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INTER-OFFICE MEMORANDUM

TO: Patrick Davis, President, City Council
FROM: Brennon Williams, Director, Planning Department

SUBJECT: AC-20-12 Project PR-2020-004030 SI-2020-00540: Marsha Kearney and Mike Mirabal appeal the decision of the Development Review Board to approve a Site Plan for all or a portion of TRACT E-1 PLAT OF TRACTS D-1, E-1 AMAFCA BLACK ARROYO CHANNEL ROW PARADISE HEIGHTS, Zoned MX-M, located at GOLF COURSE RD. NW between GOLF COURSE RD NW, BLACK ARROYO and WESTSIDE BLVD. NW, and containing approximately 8.77 acre(s). (A-12,13)

OVERVIEW

An application for a Site Plan-DRB for a 208-unit multi-family residential development for a property containing 8.77 acres at the southern half of the parcel at the southeast corner of Golf Course Blvd. NW and Westside Blvd. NW was approved by the Development Review Board (DRB) on September 30, 2020. The apartments are distributed across four buildings (52 units each) with a height of 45 feet. There is a 50-foot buffer along the east side of the property adjacent to a low density residential subdivision.

The proposal was processed through the DRB in accordance with the standards of the Integrated Development Ordinance (IDO), Sections 14-16-6-5(G) and 14-16-6-6(G), which requires a site plan approval by the DRB for any multi-family development of more than 50 units.

An appeal of the site plan approval was filed on October 13, 2020 by Marsha Kearney and Mike Mirabal. The appeal was filed in a timely manner prior to the listed deadline of October 15, 2020.

HISTORY

The IDO requires both a neighborhood meeting and a pre-application (PRT) meeting prior to submittal of an application for a Site Plan-DRB (Table 6-1-1 IDO). The required PRT was held for the subject project on March 9, 2020. A facilitated neighborhood meeting was held on May 21, 2020 with the Home Owner’s Association. Subsequently, an application for a Site Plan-DRB was submitted and
scheduled for the July 22, 2020 meeting of the DRB. Per the IDO, a Site Plan-DRB requires a legal advertisement (publication) and notification to the abutting property owners and the Neighborhood Associations. These standards were completed as required. Prior to the meeting of July 22, 2020, letters were submitted by residents voicing their concerns about zoning, traffic, density, character and crime. Concerns were also expressed about how the virtual meeting format impacted public participation. This is not a complete list of concerns but the letters are a part of the record and are attached.

At the July 22, 2020 DRB meeting, members of the public signed up to speak to give their comments. All were afforded this opportunity including cross examination or asking questions following DRB comments. DRB members made comments which needed to be addressed prior to any action on the application, so the case was deferred to the August 5, 2020 meeting to allow time address comments: from Planning regarding landscaping, on-site open space and compliance with IDO; from the Albuquerque Water Authority regarding a serviceability statement; and from Transportation regarding a trip generation count.

The case was reviewed again on August 5th, with the public commenting on traffic, density, character, school overcrowding, and crime. DRB members had additional items needing to be addressed and the DRB deferred the case to the August 26th meeting. For the August 26th meeting, the applicant requested a deferral to September 30th and the case was not reviewed. At the review meeting of September 30th, the public commented again concerning traffic, density, character, and crime. They also commented that the buffer between the existing residential development the proposed project should not include a wall or a drainage pond.

The DRB approved the site plan at the September 30th meeting, as noted in the Notice of Decision, with delegation to Planning to finalize design of the wall in the landscape buffer and Water Authority to execute the development agreement.

APPEAL

IDO Section 14-16-6-4(U) outlines the applicable criteria for the appeal in determining whether the DRB made one of the following mistakes when rendering their decision:

1. The decision-making body or the prior appeal body acted fraudulently, arbitrarily, or capriciously.
2. The decision being appealed is not supported by substantial evidence.
3. The decision-making body or the prior appeal body erred in applying the requirements of this IDO (or a plan, policy, or regulation referenced in the review and decision-making criteria for the type of decision being appealed).

The appellant cites the following as reasons for the appeal (in bold text). Staff’s response to the appellant’s arguments follows (in regular text). A full list of the appellant’s arguments are contained in Marsha Kearney’s appeal application dated October 13, 2020 which is included in the packet.

1. Appellant: The project is not in compliance with NMSA 1978 §3-21-5 and the IDO §1-2 requires compliance with existing law on the same subject. The IDO policies require the
project to be in ‘scale and character’ with the surrounding area.

Staff Response: The City of Albuquerque is a home rule municipality. Under the State of New Mexico Constitution, municipalities that adopt a charter may exercise the legislative powers and perform all functions not expressly denied by general law or charter. (N.M. Const. art. 10, § 6, subd. D.) Planning authorities of a municipality are required to adopt regulations governing the planning and platting of land within its municipal boundary. (NMSA 1978, § 3-19-5.) Pursuant to planning and platting authority municipalities must also adopt a master plan, or comprehensive plan, within the municipal jurisdiction. (NMSA 1978, § 3-19-9.) In partnership with Bernalillo County, the City adopted the Albuquerque/Bernalillo County Comprehensive Plan (ABC Comp Plan), as required by state statute. One of the purposes of the Integrated Zoning Ordinance (IDO) is to implement the adopted ABC Comp Plan. (IDO § 14-16-1-3(A).) Therefore, the IDO controls the regulations for scale and character of development within the City. For this site plan application, DRB is responsible for applying IDO requirements related to scale and character through zoning, height, setbacks, and parking requirements.

2. Appellant: The application does not address the cumulative effects regarding traffic, overcrowded schools, job/housing balance and will lead to problems for the Westside.

Staff Responses:
Traffic. The apartment development did not meet the threshold to require a Traffic Impact Study. The listed threshold is 100 vehicles in or out during AM or PM peak hour. The consultant was asked to provide a trip generation analysis which concluded that the threshold was not met. Staff verified this using the Institute of Traffic Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual based on the number of apartment units.

Traffic Roundabout. The traffic roundabout that was designed to the north of the site was presented for the August 5th, 2020 DRB meeting. Consequently, the DRB Transportation Engineer asked for geometry for this layout, as well as a shared access agreement. A shared access agreement allows the subject site and the parcel to the north to share use of the traffic roundabout which is partially on each site. It was stated that the owner of both parcels was expecting a future commercial development for the northern parcel, but did not yet know the details. The roundabout is appropriate for traffic circulation based on existing driveway locations and was deemed adequate for the amount of traffic expected for the Wintergreen Apartments in combination with the lot size to the north.

Schools. Major developments are reviewed by Albuquerque Public Schools (APS). APS commented on the application in a July 21, 2020 memorandum. APS reported that the estimated 53 elementary students generated from the apartments would strain Seven Bar Elementary School which had 17 spaces available. Yet, APS stated that they had measures to accommodate student overcapacity issues, such as the use of portables. APS reported that the middle school and the high school in the area had space available for the estimated 23 middle school and 23 high school students estimated to be generated by the apartments.

Job-Housing Balance. There is no IDO requirement to require a site plan be reviewed regarding the jobs-to-housing balance on the westside of Albuquerque.
3. **Appellant: The IDO changed the site zoning from C-2 to MX-M without notification to adjacent property owners.**

   Staff Response: The IDO was drafted between 2015 and 2018 with many public meeting opportunities to review standards and proposed zones, and it was in the City’s review and decision process from December 2016 through May 2018, with multiple public hearings at each step in the approval process.

   The IDO converted the subject parcel along with all properties in Albuquerque when the IDO first went into effect in May 2018. That review/decision process created new zoning citywide under a legislative process. For legislative actions, the City does not provide notice to every property owner, instead the City puts an ad in the legal notices in the Albuquerque Journal and sends emails/letters to neighborhood representatives on file with the Office of Neighborhood Coordination. The neighborhood notice requirement is set by the Neighborhood Association Recognition Ordinance (NARO) and generally administered by the Office of Neighborhood Coordination.

4. **Appellant: The DRB did not appropriately apply the Neighborhood Edge provision of the IDO, particularly with regard to the placement of a wall and a retention pond in the 15 foot buffer area.**

   Staff Response:
   The DRB correctly applied the provisions of the IDO with regard to a wall and stormwater management areas being placed in the Edge Buffer area.

   **Wall.** There is no restriction in the IDO or DPM on a wall being constructed within the edge landscape buffer so long as the intent of IDO §5-6(E)(1)(a) ‘to mitigate the impacts of significant differences in property use, size, or scale is met.’

   IDO §5-7(C)(1) states:

   Walls may be constructed anywhere on a parcel, including but not limited to any front, side, or rear setback area, unless otherwise prohibited by this IDO, by Articles 14-1 and 14-3 of ROA 1994 (Uniform Administrative Code and Uniform Housing Code), Article 14-2 of ROA 1994 (Fire Code), or by clear site triangle requirements in the Development Process Manual (DPM).

   Placing a wall in the buffer area between the apartments and the adjacent Seven Bar subdivision does not reduce the function of the edge buffer to mitigate impacts of the differences in property use, size, or scale.

   **Stormwater Ponds.** The IDO Section on Landscaping and Stormwater Management Features includes language that buffer areas should serve as stormwater management areas:

   Required landscape and buffer areas shall be designed to serve as stormwater
management areas to the maximum extent practicable and consistent with their required locations and vegetation. (IDO §5-6(C)(13)(a))

The IDO encourages ponding in the buffer area and does not restrict it.

5. **Appellant: The DRB review reduced public input to less than available with the EPC. Signed postings and mailed notice was inadequate.**

Staff Response: The application met the criteria for review by the DRB and the notification procedures were met according to IDO Table 6-1-1 and included published notice, mailed noticed, sign posting, electronic mail, and web posting. Pre-application and neighborhood meetings were provided by the applicant. The applicant reported in their submittal and their sworn testimony to the DRB that all IDO notice requirements were met. The applicant followed the Office of Neighborhood Coordination’s list of addresses to mail out letters. That list was generated according to rules for determining the buffer map and the AGIS zoning on the arroyo did not identify that the arroyo was considered a right-of-way. Because of the requirement to notice properties within 100-foot, the buffer map shows that three homes were identified for notice on Benton Avenue which is south of the arroyo. The applicant’s submittal shows evidence of mailing notice to those three addresses on Benton Avenue.

The applicant reported to the DRB that the yellow sign was posted per the sign posting agreement. On July 20th, the applicant became aware that the yellow sign was leaning over at a 45-degree angle, and the applicant reported that they immediately re-erected the sign.

The IDO requires the applicant to make all reasonable attempts to supply notice with an understanding that slight errors make occur.

   If the applicant provides evidence that the required notices were timely provided, then failure of a property owner or Neighborhood Association to receive actual notice due to changes of address since the latest update to the City or County real estate records, or due to changes of e-mail addresses since those were last provided to the City, or due to errors in postal delivery or newspaper publishing, or for other reasons beyond the control of applicant or City, shall not be grounds for a delay of application review or public hearings, or for appeal of the resulting decision. IDO §6-4(K)(7)(e)

Here, the applicant satisfied the IDO notice requirements and made reasonable attempts to correct the leaning notice on the property.

6. **Appellant: The appeal needs to be brought before the entire City Council in accordance with NMSA 1978 § 3-21-6(C) which requires approval of a majority of the vote of the members of the City Council when 20% or more of adjacent landowners within a certain area protest in writing.**

Staff Response: Appellant’s claim that the City of Albuquerque must follow NMSA 1978, § 3-21-6(C) for a site plan review is incorrect. The City of Albuquerque is a home-rule municipality. By state law, the City may adopt ordinances that regulate zoning and planning procedures. When the City Council enacted the IDO, it restricted the twenty-percent rule of §3-21-6(C) to only zone
map amendments (See IDO § 6-7(G)). IDO § 6-7(G) does not apply to site plan applications such as the Wintergreen apartments.

7. **Appellant**: The Open Meetings Act is violated when the DRB reviewed the site plan during a pandemic and through the use of Zoom meetings.

Staff Response: The Mayor of Albuquerque, Timothy M. Keller, signed the ‘Seventh Declaration of Local Emergency Due to Novel Coronavirus COVID-19’ which included the following statement authorizing the DRB to conduct a virtual meeting via teleconference or videoconference:

“9. Pursuant to the need for responsive and well-informed government continuity during the current emergency, all public boards, commissions, and committees subject to the Public Boards and Commissions Ordinance § 2-6-1-1 et seq., are hereby authorized to conduct virtual meetings via teleconference or videoconference for the duration of this Order…”

The DRB made efforts to make sure that members of the public wanting to participate in the DRB meetings could do so successfully. The DRB Chair offered the public the opportunity to both speak and engage in cross examination, the same opportunities that were provided for the in-person meetings.

8. **Appellant**: The applicant presented a new site plan on the day the project was approved that showed a roundabout and water system partially on the parcel to the north.

Staff Response:

**Traffic Roundabout.** The traffic roundabout that was designed on the northern boundary of the site was presented for the August 5th, 2020 DRB meeting, almost two months prior to the approval date. Consequently, the DRB Transportation Engineer asked for the geometry of this layout as well as a shared access agreement. A shared access agreement allows the subject site (Tract E1) and the parcel to the north (Tract D1) to share use of the roundabout which is partially on each site. It was stated that the owner of both parcels was expecting a future commercial development for the northern parcel, but did not know the details. The roundabout is appropriate for traffic circulation based on existing driveway locations and was deemed adequate for the amount of traffic expected for the Wintergreen Apartments in combination with the lot size to the north.

**Water and Sewer:** The proposed Wintergreen Apartments (Tract E1) will be obtaining water service from the existing 12” waterline along its property frontage along Golf Course Rd. The existing 12” waterline along Golf Course Rd. covers the entire western property frontages of Tract D1 and Tract E1. Water service to the northern parcel (Tract D1) is likely to come from the 12” waterline along Golf Course Rd., but official requirements have not been determined as there has not been a request for availability for this property. Developments on separate properties are required to have separate water services and accounts per Water Authority requirements. In other words, any development on northern Tract D1 will not be able to connect to the private water system on the apartment parcel Tract E1, as they shall both be separate.
Wintergreen Apartments (Tract E1) will be extending a public sanitary sewer internal to the site from an existing public sanitary sewer along its southern property frontage, north to its northern property line. This is a requirement to facilitate a future extension north to serve development that takes place on northern Tract D1, given that there is currently not any public sanitary sewer along the property frontages along Golf Course Rd.

All approvals related to transportation, water, and sewer service infrastructure for the subject parcel followed normal review analysis and met the requirements of the IDO, DPM, and Water Authority requirements.

CONCLUSION

The DRB evaluated the Site Plan based on the zoning of the subject site with the associated standards of the IDO. The IDO is the authoritative document for Albuquerque, a home rule municipality. The DRB ultimately approved a Site Plan because it met all of the applicable technical standards of the IDO and Development Process Manual. The DRB did not err in applying the applicable IDO standards. The decision of the DRB was supported by substantial evidence in the record including DRB review comments for each subject area and oral testimony in the DRB meetings. The DRB did not act fraudulently, arbitrarily, or capriciously. The DRB acted within its authority to approve the Site Plan for the multi-family project.

Jolene Wolfley, Chair
Development Review Board
Planning Department
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OFFICIAL NOTIFICATION OF DECISION

Calabacillas Group C/O Donald Harville
3301 R Coors Boulevard NW
ABQ, NM 87120

Project# PR-2020-004030
Application#
SI-2020-00540 SITE PLAN – DRB

LEGAL DESCRIPTION:

For all or a portion of: TRACT E-1 PLAT OF
TRACTS D-1, E-1 AMAFCA BLACK ARROYO
CHANNEL ROW PARADISE HEIGHTS, zoned
MX-M, located at GOLF COURSE RD NW
between GOLF COURSE RD NW, BLACK
ARROYO and WESTSIDE BLVD containing
approximately 8.77 acre(s). (A-12,13)

On September 30, 2020, the Development Review Board (DRB) held a public meeting concerning
the above referenced application and approved the request, with delegation to Parks and
Recreation, ABCWUA, and Planning, based on the following Findings:

1. This is a request to construct 208 multi-family residential dwellings on the subject property.
The site plan is required to be reviewed by the Development Review Board (DRB) because
more than 50 dwelling units are being proposed.
   1. Pursuant to 6-6(G)(3) Review and Decision Criteria An application for a Site Plan –
      DRB shall be approved if it meets all of the following criteria:

   a. 6-6(G)(3)(a) The Site Plan complies with all applicable provisions of this IDO, the
      DPM, other adopted City regulations, and any conditions specifically applied to
      development of the property in a prior permit or approval affecting the property.
The structure heights, parking, and landscaping meet the IDO and site plan requirements: the building height of 45 feet complies with the maximum allowed 45-foot building height; 374 parking spaces are provided where 312 parking spaces are required; and 144,030 square feet of landscaping is proposed where 48,141 square feet is required. A landscape buffer adjoining the existing low density residential neighborhood is 50 feet wide and will be designed to meet the IDO and site plan requirements with the adherence to the conditions of approval (see below). Usable open space is proposed to be 144,030 square feet, featuring a pool area, a 5-foot wide crushed gravel trail around the perimeter of the site, and park benches; 45,600 square feet of usable open space is required.

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

The site has access to a full range of urban services including utilities, roads and emergency services. A traffic impact study is not required for this project because it does not meet the threshold for such study as stated by Transportation.

c. 6-6(G)(3)(c) The Site Plan mitigates any significant adverse impacts on the surrounding area to the maximum extent practicable.

The applicant will provide screening through landscaping and walls/fencing to shield the proposed development from adjacent residential development. The southern border of the site is adjacent to a concrete arroyo channel owned by AMAFCA and 3 feet of view fencing on top of 3 feet of block wall complies with the IDO for property adjacent to an arroyo.

2. This site requires an Infrastructure List. This was approved by the DRB at the meeting of September 30, 2020.

3. The Neighborhood Edge requirement of 14-16-5-9 of the IDO is met; a 15-foot wide landscape buffer is required, but a 50-foot wide buffer is provided.

4. Staff received letters of opposition to the request and members of the public spoke at the hearing in opposition to the request. Concerns included traffic, building height, privacy, crime, and impact on neighborhood character.

5. The applicant provided the required notice as outlined in the IDO Table 6-1-1.

6. The proposed use is allowed within the MX-M zone.
Conditions:

1. This Site Plan is valid 5 years from DRB approval (9/30/2020). An extension may be requested prior to the expiration date.
2. A note will be added to the site plan: “Pursuant to IDO 5-6(C)(5)(b) Organic mulch, such as wood chips or pecan shells, is required as ground cover for the portion of any landscaped area surrounding the vegetation root ball, as well as beneath the entire tree canopy or dripline, in each required landscape area.”
3. Final sign off is delegated to ABCWUA for execution of the development agreement.
4. Final sign off is delegated to Planning to finalize the wall and landscaping in the 15 foot portion of the landscape buffer adjacent to the existing residential subdivision.
5. The applicant will obtain final sign off from ABCWUA, and Planning by December 30, 2020 or the case may be scheduled for the next DRB hearing and could be denied her the DRB Rules of Procedure.

APPEAL: If you wish to appeal this decision, you must do so within 15 days of the DRB’s decision or by OCTOBER 15, 2020. The date of the DRB’s decision is not included in the 15-day period for filing an appeal, and if the 15th day falls on a Saturday, Sunday or Holiday, the next working day is considered as the deadline for filing the appeal.

For more information regarding the appeal process, please refer to Section 14-16-6-4(U) of the Integrated Development Ordinance (IDO). Appeals should be submitted via email to PLNDRS@CABQ.GOV (if files are less than 9MB in size). Files larger than 9MB can be sent to PLNDRS@CABQ.GOV using https://wetransfer.com. A Non-Refundable filing fee will be calculated and you will receive instructions about paying the fee online.

You will receive notification if any 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. Applicants submitting for building permit prior to the completion of the appeal period do so at their own risk. Successful applicants are reminded that there may be other City regulations of the IDO that must be complied with, even after approval of the referenced application(s).

Sincerely,

Jolene Wolfley
DRB Chair

JW/jr
Tierra West, LLC, 5571 Midway Park Place NE, ABQ, NM 87109
City of Albuquerque

DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD APPLICATION

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

SUBDIVISIONS
- □ Final Sign off of EPC Site Plan(s) (Form P2)
- □ Amendment to Site Plan (Form P2)
- □ Vacation of Public Right-of-way (Form V)
- □ Major - Preliminary Plat (Form P1)
- □ Minor Amendment to Infrastructure List (Form S2)
- □ Vacation of Public Easement(s) DRB (Form V)
- □ Minor - Preliminary/Final Plat (Form S2)
- □ Extension of Infrastructure List or IIA (Form S1)
- □ Vacation of Private Easement(s) (Form V)
- □ Amendment to Preliminary Plat (Form S2)
- □ Temporary Deferral of SAN (Form V2)
- □ Sidewalk Waiver (Form V2)
- □ Extension of Preliminary Plat (Form S1)
- □ Waiver to IDO (Form V2)
- □ Sketch Plat Review and Comment (Form S2)
- □ Waiver to DPM (Form V2)
- □ Decision of DRB (Form A)

SITE PLANS
- □ DRB Site Plan (Form P2)

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF REQUEST

APPLICATION INFORMATION

Applicant: Mike Miranda
Phone: 505-363-4440
Email: miker@comcast.net
Address: 10951 Carrero Drive NW
City: Albuquerque
State: NM
Zip: 87114
Phone: 505-899-9705
Email: rimekk1978@gmail.com
Address: 10921 Carrero Drive NW
City: Albuquerque
State: NM
Zip: 87114
Professional/Agent (if any): Marsha Kearney
City: Albuquerque
Proprietary Interest in Site: Adjacent Homeowner
List all owners:

SITE INFORMATION (Accuracy of the existing legal description is crucial! Attach a separate sheet if necessary.)

Lot or Tract No.: E-1 Plat of Tracts D-1 E-1 Block: 3383 PARADISE
Subdivision/Addition: AMAFCA BLACK ARROYO-CUTWATER
MRGCDA Map No.: 839-1386
Zone Atlas Page(s): A-1213 Existing Zoning: MX-M
# of Proposed Lots: 2 Total Area of Site (Acres): 8.79 acres

LOCATION OF PROPERTY BY STREETS

Site Address/Street: Golf Course Rd NW Between Golf Course Rd NW and Westside Blvd.

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

Project #: PA-2020-004030 App #: S1-2020-00540 Site Plan - DRB

Signature: Mike D. Miranda Date: 10/13/2020
Printed Name: Mike D. Miranda
Applicant or Agent

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Case Numbers Action Fees Case Numbers Action Fees

Meeting Date: Fee Total:
Staff Signature: Date: Project #
FORM A: Appeals
Complete applications for appeals will only be accepted within 15 consecutive days, excluding holidays, after the decision being appealed was made.

