. Our small neighborhood streets, with slurry applications every ten years might not be able to handle an additional 190 cars a week.

Thank you for you consideration in this matter.

Ron Montbrand
14300 Arcadia Rd NE.
.01 miles from proposed church, Google Maps sends traffic in front of my property.
Ms. Toffaleti:

Please include our concerns for the "re-zoning" efforts for the purpose of building a church in the southeast corner of Supper Rock neighborhood. My husband and I moved to this neighborhood in May 2005 because it was a quiet residential area. Our home was built in 1985 and I am certain that there are other homes that were already built here - a residential community.

Our concern rests with the increase in traffic throughout the entire neighborhood - all of Supper Rock south of Encantado. The only direct access is through neighborhood streets. The proposed location of the church is in the farthest southeast corner of the residential community. The streets in our community were not designed for that level of intense traffic; they were designed for one car to park on one side and one car to pass. An increase in traffic begins to affect community members who walk for their health or pleasure. Please consider our concerns in making your decision.

Respectfully submitted,
Gracie and Richard Martinez
14409 Windsor Pl, NE
Albuquerque, NM  87123

This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
Toffaleti, Carol G.

From: John Gil <jg.jwg.nm@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 03, 2018 8:08 PM
To: Toffaleti, Carol G.
Cc: Henry, Dora L.
Subject: SUBJECT SUPPER ROCK NEIGHBORHOOD #2018-001417
Attachments: Church_2.txt

Carol, thank you for the email. Please see attached file.
John Gilstrap

This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
Opposition to above Zone Map Amendment to allow construction of a church.
John and Debbie Gilstrap  14408 Arcadia Rd NE Albuquerque, NM 87123
Phone (505) 459-8006  email:  jg.jwg.nm@gmail.com

What’s wrong with Church??
There is nothing wrong with Church. The world could use more!!
Equal opposition would apply to a Community Center or Theater or other facility selecting such an unusual location.

We are totally OPPOSED to this rezoning issue!!

The basic real estate adage: Location - Location - Location was ignored.
Church usually found along major city through streets or close to neighborhood entrances. Church Leadership however, selects the furthestmost distant corner of our residential neighborhood.
The choice appears to disregard all reasoning of location suitability.

Closest access point at Tramway / Encantado - then must travel 1.1 miles negotiating a multitude of zigzag streets characteristic of the neighborhood, increasing the probability of tragic pedestrian or vehicle accidents.
More traffic brings - noise, crime, litter, etc.

Currently we have no information on the number or type of Church activities.
Sundays? Weekdays? Holidays? Today’s congregations are taking on more and more roles. It could be an endless list - Daycare center, Youth activities,
Senior citizen activities, Social services and many other activities.

If the additional roles listed above are not permitted initially, what is to prevent further disruption to our neighborhood. The Church building is already there.

Our home being directly adjacent to the proposed Church - The real estate market will view of our home as less desirable and difficult to sell.

Allowing this rezoning to pass -
Will change the entire character of the Neighborhood.  !!! FOREVER !!!

*******************************************************************************
Jack Freedman 130 Camino de la Sierra NE 87123

Also note that I have looked at several city websites including these, https://ddei3-0-ctp.trendmicro.com:443/wis/clicktime/v1/query?url=http%3a%2f%2fddocuments.cabq.gov%2fplanning%2fcode%2denforcement%2fCodeEnf%2dZoningCode%2dFullText%2dDec2017.pdf&umid=B25E9D80-7612-B005-B2E5-69C4A73BF37F&auth=f0ebcd052f61e7a39dc93191e8a01d02608499af-1867dd0f6d5c9cc4e85b666be7631165519fccdd
https://www.cabq.gov/planning/code-enforcement-zoning/comprehensive-city-zoning-code

and I can find no definitions for zoning codes of PD or R1-D that are on the notice sign posted on the lot in question that the church wants rezoned. The current sign still refers to hearing date of Sept. 13 which has been changed to Oct. 11.