- **APPEAL OF A DECISION OF CITY PLANNING STAFF (HISTORIC PRESERVATION PLANNER) ON A HISTORIC CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS – MINOR TO THE LANDMARKS COMMISSION (LC)**
- **APPEAL OF A DECISION OF CITY PLANNING STAFF ON AN IMPACT FEE ASSESSMENT TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING COMMISSION (EPC)**
- **APPEAL TO CITY COUNCIL THROUGH THE LAND USE HEARING OFFICER (LUHO)**
  - Interpreter Needed for Hearing? **No**, if yes, indicate language:
  - A Single PDF file of the complete application including all documents being submitted must be emailed to PLNDRS@cabc.gov prior to making a submittal. Zipped files or those over 5 MB cannot be delivered via email, in which case the PDF must be provided on a CD. PDF shall be organized with the Development Review Application and this Form A at the front followed by the remaining documents in the order provided on this form.
  - Project number of the case being appealed, if applicable: **PR-2020-004030**
  - Application number of the case being appealed, if applicable: **SL-2020-00549**
  - Type of decision being appealed: **SITE PLAN APPROVAL**
  - Letter of authorization from the appellant if appeal is submitted by an agent (N/A)
  - Appellant’s basis of standing in accordance with IDO Section 14-16-6-4(U)(2)
  - Reason for the appeal identifying the section of the IDO, other City regulation, or condition attached to a decision that has not been interpreted or applied correctly, and further addressing the criteria in IDO Section 14-16-6-4(U)(4)
  - Copy of the Official Notice of Decision regarding the matter being appealed

---

**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.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature: Mike D. Mirabal</th>
<th>Date: 10/13/2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Printed Name: Mike D. Mirabal</td>
<td>Applicant or Agent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Form A Checklist
Project #PR-2020-0040303

Letter of authorization from the appellant is submitted by an agent -

This is not necessary as the listed appellant will be submitting the appeal. The listed agent is actually included in presenting this appeal.

Appellant's basis of standing in accordance with IDO Section 14-16-6-4(U)(4)

Both Marsha Kearney and Mike Mirabel are owners, as listed in the records of the County Assessor, of Property located partially or completely within 100 feet (excluding public rights of way) of property listed in the application.

Reason for the appeal identifying the section of the IDO, other City regulation, or condition attached to a decision that has not been interpreted or applied correctly, and further addressing the criteria in IDO Section 14-16-6-4(U)(4)

See attachment #1

Copy of the Official Notice of Decision regarding the matter being appealed

See attachment #2
1. **Neighborhood Protection Policies are being ignored.**

This project is not in compliance with the State Statutes, Universal Citation: NM Stat § 3-21-5 (2019). On the first page of the Integrated Development Ordinance (IDO) under 1-2 Authority it states that “In enacting the IDO, the City intends to comply with the provisions of existing law on the same subject, and the provision of this IDO should be interpreted to achieve that goal.”

Albuquerque/Bernalillo County Comprehensive Plan - As Adopted by City Council March 2017

The ABC-Z Comp Plan Policies are not being followed as the project is not in “Scale and Character” with the surrounding area, which are single homes (all of a Southwest design with a two story height limit. The area is not an activity center, transit corridor, nor does it have a grid system of roadways to disperse traffic in different directions.

2. **School and Traffic Issues will be exacerbated.**

The two biggest issues in this community are overcrowded schools and traffic congestion due to inadequate infrastructure and a high percentage of the workers needing to commute to work. Instead of alleviating these problems, this use of the land will greatly add to the problems. This area was previously zoned as C-2 with conditional use apartments (2 story vs. 4 story buildings) and a proposal for an apartment complex was denied in 2006, because it did not address the school issue (one of three criteria that had to be met for conditional use). It's estimated this proposed complex will add 100 students to schools at and above capacity, with no plans to construct more capacity in the future. There is a very low job to population ratio in the area, which results in a high number of commuters. Add to that the fact that Westside is used as a major access to Rio Rancho and hospitals in the immediate area (Rust Center and Lovelace). This application, and other such projects do not address cumulative effects regarding traffic, overcrowded schools, job/housing balance and will lead to future problems for the Westside.

3. **IDO changed C2 to M-XM without notification to adjacent property owners.**

The project area was previously zoned C-2, which fit in well with the needs of the neighborhood. This community is tight-knit neighborhood, with many living here since it was first established over 20 years ago. All of those living with 100 feet of the project area were never informed directly of the change in zoning, or even the conversion opportunity in 2018-2019. At a minimum the homeowners immediately adjacent to the property should have been notified. The MX-M zoning is more permissive (45 foot high) and creates much greater problems for the neighborhood and surrounding communities (schools, traffic) as it greatly decreases neighborhood protection, especially as it relates to security, privacy, and solar access due to the height of the buildings.

4. **The Neighborhood Edge direction is being ignored.**

Section 5-6(E)(2)(a) states that a landscape buffer area at least 15 foot wide will be provided adjacent to the adjacent properties. The landscape buffer is being ignored in the area where the retention pond is proposed. Also, according to 5-6(E)(1)(b) the wall is to be placed at least 15 feet from the adjacent property. The site plan shows a wall to be constructed within 5 feet of the property line. Both of these issues are critical to protection of the the adjacent property
owners to lessen the impacts to their property. In these cases the decision-making body did NOT apply the regulations of the IDO.

5. **The lack of adherence to the notification process and removal of the EPC review has greatly hindered the community involvement.**

The IDO process greatly reduces the public/community input aspect of projects, especially those which are below the 10 acre, 247 unit threshold. The City has removed the site plan review from the EPC to the DRB. This results in great reduction of public involvement, no consideration of cumulative effects or adverse impacts and the lack of adherence to Comp plan policies. The DRB can only review the site plan. This results in a project that is not required to meet the needs of the neighborhood and community. With there only being one stage of public involvement and notification limited to the adjacent property owners and signage at the property site - these actions are even more critical. This is especially true in this time of the pandemic. In this case the applicant did not have the signage did not meet the requirement of being visible on site until less than 48 hours before the first hearing. The mailing list was incomplete and several people who were to be contacted were not. In addition, some residents were not contacted because the arroyo right-of-way was not taken into consideration. In this case, even though there were meetings with Tierra West they did not have to listen to our input, nor seek compromise to address issues.

6. **This appeal needs to be brought forward to the entire City Council.**

In accordance with New Mexico Statues Chapter 3, Article 21, Section 3-21-6(c), this appeal needs to be brought forward to the entire City Council. There were 100% written opposition to this project by all the notified homeowners in 7 Bar North neighborhood. This neighborhood by far makes up the majority of the adjacent property owners, far exceeding the 20% limit.

7. **This process violates the Open Meetings Act.**

During normal times this process greatly limits community involvement, and with the pandemic that is even more true as we abide by the pandemic guidelines. Add in the essential workers, responsibilities to family, economic situation, at-risk residents. Zoom meetings have been difficult to hear, ability to participate is limited. It’s a grievous to see this process pushed through during this time of trouble.

8. **Presentation of new site plan and documents to the DRB on the same day as the Project was approved is inappropriate and should push back the process.**

Tierra West presented a new site plan that included a round-about that was not on the original plan. This is a major change that also shows plan for a road to the tract on the north side of the project. This indicates that another project is planned for that property, yet no permit has been applied for there. The tract is owned by the same people. If they keep it separate they avoid doing any planning beyond the IDO. The same situation is true for the water system being proposed. The site plan should include the property to the north if the infrastructure of the tract is involved. Tierra West was supposed to get with the neighborhood to discuss the wall design. The date is October 12th and they are not yet ready to meet.
Councilors,

I am writing with great concern of the process concerning the Wintergreen Apartment development. This development has exposed several issues of Due Process and fairness. Our neighborhood has been in existence for approximately 22 years. we have become a very cohesive neighborhood, and feel very close knit and safe in our development. Until recently our Privacy, Safety, convenience, and tranquility, have not been under threat. This Development is a threat to all that we have become accustomed.

1. Previous apartment proposals have been deemed a negative impact to the community.
2. The property in question was zoned C-2 Conditional use for apartment development. (26 ft. Max. height)
3. The Zoning for the property was changed without notice to residents within 100 feet. (per previous existing regulations)
4. The previous site plan was changed from individual acre lots to two larger tracts of approx. 8.5 acres.( No Notification.)
5. The Notification process did not include all residents with in 100 feet. (current regulations)
6. The development was sent to the DRB which only considers site plans ( not public concerns)
7. The developers are not required to consider or act on neighborhood concerns. (non-binding)
8. Input to the DRB was ignored since they only do site plans.
9. Site plan was approved by DRB over objection of established neighborhood.
10. Changes to site plan were made the day of DRB, and were not shown to residents in advance. (Secondary submittal)
11. The process violates the intent of the IDO and the zoning process. It doesn’t take into consideration existing Comp plans and sector plans.
12. Apartment height and style are inconsistent with surrounding neighborhood. (Violates IDO standards)
13. Using commercial property for multi-family housing eliminates opportunities for local community jobs and creates traffic congestion.
14. This development overcrowds our schools and is detrimental to quality education.
15. National traffic studies don’t consider site specific data. Our Traffic flows are already at dangerous levels. (Site specific required)
16. This project was proposed under pandemic restrictions, and has not allowed us open access.
17. The IDO is a flawed document in that it creates unequal rights.

We have constitutional rights to privacy, we have a right to safety, we have rights to good schools and tranquility.
This process restricts our rights, based on the fact that this property is being developed on an 8.6-acre site.
Due to the size of the lot, the developers are not required to consider the impacts to the community. Normally these developments would go to the EPC, where there would be fair consideration of impact. If this lot were 10 acres or more it would require impact studies.
This is an arbitrary regulation that restricts fairness and due process to our community. Residents are now being treated differently based on lot size. Very unfair and inconsistent.
PLANNING DEPARTMENT
DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DIVISION
600 2nd Street NW, Ground Floor, 87102
P.O. Box 1293, Albuquerque, NM 87103
Office (505) 924-3946

OFFICIAL NOTIFICATION OF DECISION

Calabacillas Group C/O Donald Harville
3301 R Coors Boulevard NW
ABQ, NM 87120

Project# PR-2020-004030
Application#
SI-2020-00540 SITE PLAN - DRB

LEGAL DESCRIPTION:

For all or a portion of: TRACT E-1 PLAT OF
TRACTS D-1, E-1 AMAFCA BLACK ARROYO
CHANNEL ROW PARADISE HEIGHTS, zoned
MX-M, located at GOLF COURSE RD NW
between GOLF COURSE RD NW, BLACK
ARROYO and WESTSIDE BLVD containing
approximately 8.77 acre(s). (A-12,13)

On September 30, 2020, the Development Review Board (DRB) held a public meeting concerning
the above referenced application and approved the request, with delegation to Parks and
Recreation, ABCWUA, and Planning, based on the following Findings:

1. This is a request to construct 208 multi-family residential dwellings on the subject property.
The site plan is required to be reviewed by the Development Review Board (DRB) because
more than 50 dwelling units are being proposed.

   1. Pursuant to 6-6(G)(3) Review and Decision Criteria An application for a Site Plan –
      DRB shall be approved if it meets all of the following criteria:

   a. 6-6(G)(3)(a) The Site Plan complies with all applicable provisions of this IDO, the
      DPM, other adopted City regulations, and any conditions specifically applied to
      development of the property in a prior permit or approval affecting the property.
The structure heights, parking, and landscaping meet the IDO and site plan requirements: the building height of 45 feet complies with the maximum allowed 45-foot building height; 374 parking spaces are provided where 312 parking spaces are required; and 144,030 square feet of landscaping is proposed where 48,141 square feet is required. A landscape buffer adjoining the existing low density residential neighborhood is 50 feet wide and will be designed to meet the IDO and site plan requirements with the adherence to the conditions of approval (see below). Usable open space is proposed to be 144,030 square feet, featuring a pool area, a 5-foot wide crushed gravel trail around the perimeter of the site, and park benches; 45,600 square feet of usable open space is required.

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

The site has access to a full range of urban services including utilities, roads and emergency services. A traffic impact study is not required for this project because it does not meet the threshold for such study as stated by Transportation.

c. 6-6(G)(3)(c) The Site Plan mitigates any significant adverse impacts on the surrounding area to the maximum extent practicable.

The applicant will provide screening through landscaping and walls/fencing to shield the proposed development from adjacent residential development. The southern border of the site is adjacent to a concrete arroyo channel owned by AMAFCA and 3 feet of view fencing on top of 3 feet of block wall complies with the IDO for property adjacent to an arroyo.

2. This site requires an Infrastructure List. This was approved by the DRB at the meeting of September 30, 2020.

3. The Neighborhood Edge requirement of 14-16-5-9 of the IDO is met; a 15-foot wide landscape buffer is required, but a 50-foot wide buffer is provided.

4. Staff received letters of opposition to the request and members of the public spoke at the hearing in opposition to the request. Concerns included traffic, building height, privacy, crime, and impact on neighborhood character.

5. The applicant provided the required notice as outlined in the IDO Table 6-1-1.

6. The proposed use is allowed within the MX-M zone.
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Conditions:

1. This Site Plan is valid 5 years from DRB approval (9/30/2020). An extension may be requested prior to the expiration date.

2. A note will be added to the site plan: “Pursuant to IDO 5-6(C)(5)(b) Organic mulch, such as wood chips or pecan shells, is required as ground cover for the portion of any landscaped area surrounding the vegetation root ball, as well as beneath the entire tree canopy or dripline, in each required landscape area.”

3. Final sign off is delegated to ABCWUA for execution of the development agreement.

4. Final sign off is delegated to Planning to finalize the wall and landscaping in the 15 foot portion of the landscape buffer adjacent to the existing residential subdivision.

5. The applicant will obtain final sign off from ABCWUA, and Planning by December 30, 2020 or the case may be scheduled for the next DRB hearing and could be denied her the DRB Rules of Procedure.

APPEAL: If you wish to appeal this decision, you must do so within 15 days of the DRB’s decision or by OCTOBER 15, 2020. The date of the DRB’s decision is not included in the 15-day period for filing an appeal, and if the 15th day falls on a Saturday, Sunday or Holiday, the next working day is considered as the deadline for filing the appeal.

For more information regarding the appeal process, please refer to Section 14-16-6-4(U) of the Integrated Development Ordinance (IDO). Appeals should be submitted via email to PLNDRS@CABQ.GOV (if files are less than 9MB in size). Files larger than 9MB can be sent to PLNDRS@CABQ.GOV using https://wetransfer.com. A Non-Refundable filing fee will be calculated and you will receive instructions about paying the fee online.

You will receive notification if any 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. Applicants submitting for building permit prior to the completion of the appeal period do so at their own risk. Successful applicants are reminded that there may be other City regulations of the IDO that must be complied with, even after approval of the referenced application(s).

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Jolene

DRB Chair

JW/jr
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Tierra West, LLC, 5571 Midway Park Place NE, ABQ, NM 87109
In the Official Notice of Decision for the above stated application, on page 2 of 4, it states:

3. The Neighborhood Edge requirement of 14-16-5-9 of the IDO is met, a 15-foot wide landscape buffer is required, but a 50-foot wide buffer is provided.

Three major points:

1. The wall/fence proposed needs to be move 15 feet away from the adjacent property vs. the proposed 5 feet.

There is NO mention of the wall/fence that is supposed to be placed 15 feet from the adjacent property as noted on page 260 of the IDO, Section 14-16-5-6(E). This page is attached. I am also enclosing the B24- Edge Buffer Landscaping write-up for the LUPZ Committee (August 12). As stated in this presentation:

   “The IDO today would require that the landscaped area be between a wall on the subject site and the adjacent property.”

This is also portrayed in the visualization “Outcome of IDO Regulations today.”

2. The location of the retention pond goes all the way to the property line of several residences. There should be a 15 foot landscaped buffer between the pond and adjacent properties.

Note on the site plan enclosed that there is NO buffer of any sort provided, violation of the Neighborhood Edge requirement of 14-16-5-9 of the IDO.

3. The 50-foot buffer is a requirement of 14-16-5-9(F)(1) of the IDO. This section addresses Parking, Drive-Throughs or Drive-Ups, and Loading.

Enclosed is page 287 of the IDO, where it states:

“For Regulated Lots 10,000 square feet or larger, parking areas and drive-through lanes shall be separated from any abutting Protected lot by a minimum of 50 feet (see figure below). For parking areas, landscaping requirements in Subsection 14-16-5-6(F)(1) apply.”
Part 14-16-5: Development Standards

5-10: Solar Access

5-9(F): Parking, Drive-throughs Or Drive-ups, and Loading

5-9(F)(1): Parking and Drive-throughs or Drive-ups

5-9(E)(2) Where parking or vehicle circulation areas on a Regulated Lot abut a Protected Lot, a minimum 6 foot high opaque wall or fence shall also be required to visually screen the parking or circulation area. Chain link fence with slats shall not constitute acceptable screening.

5-9(F) PARKING, DRIVE-THROUGHS OR DRIVE-UPS, AND LOADING

5-9(F)(1) Parking and Drive-throughs or Drive-ups

For Regulated Lots 10,000 square feet or larger, parking areas and drive-through lanes shall be separated from any abutting Protected Lot by a minimum of 50 feet (see figure below). For parking areas, landscaping requirements in Subsection 14-16-5-6(F)(1) apply. For drive-throughs, requirements in Subsection 14-16-5-5(I) apply.

5-9(F)(2) Truck Loading Areas

No truck loading area shall be located between a primary or accessory structure on a Regulated Lot and any side or rear lot line abutting a Protected Lot.

5-10 SOLAR ACCESS

5-10(A) PURPOSE

The standards in this Section 14-16-5-10 are intended to allow for development while ensuring continued access to solar energy.

5-10(B) APPLICABILITY

The standards in this Section 14-16-5-10 apply to development in the R-A, R-1, R-MC, and R-T zone districts.

5-10(C) BUILDING HEIGHT

5-10(C)(1) The building height shall not exceed the following heights, determined by the distance cardinally south from the northern boundary of the lot as shown in Table 5-10-1, or angle plane equivalent. Distances in Table 5-10-1 have been calibrated to a 32 degree angle that allows 1 hour of Winter Solstice sunlight that hits at least 2 feet up on a southern-facing wall located 10 feet from the property line. Distances from the northern property line that are not whole numbers are rounded down.
LAND USE, PLANNING AND ZONING SUBCOMMITTEE
of the
CITY COUNCIL

August 12th, 2020

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT NO. _____ TO Exhibit 1 to O-20-10

AMENDMENT SPONSORED BY COUNCILOR Trudy Jones

- On Page 277, amend section 5-6(E) as depicted in Exhibit A to this amendment.

_explanation_: This amendment is new at the August 12th LUPZ and is in response to public comment at the June 10th and June 24th LUPZ meetings. This amendment proposes to revise the section in the IDO related to edge buffer landscaping. The IDO has specific requirements for edge buffer landscaping depending on what the development adjacent to the subject site is and has different standards for development adjacent next to residential, multi-family, mixed-use, non-residential, or industrial development. This amendment makes formatting changes to this section to make it clearer.

Additionally, based on feedback of its implementation in development projects since the effective date of the IDO there is a substantive change to 5-6(E)(1)(b), which regulates where a wall shall be placed when a wall will be used in conjunction with a landscaped buffer. The IDO today would require that the landscaped area be between a wall on the subject site and the adjacent property. This would create a random patch of landscaping outside of the wall on the subject site that may not be maintained. This amendment switches the location of the landscape buffer and the wall, requiring the landscaped area to be inside of the wall on the subject property.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome of IDO Regulations Today</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent Property</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome of Proposed IDO Regulations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent Property</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the Official Notice of Decision for the above stated application, on page 2 of 4, it states:

3. The Neighborhood Edge requirement of 14-16-5-9 of the IDO is met, a 15-foot wide landscape buffer is required, but a 50-foot wide buffer is provided.

Three major points:

1. The wall/fence proposed needs to be move 15 feet away from the adjacent property vs. the proposed 5 feet.

There is NO mention of the wall/fence that is supposed to be placed 15 feet from the adjacent property as noted on page 277 of IDO, Section 14-16-5-6(E). This page was submitted with previous documentation. I am enclosing the B24-Edge Buffer Landscaping write-up for the LUPZ Committee (August 12). As stated in this presentation:

“The IDO today would require that the landscaped area be between a wall on the subject site and the adjacent property.”

This is also portrayed in the visualization “Outcome of IDO Regulations today.”

2. The location of the retention pond goes all the way to the property line of several residences. There should be a 15 foot landscaped buffer between the pond and adjacent properties.

Note on the site plan enclosed that there is NO buffer of any sort provided, violation of the Neighborhood Edge requirement of 14-16-5-9 of the IDO.

3. The 50-foot buffer is a requirement of 14-16-5-9(F)(1) of the IDO. This section addresses Parking, Drive-Throughs or Drive-Ups, and Loading.

Enclosed is page 287 of the IDO, where it states:

“For Regulated Lots 10,000 square feet or larger, parking areas and drive-through lanes shall be separated from any abutting Protected lot by a minimum of 50 feet (see figure below). For parking areas, landscaping requirements in Subsection 14-16-5-6(F)(1) apply.”
On Page 277, amend section 5-6(E) as depicted in Exhibit A to this amendment.

Explanation: This amendment is new at the August 12th LUPZ and is in response to public comment at the June 10th and June 24th LUPZ meetings. This amendment proposes to revise the section in the IDO related to edge buffer landscaping. The IDO has specific requirements for edge buffer landscaping depending on what the development adjacent to the subject site is and has different standards for development adjacent next to residential, multi-family, mixed-use, non-residential, or industrial development. This amendment makes formatting changes to this section to make it clearer.

Additionally, based on feedback of its implementation in development projects since the effective date of the IDO there is a substantive change to 5-6(E)(1)(b), which regulates where a wall shall be placed when a wall will be used in conjunction with a landscaped buffer. The IDO today would require that the landscaped area be between a wall on the subject site and the adjacent property. This would create a random patch of landscaping outside of the wall on the subject site that may not be maintained. This amendment switches the location of the landscape buffer and the wall, requiring the landscaped area to be inside of the wall on the subject property.
Part 14-16-5: Development Standards

5-10: Solar Access

5-9(F) Parking, Drive-throughs or Drive-ups, and Loading

5-9(F)(2) Where parking or vehicle circulation areas on a Regulated Lot abut a Protected Lot, a minimum 6 foot high opaque wall or fence shall also be required to visually screen the parking or circulation area. Chain link fence with slats shall not constitute acceptable screening.

5-9(F) PARKING, DRIVE-THROUGHS OR DRIVE-UPS, AND LOADING

5-9(F)(1) Parking and Drive-throughs or Drive-ups
For Regulated Lots 10,000 square feet or larger, parking areas and drive-through lanes shall be separated from any abutting Protected Lot by a minimum of 50 feet (see figure below). For parking areas, landscaping requirements in Subsection 14-16-5-6(F)(1) apply. For drive-throughs, requirements in Subsection 14-16-5-5(I) apply.

5-9(F)(2) Truck Loading Areas
No truck loading area shall be located between a primary or accessory structure on a Regulated Lot and any side or rear lot line abutting a Protected Lot.

5-10 SOLAR ACCESS

5-10(A) PURPOSE
The standards in this Section 14-16-5-10 are intended to allow for development while ensuring continued access to solar energy.

5-10(B) APPLICABILITY
The standards in this Section 14-16-5-10 apply to development in the R-A, R-1, R-MC, and R-T zone districts.