There are no survey stakes on this proposed lot. This lot and adjoining lots have been tested and inspected at least twice over the past 6 or 7 years and it was determined that the ground was not conducive for any building construction and that any water supply to the lots would require lines to be installed to get water from Carnuel.

On 9/5/2018 9:45 AM, Toffaleti, Carol G. wrote:

Good morning Sir,

I’m the case planner for this request for a Zone Map Amendment in your neighborhood.

A copy of your email (below) is in the public EPC file for the request and will be included in the full staff report. However, it would be helpful to have your name and address to complete the record. Can you please respond with that information.
Please also direct any future questions or comments on the request to me.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Best Regards,

CAROL TOFFALETI
long range senior planner
o 505.924.3345
e cgtoffaleti@cabq.gov
cabq.gov/planning

From: Vos, Michael J.
Sent: Thursday, August 30, 2018 10:05 AM
To: Toffaleti, Carol G. <cgtoffaleti@cabq.gov>
Subject: FW: ZMA to Wells Sandia Manor - LOTB / BLOCK2, to allow construction of a church

Carol,
Please see below for some neighborhood comments on the zone change request on Camino de la Sierra.

Thanks,
Michael

From: Jack Free44 [mailto:jackfree44@comcast.net]
Sent: Thursday, August 30, 2018 4:39 AM
To: Planning Dev Help
Subject: ZMA to Wells Sandia Manor - LOTB / BLOCK2, to allow construction of a church

One of my neighbors made these statements regarding the church wanting a rezone for their proposed building of a new church inside the Supper Rock neighborhood.
I think this sums up the feelings of many residents in this area.
There will be many residents opposed to this rezoning at the September 13 meeting.

See quote below:

------------------------------------------------------------
ZMA to Wells Sandia Manor - LOTB / BLOCK2
to allow construction of a church.

Commonly known as SupperRock neighborhood.

Public Hearing on Thursday, September 13, 2018 at 8:30am
Plaza del Sol Building - 600 2nd St NW  ABQ., NM

Could count on one hand the number of property owners who received : NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING about this re-zoning issue.
This affects you, your family, me and the entire neighborhood !!!

Totally OPPOSED to church construction!!

A church in the farthest corner of an established neighborhood, seems quite odd to me!!  Maybe, should be built along major city through streets
not hidden in a neighborhood.
Don't forget about the associated church parking lot.  Generated traffic with
safety concerns to residents, children playing in the streets, walking your dog,
and our recreational visitors such as Mountain bikers and Hikers.

If church construction is allowed to proceed.  Just the dirt work preparing
the job site will be our worst nightmare!!  The number of large trucks, heavy
equipment traveling through our neighborhood will be enormous.  Then comes
installing Utilities - Gas, sewer and water, electric, CATV. (sewer pumped uphill).
Now they can get concrete footings constructed, put up church walls and roof,
then comes the asphalt parking lot. This was a short form description of what lies ahead for our neighborhood. This property should have been developed 25 or 30 years ago, not now or ever. The city of ABQ should purchase and keep as Open space, exercise area, dog walking, etc. Keep it simple.
Toffaleti, Carol G.

From: Theresa De Vargas <tresadeva@hotmail.com>
Sent: Friday, September 14, 2018 9:34 PM
To: Toffaleti, Carol G.
Subject: Opposition of Rezoning

Importance: Low

I have been living west of Arcadia on Monte Largo for 30 years. This neighborhood is hidden and does not need to be exposed to high traffic. To put a business (yes a church is a business) inside THIS neighborhood is unacceptable ... There is property on Encantado next to a church ... That's where this church belongs.

Sincerely,

Theresa De Vargas

This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
Hello Chuck,

I’m following up about the additional sheet of questions that you sent last week regarding the proposed zone change (project# 2018-001417). The last question looks incomplete...should there be more? May I also suggest that the questions be numbered rather than “bulleted”. It would make it easier to refer to them since there are quite a few. I will forward any revisions to the questions to Ron Hensley, the agent, and include them in the EPC file and staff report.

Several questions go beyond what the Environmental Planning Commission (EPC) will be considering. Please keep in mind that the request is to rezone the property to R-1D. The review and approval criteria for zone changes are in Subsection 6-7(F)(3) on p. 247 of the IDO. The applicant must justify the request per those criteria and the EPC must base their decision on them. Questions in your list about the use of the property under R-1D may be relevant and those will be addressed in my staff report, but not questions about a potential future construction phase, etc. If the zone change is approved, potential future development on the 1 acre would be governed by all the regulations in the Integrated Development Ordinance that pertain to the zone district, the use, and the location of the property, as well any other applicable laws and City regulations. For example regardless of the use, building colors would need to comply with Subsection 5-2(H)(1) Properties within 330 feet of Major Public Open Space, given proximity to Sandia Foothills Open Space.

You mention the possibility of a neighborhood meeting with the church pastor. Were you thinking of a meeting coordinated with the Supper Rock Neighborhood Association? I understand the proposed zone change for a church was discussed at their meeting in April of this year. The applicant offered a neighborhood meeting to the official representatives of the association more recently, as required by Subsection 6-4(C) NEIGHBORHOOD MEETING in the IDO, but none was requested.

General Information
The agenda and staff report will be available late afternoon on Thursday, October 4th—at:  
http://www.cabq.gov/planning/boards-commissions/environmental-planning-commission/epc-agendas-reports-minutes
The report will include any comments received from the public, as well as from city departments and agencies, and staff analysis of the request.

Written comments should be emailed to me as case planner. If received by Monday, October 1st, they can be included in the report; by Tuesday, October 9th at 9 am, they can be forwarded to the EPC (“24-hour rule”). Verbal testimony is also welcome at the EPC hearing on Thursday, October 11th. Please sign in to speak before the agenda item is heard.

Other links about planning and zoning in Albuquerque that may be generally useful are:  
- Comprehensive Plan: long term community vision, goals & policies to achieve it (listed first on Plans & Publications page)  
- Integrated Development Ordinance (IDO): land use and development regulations  
- City mapping resources

I am happy to clarify any of this over the phone, and look forward to receiving revisions to the questions.

Thanks & Best Regards,
From: Chuck [mailto:csbell65@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 11, 2018 7:23 AM
To: Toffaleti, Carol G. <cgtoffaleti@cabq.gov>
Subject: Re: information on City zoning

Carol,

Please see attached questions that I and my neighbors have regarding the re-zoning proposal south of Arcadia RD NE, at the foot hills.

Respectfully,

Chuck Bell

On Sep 7, 2018, at 2:10 PM, Toffaleti, Carol G. <cgtoffaleti@cabq.gov> wrote:

Hello Mr. Bell,

The new zoning code is called the Integrated Development Ordinance (IDO).

If you download the PDF of the IDO from this Planning Department webpage, the document is bookmarked, searchable, and hyperlinked to make it easier to find what you’re looking for. For example, you could search [Control-F] on community residential facility or group home to find all the references to these land uses in the document. The terms are defined in Section 7-1.

The on-line Official Zoning Map is accessible from the same webpage.
While the Planning Department was working on the IDO and--before that--on updating our Comprehensive Plan, a project website was created called https://ddei3-0-ctp.trendmicro.com:443/wis/clicktime/v1/query?url=https%3a%2f%2fabc-zone.com%2f&umid=F6EBDC5D-7598-6005-8EB-7C2774897031&auth=f0ebcd052f61e7a39dc93191e8a01d02608499af-af4e72724e0ae791b391e6ee90ffe9a704d697f. There is a lot of information on the website, but I think you will find this page useful since it focuses on R-1: https://ddei3-0-ctp.trendmicro.com:443/wis/clicktime/v1/query?url=https%3a%2f%2fabc-zone.com%2fdocument%2ftable%2d4%2d2%2d1%2dallowable%2duses%2d2dr%2d2dzone%2ddistrict&umid=F6EBDC5D-7598-6005-8EB-7C2774897031&auth=f0ebcd052f61e7a39dc93191e8a01d02608499af-5f956c2bf8b2d6890a09c4ab607120525609738e

I hope you will find these resources useful. If you have questions about accessing information or the content of the IDO, etc., feel free to get back to me.