5-10(C) BUILDING HEIGHT
5-10(C)(1) The building height shall not exceed the following heights, determined by the distance cardinally south from the northern boundary of the lot as shown in Table 5-10-1, or angle plane equivalent. Distances in Table 5-10-1 have been calibrated to a 32 degree angle that allows 1 hour of Winter Solstice sunlight that hits at least 2 feet up on a southern-facing wall located 10 feet from the property line. Distances from the northern property line that are not whole numbers are rounded down.
October 25, 2020

Mr. Salas,

This is to inform you that I, Marsha E. Kearney, am not acting as Michael Mirabal’s agent, but as a second appellant in the case of Project #PR-2020-0040303. Sorry for the confusion.

MARSHA E. KEARNEY
10927 Carreta Drive NW

Mr. Salas,

This is to let you know I am in agreement with Marsha E. Kearney’s above statement. She is the second appellant, not the Agent, in the case of Project #PR-2020-0040303.

MIKE D. MIRABAL
10951 Carreta Drive NW
installed on remaining portions of the side or rear lot line, as applicable.

5-6(E)(1)(c) For the purposes of this Subsection 14-16-5-6(E), “industrial development” refers to the zone districts and uses indicated in Subsection 14-16-5-6(E)(4)(a) (Industrial Development Adjacent to Non-industrial Development).

5-6(E)(1)(d) Additional buffering may be required for specific uses, pursuant to any Use-specific Standards for those uses in Section 14-16-4-3 or Neighborhood Edge standards in Section 14-16-5-9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Type</th>
<th>Development Next to</th>
<th>Specific Standards</th>
<th>General Buffering</th>
<th>Buffering in DT-UC-MS-PT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multi-family, mixed-use, or non-residential</td>
<td>R-A, R-1, R-MC, or R-T</td>
<td>14-16-5-6(E)(2)</td>
<td>Landscaped buffer area ≥15 ft.</td>
<td>Wall, fence, or vegetative screen ≥6 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed-use or non-residential</td>
<td>R-ML or R-MH</td>
<td>14-16-5-6(E)(3)</td>
<td>Landscaped buffer area ≥20 ft.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>Non-industrial development</td>
<td>14-16-5-6(E)(4)</td>
<td>Landscaped buffer area ≥25 ft.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5-6(E)(2) Development Next to Low-density Residential Zone Districts

Where multi-family, mixed-use, or non-residential development other than industrial development occurs on a lot abutting or across an alley from a lot in an R-A, R-1, R-MC, or R-T zone district with 1 or more residential dwellings, the following buffer shall be provided along the lot line, as specified for the relevant area below.

5-6(E)(2)(a) General

A landscape buffer area at least 15 feet wide shall be provided. One (1) deciduous or evergreen tree at least 6 feet tall at the time of planting and at least 25 feet tall at maturity, and 3 shrubs, shall...
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD
SUPPLEMENTAL SUBMITTAL

(Deadline is Friday at noon unless noted on 2019 agenda – late submittals will not be accepted unless approved by the DRB)

PROJECT NO. 8/21/2020
Application No. PR-2020-004030/ SD-2020-00540

TO:

X Planning Department/Chair
X Hydrology
X Transportation Development
X Albuquerque/ Bernalillo Co. WUA
X Code Enforcement

*(Please attach this sheet with each collated set for each board member)

NOTE: ELECTRONIC VERSION (ie disk, thumbdrive) is Required. Submittal will not be accepted without.

DRB SCHEDULED HEARING DATE: August 26, 2020 HEARING DATE OF DEFERRAL: July 22, 2020

SUBMITTAL DESCRIPTION: Plan Updates and response to comments

CONTACT NAME: Richard Stevenson

TELEPHONE: 505-858-3100 EMAIL: rstevenson@tierrawestllc.com
CONCEPT MASTER UTILITY PLAN

PRELIMINARY - NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

Golf Course Rd NE

Diagram with various annotations including:
- Legend with different symbols and lines
- Notations for utilities, drainage, and zoning
- Dimensions and distances for various elements

Detailed annotations and symbols indicating:
- Grates
- Rims
- Drainage channels
- Parking areas
- Property lines

Notes and instructions for construction and planning:
- General notes on the construction process
- Specific instructions for utilities installation
- Zoning regulations

Graphical scale for measurement and orientation

The diagram is comprehensive, showing the layout and planning details for the Wintergreen Luxury Apartments project along Golf Course Rd NE.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Int Delay, s/veh</th>
<th>0.7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Movement</td>
<td>WBL</td>
<td>WBR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Vol, veh/h</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Vol, veh/h</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicting Peds, #/hr</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign Control</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>Stop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT Channelized</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage Length</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veh in Median Storage, #</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak Hour Factor</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Vehicles, %</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mvmt Flow</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major/Minor</th>
<th>Minor1</th>
<th>Major1</th>
<th>Major2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conflicting Flow All</td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>1413</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Hdwy</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>6.94</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Hdwy Stg 1</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Hdwy Stg 2</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up Hdwy</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pot Cap-1 Maneuver</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platoon blocked, %</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mov Cap-1 Maneuver</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mov Cap-2 Maneuver</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>WB</th>
<th>NB</th>
<th>SB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HCM Control Delay, s</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM LOS</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Lane/Major Mvmt</th>
<th>NBT</th>
<th>NBR/WBLn1</th>
<th>SBL</th>
<th>SBT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capacity (veh/h)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM Lane V/C Ratio</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.232</td>
<td>0.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM Control Delay (s)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM Lane LOS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TREASURER'S CERTIFICATION

This is to certify that taxes are current and paid on property located at:

1002556-09

IN THE OFFICE OF THE CITY AUDITOR

May 12, 2009

NOTICE OF SUBDIVISION PLAT CONDITIONS

A variance or minor from certain subdivision requirements has been granted by the City and the Albuquerque Metropolitan Area Flood Control Authority in connection with this plat.

Future subdivision of lands within this plat, zoning and site development plan approvals, and development permits may be conditioned upon dedication of rights-of-way and easements, and/or upon improvements, as required by the Ordinance. Any variance or minor from subdivision requirements has been granted by the City and the Albuquerque Metropolitan Area Flood Control Authority in connection with this plat.

The City and the Authority may require and/or permit easements to be added, modified or removed when future plans or site development plans are approved.

By its approval, the City makes no representation or warranty as to availability of utilities, or final approval of improvements required or permitted under this plat.

DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

The purpose of this plat is to reserve the boundary between Tracts C and D. Delete all portions of Tracts A, B, and E. To form a single tract, designate new Tract E-1 and divide both Tracts C and D into two Tracts C-1 and C-2. The tract will be divided by a line running north-south from the northern boundary of Tract E-1, through the center of Tract E-1, and to the southern boundary of Tract E-1.

SURVEYOR'S CERTIFICATION

I, John J. Bordeneuve, a registered professional engineer and land surveyor under the laws of the State of New Mexico, do hereby certify that this plat was prepared by me, and under my supervision, in compliance with all applicable laws, regulations, rules, and orders of the City of Albuquerque. This plat has been approved by the City of Albuquerque and is in conformance with all applicable laws, regulations, rules, and orders. The information contained herein is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.

John J. Bordeneuve
AIA, PE

NOTARY PUBLIC

BORDENAVE DESIGNS
P.O. BOX 91984, ALBUQUERQUE, NM 87198
(505) 382-1344
FAX (505) 382-9101

PLAT OF TRACTS D-I, E-I
AMAFC BLACK ARROYO CHANNEL ROW
PARADISE HEIGHTS, UNIT I
ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO
MARCH, 2009

APPROVALS

PROJECT NO: 1002556 APPLICATION NO: 09DRB-70099

CITY SURVEYOR

PAINT AND RECHAR

CITY ENGINEER

A.M.A.F.C.A.

Utilities

Transportation Division

Chairperson, Planning Department

TALOS LOG NO. 2009101434

FREE CONSENT AND DEDICATION

The subdivision of the land described on this plat is with the free consent of and in accordance with the desires of the undersigned owners of the land. The Owners hereby warrant that they hold, own and have a complete and indefeasible title to the lands described.

In addition to the owners of Tracts D and E, does hereby dedicate public rights-of-way, shown herein, in fee simple with warranty covenants to the City of Albuquerque.

Tracts D & E (GALINDO LULAS GROUP, A NEW MEXICO GENERAL PARTNERSHIP)

Notary Public

Donald J. Bordeneuve, General Partner

State of New Mexico
COUNTY OF BERNEALLO

This instrument was acknowledged before me on 03-05-09 by
Donald J. Bordeneuve, General Partner.

John J. Kelly, P.E., Executive Engineer

STATE OF NEW MEXICO
COUNTY OF BERNEALLO

This instrument was acknowledged before me on 03-05-09 by
John J. Kelly, P.E., Executive Engineer.

Notary Public
### PROPOSED NAME OF PLAT AND/OR SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN

**Tract E-1 Plat of Tracts D-1, E-1 AMAFCA Black Arroyo Channel ROW Paradise Heights Unit 1 Containing 8.77 Ac**

**EXISTING LEGAL DESCRIPTION PRIOR TO PLATTING ACTION**

Following is a summary of PUBLIC/PRIVATE Infrastructure required to be constructed or financially guaranteed for the above development. This Listing is not necessarily a complete listing. During the SIA process and/or in the review of the construction drawings, if the DRC Chair determines that appurtenant items and/or unforeseen items have not been included in the infrastructure listing, the DRC Chair may include those items in the listing and related financial guarantee. Likewise, if the DRC Chair determines that appurtenant or non-essential items can be deleted from the listing, those items may be deleted as well as the related portions of the financial guarantees. All such revisions require approval by the DRC Chair, the User Department and agent/owner. If such approvals are obtained, these revisions to the listing will be incorporated administratively. In addition, any unforeseen items which arise during construction which are necessary to complete the project and which normally are the Subdivider's responsibility will be required as a condition of project acceptance and close out by the City.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financially Guaranteed Under</th>
<th>DRC #</th>
<th>Construction Certification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Cnst Engineer P.E.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DRC #</th>
<th>DRC #</th>
<th>Type of Improvement</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Engineer’s Certification for Grading &amp; Drainage is required for release of Financial Guarantee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8&quot; SAS PIPE</td>
<td>Public Sanitary Sewer extension from the southern boundary of Tract E-1, at the existing collector line along the southern property line, extend north along the drive isle of Tract E-1, to 35-ft into Tract D-1. A total of ±980-ft of 8&quot; PVC sewer per ABCWUA Std. Dwgs within a 20-ft dedicated public sanitary sewer easement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ST LT, &lt;25' w/ 1 LED</td>
<td>Install three public street lighting along property Tract E-1 frontage (±580-ft) along Golf Course Rd., as required by City Engineer.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**FIGURE 12**

**TO SUBDIVISION IMPROVEMENTS AGREEMENT**

**DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD (D.R.B.) REQUIRED INFRASTRUCTURE LIST**

**10820 Golf Course Rd. NW (Wintergreen Apartments)**

**EXISTING LEGAL DESCRIPTION PRIOR TO PLATTING ACTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Site Plan Approved:</th>
<th>Date Preliminary Plat Approved:</th>
<th>Date Preliminary Plat Expires:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>______________________</td>
<td>____________________________</td>
<td>____________________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DRB Project No.:** PR-004030

**DRB Application No.:** SD-2020-00540

**Public Sanitary Sewer extension from the southern boundary of Tract E-1, at the existing collector line along the southern property line, extend north along the drive isle of Tract E-1, to 35-ft into Tract D-1. A total of ±980-ft of 8" PVC sewer per ABCWUA Std. Dwgs within a 20-ft dedicated public sanitary sewer easement**

**Install three public street lighting along property Tract E-1 frontage (±580-ft) along Golf Course Rd., as required by City Engineer.**
The items listed below are on the CCIP and approved for Impact Fee credits. Signatures from the Impact Fee Administrator and the City User Department is required prior to DRB approval of this listing. The Items listed below are subject to the standard SIA requirements.

The items listed below are on the CCIP and approved for Impact Fee credits. Signatures from the Impact Fee Administrator and the City User Department is required prior to DRB approval of this listing. The Items listed below are subject to the standard SIA requirements.

The items listed below are on the CCIP and approved for Impact Fee credits. Signatures from the Impact Fee Administrator and the City User Department is required prior to DRB approval of this listing. The Items listed below are subject to the standard SIA requirements.

The items listed below are on the CCIP and approved for Impact Fee credits. Signatures from the Impact Fee Administrator and the City User Department is required prior to DRB approval of this listing. The Items listed below are subject to the standard SIA requirements.

The items listed below are on the CCIP and approved for Impact Fee credits. Signatures from the Impact Fee Administrator and the City User Department is required prior to DRB approval of this listing. The Items listed below are subject to the standard SIA requirements.

The items listed below are on the CCIP and approved for Impact Fee credits. Signatures from the Impact Fee Administrator and the City User Department is required prior to DRB approval of this listing. The Items listed below are subject to the standard SIA requirements.

The items listed below are on the CCIP and approved for Impact Fee credits. Signatures from the Impact Fee Administrator and the City User Department is required prior to DRB approval of this listing. The Items listed below are subject to the standard SIA requirements.

The items listed below are on the CCIP and approved for Impact Fee credits. Signatures from the Impact Fee Administrator and the City User Department is required prior to DRB approval of this listing. The Items listed below are subject to the standard SIA requirements.

The items listed below are on the CCIP and approved for Impact Fee credits. Signatures from the Impact Fee Administrator and the City User Department is required prior to DRB approval of this listing. The Items listed below are subject to the standard SIA requirements.

The items listed below are on the CCIP and approved for Impact Fee credits. Signatures from the Impact Fee Administrator and the City User Department is required prior to DRB approval of this listing. The Items listed below are subject to the standard SIA requirements.

The items listed below are on the CCIP and approved for Impact Fee credits. Signatures from the Impact Fee Administrator and the City User Department is required prior to DRB approval of this listing. The Items listed below are subject to the standard SIA requirements.

The items listed below are on the CCIP and approved for Impact Fee credits. Signatures from the Impact Fee Administrator and the City User Department is required prior to DRB approval of this listing. The Items listed below are subject to the standard SIA requirements.

The items listed below are on the CCIP and approved for Impact Fee credits. Signatures from the Impact Fee Administrator and the City User Department is required prior to DRB approval of this listing. The Items listed below are subject to the standard SIA requirements.

The items listed below are on the CCIP and approved for Impact Fee credits. Signatures from the Impact Fee Administrator and the City User Department is required prior to DRB approval of this listing. The Items listed below are subject to the standard SIA requirements.

The items listed below are on the CCIP and approved for Impact Fee credits. Signatures from the Impact Fee Administrator and the City User Department is required prior to DRB approval of this listing. The Items listed below are subject to the standard SIA requirements.

The items listed below are on the CCIP and approved for Impact Fee credits. Signatures from the Impact Fee Administrator and the City User Department is required prior to DRB approval of this listing. The Items listed below are subject to the standard SIA requirements.

If the site is located in a floodplain, then the financial guarantee will not be released until the LOMR is approved by FEMA.

Street lights per City requirements.

1

2

3

NAME (print) DRB CHAIR - date PARKS & RECREATION - date

FIRM TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT - date AMAFCA - date

SIGNATURE - date UTILITY DEVELOPMENT - date CODE ENFORCEMENT - date

CITY ENGINEER - date ___________ - date

NOTES

AGENT / OWNER DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD MEMBER APPROVALS

Richard Stevenson

NAME (print) DRB CHAIR - date PARKS & RECREATION - date

Tiera West LLC TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT - date AMAFCA - date

SIGNATURE - date UTILITY DEVELOPMENT - date CODE ENFORCEMENT - date

CITY ENGINEER - date ___________ - date

DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE REVISIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REVISION</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>DRC CHAIR</th>
<th>USER DEPARTMENT</th>
<th>AGENT / OWNER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PAGE 2 OF 2

(Rev. 2-16-18)
AGENDA ITEM NO: 3

DRB Project Number: PR-2020-004030

Application Number: 

Project Name: 

REQUEST: Site Plan

COMMENTS:

1) Please verify that fence will be 3 ft.
2) CE has reviewed this plan for compliance with the IDO and has no objections.

Response:
The wall height along Golf Course Road frontage is 3-ft in height, per label 20, on sheet C-1, per the IDO requirements on Table 5-7-1.

(Comments may continue onto the next page)

Disclaimer: The comments provided are based upon the information received from the applicant/agent. If new or revised information is submitted, additional comments may be provided by Planning.

FROM: Carl Garcia, Code Supervisor
Planning Department
924-3838 cagarcia@cabq.gov

ACTION:

APPROVED ___; DENIED ____; DEFERRED ___; COMMENTS PROVIDED _X_; WITHDRAWN ___

DELEGATED: (TRANS) (HYD) (WUA) (PRKS) (PLNG) (CE)

8/5/2020
DRB Project Number: 4030  AGENDA ITEM NO: 3  
Golf Course Apartments

SUBJECT: Site Plan

ENGINEERING COMMENTS:

1. Label walkway widths to buildings, too. A minimum 6-foot sidewalk is required from main building to right-of-way. This requirement falls short adjacent to the building to the north. Label curb ramps as needed for the 6-foot pedestrian crossing across the driving aisle.

   Response: I believe I have labeled every sidewalk with a dimension, or with a call out referencing the width. The sidewalk width along the building to the north was widened to 6-ft. The curb ramps were labeled see callout 7.

2. At least one minimum 5-foot wide sidewalk is required between buildings.

   Response: this is now provided.

3. Does curb need to be called out where there seems to be a median cut for the ADA path in front of the clubhouse? Also call out curb as needed for the proposed traffic circle, and list radius of circle.

   Response: Curb labelled near the club house as ‘zero curb’, curb is labeled around the traffic circle and the radius added.

4. Where are the clear sight triangles at access points for both the site plan and the landscaping plan shown under AASHTO guidelines? I could not find these.

   Response: They are on the plan, I’ve highlighted them below on sheet C-1, per DPM standards for driveway

   MINI CLEAR SIGHT TRIANGLE NOTE

   LANDSCAPING AND SIGNAGE WILL NOT INTERFERE WITH CLEAR SIGHT REQUIREMENTS. THEREFORE, SIGNS, WALLS, TREES, AND SHRUBBERY BETWEEN 3 AND 8 FEET TALL (AS MEASURED FROM THE GUTTER PAN) WILL NOT BE ACCEPTABLE IN THE CLEAR SIGHT TRIANGLE (11’X11’ PER DPM 7-11(D)).
5. There was a statement regarding turn bay sufficiency on the left turn lane. How many vehicular trips is this based on? I could not find an analysis. It is sufficient to just have the apartments as part of the analysis, as stated.

Response: See attached analysis using Synchro 10. The volumes on Golf Course Rd. were derived from the Mid-Region Council of Governments’ TAQA (Transportation Analysis Querying Application) website for the PM Peak Hour when trips will be returning to the apartments. The Trip Distribution I sent last week indicated that only a small percentage (about 20%) of traffic would arrive to the apartments from the north on Golf Course Rd. However, to be conservative, I assumed that half of the entering traffic would arrive to the apartments from the north (i.e., the southbound left turn entering traffic). The analysis on the attached Synchro 10 HCM6 Unsignalized Report demonstrates that the 95th Percentile calculated queue will be less than 1 vehicle. Therefore, the existing southbound left turn lane should not need to be extended.

6. The City is requesting public streetlighting on the infrastructure list along frontage. We realize that the old Golf Course Road Improvements did not have them, but this was a separate department that oversees the project, and we don’t know the reasoning at the time as to why they were not included. Additionally, traffic has increased since that time.

Response: Added to I.L.

7. Provide distance shown between east property line and walkway along east side of site since neighbors had concerns about this.

Response: Dimensioning added.

8. If the plat shows a cross easement, that will definitely work for Transportation, but I did not find it in the new submittal package.
Response: Plat included in re-submittal.

DELEGATED: TO: (TRANS) (HYD) (WUA) (PRKS) (CE) (PLNG)

FROM: Jeanne Wolfenbarger, P.E. DATE: August 5, 2020
Transportation Development 505-924-3991 or jwolfenbarger@cabq.gov

ACTION:

APPROVED __; DENIED __; DEFERRED __; COMMENTS PROVIDED __; WITHDRAWN __

NOTE: A BLANKET CROSS ACCESS AND DRAINAGE EASEMENT IS CREATED BETWEEN TRACTS D-1 AND E-1 BY THIS PLAT. MAINTENANCE OF THE EASEMENT IS THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE UNDERLYING OWNER.
Development Review Board (DRB)
Review Comments
Utility Development Section
Reviewer: Kristopher Cadena, P.E.
Phone: 505.289.3301

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DRB Project No:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Item No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PR-2020-004030</td>
<td>08/05/20</td>
<td>#3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone Atlas Page:</th>
<th>Legal Description:</th>
<th>Location:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-12 &amp; A-13</td>
<td>A-12 &amp; A-13</td>
<td>GOLF COURSE RD NW between GOLF COURSE RD NW, BLACK ARROYO and WESTSIDE BLVD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Request For:
SI-2020-00540 - SITE PLAN

ABCWUA Comment:

Please provide written description of how the following comments were addressed with the next submittal.

1. Serviceability Letter #200506 has been written and provides the conditions for service.
2. The property is outside of the Adopted Service Area. A Water Authority Board approved development agreement will be required prior to Site Plan approval. The serviceability letter will serve as an exhibit to the development agreement.
3. **Utility Plan – Plan Updated**
   a. Please label the existing public sanitary sewer along the southern frontage.
   b. Label the proposed private sanitary sewer along the southern property line.
   c. Note indicates 20’ private exclusive easement for public sanitary sewer which is not correct.
d. Rather than extending public sanitary sewer to the proposed roundabout for future access to existing Tract D-1, in an effort to minimize onsite public sanitary sewer, it seems the public sanitary sewer may be better suited to extend due north. This would require the relocation of the proposed dumpster enclosure near the northeast corner of the development. Has the proposed alignment been coordinated with existing Tract D-1?
   i. Vacation of the existing public sanitary sewer easement as well as granting of the new public sanitary sewer easement will be required.
      Response: Refer exhibit 2020013 D-1 & E-1 Concept SAS layout 8.5.20 showing coordination with future D-1 property development.

e. PREVIOUS COMMENT: Label all proposed onsite private waterline accordingly. There is a proposed 6” waterline that shall be labeled as private.

f. A proposed 8” water meter is being used to create a single connection for a private onsite loop for both domestic and fire protection. Typically, fire lines are unmetered and separate from metered service. Please confirm with the Fire Marshal that they approve fire protection downstream of a metered service.
   Response: Dom WL and FL separated.

4. Infrastructure list – I.L Updated
   a. The proposed public sanitary sewer item indicates the northern terminus is the northern property boundary of existing Tract D-1 which is incorrect.
3. PR-2020-004030 (1002566, 1004501, 1004503) SI-2020-00540 - SITE PLAN TIERRA WEST, LLC agent(s) for CALABACILLAS GROUP C/O DONALD HARVILLE request(s) the aforementioned action(s) for all or a portion of: A-12 & A-13, zoned MX-M, located at GOLF COURSE RD NW between GOLF COURSE RD NW, BLACK ARROYO and WESTSIDE BLVD containing approximately 8.77 acre(s). (A-12,13)[Deferred from 7/22/20] PROPERTY OWNERS: CALABACILLAS GROUP C/O DONALD HARVILLE REQUEST: SITE PLAN FOR APARTMENT WITH MORE THAN 50 UNITS

Open Space Comments:
On the south property line, this parcel butts up to the Black Arroyo which drains into Open Space’s Calabacillas Arroyo and eventually into the Rio Grande, and there is a concern about flows from the site. Therefore, native plants would be the best choice for landscaping materials. Chinese Pistache (especially females) are invasive and there is a concern about invasives moving down the Black Arroyo to the Calabacillas and Rio.
PRD requests removing Chinese Pistache from the plant list and preferably limiting all plant material to natives. Landscape species should comply with the CABQ Pollen Control Ordinance.