Best Regards,

<image002.jpg>

CAROL TOFFALETI
long range senior planner
o 505.924.3345
e cgtoffaleti@cabq.gov
cabq.gov/planning

---

From: Toffaleti, Carol G.
Sent: Friday, September 07, 2018 9:10 AM
To: 'Chuck' <csbell65@gmail.com>
Cc: cnkokeefe@msn.com; baasch1@comcast.net; 'Ron Hensley' <ron@thegroup.cc>
Subject: RE: Rezoning proposal South of Arcadia Rd NE 87123

Hello Mr. Bell,

I’m the case planner with the City Planning Department for this rezoning request that the Environmental Planning Commission (EPC) will be reviewing and deciding.

If you have any comments that you wish the EPC to consider, please email them to me and/or you are welcome to attend the hearing to express them verbally.

FYI, the hearing is currently scheduled for next Thursday, but the applicant has requested a deferral to the October 11, 2018 hearing. It is very likely that the EPC will accept the deferral request, but it will not be official until they take action on September 13th. If you do wish to email comments, please send them to me no later than October 1st to be addressed in my staff report or no later than October 9th at 9 AM to be forwarded directly to the Commissioners.

Information about the EPC, including hearing agendas and staff reports, is available at http://www.cabq.gov/planning/boards-commissions/environmental-planning-commission. I am also happy to answer any questions about the EPC process or Zoning Map Amendment.

Thank you and Best Regards,

<image002.jpg>
From: Ron Hensley [mailto:ron@thegroup.cc]
Sent: Friday, September 07, 2018 8:31 AM
To: ’Chuck’ <csbell65@gmail.com>
Cc: cnkokeefe@msn.com; baasch1@comcast.net; Toffaleti, Carol G. <cgtoffaleti@cabq.gov>
Subject: RE: Rezoning proposal South of Arcadia Rd NE 87123

Mr. Bell,
I understand your concerns regarding the construction of the church. I hope the following answers those concerns.

1. The site is actually just over 4 acres. The church is seeking to change only the eastern acre to R-1, The remaining 3 acres of the tract would maintain the PD zone.
2. The proposed 5,000 sq.ft. structure would be used for church meetings. The church has about 20-25 families and meet on Sunday mornings and then about 10-15 families that meet Wednesday evenings. There will be other occasional meetings, but nothing else is scheduled regularly.
3. The church will have no other functions other than meetings.

Ron E. Hensley P.E.
505-410-1622
<image003.png>
ron@thegroup.cc

From: Chuck [mailto:csbell65@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, September 07, 2018 7:32 AM
To: Ron@thegroup.cc
Subject: Rezoning proposal South of Arcadia Rd NE 87123

Mr. Hensley,

Thank you for discussing the church’s plans for the property (three acres south of my home at 14112 Arcadia Rd. NE) and letting me email questions a few questions.
1. Will the church zone all three acres R-1D?
2. Will the 5,000 sq. ft. structure built on the east acre be a single family dwelling?
3. Will the dwelling be designed to accommodate a Community Residential Program?
4. Does the church plan on having a Community Residential Program in the dwelling? Pg. 5 of the attachment titled “5 ABQ zoning overview” describes the CRP allowed on R-1 properties.
5. If the church plans on having a CRP in the dwelling, do you plan on notifying the neighbors and the Supper Rock Neighborhood Association?

Here is the association’s contact information:
Thank you for taking the time to answer the questions.