Response:

Please review updated landscape plan. Locally-occurring plants were used where possible and a column is added to the plant schedule indicating native status. Also added a number of pinon pines to the planting plan as a source of native evergreen color. Vines have been removed. Tried to keep other planting quantities and locations the same, adjusting for layout where necessary.
HEARING DATE/AGENDA ITEM 3

Project Number: PR-2020-004030
Application Number: SD-2020-00540
Project Name: Wintergreen Luxury Apartments
Request: Site Plan for Apartment with more than 50 Units

COMMENTS (requirements that need to be met):

- There is no Code Enforcement signature block
- The applicant needs to verify if a sensitive lands analysis is required
- The landscape buffer along the eastern property boundary meets the IDO requirements. However, the applicant could add additional trees in the landscape buffer to provide additional screening between the Site and the adjacent single-family residential dwellings east of the Site to provide two full layers of trees within the buffer.
- Open space calculations need to be provided.
- Staff recommends park benches be placed in the landscaped open space and near the sidewalks and trails within the proposed development.
- Outdoor/exterior lighting needs to be depicted.
- The CMU screen wall along the boundary of the Site is depicted as 6-feet in height. However, this screen wall cannot be more than 3 feet in height in the front yard. The Zoning Enforcement Officer (ZEO) must make an exception to this height standard for security reasons due to specific site conditions or the nature of the land use or related materials and facilities on the site according to 5-7(D)(3)(c) of the IDO. Along the southern boundary of the site adjacent to the arroyo running alongside the southern boundary of the Site, the applicant should consider 3-feet of wrought iron on top of 3-feet of CMU blocks in lieu of 6-feet of CMU blocks.

Response:
The wall height along Golf Course Road frontage is 3-ft in height, per label 20, on sheet C-1, per
the IDO requirements on Table 5-7-1.

(see comments on the next page)

- Staff is concerned about the gap between the existing CMU wall along the adjacent subdivision east of the Site and the proposed 6-foot CMU wall along the eastern boundary of the Site because of possible maintenance issues and unwanted access.

Response:
A reviewed, enhance and more appealing design is proposed with an offset alignment wall. This meets the screening intent but allows maintenance access and provide better visuals for both neighbors. See below a concept sketch:

- Staff requests the applicant provide a plane-angle illustration/depiction of the proposed apartments and the residences to the east of the Site depicting to scale the height of the proposed apartments and the residences and the distance between them.

- Consider moving the dumpsters farther away from the residential development

- Please provide an elevation key so that we can determine each elevation of each building

- The unit mix table is difficult to read, the letters are blurry can you update so that is more clear

- COMMENTS (requirements that are met):

- The façade is consistent with 5-11(E)(2) because it has a clear distinction between the ground floor and upper floors, windows on upper floors, primary pedestrian entrances, wall projections and changes in plane and material (see IDO for full citation).

- The carports are consistent with 5-11-(D)(4) although some of them are located between
the street and building most of them are disbursed throughout the site and there street facing carports are screened by a row of street trees

- The landscaping plan exceeds the requirements by providing a total of 144,030 square feet of landscaping when 48,141 square feet are required.

- Please note that staff could have future comments and the Site Plan is still under review.

**Disclaimer:** The comments provided are based upon the information received from the applicant/agent. If new or revised information is submitted, additional comments may be provided by Planning.

FROM: Jay Rodenbeck 
Planning Department 
DATE: 8/5/2020
NOT TO SCALE

NOTE: All dimensions shown were determined from research.
No field work was performed for this project. Client shall be
responsible for their accuracy. Scale and position of the
tract are not shown. It is the client's responsibility to
verify the accuracy of all information shown on this
sheet.

1. AN EXCAVATION/CONSTRUCTION PERMIT WILL BE REQUIRED BEFORE
BEGINNING ANY WORK WITHIN CITY RIGHT-OF-WAY.
2. ALL WORK DETAILED ON THESE PLANS TO BE PERFORMED, EXCEPT AS
OTHERWISE STATED OR PROVIDED HERON, SHALL BE CONSTRUCTED IN
ACCORDANCE WITH CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE INTERIM STANDARD
SPECIFICATIONS FOR PUBLIC WORKS CONSTRUCTION, 1985.
3. TWO WORKING DAYS PRIOR TO ANY EXCAVATION, THE CONTRACTOR
MUST CONTACT NEW MEXICO ONE CALL, DIAL "811" [OR (505) 260-1990]
FOR THE LOCATION OF EXISTING UTILITIES.
4. PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION, THE CONTRACTOR SHALL EXCAVATE AND
VERIFY THE HORIZONTAL AND VERTICAL LOCATIONS OF ALL
CONNECTIONS. SHOULD A CONFlict EXIST, THE CONTRACTOR SHALL
NOTIFY THE ENGINEER SO THAT THE CONFLICT CAN BE RESOLVED WITH A
MINIMUM AMOUNT OF DELAY.
5. BACKFILL COMPACTION SHALL BE ACCORDING TO TRAFFIC/STREET USE.
6. MAINTENANCE OF THESE FACILITIES SHALL BE THE RESPONSIBILITY OF
THE OWNER OF THE PROPERTY SERVED.
7. WORK ON ARTERIAL STREETS SHALL BE PERFORMED ON A 24-HOUR BASIS.
8. CONTRACTOR MUST CONTACT JASON RODRIGUEZ AT 235-8016 AND
CONSTRUCTION COORDINATION AT 924-3416 TO SCHEDULE AN
INSPECTION.

LEGEND
\begin{itemize}
\item \textbf{CONCEPTUAL GRADING & DRAINAGE PLAN}
\item \textbf{TIERRA WEST, LLC}
\item \textbf{PRELIMINARY - NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION}
\item \textbf{GOLF COURSE RD NE}
\item \textbf{ALL EXISTING UTILITIES SHOWN WERE OBTAINED FROM RESEARCH,
AS-BUILTS, SURVEYS OR INFORMATION PROVIDED BY OTHERS. IT SHALL BE
THE SOLE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE CONTRACTOR TO CONDUCT ALL
NECESSARY FIELD INVESTIGATIONS PRIOR TO AND INCLUDING ANY
EXCAVATION, TO DETERMINE THE ACTUAL LOCATION OF UTILITIES AND
OTHER IMPROVEMENTS, PRIOR TO STARTING THE WORK. ANY CHANGES
FROM THIS PLAN SHALL BE COORDINATED WITH AND APPROVED BY THE
ENGINEER.}
\end{itemize}
CONCEPTUAL GRADING & DRAINAGE PLAN
TIERRA WEST, LLC
PRELIMINARY - NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION
WINTERGREEN LUXURY APARTMENTS
GOLF COURSE RD NE

PROPOSED BASIN MAP
DEVELOPED CONDITION - 10800 GOLF COURSE RD. NW

HISTORIC BASIN MAP
EXISTING CONDITION - 10880 GOLF COURSE RD. NW

Legend:
- Boundary
- Legend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pipe Number</th>
<th>D (in)</th>
<th>Stage (ft)</th>
<th>Area (ft²)</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>Q (cfs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>0.475</td>
<td>14.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>0.675</td>
<td>13.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>12.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>12.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>0.775</td>
<td>14.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>0.975</td>
<td>13.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Manning's Equation:
Q = 0.048 A^0.6 S^0.82

A = Area
S = Slope
v = v0.5
CONSTRUCTION DETAILS

TIERRA WEST, LLC

PRELIMINARY - NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

WINTERGREEN LUXURY APARTMENTS
GOLF COURSE RD NE

CONSTRUCTION DETAILS

GENERAL NOTES:
1. ALL DIMENSIONS ARE IN FEET AND INCHES.
2. ALL AREAS ARE IN SQUARE FEET EXCEPT AS OTHERWISE NOTED.
3. ALL CONCRETE AND STONE IS TO BE PROPORTIONED BY THE MANUFACTURER.
4. ALL EXTERIOR JOINTS TO BE GROOVED.
5. ALL EXTERIOR WALLS TO BE PLASTERED.
6. ALL INTERIOR WALLS TO BE PLASTERED.
7. ALL EXTERIOR JOINTS TO BE GROOVED.
8. ALL INTERIOR JOINTS TO BE GROOVED.
9. ALL EXTERIOR JOINTS TO BE GROOVED.

DIMENSIONED GRIDS SPECIFICATION FOR FIRE ACCESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grid</th>
<th>Grid</th>
<th>Grid</th>
<th>Grid</th>
<th>Grid</th>
<th>Grid</th>
<th>Grid</th>
<th>Grid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

072
PAREX USA LARIAT 821L (57)

PAREX USA LARIAT 821L (57)

PAREX US CLAY 1571L (24)

METAL COPING CAP PAINT TO MATCH STUCCO COLOR, TYP.

PAREX USA LARIAT 821L (57)

METAL COPING CAP PAINT TO MATCH STUCCO COLOR, TYP.

PAREX US CLAY 1571L (24)

WHITE STOREFRONT FRAME W/LOW E GLASS, TYP.

PAREX US CLAY 1571L (24)

PAREX USA LARIAT 821L (57)

PAREX US CLAY 1571L (24)

METAL COPING CAP PAINT TO MATCH STUCCO COLOR, TYP.

098

FIND ELEVATION

1/8" = 1'-0"
SOUTH ELEVATION

1/8" = 1'-0"
PAREX US CLAY 1571L (24)
PAREX USA LARIAT 821L (57)
PAREX US CLAY 1571L (24)
PAREX USA LARIAT 821L (57)
WHITE STOREFRONT FRAME W/LOW E GLASS, TYP.

PAREX US CLAY 1571L (24)
PAREX USA LARIAT 821L (57)
PAREX US CLAY 1571L (24)
PAREX USA LARIAT 821L (57)

PAREX US CLAY 1571L (24)
PAREX USA LARIAT 821L (57)
PAREX US CLAY 1571L (24)
PAREX USA LARIAT 821L (57)

PAINT DOOR TO MATCH STUCCO COLOR
METAL COPING CAP PAINT TO MATCH STUCCO COLOR, TYP.

WEST ELEVATION
1/8" = 1'-0"
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD
SUPPLEMENTAL SUBMITTAL
(Deadline is Friday at noon unless noted on 2019 agenda – late submittals will not be accepted unless approved by the DRB)

PROJECT NO. PR-2020-004030
Application No. SI-2020-00540

TO:
✓ Planning Department/Chair
✓ Hydrology
✓ Transportation Development
✓ Albuquerque/ Bernalillo Co. WUA
✓ Code Enforcement
*(Please attach this sheet with each collated set for each board member)

NOTE: ELECTRONIC VERSION (ie disk, thumbdrive) is Required. Submittal will not be accepted without.

DRB SCHEDULED HEARING DATE: 8·5·2020 HEARING DATE OF DEFERRAL: 7·22·2020

SUBMITTAL DESCRIPTION: Updated Site Plan, response to comments
letter

CONTACT NAME: Richard Stevenson

TELEPHONE: 505-258-3100 EMAIL: rstevenson@herrawestllc.com
# DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD APPLICATION

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

## SUBDIVISIONS

- [ ] Final Sign off of EPC Site Plan(s) (Form P2)
- [ ] Amendment to Site Plan (Form P2)
- [ ] Vacation of Public Right-of-way (Form V)
- [ ] Minor – Preliminary (Form P1)
- [ ] Amendment to Site Plan (Form P2)
- [ ] Vacation of Private Easement(s) (Form V)
- [ ] Minor – Preliminary (Form S2)
- [ ] Extension of Infrastructure List or IIA (Form S1)
- [ ] Vacation of Public Easement(s) (Form V)
- [ ] Major - Final Plat (Form S1)
- [ ] Extension of Infrastructure List (Form S2)
- [ ] Sketch Plat Review and Comment (Form S2)
- [ ] Amendment to Preliminary Plat (Form S2)
- [ ] Minor Amendment to Infrastructure List (Form S2)
- [ ] Decision of DRB (Form A)
- [ ] Extension of Preliminary Plat (Form S1)
- [ ] Temporary Deferral of SNV (Form V2)
- [ ] Sidewalk Waiver (Form V2)
- [ ] Waiver to IDO (Form V2)
- [ ] Waiver to DPM (Form V2)
- [ ] PRE-APPLICATIONS
- [ ] APPEAL

## SITE PLANS

- [ ] DRB Site Plan (Form P2)

### BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF REQUEST

**Site Plan DRB**

## APPLICATION INFORMATION

Applicant: Calbac Illas Group C/O Donald Harville  
Address: 3301 R Coors Blvd NW  
City: Albuquerque  
State: NM  
Zip: 87120

Professional/Agent (if any): Tierra West, LLC  
Address: 5571 Midway Park Pl NE  
City: Albuquerque  
State: NM  
Zip: 87109

Email: peterstalland@hotmail.com  
Phone: 505-858-3100  
Email: rstevenson@tierrawestllc.com

## SITE INFORMATION (Accuracy of the existing legal description is crucial! Attach a separate sheet if necessary.)

- **Lot or Tract No.**: TR E-1 PLAT OF TRS D-1, E-1 A MFCA Black Arroyo Channel Row Paradise Heights  
- **Subdivision/Addition**:  
- **Block**:  
- **Unit**:  
- **MRGCD Map No.**:  
- **UPC Code**:  
- **Zone Atlas Page(s)**: A-12 & A-13-Z  
- **Existing Zoning**: MX-M  
- **Proposed Zoning**: MX-M  
- **# of Existing Lots**: 1  
- **# of Proposed Lots**: 1  
- **Total Area of Site (Acres)**: 8.77

## LOCATION OF PROPERTY BY STREETS

**Site Address/Street**: Golf Course  
Between: Golf Course and: Westside Blvd

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

1002586, 1004501, 1004503

## SIGNATURES

**Signature**:  
**Printed Name**: Ronald R. Bohannan  
**Date**: 6/26/2020

## FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Numbers</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Fees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SI-2020-00540</td>
<td>SP-DRB</td>
<td>$570</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Meeting Date**: July 22, 2020  
**Fee Total**: $570

**Staff Signature**: Vanessa A Segura  
**Date**: 6/26/2020  
**Project #**: PR-2020-004030
FORM P2: SITE PLAN – DRB

Please refer to the DRB public meeting schedules for meeting dates and deadlines. Your attendance is required.

A Single PDF file of the complete application including all 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. PDF shall be organized with the Development Review Application and this Form P2 at the front followed by the remaining documents in the order provided on this form.

☐ SITE PLAN – DRB
☐ MAJOR AMENDMENT TO SITE PLAN – DRB
☐ EXTENSION OF SITE PLAN – DRB

N/A Interpreter Needed for Hearing? ______ if yes, indicate language: ____________________________

☐ PDF of application as described above
☒ Zone Atlas map with the entire site clearly outlined and labeled
☒ Letter of authorization from the property owner if application is submitted by an agent
☒ Sites 5 acres or greater: Archaeological Certificate in accordance with IDO Section 14-16-6-5(A) (not required for Extension)
☒ Signed Traffic Impact Study (TIS) Form
☒ Signed Form DRWS Drainage Report, Grading and Drainage Plan, and Water & Sewer Availability Statement filing information (not required for Extension)

☒ Justification letter describing, explaining, and justifying the request per the criteria in IDO Section 14-16-6-6(G)(3)

N/A Explanation and justification of requested deviations, if any, in accordance with IDO Section 14-16-6-4(O)

☒ Proof of Pre-Application Meeting with City staff per IDO Section 14-16-6-4(B) (not required for Extension)
☒ Proof of Neighborhood Coordination Neighborhood meeting inquiry response
☒ Proof of email with read receipt OR Certified Letter offering meeting to applicable associations

N/A If a meeting was requested or held, copy of sign-in sheet and meeting notes

☒ Sign Posting Agreement

☑ Required notices with content per IDO Section 14-16-6-4(K)(6)
☒ Office of Neighborhood Coordination notice inquiry response
☒ Copy of notification 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) provided by Planning Department or created by applicant, copy of notifying letter, and proof of first class mailing

☒ Completed Site Plan Checklist

☒ Site Plan and related drawings (7 copies, 24” x 36” folded to fit into an 8.5” x 14” pocket)
N/A Copy of the original approved Site Plan or Master Development Plan (for amendments only) (1 copy, 24” x 36”)
N/A Site Plan and related drawings reduced to 8.5” x 11” format (1 copy)
N/A Landfill disclosure statement per IDO Section 14-16-5-2(G) if site is within a designated landfill buffer zone
N/A Infrastructure List, if required

FINAL SIGN-OFF FOR MASTER DEVELOPMENT PLANS AND SITE PLANS – EPC

☐ Interpreter Needed for Hearing? ______ if yes, indicate language: ____________________________

☐ PDF of application as described above
☐ Zone Atlas map with the entire site clearly outlined and labeled
☐ Letter of authorization from the property owner if application is submitted by an agent
☐ Solid Waste Department signature on Site Plan
☐ Signed Form DRWS Drainage Report, Grading and Drainage Plan, and Water & Sewer Availability Statement filing information
☐ Approved Grading and Drainage Plan
☐ Copy of Site Plan with Fire Marshal’s stamp, i.e. “Fire 1” plan (not required for Master Development Plans)
☐ Copy of EPC Notice of Decision and letter explaining how each EPC condition has been met
☐ Site Plan and related drawings (7 copies, 24” x 36” folded to fit into an 8.5” x 14” pocket)
☐ Site Plan and related drawings reduced to 8.5” x 11” format (1 copy)
☐ Infrastructure List, if required

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, if required, or otherwise processed until it is complete.

Signature: _______________________________ Date: 06/26/2020
Printed Name: Ronald R. Bohannon
☐ Applicant or ☐ Agent

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Case Numbers: SI-2020-00540 Project Number: PR-2020-004030

Staff Signature: Vanessa A. Segura
Date: 6/26/2020
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IDO Zone Atlas
May 2018

IDO Zoning information as of May 17, 2018
The Zone Districts and Overlay Zones are established by the Integrated Development Ordinance (IDO).

For more details about the Integrated Development Ordinance visit: http://www.cabq.gov/planning/codes-policies-regulations/integrated-development-ordinance
March 16, 2020

Ms. Jolene Wolfley, Chair
Development Review Board
City of Albuquerque
P.O. Box 1293
Albuquerque, NM 87103

RE: DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD (DRB) SITE PLAN
TR E-1 PLAT OF TRS D-1, E-1 AMAFCA BLACK ARROYOCHANNEL ROW
PARADISE HEIGHTS UNIT 1 CONT
ZONE ATLAS MAP: A-12-Z & A-13-Z

Dear Ms. Wolfley:

The purpose of this letter is to authorize Tierra West LLC to act as agent on behalf of Calabacillas Group c/o Donald Harville pertaining to any and all submittals made to the City of Albuquerque for the above-referenced site.

Signature: Donald Harville
Title: General Partner
Date: 3-17-2020
DATE: May 6, 2020

SUBJECT: Albuquerque Archaeological Ordinance - Compliance Documentation

Case Number(s): PR-2020-003731
Agent: Tierra West, LLC
Applicant: Calaba Illas Grup, LLC c/o Donald Harville
Legal Description: TR E-1 PLAT OF TRS D-1, E-1 AMAFCA BLACK ARROYO CHANNEL
Zoning: MX-M
Acreage: 8.77
Zone Atlas Page(s): A-12-Z and A-13-Z

CERTIFICATE OF NO EFFECT: ☑ Yes ☐ No
CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL: ☐ Yes ☑ No

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION:
Historic Google Earth Images

SITE VISIT: N/A

RECOMMENDATIONS:
Aerial photographs suggest the west half of the property has been bladed. The remainder of the property appears to have been disturbed by surrounding construction activities. Therefore:
CERTIFICATE OF NO EFFECT ISSUED-under 6-5(A) (3)(a) criterion 2 "The property has been disturbed through previous land use"

SUBMITTED BY:

[Signature]
Douglas H. M. Boggess, MA, RPA
Senior Principal Investigator
Acting City Archaeologist
Lone Mountain Archaeological Services, Inc.

SUBMITTED TO:
Russell Brito, Planning Manager
City of Albuquerque Planning Department
CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE
TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDY (TIS) FORM

APPLICANT: Tierra West, LLC
DATE OF REQUEST: 05/19/2020
ZONE ATLAS PAGE(S) A-12 & A-13

CURRENT:

LEGAL DESCRIPTION: TR E-1 PLAT OF TRS D-1, E-1 AMAFCA BLACK ARROYO CHANNEL ROW PARADISE HEIGHTS
ZONING ___MX-M_________

LOT OR TRACT # ___E-1____ BLOCK #

PARCEL SIZE (AC/SQ. FT.) 8.77

SUBDIVISION NAME

REQUESTED CITY ACTION(S):

ANNEXATION [ ]
ZONE CHANGE [ ]: From To
SECTOR, AREA, FAC, COMP PLAN [ ]
AMENDMENT (Map/Text) [ ]

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

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:

NO CONSTRUCTION/DEVELOPMENT [ ]
NEW CONSTRUCTION [ X ]
EXPANSION OF EXISTING DEVELOPMENT [ ]

# OF UNITS: 209
BUILDING SIZE: total 238,864 (sq. ft.)

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

APPLICANT OR REPRESENTATIVE ___________________________ DATE 05-19-2020
(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:
The number of units, 209, is less than the threshold of a minimum of 247 units based on ITE Code #220

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.

5/19/2020

TRAFFIC ENGINEER ___________________________ DATE ___________________________

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
FORM DRWS: DRAINAGE REPORT/GRADING AND DRAINAGE PLAN / WATER & SANITARY SEWER AVAILABILITY
THIS FORM IS REQUIRED WITH THE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD APPLICATION FOR SUBDIVISIONS AND SITE PLANS.

PROJECT NAME: Apartments at Golf Course

AGIS MAP #: A-12-Z & A-13-Z

LEGAL DESCRIPTIONS: TR E-1 PLAT OF TRS D-1, E-1 AMAFCA
BLACK ARROYO CHANNEL ROW PARADISE HEIGHTS

DRAINAGE REPORT/GRADING AND DRAINAGE PLAN

A drainage report/grading and drainage plan, as per the Drainage Ordinance, was submitted to the City of Albuquerque Planning Department, Hydrology Division (2nd /Ground Floor, Plaza del Sol) on 6/26/2020 (date).

Applicant/Agent

6/26/2020

06/26/20

Hydrology Division Representative

NOTE: A GRADING AND DRAINAGE PLAN MUST BE APPROVED PRIOR TO DRB APPROVAL

WATER AND SEWER AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

A Water and Sewer Availability Statement for this project was requested to the ABCWUA (2nd/Ground floor, Plaza del Sol) on May 6, 2020 (date).

Applicant/Agent

6/26/2020

06/26/2020

ABCWUA Representative

PROJECT # Type text here

Revised 5/18
June 26, 2020

Ms. Jolene Wolfley, Chair
Design Review Board
PO Box 1293
Albuquerque, NM 87102

RE: SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN - DRB
PROPOSED 208 APARTMENT DEVELOPMENT AT GOLF COURSE RD
LEGAL DESCRIPTION; TR E-1 PLAT OF TRS D-1, E-1 AMAFCA
BLACK ARROYO CHANNEL ROW PARADISE HEIGHTS UNIT 1
ZONE ATLAS MAP: A-12-Z & A-13-Z

Dear Ms. Wolfley:

On behalf of Calabacillas Group c/o Donald Harville, Tierra West, LLC is submitting for the approval of a Site Development Plan to the Development Review Board (DRB). The request is for a site plan approval to the Development Review Board for an upscale apartment development on the 8.7 acre vacant site, which consists of the southern half of the vacant property at the south east corner of Golf Course Blvd. and Westside Blvd. NW. The site is currently zoned MX-M per the IDO zoning designations. This is a new application request, and is not associated to any prior requests.

**Site Development Plan - DRB**

The project will consist of a total of 208 apartments across four buildings, 52 apartments in each of the four buildings with the maximum height of 45-ft. This equates to a density of 24 units per acre. The apartments will comprise of a mix of studio, one and two bedroom apartments. The complex will be gated and include a 4,000 sf club house with pool for the residents. This is a high quality apartment project, with generous landscaping, water features and landscape sculptures by local artists, covered parking, high end finishes in the apartments including granite, stainless steel and porcelain tile floors and elevators within each building.

We have met with the HOA three times to discuss the application and engage in and incorporate feedback provided by the neighbors, while also answer their concerns on the project. Two of the HOA meetings were facilitated with the meeting minutes included in the application file. The proposed development meets all regulations and requirements set out in the IDO.

If you have any questions or need additional information regarding this matter, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Ronald R. Bohannan, P.E.

Enclosure/s

JN: 202013
RRB/rs/kw
PRE-APPLICATION REVIEW TEAM (PRT) MEETING NOTES

PA# 20-070  Date: 09 Mar 2020  Time: 3:00 pm

Address: 

AGENCY REPRESENTATIVES AT MEETING:
Planning: Russell Brito
Code Enforcement: Charles Maestas, Carl Garcia
Fire Marshall: Inspector Rodriguez
Transportation: 
Other: 

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

REQUEST: 

SITE INFORMATION:
Zone: MX-M  Size: 
Use:  Overlay Zone: 
Comp Plan Area Of: Comp Plan Corridor: 
Comp Plan Center: MPOS or Sensitive Lands: 
Parking: MR Area: 
Landscaping: Street Trees: 
Use Specific Standards: 
Dimensional Standards: 

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

PROCESS:
Type of Action: Site Plan - DRB
Review and Approval Body: DRB  Is this PRT a requirement? yes
NOTES:

- Max height is 45' mech. units & screening can encroach per Table 5-1.9
  - Height is to top of parapet
- Parking: no maximum
- Gated community is fine
- Impact Fee Reduction is for drainage

- Project 1004501 - possible site plan Z-97-88 and Z-98-19
- S-9 Neighborhood Edges
  - 15' landscape buffer (5-6(E))
  - 50' buffer area: No parking or access to parking
- S-6 Landscape
- S-3(B)(3) on-site Pedestrian Connections
- Fire Marshall: 10 ft. gaps between carports is okay if distance from access road to the face of the building is no more than 30' feet maximum
Kristl Walker

From: Carmona, Dalaina L. <dlcarmona@cabq.gov>
Sent: Thursday, April 30, 2020 12:11 PM
To: Kristl Walker
Subject: Golf Gourse Blvd & Westside Blvd Public Notice Inquiry
Attachments: IDZoneAtlasPage_A-12-Z.PDF

Dear Applicant,

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Association Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Address Line 1</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip</th>
<th>Mobile Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Westside Coalition of Neighborhood Associations</td>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>Hendriksen</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hhlen@comcast.net">hhlen@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>10592 Rio Del Sol NW</td>
<td>Albuquerque</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>87114</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westside Coalition of Neighborhood Associations</td>
<td>Rene</td>
<td>Horvath</td>
<td><a href="mailto:aboard111@gmail.com">aboard111@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>5515 Palomino Drive NW</td>
<td>Albuquerque</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>87120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven Bar North HOA</td>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>Corder</td>
<td></td>
<td>PO Box 45960</td>
<td>Rio Rancho</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>87174</td>
<td>505615C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven Bar North HOA</td>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Templeton</td>
<td><a href="mailto:scott.templeton@comcast.net">scott.templeton@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>4332 Dry Creek Place NW</td>
<td>Albuquerque</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>87114</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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


Thanks,

Dalaina L. Carmona
Senior Administrative Assistant
Public Notice Inquiry For:
   Development Review Board

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

Contact Name
   Kristl Walker

Telephone Number
   505-858-3100

Email Address
   kwalker@tierrawestllc.com

Company Name
   Tierra West LLC

Company Address
   5571 Midway Park Pl

City
   Albuquerque

State
   Nm

ZIP
   87109

Legal description of the subject site for this project:
   TR E-1 plat of TRS D-1, E-1 AMAFCA Black Arroyo

Physical address of subject site:
   Golf Course

Subject site cross streets:
   Golf Course blvd & Westside Blvd

Other subject site identifiers:
   This site is located on the following zone atlas page:
      A-12 & A-13
This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
From: Kristl Walker
Sent: Wednesday, May 13, 2020 2:51 PM
To: 'hlhen@comcast.net'; 'scott.templeton@comcast.net'
Subject: FW: 2020013 Apartments at Golf Course Site Plan -DRB
Attachments: 2020013 05-13-20 Neighborhood Email.pdf

May 13, 2020

RE: SITE PLAN - DRB
PROPOSED 208 APARTMENT DEVELOPMENT AT GOLF COURSE RD
LEGAL DESCRIPTION; TR E-1 PLAT OF TRS D-1, E-1 AMAFGA
BLACK ARROYO CHANNEL ROW PARADISE HEIGHTS UNIT 1
ZONE ATLAS MAP: A-12-Z & A-13-Z

Dear hlhen@comcast.net; aboard111@gmail.com; scott.templeton@comcast.net:

In accordance with the procedures of the City of Albuquerque’s Integrated Development Ordinance (IDO) Subsection 14-16-6-4(K)(2) E-Mail Public Notice, we are notifying you as a registered Neighborhood Association that Tierra West, LLC intends to submit an application for Site Plan approval to the Development Review Board (DRB) for the proposed development.

The proposed development is for four buildings each with 52 apartment units and a single story club house with amenities for residents. A total of 360 parking spaces shall be provided, located around the perimeter of the development. A 50-ft buffer setback as required by the IDO is provided along the east side of the property adjacent to the residential zone properties. Attached to this letter is the proposed site plan detailing the proposed development.

Per the IDO notification requirements, you have 15 days from the date of this letter to respond by either 1) requesting a meeting* or 2) declining to meet. If you do not respond within 15 days, you are waiving the opportunity for a Neighborhood Meeting, and we can submit our application anytime thereafter. *Communication has occurred between Tierra West and the HOA with a facilitated neighborhood meeting scheduled for Thursday May 21, 2020 at 4:00 pm. The facilitated meeting will allow the general membership of the Neighborhood Association to review the project and for Tierra West to address their questions and concerns of the development.

Prior to submitting the DRB application, we will send Mailed and/or Emailed Public Notice as required by IDO Table 6-1-1 to make you aware of the public meeting at which the project will be reviewed and decided by the City.

Tierra West LLC Contact(s):
Richard Stevenson, P.E and Ronald R. Bohannan, P.E
5571 Midway Park Place NE
Albuquerque, NM 87109
rstevenson@tierrawesllc.com / rrb@tierrawestllc.com
505-558-3100

Sincerely,

Ronald R. Bohannan, P.E.
cc: Peter Stalland

Enclosures: Site Plan, Zone Atlas Map

JN: 2020013
RRB/kw

Kristl Walker
Administrative Assistant
Tierra West, LLC
5571 Midway Park Place NE
Albuquerque, NM 87109
505-858-3100 Office
505-858-1118 Fax
kwalker@tierrawestllc.com
From: Kristl Walker
Sent: Wednesday, May 13, 2020 10:57 AM
To: 'aboard111@gmail.com'
Cc: Ron Bohannan; Richard Stevenson; Jaimie Garcia
Subject: 20200013 Apartments at Golf Course Site Plan -DRB
Attachments: 20200013 05-13-20 Neighborhood Email.pdf

May 13, 2020

RE: SITE PLAN - DRB
PROPOSED 208 APARTMENT DEVELOPMENT AT GOLF COURSE RD
LEGAL DECIPTION; TR E-1 PLAT OF TRS D-1, E-1 AMAFCA
BLACK ARROYO CHANNEL ROW PARADISE HEIGHTS UNIT 1
ZONE ATLAS MAP: A-12-Z & A-13-Z

Dear hlhen@comcast.net; aboard111@gmail.com; scott.templeton@comcast.net:

In accordance with the procedures of the City of Albuquerque's Integrated Development Ordinance (IDO) Subsection 14-16-6-4(K)(2) E-Mail Public Notice, we are notifying you as a registered Neighborhood Association that Tierra West, LLC intends to submit an application for Site Plan approval to the Development Review Board (DRB) for the proposed development.

The proposed development is for four buildings each with 52 apartment units and a single story club house with amenities for residents. A total of 360 parking spaces shall be provided, located around the perimeter of the development. A 50-ft buffer setback as required by the IDO is provided along the east side of the property adjacent to the residential zone properties. Attached to this letter is the proposed site plan detailing the proposed development.

Per the IDO notification requirements, you have 15 days from the date of this letter to respond by either 1) requesting a meeting* or 2) declining to meet. If you do not respond within 15 days, you are waiving the opportunity for a Neighborhood Meeting, and we can submit our application anytime thereafter.

*Communication has occurred between Tierra West and the HOA with a facilitated neighborhood meeting scheduled for Thursday May 21, 2020 at 4:00 pm. The facilitated meeting will allow the general membership of the Neighborhood Association to review the project and for Tierra West to address their questions and concerns of the development.

Prior to submitting the DRB application, we will send Mailed and/or Emailed Public Notice as required by IDO Table 6-1-1 to make you aware of the public meeting at which the project will be reviewed and decided by the City.

Tierra West LLC Contact(s):
Richard Stevenson, P.E and Ronald R. Bohannan, P.E
5571 Midway Park Place NE
Albuquerque, NM 87109
rstevenson@tierrawestllc.com / rr@tierrawestllc.com
505-858-3100

Sincerely,

Ronald R. Bohannan, P.E.

cc: Peter Stalland
Enclosures: Site Plan, Zone Atlas Map

JN: 2020013
RRB/kw

Kristl Walker
Administrative Assistant
Tierra West, LLC
5571 Midway Park Place NE
Albuquerque, NM 87109
505-858-3100 Office
505-858-1118 Fax
kwalker@tierrawestllc.com
May 13, 2020

Mr. Jack Corder  
Seven Bar North HOA  
PO Box 45960  
Albuquerque NM 87174

RE: SITE PLAN - DRB  
PROPOSED 208 APARTMENT DEVELOPMENT AT GOLF COURSE RD  
LEGAL DESCRIPTION; TR E-1 PLAT OF TRS D-1, E-1 AMAFCA  
BLACK ARROYO CHANNEL ROW PARADISE HEIGHTS UNIT 1  
ZONE ATLAS MAP: A-12-Z & A-13-Z

Dear Mr. Corder:

In accordance with the procedures of the City of Albuquerque’s Integrated Development Ordinance (IDO) Subsection 14-16-6-4(K)(2) Mail Public Notice, we are notifying you as a registered Neighborhood Association that Tierra West, LLC intends to submit an application for Site Plan approval to the Development Review Board (DRB) for the proposed development.

The proposed development is for four buildings each with 52 apartment units and a single story club house with amenities for residents. A total of 360 parking spaces shall be provided, located around the perimeter of the development. A 50-ft buffer setback as required by the IDO is provided along the east side of the property adjacent to the residential zone properties. Attached to this letter is the proposed site plan detailing the proposed development.

Per the IDO notification requirements, you have 15 days from the date of this letter to respond by either 1) requesting a meeting* or 2) declining to meet. If you do not respond within 15 days, you are waiving the opportunity for a Neighborhood Meeting, and we can submit our application anytime thereafter.  
*Communication has occurred between Tierra West and the HOA with a facilitated neighborhood meeting scheduled for Thursday May 21, 2020 at 4:00 pm. The facilitated meeting will allow the general membership of the Neighborhood Association to review the project and for Tierra West to address their questions and concerns of the development.

Prior to submitting the DRB application, we will send Mailed and/or Emailed Public Notice as required by IDO Table 6-1-1 to make you aware of the public meeting at which the project will be reviewed and decided by the City.

Tierra West LLC Contact(s):  
Richard Stevenson, P.E and Ronald R. Bohannan, P.E  
5571 Midway Park Place NE  
Albuquerque, NM 87109  
rstevenson@tierrawestllc.com / rrb@tierrawestllc.com  
505-858-3100

Sincerely,

Ronald R. Bohannan, P.E.

cc: Peter Stalland

Enclosures: Site Plan. Zone Atlas Map

JN: 2020013
RRB/kw
May 13, 2020

Ms. Rene Horvath
Westside Coalition of NA
5515 Palomino Drive NW
Albuquerque NM 87120

RE: SITE PLAN - DRB
PROPOSED 208 APARTMENT DEVELOPMENT AT GOLF COURSE RD
LEGAL DESCRIPTION; TR E-1 PLAT OF TRS D-1, E-1 AMAFCA
BLACK ARROYO CHANNEL ROW PARADISE HEIGHTS UNIT 1
ZONE ATLAS MAP: A-12-Z & A-13-Z

Dear Ms. Horvath:

In accordance with the procedures of the City of Albuquerque’s Integrated Development Ordinance (IDO) Subsection 14-16-6(K)(2) Mail Public Notice, we are notifying you as a registered Neighborhood Association that Tierra West, LLC intends to submit an application for Site Plan approval to the Development Review Board (DRB) for the proposed development.

The proposed development is for four buildings each with 52 apartment units and a single story club house with amenities for residents. A total of 360 parking spaces shall be provided, located around the perimeter of the development. A 50-ft buffer setback as required by the IDO is provided along the east side of the property adjacent to the residential zone properties. Attached to this letter is the proposed site plan detailing the proposed development.

Per the IDO notification requirements, you have 15 days from the date of this letter to respond by either 1) requesting a meeting* or 2) declining to meet. If you do not respond within 15 days, you are waiving the opportunity for a Neighborhood Meeting, and we can submit our application anytime thereafter.

*Communication has occurred between Tierra West and the HOA with a facilitated neighborhood meeting scheduled for Thursday May 21, 2020 at 4:00 pm. The facilitated meeting will allow the general membership of the Neighborhood Association to review the project and for Tierra West: to address their questions and concerns of the development.

Prior to submitting the DRB application, we will send Mailed and/or Emailed Public Notice as required by IDO Table 6-1-1 to make you aware of the public meeting at which the project will be reviewed and decided by the City.

Tierra West LLC Contact(s):
Richard Stevenson, P.E and Ronald R. Bohannan, P.E
5571 Midway Park Place NE
Albuquerque, NM 87109
rstevenson@tierrawestllc.com / rrb@tierrawestllc.com
505-858-3100

Sincerely,

Ronald R. Bohannan, P.E.

cc: Peter Stalland

Enclosures: Site Plan. Zone Atlas Map

JN: 2020013
RRB/kw
May 13, 2020

Mr. Harry Hendriksen
Westside Coalition of NA
15692 Rio Del Sol NW
Albuquerque NM 87114

RE: SITE PLAN - DRB
PROPOSED 208 APARTMENT DEVELOPMENT AT GOLF COURSE RD
LEGAL DESCRIPTION; TR E-1 PLAT OF TRS D-1, E-1 AMAFCA
BLACK ARROYO CHANNEL ROW PARADISE HEIGHTS UNIT 1
ZONE ATLAS MAP: A-12-Z & A-13-Z

Dear Mr. Hendriksen:

In accordance with the procedures of the City of Albuquerque's Integrated Development Ordinance (IDO) Subsection 14-16-6-4(K)(2) Mail Public Notice, we are notifying you as a registered Neighborhood Association that Tierra West, LLC intends to submit an application for Site Plan approval to the Development Review Board (DRB) for the proposed development.

The proposed development is for four buildings each with 52 apartment units and a single story club house with amenities for residents. A total of 360 parking spaces shall be provided, located around the perimeter of the development. A 50-ft buffer setback as required by the IDO is provided along the east side of the property adjacent to the residential zone properties. Attached to this letter is the proposed site plan detailing the proposed development.

Per the IDO notification requirements, you have 15 days from the date of this letter to respond by either 1) requesting a meeting* or 2) declining to meet. If you do not respond within 15 days, you are waiving the opportunity for a Neighborhood Meeting, and we can submit our application anytime thereafter.

*Communication has occurred between Tierra West and the HOA with a facilitated neighborhood meeting scheduled for Thursday May 21, 2020 at 4:00 pm. The facilitated meeting will allow the general membership of the Neighborhood Association to review the project and for Tierra West to address their questions and concerns of the development.

Prior to submitting the DRB application, we will send Mailed and/or Emailed Public Notice as required by IDO Table 6-1-1 to make you aware of the public meeting at which the project will be reviewed and decided by the City.

Tierra West LLC Contact(s):
Richard Stevenson, P.E. and Ronald R. Bohannan, P.E
5571 Midway Park Place NE
Albuquerque, NM 87109
rstevenson@tierrawestllc.com / rrb@tierrawestllc.com
505-858-3100

Sincerely,

Ronald R. Bohannan, P.E.

cc: Peter Stalland

Enclosures: Site Plan, Zone Atlas Map

J#: 2020013
RRB/kw
May 13, 2020

Mr. Scott Templeton
Seven Bar North HOA
4332 Dry Creek Place NW
Albuquerque NM 87114

RE: SITE PLAN - DRB
PROPOSED 208 APARTMENT DEVELOPMENT AT GOLF COURSE RD
LEGAL DESCRIPTION; TR E-1 PLAT OF TRS D-1, E-1 AMAFCA
BLACK ARROYO CHANNEL ROW PARADISE HEIGHTS UNIT 1
ZONE ATLAS MAP: A-12-Z & A-13-Z

Dear Mr. Templeton:

In accordance with the procedures of the City of Albuquerque’s Integrated Development Ordinance (IDO) Subsection 14-16-6-4(K)(2) Mail Public Notice, we are notifying you as a registered Neighborhood Association that Tierra West, LLC intends to submit an application for Site Plan approval to the Development Review Board (DRB) for the proposed development.

The proposed development is for four buildings each with 52 apartment units and a single story club house with amenities for residents. A total of 360 parking spaces shall be provided, located around the perimeter of the development. A 50-ft buffer setback as required by the IDO is provided along the east side of the property adjacent to the residential zone properties. Attached to this letter is the proposed site plan detailing the proposed development.

Per the IDO notification requirements, you have 15 days from the date of this letter to respond by either 1) requesting a meeting or 2) declining to meet. If you do not respond within 15 days, you are waiving the opportunity for a Neighborhood Meeting, and we can submit our application anytime thereafter. Communication has occurred between Tierra West and the HOA with a facilitated neighborhood meeting scheduled for Thursday May 21, 2020 at 4:00 pm. The facilitated meeting will allow the general membership of the Neighborhood Association to review the project and for Tierra West to address their questions and concerns of the development.

Prior to submitting the DRB application, we will send Mailed and/or Emailed Public Notice as required by IDO Table 6-1-1 to make you aware of the public meeting at which the project will be reviewed and decided by the City.

Tierra West LLC Contact(s):
Richard Stevenson, P.E and Ronald R. Bohannan, P.E
5571 Midway Park Place NE
Albuquerque, NM 87109
rstevenson@tierrawestllc.com / rrb@tierrawestllc.com
505-858-3100

Sincerely,

Ronald R. Bohannan, P.E.

cc: Peter Stalland

Enclosures: Site Plan, Zone Atlas Map

JN: 2020013
RRB/w
Harry Hendriksen
Westside Coalition of NA
10592 Rio Del Sol NW
Albuquerque, NM 87114

Postage $7.00

Rene Horvath
Westside Coalition of NA
5515 Palomino Drive NW
Albuquerque, NM 87120

Postage $7.00

Scott Templeton
Seven Bar North HOA
4332 Dry Creek Place NW
Albuquerque, NM 87114

Postage $7.00

Proof of mailings
"Certified Stamp"
Proof of Mailings
U.S. Postal Service
CERTIFIED MAIL® RECEIPT
Domestic Mail Only

CERTIFIED MAIL® Fee 3.05
Return Receipt (optional) $ 2.45
Endorsement (optional) 9
Certified & Registered $ 8
Adult Signature Required 6
Adult Signature Required Delivery 6
Postage 1.20
Total Postage & Fee $ 1.60

Send To:
Jack Corder
Seven Bar North HOA
PO Box 45960
Rio Rancho, NM 87174

Return Receipt Available Postmark Here

7018 0040 0000 5421 5669
7018 0040 0000 5421 5669
SIGN POSTING AGREEMENT

Requirements

Posting Signs Announcing Public Hearings

All persons making application to the City under the requirements and procedures established by the Integrated Development Ordinance are responsible for the posting and maintaining of one or more signs on the property which is subject to the application, as shown in Table 6-1-1. Vacations of public rights-of-way (if the way has been in use) also require signs. Waterproof signs are provided at the time of application for a $10 fee per sign. If the application is mailed, you must still stop at the Development Services Front Counter to pick up the sign(s).

The applicant is responsible for ensuring that the signs remain posted throughout the 15-day period prior to any public meeting or hearing. Failure to maintain the signs during this entire period may be cause for deferral or denial of the application. Replacement signs for those lost or damaged are available from the Development Services Front Counter.

1. Location
   A. The sign shall be conspicuously located. It shall be located within twenty feet of the public sidewalk (or edge of public street). Staff may indicate a specific location.
   B. The face of the sign shall be parallel to the street, and the bottom of the sign shall be at least two feet from the ground.
   C. No barrier shall prevent a person from coming within five feet of the sign to read it.

2. Number
   A. One sign shall be posted on each paved street frontage. Signs may be required on unpaved street frontages.
   B. If the land does not abut a public street, then, in addition to a sign placed on the property, a sign shall be placed on and at the edge of the public right-of-way of the nearest paved City street. Such a sign must direct readers toward the subject property by an arrow and an indication of distance.

3. Physical Posting
   A. A heavy stake with two crossbars or a full plywood backing works best to keep the sign in place, especially during high winds.
   B. Large headed nails or staples are best for attaching signs to a post or backing; the sign tears out less easily.

4. Time
   Signs must be posted from ________________ To ________________
   July 7, 2020 July 22, 2020

5. Removal
   A. The sign is not to be removed before the initial hearing on the request.
   B. The sign should be removed within five (5) days after the initial hearing.