Sincerely,

Chuck Bell
14112 Arcadia Rd. NE
Albuquerque, NM 87123
Phone: 505-615-6475
Email: csbell65@gmail.com

====================================================================
This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
Questions not answered satisfactorily:

- Will the dwelling be designed to accommodate a Community Residential Program?
- Does the church plan on having a Community Residential Program in the dwelling/facility?
- If the church plans on having a CRP in the dwelling, do you plan on notifying the neighbors and the Supper Rock Neighborhood Association?

Additional Questions after response to initial questions:

- Is the facility going to architecturally blend in with the existing neighborhood?
- Which Church of Christ is proposing this site plan, and what is the pastors name to possibly schedule a meeting with the neighborhood?
- Will the church move from its current location to permanently occupy a facility on the property recommended for rezoning?
- If the church is proposing a site plan for a 5000 square foot hall on 1 acre, what are the long-term plans for the other 3+ acres?
- What is the long-term plan for the proposed 5000 sq foot facility?
- Does the church own all of the acreage, including the acreage below Trimble and if so, what are the long-term plans for the use of this acreage?
- If the church plans on selling this acreage, are there already plans in place for the sale of this property to cover the construction of the hall?
- Is there a proposal or a future potential proposal to request re-zoning any of the acreage west of the current proposal?
- Is the hall going to be run as a standard church, or will the facility be used for other purposes? For example, a Community Residential Plan, or retreats.
- Will the facility be renting out the area during non-use times?
- What is the plan for security for the facility?
- What have been the historical zoning plans and the outcomes/issues for this property?
- What is the plan for the utilities and how those will be engineered?
- Because the proposed plan is over 1 mile on residential streets, what considerations will take place over safety concerns with additional traffic in these residential areas, and are speed bumps and additional signage on the streets a part of the proposal?
- Will current road structure support construction vehicles that would access the property?
- If current road structure is damaged or littered what entity is responsible for repair or cleaning?
- Will utilities be reduced or shut down for any length of time during construction should the re-zoning be approved?
- Will there be a waste station on or near the proposed rezoned property?
- How will waste station be powered?
- What back-up power system will be emplaced should primary power to the waste station be lost or any reason?
- What entity is responsible for security, maintenance, and
Hello Carol:
Thank you for taking the questions concerning the rezoning of EPC RZ-2018-001417 - Camino de la Serra

- Traffic going through residential areas for the church and if that is being addressed—which I believe you said there would not be—
- If this acre is zoned differently than the entire piece of property—future concerns/impact on re-zoning and usage of additional property, and again, traffic issues.
- Addressing the type of system used for sewage.

Lynn Barr
14106 Arcadia rd ne
Albuq. NM 87123
Dear Ms. Toffaleti,

I am a homeowner and resident of the Supper Rock neighborhood. My family has lived here since 1985. We moved here for the wonderful outdoor access to the Open Space foothills paths and the neighborhood's quiet, gentle proximity to nature. We have many friends in the neighborhood.

My husband and I have been appalled to find out about a church group wanting to build a structure and bring a congregation and their members into the end of this quiet residential area. It makes no sense! There is no public access from any major street, it would disrupt residents lives in a very negative way, and it wouldn't preserve the residential feel of our neighborhood. Further, it could easily devalue residential property values. Safety of our children and elderly residents--and we have both in this neighborhood--is of grave concern, too, as is increased crime--virtually guaranteed by the increased traffic.

The ONLY reasons we can think a group would even come up with such a plan is to gain major visibility from the freeway, but that is faulty, short-sighted thinking. A church should be built near roads with major access.

Because we cannot attend the changed hearing, we thought it was important to share our views with you. If our concerns are not addressed in a logical manner, we cannot even envision staying in this neighborhood, as we are already facing a rise in crime coming from increased homelessness along the Central/Tramway area. We are so discouraged after investing so many years of our lives in a city and state we love and hope to stay in.

Please let me know if we can answer any questions.

Sincerely,

Kathy Richter-Sand and Bob Richter-Sand

14514 Hilldale Road ne
Albuquerque 87123

505-220-7155 (Kathy)
505-220-1250 (Bob)
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