I have read this sheet and discussed it with the Development Services Front Counter Staff. I understand (A) my obligation to keep the sign(s) posted for (15) days and (B) where the sign(s) are to be located. I am being given a copy of this sheet.

__(Applicant or Agent)___

__(Date)___

I issued ___ signs for this application, ___ 6/26/2020 ___

__(Applicant or Agent)___  ___ 6/26/2020 ___

__(Staff Member)___

PROJECT NUMBER: PR-2020-004030

Revised 2/6/19
Dear Applicant,

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Association Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Address Line 1</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Westside Coalition of Neighborhood Associations</td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Haley</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ekhaley@comcast.net">ekhaley@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>6005 Chaparral Circle NW</td>
<td>Albuquerque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westside Coalition of Neighborhood Associations</td>
<td>Rene</td>
<td>Horvath</td>
<td><a href="mailto:aboard111@gmail.com">aboard111@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>5515 Palomino Drive NW</td>
<td>Albuquerque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven Bar North HOA</td>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>Corder</td>
<td></td>
<td>PO Box 45960</td>
<td>Rio Rancho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven Bar North HOA</td>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Templeton</td>
<td><a href="mailto:scott.templeton@comcast.net">scott.templeton@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>4332 Dry Creek Place NW</td>
<td>Albuquerque</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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


Thanks,

![Logo]

**Dalaina L. Carmona**

Senior Administrative Assistant
Office of Neighborhood Coordination
Council Services Department
1 Civic Plaza NW, Suite 9087, 5th Floor
Albuquerque, NM 87102
505-768-3334
dlcarmona@cabq.gov or ONC@cabq.gov
Website: [www.cabq.gov/neighborhoods](http://www.cabq.gov/neighborhoods)
Confidentiality Notice: This e-mail, including all attachments is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited unless specifically provided under the New Mexico Inspection of Public Records Act. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and destroy all copies of this message.

From: webmaster=cabq.gov@mailgun.org [mailto:webmaster=cabq.gov@mailgun.org] On Behalf Of ISD WebMaster
Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2020 3:41 PM
To: Office of Neighborhood Coordination <kwalker@tierrawestllc.com>
Cc: Office of Neighborhood Coordination <onc@cabq.gov>
Subject: Public Notice Inquiry Sheet Submission

Public Notice Inquiry For:
Development Review Board

If you selected "Other" in the question above, please describe what you are seeking a Public Notice Inquiry for below:
Contact Name
Kristl Walker
Telephone Number
505-858-3100
Email Address
kwalker@tierrawestllc.com
Company Name
Tierra West LLC
Company Address
5571 Midway Park PL
City
Albuquerque
State
NM
ZIP
87109

Legal description of the subject site for this project:
TR E-1 plat of TRS D-1, E-1 AMAFCA Black Arroyo
Physical address of subject site:
Golf Course
Subject site cross streets:
Golf Course and Westside Blvd
Other subject site identifiers:
This site is located on the following zone atlas page:
A-12 & A-13

This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
June 26, 2020

Mr. Scott Templeton
Seven Bar North HOA
4332 Dry Creek Place NW
Albuquerque, NM 87114

RE: SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN - DRB
PROPOSED 208 APARTMENT DEVELOPMENT AT GOLF COURSE RD
LEGAL DESCRIPTION; TR E-1 PLAT OF TRS D-1, E-1 AMAFCA
BLACK ARROYO CHANNEL ROW PARADISE HEIGHTS UNIT 1
ZONE ATLAS MAP: A-12-Z & A-13-Z

Dear Mr. Templeton,

In accordance with the procedures of the City of Albuquerque’s Integrated Development Ordinance (IDO) Subsection 14-16-6-4(K)(2) Mailed Public Notice, we are notifying you as a Neighborhood Association Representative/nearby Property Owner that Tierra West, LLC will be submitting an application for Site Development Plan to the Development Review Board per Table 6-1-1 to be reviewed and decided by the Reviewing body/Decision-maker per Table 6-1-1.

Site Plan-DRB
The request is for a site plan approval to the Development Review Board for an upscale apartment development on the 8.7 acre vacant site, which consists of the southern half of the vacant property at the south east corner of Golf Course Blvd. and Westside Blvd. NW. The site is zoned MX-M per the IDO zoning designations. This is a new application request, and is not associated to any prior requests.

The project will consist of a total of 208 apartments across four buildings, 52 apartments in each buildings with a maximum building height of 45-ft. The apartments will comprise of a mix of studio, one and two bedroom apartments. The complex will be gated and include a 4,000 sf club house with pool facilities for the residents. The developer is striving to deliver a high quality project to enhance the neighborhood, with generous landscaping and water features, covered parking, high end finishes in the apartments including granite, stainless steel and porcelain title floors and elevators within each building.

Due to the updated meeting policies and guidelines regarding COVID-19 an online zoom meetings will take the place of the normal Development Review Board hearing that is held at Plaza Del Sol. The public hearing for this request will be on July 22, 2020 at 9:00 am.

The agenda for the Development Review Board meeting is posted on the City website by Friday afternoon ahead of the Wednesday Meeting. The agenda includes information on accessing the DRB meeting. Meeting details and agendas will be available on the City of Albuquerque’s website link below.

If you have any questions or need additional information regarding this matter, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Tierra West LLC Contact(s):
Ronald R. Bohannan, PE
5571 Midway Park Place NE
Albuquerque, NM 87109
rrb@tierrawestllc.com
505-858-3100

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Ronald R. Bohannan, P.E.

Enclosure/s

JN: 2020013
RRB/rs/kw
June 26, 2020

Mr. Jack Corder  
Seven Bar North HOA  
PO Box 45960  
Rio Rancho, NM 87174

RE: SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN - DRB  
PROPOSED 208 APARTMENT DEVELOPMENT AT GOLF COURSE RD  
LEGAL DESCRIPTION; TR E-1 PLAT OF TRS D-1, E-1 AMAFCA  
BLACK ARROYO CHANNEL ROW PARADISE HEIGHTS UNIT 1  
ZONE ATLAS MAP: A-12-Z & A-13-Z

Dear Mr. Corder,

In accordance with the procedures of the City of Albuquerque’s Integrated Development Ordinance (IDO) Subsection 14-16-6-4(K)(2) Mailed Public Notice, we are notifying you as a Neighborhood Association Representative/nearby Property Owner that Tierra West, LLC will be submitting an application for Site Development Plan to the Development Review Board per Table 6-1-1 to be reviewed and decided by the Reviewing body/Decision-maker per Table 6-1-1.

Site Plan-DRB  
The request is for a site plan approval to the Development Review Board for an upscale apartment development on the 8.7 acre vacant site, which consists of the southern half of the vacant property at the south east corner of Golf Course Blvd. and Westside Blvd. NW. The site is zoned MX-M per the IDO zoning designations. This is a new application request, and is not associated to any prior requests.

The project will consist of a total of 208 apartments across four buildings, 52 apartments in each buildings with a maximum building height of 45-ft. The apartments will comprise of a mix of studio, one and two bedroom apartments. The complex will be gated and include a 4,000 sf club house with pool facilities for the residents. The developer is striving to deliver a high quality project to enhance the neighborhood, with generous landscaping and water features, covered parking, high end finishes in the apartments including granite, stainless steel and porcelain title floors and elevators within each building.

Due to the updated meeting policies and guidelines regarding COVID-19 an online zoom meetings will take the place of the normal Development Review Board hearing that is held at Plaza Del Sol. The public hearing for this request will be on July 22, 2020 at 9:00 am.

The agenda for the Development Review Board meeting is posted on the City website by Friday afternoon ahead of the Wednesday Meeting. The agenda includes information on accessing the DRB meeting. Meeting details and agendas will be available on the City of Albuquerque’s website link below:

If you have any questions or need additional information regarding this matter, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Tierra West LLC Contact(s):
Ronald R. Bohannan, PE
5571 Midway Park Place NE
Albuquerque, NM 87109
rrb@tierrawestllc.com
505-858-3100

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Ronald R. Bohannan, P.E.

Enclosure/s

JN: 2020013
RRB/rs/kw
June 26, 2020

Ms. Elizabeth Haley
Westside Coalition of NA
6005 Chaparral Circle NW
Albuquerque, NM 87114

RE: SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN - DRB
PROPOSED 208 APARTMENT DEVELOPMENT AT GOLF COURSE RD
LEGAL DESCRIPTION; TR E-1 PLAT OF TRS D-1, E-1 AMAFCA
BLACK ARROYO CHANNEL ROW PARADISE HEIGHTS UNIT 1
ZONE ATLAS MAP: A-12-Z & A-13-Z

Dear Ms. Haley,

In accordance with the procedures of the City of Albuquerque’s Integrated Development Ordinance (IDO) Subsection 14-16-6-4(K)(2) Mailed Public Notice, we are notifying you as a Neighborhood Association Representative/nearby Property Owner that Tierra West, LLC will be submitting an application for Site Development Plan to the Development Review Board per Table 6-1-1 to be reviewed and decided by the Reviewing body/Decision-maker per Table 6-1-1.

Site Plan-DRB
The request is for a site plan approval to the Development Review Board for an upscale apartment development on the 8.7 acre vacant site, which consists of the southern half of the vacant property at the south east corner of Golf Course Blvd. and Westside Blvd. NW. The site is zoned MX-M per the IDO zoning designations. This is a new application request, and is not associated to any prior requests.

The project will consist of a total of 208 apartments across four buildings, 52 apartments in each building with a maximum building height of 45-ft. The apartments will comprise of a mix of studio, one and two bedroom apartments. The complex will be gated and include a 4,000 sf club house with pool facilities for the residents. The developer is striving to deliver a high quality project to enhance the neighborhood with generous landscaping and water features, covered parking, high end finishes in the apartments including granite, stainless steel and porcelain title floors and elevators within each building.

Due to the updated meeting policies and guidelines regarding COVID-19 an online zoom meetings will take the place of the normal Development Review Board hearing that is held at Plaza Del Sol. The public hearing for this request will be on July 22, 2020 at 9:00 am.

The agenda for the Development Review Board meeting is posted on the City website by Friday afternoon ahead of the Wednesday Meeting. The agenda includes information on accessing the DRB meeting. Meeting details and agendas will be available on the City of Albuquerque’s website link below:

If you have any questions or need additional information regarding this matter, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Tierra West LLC Contact(s):
Ronald R. Bohannan, PE
5571 Midway Park Place NE
Albuquerque, NM 87109
rrb@tierrawestllc.com
505-858-3100

Sincerely,

Ronald R. Bohannan, P.E.

Enclosure/s

JN:  2020013
RRB/rs/kw
June 26, 2020

Ms. Rene Horvath  
Westside Coalition NA  
5515 Palomino Drive NW  
Albuquerque, NM 87120

RE: SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN - DRB  
PROPOSED 208 APARTMENT DEVELOPMENT AT GOLF COURSE RD  
LEGAL DESCRIPTION; TR E-1 PLAT OF TRS D-1, E-1 AMAFCA  
BLACK ARROYO CHANNEL ROW PARADISE HEIGHTS UNIT 1  
ZONE ATLAS MAP: A-12-Z & A-13-Z

Dear Ms. Horvath,

In accordance with the procedures of the City of Albuquerque's Integrated Development Ordinance (IDO) Subsection 14-16-6-4(K)(2) Mailed Public Notice, we are notifying you as a Neighborhood Association Representative/nearby Property Owner that Tierra West, LLC will be submitting an application for Site Development Plan to the Development Review Board per Table 6-1-1 to be reviewed and decided by the Reviewing body/Decision-maker per Table 6-1-1.

Site Plan-DRB
The request is for a site plan approval to the Development Review Board for an upscale apartment development on the 8.7 acre vacant site, which consists of the southern half of the vacant property at the south east corner of Golf Course Blvd. and Westside Blvd. NW. The site is zoned MX-M per the IDO zoning designations. This is a new application request, and is not associated to any prior requests.

The project will consist of a total of 208 apartments across four buildings, 52 apartments in each buildings with a maximum building height of 45-ft. The apartments will comprise of a mix of studio, one and two bedroom apartments. The complex will be gated and include a 4,000 sf club house with pool facilities for the residents. The developer is striving to deliver a high quality project to enhance the neighborhood, with generous landscaping and water features, covered parking, high end finishes in the apartments including granite, stainless steel and porcelain title floors and elevators within each building.

Due to the updated meeting policies and guidelines regarding COVID-19 an online zoom meetings will take the place of the normal Development Review Board hearing that is held at Plaza Del Sol. The public hearing for this request will be on July 22, 2020 at 9:00 am.

The agenda for the Development Review Board meeting is posted on the City website by Friday afternoon ahead of the Wednesday Meeting. The agenda includes information on accessing the DRB meeting. Meeting details and agendas will be available on the City of Albuquerque’s website link below:

If you have any questions or need additional information regarding this matter, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Tierra West LLC Contact(s):
Ronald R. Bohannan, PE
5571 Midway Park Place NE
Albuquerque, NM 87109
rrb@tierrawestllc.com
505-858-3100

Sincerely,

Ronald R. Bohannan, P.E.

Enclosure/s

JN:  2020013
RRB/rs/kw
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Albuquerque, NM 87114

Shipper Name
Terra West, LLC
5571 Midway Park Pl NE
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June 26, 2020

RE: SITE PLAN - DRB
PROPOSED 208 APARTMENT DEVELOPMENT AT GOLF COURSE RD
LEGAL DESCRIPTION; TR E-1 PLAT OF TRS D-1, E-1 AMAFCA
BLACK ARROYO CHANNEL ROW PARADISE HEIGHTS UNIT 1
ZONE ATLAS MAP: A-12-Z & A-13-Z

To Whom It May Concern:

In accordance with the procedures of the City of Albuquerque's Integrated Development Ordinance (IDO) Subsection 14-16-6-4(K)(2) Mailed Public Notice, we are notifying you as a nearby Property Owner that Tierra West, LLC will be submitting an application for Site Development Plan to the Development Review Board per Table 6-1-1 to be reviewed and decided by the Reviewing body/Decision-maker per Table 6-1-1.

Site Plan-DRB
The request is for a site plan approval to the Development Review Board for an upscale apartment development on the 8.7 acre vacant site, which consists of the southern half of the vacant property at the south east corner of Golf Course Blvd. and Westside Blvd. NW. The site is zoned MX-M per the IDO zoning designations. This is a new application request, and is not associated to any prior requests.

The project will consist of a total of 208 apartments across four buildings, 52 apartments in each buildings with a maximum building height of 45-ft. The apartments will comprise of a mix of studio, one and two bedroom apartments. The complex will be gated and include a 4,000 sf club house with pool facilities for the residents. The developer is striving to deliver a high quality project to enhance the neighborhood, with generous landscaping and water features, covered parking, high end finishes in the apartments including granite, stainless steel and porcelain title floors and elevators within each building.

Due to the updated meeting policies and guidelines regarding COVID-19 an online zoom meetings will take the place of the normal Development Review Board hearing that is held at Plaza Del Sol. The public hearing for this request will be on July 22, 2020 at 9:00 am.

The agenda for the Development Review Board meeting is posted on the City website by Friday afternoon ahead of the Wednesday Meeting. The agenda includes information on accessing the DRB meeting. Meeting details and agendas will be available on the City of Albuquerque’s website link below:


If you have any questions or need additional information regarding this matter, please do not hesitate to contact me.
**Tierra West Contact:**
Ronald R. Bohannan, P.E.
President
Tierra West LLC
5571 Midway Park Place NE
Albuquerque, NM 87109
rrb@tierrawestllc.com
505-858-3100

Tierra West LLC Contact:
Richard Stevenson
5571 Midway Park Place NE
Albuquerque, NM 87109
rstevenson@tierrawestllc.com
505-858-3100

Sincerely,

Ronald R. Bohannan, PE

JN: 2020013
RRB/rs/kw
LOPEZ STEVEN C & GOLDBERG
MELANIE A
10935 CARRETA DR NW
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87114-6504

WARD LARRY A & GERALDINE S
4501 NOCHE CLARA AVE NW
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87114

FIFE JOHN WAYNE & MARSHA YVETT
10932 CARRETA DR NW
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87114
TIERRA WEST, LLC
5571 MIDWAY PARK PLACE NE
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87109

GREENWOOD REBEKAH SULTEMEIER
11009 CARRETA DR NW
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87114-6517

TIERRA WEST, LLC
5571 MIDWAY PARK PLACE NE
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87109

JAEGER JACK J II
4516 BENTON AVE NW
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87114

TIERRA WEST, LLC
5571 MIDWAY PARK PLACE NE
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87109

FISHER TINA R
11005 CARRETA DR NW
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87114-6517
TIERRA WEST, LLC
5571 MIDWAY PARK PLACE NE
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87109

BACA DEBORAH
4505 NOCHE CLARA AVE NW
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87114-5599

TIERRA WEST, LLC
5571 MIDWAY PARK PLACE NE
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87109

ISSUES JAMES A & MARY JO
4424 CAMPO DE MAIZ RD NW
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87114

TIERRA WEST, LLC
5571 MIDWAY PARK PLACE NE
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87109

MURRIETA JAMES P JP TYRA J
TRUSTEES MURRIETA RVT
10940 CARRETA DR NW
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87114-6506
MIRABAL MICHAEL D & MIRABAL
CATHY F
10951 CARRETA DR NW
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87114-6504

SANDOVAL NICK A & DEBBIE L
12009 SULLIVAN CT NW
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87114-6535

MARSHA E KEARNEY & JOHN R
10927 CARRETA DR NW
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87114-6504
TIERRA WEST, LLC
5571 MIDWAY PARK PLACE NE
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87109

Serna Mike R Irrevocable LVT
10812 Olympic St NW
Albuquerque NM 87114-5429

TIERRA WEST, LLC
5571 MIDWAY PARK PLACE NE
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87109

Maggio Michael & Joann
10920 Carreta Dr NW
Albuquerque NM 87114

TIERRA WEST, LLC
5571 MIDWAY PARK PLACE NE
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87109

Calabacillas Group C/O Donald
Harville
3301 R Coors Blvd NW 305
Albuquerque NM 87120-1229
TIERRA WEST, LLC
5571 MIDWAY PARK PLACE NE
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87109

CALABACILLAS GROUP
3301R COORS BLVD NW 305
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87120-1229

TIERRA WEST, LLC
5571 MIDWAY PARK PLACE NE
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87109

RAINWATER KATHRYN M & CHARLES T
CO-TRUSTEES RAINWATER FAMILY
TRUST
4509 NOCHE CLARA AVE NW
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87114-5599

TIERRA WEST, LLC
5571 MIDWAY PARK PLACE NE
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87109

WHEELER STEPHEN C & MARCIA L
4524 BENTON AVE NW
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87114
HUTCHINSON TERRY SCOTT  
10947 CARRETA DR NW  
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87114-6504

CALABAC ILLAS GROUP C/O DONALD HARVILLE  
3301R COORS BLVD NW 305  
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87120-1229

MORGAN KRISTEN  
10923 CARRETA DR NW  
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87114-6504
TIERRA WEST, LLC
5571 MIDWAY PARK PLACE NE
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87109

AMAFCA
2600 PROSPECT AVE NE
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87107-1836

TIERRA WEST, LLC
5571 MIDWAY PARK PLACE NE
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87109

REES PAUL J & DEBORAH A
10931 CARRETA DR NW
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87114

TIERRA WEST, LLC
5571 MIDWAY PARK PLACE NE
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87109

MCCORMACK DANIEL J & VICTORIA M
10919 CARRETA DR NW
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87114-6504

162
Wintergreen
Luxury Apartments
Golf Course Blvd
Albuquerque, NM Conceptual Landscape Plan
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD
SUPPLEMENTAL SUBMITTAL

(Deadline is Friday at noon unless noted on 2019 agenda – late submittals will not be accepted unless approved by the DRB)

PROJECT NO. __PR-2020-004030____________________
Application No. SI-2020-00540____________________

TO:

X  Planning Department/Chair
X  Hydrology
X  Transportation Development
X  Albuquerque/ Bernalillo Co. WUA
X  Code Enforcement

*(Please attach this sheet with each collated set for each board member)

NOTE: ELECTRONIC VERSION (ie disk, thumbdrive) is Required. Submittal will not be accepted without.

DRB SCHEDULED HEARING DATE: __September 30, 2020__ HEARING DATE OF DEFERRAL: __August 26, 2020__

SUBMITTAL DESCRIPTION: Plan Updates, Infrastructure list and response to comments

CONTACT NAME: Richard Stevenson

TELEPHONE: 505-858-3100 EMAIL: rstevenson@tierrawestllc.com
### Financially Constructed Size Type of Improvement Location From To

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financially Guaranteed Under</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Type of Improvement</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DRC #</td>
<td>DRC #</td>
<td>Engineer’s Certification for Grading &amp; Drainage is required for release of Financial Guarantee</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRC #</td>
<td>DRC #</td>
<td>8&quot; SAS PIPE</td>
<td>Public Sanitary Sewer extension from the southern boundary of Tract E-1, at the existing collector line along the southern property line, extend north along the drive isle of Tract E-1, to 35-ft into Tract D-1. A total of ± 980-ft of 8&quot; PVC sewer per ABCWUA Std. Dwg within a 20-ft dedicated public sanitary sewer easement.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRC #</td>
<td>DRC #</td>
<td>ST LT, &lt;25' w/ 1 LED</td>
<td>Install three public street lights, including all appurtenances, along property Tract E-1 frontage (± 580-ft) along Golf Course Rd., as required by City Engineer.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Construction Certification**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Private Construction Certification</th>
<th>P.E. Construction Certification</th>
<th>City Cnst</th>
<th>Engineer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXISTING LEGAL DESCRIPTION PRIOR TO PLATTING ACTION**

Tract E-1 Plat of Tracts D-1, E-1 AMAFCA Black Arroyo Channel ROW Paradise Heights Unit 1 Containing 8.77 Ac

Following is a summary of PUBLIC/PRIVATE Infrastructure required to be constructed or financially guaranteed for the above development. This Listing is not necessarily a complete listing. During the SIA process and/or in the review of the construction drawings, if the DRC Chair determines that appurtenant items and/or unforeseen items have not been included in the infrastructure listing, the DRC Chair may include those items in the listing and related financial guarantee. Likewise, if the DRC Chair determines that appurtenant or non-essential items can be deleted from the listing, those items may be deleted as well as the related portions of the financial guarantees. All such revisions require approval by the DRC Chair, the User Department and agent/owner. If such approvals are obtained, these revisions to the listing will be incorporated administratively. In addition, any unforeseen items which arise during construction which are necessary to complete the project and which normally are the Subdivider’s responsibility will be required as a condition of project acceptance and close out by the City.
The items listed below are on the CCIP and approved for Impact Fee credits. Signatures from the Impact Fee Administrator and the City User Department is required prior to DRB approval of this listing. The items listed below are subject to the standard SIA requirements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financially Constructed Guaranteed Under Size</th>
<th>Type of Improvement</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>City Cnst Inspector P.E. Engineer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DRC #</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRC #</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approval of Creditable Items:
- Impact Fee Administrator Signature Date
- City User Dept. Signature Date

NOTES
If the site is located in a floodplain, then the financial guarantee will not be released until the LOMR is approved by FEMA.

Street lights per City requirements.

---

1.

2.

3.

---

AGENT / OWNER

Richard Stevenson P.E

NAME (print)

Tierra West LLC

FIRM

SIGNATURE - date

---

DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD MEMBER APPROVALS

DRB CHAIR - date

PARKS & RECREATION - date

TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT - date

AMAFCA - date

UTILITY DEVELOPMENT - date

CODE ENFORCEMENT - date

CITY ENGINEER - date

---

DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE REVISIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REVISION</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>DRC CHAIR</th>
<th>USER DEPARTMENT</th>
<th>AGENT / OWNER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PAGE 2 OF 2

(Rev. 2-16-18)
Following is a summary of PUBLIC/PRIVATE Infrastructure required to be constructed or financially guaranteed for the above development. This Listing is not necessarily a complete listing. During the SIA process and/or in the review of the construction drawings, if the DRC Chair determines that appurtenant items and/or unforeseen items have not been included in the infrastructure listing, the DRC Chair may include those items in the listing and related financial guarantee. Likewise, if the DRC Chair determines that appurtenant or non-essential items can be deleted from the listing, those items may be deleted as well as the related portions of the financial guarantees. All such revisions require approval by the DRC Chair, the User Department and agent/owner. If such approvals are obtained, these revisions to the listing will be incorporated administratively. In addition, any unforeseen items which arise during construction which are necessary to complete the project and which normally are the Subdivider’s responsibility will be required as a condition of project acceptance and close out by the City.

### Infrastructure List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financially Guaranteed DRC #</th>
<th>Under DRC #</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Type of Improvement</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>8” PVC</strong></td>
<td>Engineer’s Certification for Grading &amp; Drainage is required for release of Financial Guarantee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public Sanitary Sewer extension from the northern property boundary of lot D-1. A total of 980-ft of 8” pvc sewer per ABCWUA Std. Dwg within a 20-ft dedicated sanitary sewer easement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 12**

- Date Preliminary Plat Expires: ________________
- Date Submitted: 7/31/2020
- TO SUBDIVISION IMPROVEMENTS AGREEMENT
- DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD (D.R.B.) REQUIRED INFRASTRUCTURE LIST
- PROPOSED NAME OF PLAT AND/OR SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN
- 10820 Golf Course Rd. NW (Wintergreen Apartments)
- EXHIBIT "A"- INFRASTRUCTURE LIST

**EXISTING LEGAL DESCRIPTION PRIOR TO PLATTING ACTION**

**Public Sanitary Sewer**

- Extension from the southern boundary of the site at the existing collector line along the drive isle to the northern property boundary of lot D-1. A total of 980-ft of 8” pvc sewer per ABCWUA Std. Dwgs within a 20-ft dedicated sanitary sewer easement.

**Construction Certification**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Private Inspector</th>
<th>P.E. Engineer</th>
<th>City Const. Engineer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The items listed below are on the CCIP and approved for Impact Fee credits. Signatures from the Impact Fee Administrator and the City User Department is required prior to DRB approval of this listing. The items listed below are subject to the standard SIA requirements.

### Financially Constructed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DRC #</th>
<th>Under Type of Improvement Location From To City Cnst Inspector P.E. Engineer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Approval of Creditable Items:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Fee Administrator Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>City User Dept. Signature Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NOTES

If the site is located in a floodplain, then the financial guarantee will not be released until the LOMR is approved by FEMA. Street lights per City requirements.

1

2

3

### DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD MEMBER APPROVALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME (print)</th>
<th>DRB CHAIR - date</th>
<th>PARKS &amp; RECREATION - date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Richard Stevenson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRM</th>
<th>TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT - date</th>
<th>AMAFCA - date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tierra West LLC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIGNATURE - date</th>
<th>UTILITY DEVELOPMENT - date</th>
<th>CODE ENFORCEMENT - date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| CITY ENGINEER - date | |
|----------------------| |
|                     | |

### DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE REVISIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REVISION</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>DRC CHAIR</th>
<th>USER DEPARTMENT</th>
<th>AGENT OWNER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Trip Distribution Table

**Project Name**

**Sub Area Employment Data:**

For determination of Trip Distribution for Proposed Residential Development Trips

2015 and 2025 Data Taken from Mid-Region Council of Governments’ 2035 Socioeconomic Forecasts by Data Analysis Subzones for the Mid-Region of New Mexico

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(GR)</td>
<td>Golf Course Rd. North</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(GR)</td>
<td>Golf Course Rd. South</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(WW)</td>
<td>Westside Blvd. East</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(WE)</td>
<td>Westside Blvd. West</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**

- **% Sub Area in Study:** Percentage of the total study area that each sub area represents.
- **2012 Employment:** Employment data for the year 2012.
- **2040 Employment:** Employment data for the year 2040.
- **Interpolated Employment for the Year:** Data interpolated based on the given years.
- **Employment in Study:** Employment in the study area.
- **Dist. (M.):** Distance in miles.
- **Employment / Distance:** Employment divided by distance.
- **% Employment:** Percentage of employment.
- **% Utilizing:** Percentage of employment utilizing a particular mode.
- **% Employment / Dist. Utilizing:** Percentage of employment utilizing a particular mode per distance.

**Sub Area Details:**

1. **Golf Course Rd. North**
   - Employment: 12,087
   - Distance: 3,620
   - % Utilizing: 60%
   - % Employment / Dist. Utilizing: 10%

2. **Golf Course Rd. South**
   - Employment: 15,529
   - Distance: 4,748
   - % Utilizing: 80%
   - % Employment / Dist. Utilizing: 10%

3. **Westside Blvd. East**
   - Employment: 22,103
   - Distance: 5,384
   - % Utilizing: 50%
   - % Employment / Dist. Utilizing: 10%

4. **Westside Blvd. West**
   - Employment: 4,498
   - Distance: 3,634
   - % Utilizing: 100%
   - % Employment / Dist. Utilizing: 10%

**Data Source:**

Trip_Dist_Residential.xlsx - DAZ_Pop
DRB Project Number: 4030  
Golf Course Apartments  

AGENDA ITEM NO: 2  

Golf Course Apartments  

SUBJECT: Site Plan  

ENGINEERING COMMENTS:  

1. Label all walkway widths.  

Response: Walkway width dimensions added.  

2. Show clear sight triangles at access points for both the site plan and the landscaping plan. Follow AASHTO guidelines.  

Response: clear sight triangles shown on both plans.  

3. Show how access points along Golf Course line up with the west side access points. Determine sufficiency of left turn bays on Golf Course that access the site. Also provide a turning template design at median cuts as the existing median cut may not be providing a wide enough of an opening.  

Response: Turning template included in re-submittal. Refer COA 5894.91 for Golf Course improvement plans prepared by Wilson & Company Inc. detailing the improvements and the alignment of the turn bays to the driveway at STA 16+50. The installed driveway to tract D-1/E-1 aligns with the driveway to the west. Here is a downloadable link to the plans:  
https://1drv.ms/b/s!Ah_cf8IHIL3ogk1qXG5zsPBPAjPr?e=i0AKGY  

4. Label existing Golf Course right-of-way, and show cross-section to determine sufficient right-of-way.  

Response: See cross section exhibit included in re-submittal.  

5. For informational purposes, provide vehicular trip generation for weekday traffic, PM Peak hour, and AM Peak hour.  

Response: Vehicular trip generation for weekday traffic, PM Peak hour, and AM Peak hour provided with DRB resubmittal.  

6. Follow DPM requirements for streetlighting design along Golf Course for the new site. Place streetlighting on infrastructure list, including all necessary appurtenances.  

Response: Private street light proposed at the driveway entrance for the mid-block driveway, no public street lighting is proposed. Streetlighting was warranted during the 2006 improvements of Golf Course Rd.
7. Due to proximity to City of Rio Rancho, coordinate with Rio Rancho on any traffic study needs or any improvements to Westside Boulevard. Provide any written communication.

Response: Sufficient coordination with Rio Rancho contract David Serrano made to confirm no additional traffic items necessary.

8. I was looking closer at the site plans and noticed that the property line needed to be shown on the north side of the property. It looks like shared access needs to be established with the property to the north based on driveway location after looking at AGIS even though property owner is the same.

Response: Per recorded property plat a blanket cross access is in place between D-1 and E-1. Plat included in re-submittal.

9. Additionally, I had a question about what the plans were for the property to the north given that it has the same owner. Was there a plan to replat? Is there a plan to build more apartments to the north and what is the timing of this? (This will affect how we look at the traffic and the queuing into the site.)

Response: A 30-ft wide common driveway entrance at the existing 40-ft wide driveway stub on Golf Course is proposed and will support traffic movements for both developments. At such time when Tract D-1 is developed, the developer/engineer will need to review & confirm the traffic impacts and queuing analysis for the turn bay on Golf Course is sized appropriately to support the Tract D-1 development. When reviewing the trips generated by this development for Tract E-1, the data does not support extension of the existing turn bay on Golf Course (140-ft in length).

10. The queuing analysis requested for the left and right turn bays needs to also address the gate on the southern entrance. It needs to be established. (Is there a reason for a gate at the southern entrance but not for the northern entrance?) It looks like there is additional right-of-way for a right turn lane if needed. Also provide diagram showing that a car can turn around easily without having to back up into Golf Course at this southern entrance.

Response: Southern access is for emergency vehicle services only and will be signed appropriately. Golf Course turn bay length is 140-ft and based on the trip generated for this project it will have adequate capacity. Future development on Tract D-1 will need to review capacity based on proposed development.

FROM: Jeanne Wolfenbarger, P.E.  DATE: July 22, 2020
Transportation Development
505-924-3991 or jwolfenbarger@cabq.gov

ACTION:
DRB Project Number: 4030
Golf Course Apartments

AGENDA ITEM NO: 6
Golf Course Apartments

SUBJECT: Site Plan

ENGINEERING COMMENTS:

1. Include “all appurtenances” as part of the streetlighting requirements shown on the infrastructure list.

Response - “all appurtenances” added to I.L.

2. Indicate clear sight triangles on landscaping plan. There are some plants within the sight distance triangle on the landscaping plan.

Response – landscaping plan updated with sight triangles and plants relocated where they previously encroached.

If new or revised information is submitted, additional comments may be provided by Transportation Development.

Also: Per 5-5(D) Motorcycle parking, MC parking spaces are not required in residential uses, so developer has removed 2 of the 6 spaces, leaving 4 mc parking spaces.

FROM: Jeanne Wolfenbarger, P.E.  DATE: August 26, 2020
Transportation Development
505-924-3991 or jwolfenbarger@cabq.gov

ACTION:

APPROVED __; DENIED __; DEFERRED __; COMMENTS PROVIDED __; WITHDRAWN __

DELEGATED: _______________  TO: (TRANS) (HYD) (WUA) (PRKS) (CE) (PLNG)
Development Review Board (DRB)
Review Comments
Utility Development Section
Reviewer: Kristopher Cadena, P.E.
Phone: 505.289.3301

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DRB Project No:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Item No:</th>
<th>Zone Atlas Page:</th>
<th>Legal Description:</th>
<th>Request For:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Location: GOLF COURSE RD NW between GOLF COURSE RD NW, BLACK ARROYO and WESTSIDE BLVD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ABCWUA Comment:

Please provide written description of how the following comments were addressed with the next submittal.

1. Serviceability Letter #200506 is currently being researched. It will provide the conditions for service. Public water and/or sanitary sewer extensions may be required.
2. The property is outside of the Adopted Service Area. A Water Authority Board approved development agreement will be required prior to Site Plan approval. The serviceability letter will serve as an exhibit to the development agreement.
3. Utility Plan
   a. Please show and label existing public waterline along the west and south frontages.
   b. There seems to be parallel private fire lines along the west and north drive aisles. Please confirm and label accordingly.
   c. Please show and label all proposed water meters (domestic and/or irrigation).
d. Label all proposed onsite public and private sanitary sewer accordingly.
e. Label all proposed onsite private waterline accordingly.
f. The public sanitary sewer extensions are currently being researched as part of the serviceability letter.
   i. The intent is to provide the existing Lot D-1 to the north the ability to connect to public sanitary sewer.
      1. There is an existing 30’ public sanitary sewer easement along the entire eastern frontage of the subject property. The proposed pond within this easement is not acceptable.
      2. Based on the serviceability letter, a possible alignment of the public sanitary sewer may be the easternmost north/south drive aisle. The serviceability letter will provide the official requirements.
         a. This would require vacation of the existing 30’ sanitary sewer easement, as well as granting new public sanitary sewer easement in a manner that provides access to existing Lot D-1.
         b. The proposed dumpster enclosure may need to be relocated.
         c. Given that landscaping is proposed along the existing 30’ public sanitary sewer easement, this may not be the best alignment.
         d. Continuous access for maintenance and operation shall be provided for all onsite public sanitary sewer.

Response:
Plans updated to address comments and detail a compound meter to service the development. Development agreement will be submitted to ABCWUA for processing.
Development Review Board (DRB)

Review Comments
Utility Development Section
Reviewer: Kristopher Cadena, P.E.
Phone: 505.289.3301

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DRB Project No:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Item No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PR-2020-004030</td>
<td>08/26/20</td>
<td>#6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Zone Atlas Page: A-12 & A-13
Legal Description: A-12 & A-13
Location: GOLF COURSE RD NW between GOLF COURSE RD NW, BLACK ARROYO and WESTSIDE BLVD

Request For:
SI-2020-00540 - SITE PLAN

ABCWUA Comment:

Please provide written description of how the following comments were addressed with the next submittal.

1. Serviceability Letter #200506 has been written and provides the conditions for service.
2. The property is outside of the Adopted Service Area. A Water Authority Board approved development agreement will be required prior to Site Plan approval. The serviceability letter will serve as an exhibit to the development agreement.
   Response - received Water Authority Board approval on 9/23 item R-20-19
   https://abcwua.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?id=4616928&GUID=75AD0FE0-9DB2-4BEE-B045-31BDD2CE5837

3. Utility Plan
a. Previously, an 8” water meter was proposed for a single connection for a private onsite loop for both domestic and fire protection. Current proposal is a separate water service and fire line. The fire line as shown is going through the proposed large water meter vault which is not acceptable.

Response- fire line adjusted to avoid conflict with large water meter vault.
AGENDA ITEM NO: __________ 2__________________________

DRB Project Number: __PR-2020-004030

Application Number: _____________________________________

Project Name: __________________________________________

REQUEST: Site Plan

COMMENTS:

1) Variance required for wall over 3’ in front yard area.
2) Provide calculations for required open space.

Response:

• Front yard wall changed to 3-ft wrought iron fence ontop of 3-ft CMU block wall
• Open space calculations added to sheet C1

(Comments may continue onto the next page)

Disclaimer: The comments provided are based upon the information received from the applicant/agent. If new or revised information is submitted, additional comments may be provided by Planning.

FROM: Vince Montano, Code Supervisor
Planning Department
924-3825 vmontano@cabq.gov

DATE: 7/22/2020

ACTION:

APPROVED ___; DENIED ___; DEFERRED ___; COMMENTS PROVIDED _X_; WITHDRAWN ___

DELEGATED: (TRANS) (HYD) (WUA) (PRKS) (PLNG) (CE)

7/22/2020
HEARING DATE/AGENDA ITEM 2

Project Number: PR-004030
Application Number: SD-2020-00540
Project Name: Wintergreen Luxury Apartments
Request: Site Plan for Apartment with more than 50 Units

COMMENTS (requirements that need to be met):

- **There is no Code Enforcement signature block**

  **Response:** Code enforcement signature line added.

- **The applicant needs to verify if a sensitive lands analysis is required**

  **Response:** Not required, justification below:

Following a sensitivity review of the project site in regards to IDO Section 5-2 Site Design and Sensitive Lands, the following assessment was made by the applicant that Tract E-1 does not meet any of the sensitive land elements, as described further below:

5-2(C)(1)(a) Floodplains and flood hazard areas – the site is not with in a floodplain or flood hazard area per FEMA FIRM Map 35001C0108G dated 9/26/2008
5-2(C)(1)(b) Steep slopes – Steep slopes is not defined by the IDO but generally considered steep if the slope is greater than 20%. The average slope of the undeveloped site is 4.5%
5-2(C)(1)(c) Unstable soils – per USGS the soil is bluepoint loamy fine sand 98.1%
5-2(C)(1)(d) Wetlands – per FEMA FIRM map no evidence of wetlands.
5-2(C)(1)(e) Arroyos – per FEMA FIRM map no evidence of recorded arroyos.
5-2(C)(1)(f) Irrigation facilities (acequias) – no
5-2(C)(1)(g) Escarpments – there are no escarpments on the property
5-2(C)(1)(h) Rock outcroppings – there are no rock outcroppings on the property
5-2(C)(1)(i) Large stands of mature trees – not present, the site is in an undeveloped condition with vegetation typical of the west mesa with areas of scrub, small vegetation and some minor disturbance by dumping of soils.
5-2(C)(1)(j) Archaeological sites – certificate of no effect provided by the COA dated May 6, 2020 on file.
• The landscape buffer along the eastern property boundary meets the IDO requirements. However, the applicant could add additional trees in the landscape buffer to provide additional screening between the Site and the adjacent single-family residential dwellings east of the Site to provide two full layers of trees within the buffer.

**Response:** Developer already modified the planting species in the buffer and increased the density of planting based on community feedback from the public meeting.

• Open space calculations need to be provided.

**Response:** Open space calculations added to sheet C1.

• Staff recommends park benches be placed in the landscaped open space and near the sidewalks and trails within the proposed development.

**Response:** Benches added to development and labelled call-out 18

• Outdoor/exterior lighting needs to be depicted.

**Response:** Exterior lighting added labelled call-out 20 and added to detail sheet C.6

• The CMU screen wall along the boundary of the Site is depicted as 6-feet in height. However, this screen wall cannot be more than 3 feet in height in the front yard. The Zoning Enforcement Officer (ZEO) must make an exception to this height standard for security reasons due to specific site conditions or the nature of the land use or related materials and facilities on the site according to 5-7(D)(3)(c) of the IDO. Along the southern boundary of the site adjacent to the arroyo running alongside the southern boundary of the Site, the applicant should consider 3-feet of wrought iron on top of 3-feet of CMU blocks in lieu of 6-feet of CMU blocks.

**Response:** Wall on south, west and north property frontage changes to be a 3-ft wrought iron on top of 3-ft of CMU block wall.

• Staff requests the applicant provide a plane-angle illustration/depiction of the proposed apartments and the residences to the east of the Site depicting to scale the height of the proposed apartments and the residences and the distance between them.

**Response:** Cross section exhibit included with re-submittal for reference.

• Consider moving the dumpsters farther away from the residential development

**Response:** North east dumpsters was relocated based on community feedback at the public meetings further away from the eastern property line. Dumpster location for the south west dumpster had to be relocated to avoid conflict with public sewer extension.

• Please provide an elevation key so that we can determine each elevation of each building
Response: Scale bars added for scaling purposes.

- The unit mix table is difficult to read, the letters are blurry can you update so that is more clear

Response: I reformatted the text style and think legibility is improved.

- COMMENTS (requirements that are met):
- The façade is consistent with 5-11(E)(2) because it has a clear distinction between the ground floor and upper floors, windows on upper floors, primary pedestrian entrances, wall projections and changes in plane and material (see IDO for full citation).
- The carports are consistent with 5-11-(D)(4) although some of them are located between the street and building most of them are disbursed throughout the site and there street facing carports are screened by a row of street trees
- The landscaping plan exceeds the requirements by providing a total of 144,030 square feet of landscaping when 48,141 square feet are required.
- Please note that staff could have future comments and the Site Plan is still under review.

Disclaimer: The comments provided are based upon the information received from the applicant/agent. If new or revised information is submitted, additional comments may be provided by Planning.

FROM: Jay Rodenbeck
Planning Department

DATE: 7/22/2020
A. Call to Order: 9:00 A.M.

1. Motion to amend the rules to allow a virtual meeting because of the public health emergency.

2. Remote Meeting Information: Join Zoom Meeting: https://cabq.zoom.us/j/97853896675
   Meeting ID: 978 5389 6675 By phone +1 312 626 6799 or find your local number: https://cabq.zoom.us/u/aek69Lek7U

MAJOR CASES

6. Project # PR-2020-004030 (1002566, 1004501, 1004503) SI-2020-00540 - SITE PLAN
   TIERRA WEST, LLC agent(s) for CALABACILLAS GROUP C/O DONALD HARVILLE
   request(s) the aforementioned action(s) for all or a portion of: A-12 & A-13, zoned MX-M,
   located at GOLF COURSE RD NW between GOLF COURSE RD NW, BLACK ARROYO and
   WESTSIDE BLVD containing approximately 8.77 acre(s). (A-12,13)[Deferred from 7/22/20,
   8/5/20]
   PROPERTY OWNERS: CALABACILLAS GROUP C/O DONALD HARVILLE REQUEST: SITE
   PLAN FOR APARTMENT WITH MORE THAN 50 UNITS

   Open Space Comments:
   On the south property line, this parcel butts up to the Black Arroyo which drains into Open
   Space's Calabacillas Arroyo and eventually into the Rio Grande, and there is a concern about
   flows from the site. Therefore, native plants would be the best choice for landscaping materials.
   Chinese Pistache (especially females) are invasive and there is a concern about invasives
   moving down the Black Arroyo to the Calabacillas and Rio.

   Chinese Pistache have been removed from the plant list.

   Juniper species added note "(female only)" to comply with the City's Pollen Control Ordinance.

   Note Added: Pursuant to IDO 5-6(C)(5)(b) Organic mulch, such as wood chips or pecan shells,
   is required as ground cover for the portion of any landscaped area surrounding the vegetation
   root ball, as well as beneath the entire tree canopy or dripline, in each required landscape area.

   Locally-occurring plants were used where possible and an column is added to the plant
   schedule indicating native status. I have also added a number of pinon pines to the planting
   plan as a source of native evergreen color. Vines have been removed.
### Project Description:
Rehab & widen from 2 to 4 lanes, bike lanes, pedestrian enhancements and other improvements per the Westside-McMahon Corridor Study. Transitions fr. Improv. To exist. Roadway sections include 350’ w. of Westside/Golf Course intersection SEE REMARKS SEC.

### Project Phases:
- Environ. Document
- Prel. Engr.
- Design
- Right-of-way
- Construction
- Other

### Work Zone
- Reg. Sig.

### Programmed Funds - Four Year Federal TIP by Funding Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUND SOURCE</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>4 Yr. TOTALS</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Match</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Match</td>
<td>$1,173,321</td>
<td>$469,933</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,643,254</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP-U</td>
<td>$5,385,204</td>
<td>$2,757,627</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,142,831</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP-U</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$8,058,525</td>
<td>$3,227,560</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$11,286,085</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TIP Informational Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
July 30, 2020

Richard Stevenson
Tierra West LLC
5571 Midway Park Pl.
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87109

RE: Water and Sanitary Sewer Serviceability Letter #200506

Project Name: Wintergreen Apartments
Project Address: 10820 Golf Course Rd. NW
Legal Description: TR E-1 PLAT OF TRS D-1, E-1 AMAFCA BLACK ARROYOCHANNEL ROW PARADISE HEIGHTS UNIT 1 CONT 8.7795 AC
UPC: 101206651442411302
Zone Atlas Map: A-12

Dear Mr. Stevenson:

Project Description: The subject site is located on Golf Course Rd. north of the intersection of Benton Ave. and Golf Course Rd. within the City of Albuquerque. The property consists of approximately 8.78 acres and is currently zoned MX-H for moderate intensity use. The property lies within the Pressure Zone 2WR in the Corrales trunk. The request for information indicates plans to develop the site to accommodate four 52 unit apartment buildings for a total of 208 units.

Development Agreement: Pursuant to the System Expansion Ordinance, this property is outside of the Water Authority service area and the Water Authority Board must approve a Development Agreement to serve this property and establish requirements as a condition of service. Contact Utility Development in regards to Development Agreements.

Water Resource Charge: All developments located outside of the Water Authority’s Adopted Service Area will be assessed a Water Resource Charge (WRC) as provided in the Water Authority’s Water and Sewer Rate Ordinance for the development of new water resources, rights and supplies necessary to serve the development. The WRC shall not be used for reimbursement of master planned facilities.

Existing Conditions: Water infrastructure in the area consists of the following:

- 12 inch PVC distribution main (project #NMUI-001-80) along Golf Course Rd.

Sanitary sewer infrastructure in the area consists of the following:

- PVC collector line (field verified) along the south property border. The size of this collector line shall be investigated further if development of the site deems it necessary.
- Eight inch PVC collector line (project #26-7718.83-08) within tracts A-1-A-1 and B-1-A-1 and B-1-A-2 of the BLACKARROYO DAM.

Water Service: New metered water service to the property can be provided via routine connection to the existing infrastructure along Golf Course Rd.
From the Utility Plan, provided as supplemental information to the request, it is understood that four private hydrants off of a private fire line that is looped to the public distribution main along Golf Course Rd., is proposed. While the private hydrants to be utilized by the site are condoned, the looped fire line is prohibited unless Water Authority approved backflow prevention devices are installed just downstream of the proposed connections to the public waterline and prior to any looping or branching. A preferred option would be to have a single connection point for the proposed fire line.

In addition to the utility improvements being proposed for the site it is to be noted that existing metered service and fire lines that will not be utilized are to be removed by shutting the valve near the distribution main and capping the line near the valve. For fire lines, the valve access shall be grouted, and collar removed.

Service is also contingent upon compliance with the Fire Marshal's instantaneous fire flow requirements. Water service will not be sold without adequate fire protection. Water service will only be sold in conjunction with sanitary sewer service.

Sanitary Sewer Service: Sanitary sewer service is contingent upon a developer funded collector line extension from the existing collector line along the site's south property border. The extension shall be along an alignment conducive to operation and maintenance post site development (preferably within a drive isle) and shall be the length required to facilitate service to lot D-1, to the north. From supplemental information, related to the site, it is understood that the existing easement onsite may not currently coincide with a proposed drive isle for the site. For a case such as this the easement may need to be vacated and a new easement granted to better adhere to the proposed development. Extension along the existing easement is not desired as operation and maintenance may prove more difficult given that this area will be for landscaping.

Please note that if a food establishment is being considered for the site that any such establishment must install a grease trap upstream of the domestic private sewer connection prior to discharge into the public sanitary sewer lines.

Fire Protection: From the request for availability the instantaneous fire flow requirements for the project are 2250 gallons-per-minute and four (4) hydrants. As modeled using InfoWater™ computer software, the fire flow can be met. Analysis was performed by simulating the desired fire flow from a single connection in the approximate location of the south most fire line connection as represented in the Utility Plan provided with the request. Any changes to the proposed connection points shall be coordinated through Utility Development. All new required hydrants as well as their exact locations must be determined through the City of Albuquerque Fire Marshal's Office and verified through the Utility Development Office prior to sale of service. Please note that the engineer designing the fire line is responsible for determining pressure losses and sizing of the private water line(s) downstream of the public water line to serve the proposed fire hydrants and/or fire suppression system.

Cross Connection Prevention: Per the Cross Connection Ordinance, all new non-residential premises must have a reduced pressure principle backflow prevention assembly approved by the Water Authority and installed at each domestic service connection at a location accessible to the Water Authority. All new fire line services to
fire protection systems shall be equipped with a reduced pressure principle backflow prevention assembly approved by the Water Authority and Fire Marshal having jurisdiction at each service connection. A double check valve assembly approved by the Water Authority and Fire Marshal having jurisdiction may be installed instead of a reduced pressure backflow prevention assembly provided the fire protection system contains ANSI/NSF Standard 60 or 61 water piping throughout the entire fire protection system, the fire sprinkler drain discharges into atmosphere, and there are no reservoirs, fire department connections, connections from auxiliary water supplies, antifreeze nor other additives. The Water Authority requests that all backflow (containment) devices be located above ground just outside the easement or roadway right-of-way. Contact Cross Connection at 289-3454 for more information.

Easements: Exclusive public water and sanitary sewer easements are required for all public lines that are to be constructed outside of any dedicated rights-of-way. A minimum width easement of 20 feet is required for a single utility and 25 feet for water and sewer both within the same easement. Easements for standard sized water meters need to be five feet by five feet and include the length of the water service if located on private property. For larger meters that require a meter vault, a 35 feet by 35 feet easement is required. Actual easement widths may vary depending on the depth of the lines to be installed. Acceptable easements must be documented prior to approval of service.

Pro Rata: Pro Rata is not owed and the property can utilize the services available upon completion of the requirements of this statement to connect to water and sanitary sewer.

Design and Construction of all required improvements will be at the developer / property owner’s expense. Improvements must be coordinated through the City of Albuquerque via the Work Order process. Designs must be performed by a licensed, New Mexico registered, professional engineer. Construction must be by a licensed, bonded, public utility contractor.

Costs and Fees: In addition to installation and construction costs, any new metered water services will be subject to both water and sanitary sewer Utility Expansion Charges (UEC) payable at the time of service application. All charges and rates collected will be based on the ordinances and policies in effect at the time service is actually requested and authorized.

Water Use: All new commercial developments shall be subject to the requirements for water usage and water conservation requirements as defined by the Water Authority, particularly the Water Waste Ordinance. Where available, outdoor water usage shall utilize reclaimed water.

Closure: This serviceability letter does not provide a commitment from the Water Authority to provide services to the development. It only provides details of infrastructure that is available and potential precursors for the proposed development. For service to be provided, a Board approved service connection agreement must be supplemented by this serviceability letter. The serviceability letter will remain in effect for a period of one (1) year from the date of issue and applies only to the development identified herein. Its validity is, in part, contingent upon the continuing accuracy of the
information supplied by the developer. Changes in the proposed development may require reevaluation of availability and should be brought to the attention of the Utility Development Section of the Water Authority as soon as possible.

Please feel free to contact Mr. Kristopher Cadena in our Utility Development Section at (505) 289-3301 or email at kcadena@abcwua.org if you have questions regarding the information presented herein or need additional information.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Mark S. Sanchez
Executive Director

Enclosures: Infrastructure Maps (2)
Serviceability Letter 200506
### Wintergreen Luxury Apartments (Golf Course Rd. South of Westside Blvd.)


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USE (ITE CODE)</th>
<th>24 HOUR TWO-WAY VOLUME</th>
<th>A.M. PEAK HOUR</th>
<th>P. M. PEAK HOUR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GROSS</td>
<td>ENTER</td>
<td>EXIT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily Housing (Mid-Rise)</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>1,130</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling Units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### ITE Trip Generation Equations:

- **Average Vehicle Trip Ends on a Weekday (24 HOUR TWO-WAY VOLUME)**
  \[
  T = 5.44 \times X + -1.75
  \]
  50% Enter, 50% Exit

- **Average Vehicle Trip Ends on a Weekday, Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic, One Hour Between 7am and 9am (A.M. PEAK HOUR)**
  \[
  T = 0.36 \times X + 0
  \]
  26% Enter, 74% Exit

- **Average Vehicle Trip Ends on a Weekday, Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic, One Hour Between 4pm and 6pm (P.M. PEAK HOUR)**
  \[
  T = 0.44 \times X + 0
  \]
  61% Enter, 39% Exit

#### Comments:
- Four Stories
- Based on ITE Trip Generation Manual - 10th Edition
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Jolene Wolfley, DRB Chair, Planning Department
Carl Garcia, Zoning Enforcement
Kristopher Cadena, P.E., Water Utility Authority
Ernest Armijo, P.E., Hydrology
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**Project # PR-2020-004030**

(1002566, 1004501, 1004503)

**SI-2020-00540 - SITE PLAN**

**TIERRA WEST, LLC** agent(s) for **CALABACILLAS GROUP C/O DONALD HARVILLE** request(s) the aforementioned action(s) for all or a portion of: **A-12 & A-13**, zoned MX-M, located at **GOLF COURSE RD NW between GOLF COURSE RD NW, BLACK ARROYO and WESTSIDE BLVD** containing approximately 8.77 acre(s). (A-12,13) [Deferred from 7/22/20, 8/5/20, 8/26/20]

**PROPERTY OWNERS:** CALABACILLAS GROUP C/O DONALD HARVILLE  
**REQUEST:** SITE PLAN FOR APARTMENT WITH MORE THAN 50 UNITS

**PERSONS SPEAKING ON BEHALF OF THE REQUEST:**
Mr. Ron Bohannan, Tierra West
Mr. Richard Stevenson, Tierra West

PERSONS SPEAKING IN OPPOSITION:

Mr. Mike Mirabal
Ms. Rene Horvath
Ms. Marsha Kearney
Ms. M. Ward

JOLENE WOLFLEY, DRB CHAIR: We are on item number three which is PR- 2020- 4030. Site Plan, SI-2020-540, The Calabacillas Group at Golf Course between Golf Course Road and Black Arroyo and Westside Boulevard. Okay, let me start with DRB members. Can you please identify if you have had ex parte communications? Let me know that, any DRB member. Okay and that would be since our last meeting on this case. We've already sworn in, Tierra West is the agent. We've already sworn in Mr. Bohannan, Mr. Stevenson, whichever if you want to go ahead and give us an update on your project.

MS. NICOLE SANCHEZ, CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE ATTORNEY: Excuse me, Madam Chair?

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Yes, Ms. Sanchez?

MS. SANCHEZ: I recommend swearing in the applicants at the beginning of this.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay, even if they've just been sworn in?

MS. SANCHEZ: Yes, because this will be related to this matter specifically.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Mr. Ron Bohannan, hang on, we'll start with you, do you swear, affirm to tell the truth?

MR. RON BOHANNAN, TIERRA WEST AGENT: I do.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Thank you. And then next to Mr. Richard Stevenson do you swear, affirm to tell the truth?

MR. RICHARD STEVESON, TIERRA WEST AGENT: I do.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Can you go ahead and give us an update from our last meeting with you.

MR. STEVENSON: Thank you DRB Chair. This is Richard Stevenson with Tierra West. So the last time we were at DRB, we were still waiting on the development agreement to be approved by the
Authority Board. That occurred last Wednesday. Since that time, the developer has signed the development agreement, and I believe it is in the hands of the Water Authority and the director to execute that document. So that's something I'd like to discuss with Kris Cadena this morning to see whether he can take delegation. The other items, we received some very minor landscaping plan comments last night which we worked to address this morning and I've resubmitted those to Jay Rodenbeck to update the landscaping plan to address those comments. And obviously, understand some neighbors are signed up to speak so we'd like to pass it back to the DRB Chair so we can hear their comments.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay thank you Mr. Stevenson. Let's go now to public comment. And we have Ms. Kearney and Mr. Mirabal signed up to speak. Is there anyone else who's joined us that wishes to speak on this item number 3 on golf course? I am combing through my Zoom Room. Okay, I don't see any one else signed up to speak. If you wish to, please notify us now. Okay.

MS. RENE HORVATH: I signed up to speak, this is Rene Horvath.

CHAIR WOLFLEY. Okay, thank you, Miss Horvath. We'll get to you in order. Thank you. Is there anyone else who we've overlooked? All right, Ms. Gomez, Can you start by calling our speakers one by one and then I'll swear in each one of them as we go.

MS. ANGELA GOMEZ, DRB HEARING MONITOR: Yes. The first speaker I have is Ms. Marsha Kearney.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay, Ms. Kearney let me find you. Ms. Kearney, Do you swear, affirm to tell the truth?

MS. MARSHA KEARNEY: Yes, I do.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay, and Ms. Kearney since you've kind of been representing your neighborhood you can take up to five minutes.

MS. KEARNEY: Okay. And also Mike is on the phone. I probably won't take up the five minutes but thank you very much.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay, first of all, all the contacted homeowners…

MS. SANCHEZ: Excuse me, Madam Chair?

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Ms. Kearney, I'm sorry, Ms. Sanchez?

MS. SANCHEZ: Will you please swear Ms. Kearney in?

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Oh…I just did.
MS. SANCHEZ: Thank you.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay, go ahead Ms. Kearney.

MS. KEARNEY: Okay, all the contacted homeowners of Seven Bar Loop are opposed to this project. This project violates state statutes, the ABC comp plan and the IDO as it relates to the purpose of neighborhood protection. This project does not follow the IDO when speaking to neighborhood edge. The wall needs to be moved from five feet to 15 feet from the adjacent property. Also, the retention pond area needs to be moved 15 feet back from the property line to provide for the neighborhood edge. The notification has been incomplete. Not all property owners within the hundred feet of the project area, minus the public right of ways, including the arroyo have been notified about project, especially those not part of the Seven Bar North area and to the south and west of the project. There still continues to be the concern about solar access and I request that a sunshade analysis be done for this site as the afternoon sun will be greatly affected for the neighborhood. Also the C-2 zoning which was in place before for this property only included conditional use. That's apartment complexes two story and height maximum. The height of the building should be limited to two stories. Four stories buildings are incompatible. Finally, the IDO is to replace the previous zoning which had three criteria for approval, of which two are definitely violated; jobs to housing balance, we have very low number of jobs compared to residents in this area, and school capacity which is a great concern as the elementary school will be overcrowded by the expected number of students. Thank you very much for your time.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Thank you, Ms. Kearney. And I'm taking notes and I'm sure Mr. Stevenson is taking notes. And once again, we're more, we're focusing on new items since we last met. I know staff has tried to respond to some of the neighborhood comments through DRB. Comments that went out… did you receive that Miss Carney?

MS. KEARNEY: I did not.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: You didn't, and he didn't receive the DRB comments? Okay. Mr. Rodenbeck could you make sure that Ms. Kearney, Mr. Mirabal and Ms. Horvath receive DRB comments for this case? If you could send those out right now…?

MR. JAY RODENBECK, STAFF PLANNER: This is Jay Rodenbeck; I will do that right now.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: One thing that we try to do as Planning staff is we wanted to go through… you were very timley Ms. Kearney and you sent out… we had some comments from you that we got Monday morning, and we did a special review of those comments, things that we hadn't maybe addressed early, before as staff and we wrote some responses to those. And I probably wasn't clear enough with staff that those needed to go out to the neighborhood for review. And Mr. Rodenbeck, just let me know when you've been able to send those to those three participating members today.

MR RODENBECK: This is Jay Rodenbeck; I'm in the process right now.
CHAIR WOLFLEY: And you have a chance you know, towards the end of this case review and I'm going to give the neighbors extra time if they have questions about any of those responses that we've given. So do they have those now Mr. Rodenbeck?

MR JAY RODENBECK: This is Jay Rodenbeck; I sent them to Ms. Kearney, Mr. Mirabal and Ms. Horvath.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. And then which... and the one that they might want to focus on, was addressing their specific comments. How would they identify it in your email?

MR. RODENBECK: This is Jay Rodenbeck; you'll want to click on the word document. Just PR-2020 004030-9/30/20. And then it says “concerned citizen response memo.” Here it should have all the DRB comments including this comment memo in your inbox now.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Let me go to Mr. Mirabal. I would like to swear you in... trying to find you. There you are, Mike. All right, Mr. Mirabal, do you swear, affirm to tell the truth?

MR. MIKE MIRABAL: Yes, I do.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay, go ahead with your comments.

MR. MIRABAL: My comments, I understand. As you stated at the beginning of the meeting, you're mainly looking at technical standards. And what is as a neighborhood, we're not professional architects. We're not building inspectors, none of that. We're just we're neighbors who've lived here for over 20 years. This submitted quite a bit of information as far as the negative effects to our community. This development will cause, they're long term negative effects. I don't believe this board can even address the issues, because you're kind of limited in your purview to talk about technical standards, our issues are more relevant to us and need to be addressed. But we're not given that opportunity for this process to address those issues. We need... we need to know how we can go about having our issues actually be considered. We've documented most of our issues just to get them on record, hoping that we get the opportunity to bring those issues up. We'd like you to seriously consider the negative effects that it's going to have on our community. We already have neighbors in the area that are putting their houses up for sale, and moving because of this development. Um, that's not a good thing. It's destroying the just the culture of our neighborhood, we're a close-knit neighborhood. Marsha mentioned, I believe she mentioned the water drainage that is currently suggested to be put in that 50-foot boundary, I think that, that should probably be moved in, and also the fence issue. Again, I believe this violates the intent of the IDO in that this is not a City center. It's not a travel corridor; there is no bus service on Golf Course. There is an abandoned route that used to be there, but there is no bus service on Golf Course. So it doesn't constitute a travel corridor, it doesn't constitute a City center. It's inconsistent with the neighborhood. This is poor planning in the sense that it's taking commercial property that will provide jobs, and creating more congestion on the west side, because all the jobs are on the other side of town. Um, we're not utilizing commercial property for the proper purpose. The issues of crime, traffic, schools,
community, it creates a lot of instability in our community. Again, you don’t address that. That goes to EPC, which we’re not given the opportunity to go to EPC because of the arbitrary rules in this process. As Marsha mentioned, this was zoned C-2, and we were told if there would be any changes, and since we were within 100 feet, we would be notified. We were never notified that there was a zoning change. And this is a zoning change. This was C-2 conditional for apartments, apartments were not supposed to be allowed on here unless they met certain criteria. So now MX-M is permissive and just allows developers to go free rein. There was a limit, I believe of 26 feet on those additional apartments. And here we’ve jumped to 45 feet, which will overpower our community in our neighborhood. We were never notified of a change even being within 100 feet. That was at that time. And now at this time, there are several neighbors even to the south and some on Correta (sp?) that were never notified that this was going into place. The IDO also addresses Comp plans and sector plans that are in the IDO, it’s not being considered in this because this is totally contradictory to the Comp plans and sector plans. State statute states that you have to take these into consideration. It’s not being done. We’re just, this committee is only looking at the building and technical standards of the building. There is not a format for us to voice our concerns. We are sending the letters to get it on record, but we’re not being heard. And this committee doesn’t do that. There has to be a way for the concerns of the community to be truly considered. Not just documented and say fine, we’ll just go ahead with the building. That’s my objection. We’re not, like I said, we’re not architects, we’re not builders, we’re just a community, a good community. We meet every Friday during this pandemic, because we’re, it’s a close knit community, we meet out on the street and maintain our pandemic rules, right. But we communicate with each other every Friday night. That’s going to be destroyed. And I understand, you just want to keep that little boundary there that says, oh, we don’t have to consider that. But you should consider that if you care about what happens in our communities, if you care about the city of Albuquerque, if you care about the people, and what’s happening in our communities. Thank you.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Thank you, Mr. Mirabal, and I do want you to know that I have visited your neighborhood and I visited the property because I did want to kind of understand the dynamics going on here. And you do have a very wonderful neighborhood. And I also want to say we’ll kind of go through some of the details of this. I want you to know that as the DRB members as the Planning staff, the City Council has given us certain authority. And that authority is what is in the IDO, the regulations that are there in the IDO that we must follow. And that criterion to use to review a site plan is within IDO itself as well. And it isn’t lawful for the DRB members to go outside the authority the city council has given us and I appreciate what you’re saying. But some of the considerations that you are requesting go beyond what our authority is. But we’ll go through some of those details in in a minute.

MR. MIRABAL: May I respond real quick?

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Sure.

MR. MIRABAL: I understand that. I think I’ve stated that, that you you’re limited as far as you’re capable of doing. But what I’m asking is when do when do our concerns get addressed? You’re limited, but when do we get that opportunity? That’s the problem here.
CHAIR WOLFLEY: Thank you, Mr. Mirabal, that's an excellent question. And it kind of goes back to the creation of the new comprehensive plan and the integrated development ordinance that was done in 2017. And at that time, the City Council made a decision that were there were certain types of projects that would not get… they would be reviewed based on the rules and regulations in the integrated development ordinance in site plan review, and that most of the site plan review would be reliant on pre-prescribed rules in the integrated development ordinance. And that concerns could be addressed within the construct of those rules and regulations in the IDO. There are very few site plans that go to the EPC now, and during those site plan reviews, the EPC can look at the comprehensive plan they have, because they are an appointed body by the City Council. They do have some discretionary authority. But the tract that this zone is on and this particular property within the construct of the IDO is that this is the time to address your concerns right now. There's not a future time that's more beneficial. But we can only address your concerns within the rules and regulations as they're written in the IDO.

MR. MIRABAL: Exactly, you made my point.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Yeah, and there was a decision made by the City Council, you know, a few years ago that this is how they chose to have properties addressed, going forward. And it's different from things and how they were just prior to the approval of IDO. So, I hear your frustration. I understand your frustration, yet, there is no way for the DRB to do things in a way that's different from how the City Council authorized us to proceed. And so, we're trying to lawfully proceed the way the City Council has given us authority. And so, we'll kind of, like I said, continue this discussion, I encourage you to look at that email. Mr. Rodenbeck just sent you, where we've tried to address some of the comments that you've made so far. But I'm going to turn now to our next public speaker which is Rene Horvath. Ms. Renee Horvath, do you swear, affirm to tell the truth?

MS. RENE HORVATH: Yes, I do. Can you hear me?

CHAIR WOLFLEY: We can hear you. Miss Horvath. Please go ahead.

MS. HORVATH: Ah, yeah, I did send in another letter late last, yesterday and I had a letter sent in August 5th, to point out some of the things that the previous speakers mentioned. The problem with the Wintergreen Apartment complex is that it's totally out of scale and character for the surrounding area. And as the previous speakers mentioned, this was a C-2 zone, this was a commercial zone to serve the community some commercial uses. Now, the zone is almost like it's an R-3 zone. It's just totally multi-family. And that's, to me, I agree that's like a zone change, where before you had a C-2 zone that had apartments as conditional use, and it had to meet these, at least three of these criteria with overcrowded schools with the jobs and housing balance, and meet the usable open space requirements. Well, you know, in the past, this is their neighborhoods (unintelligible) to address apartment complex that did not meet criteria and then they were not approved and now with the IDO to change those zoning to MX-M to a completely different type of use all together, and it's totally out of dimensions and scale and character, which the IDO says that there are neighborhoods even in areas of consistency, there will be policies to limit the densities and the negative impacts from the nearby development that neighborhoods would be protected and that every new development and redevelopment will need to be compatible in scale and character with the surrounding area. So here we
completely change the zoning from a complete commercial use and now it's totally apartments that will not only affect these neighbors but it affects the whole area because the west side does have overcrowded schools, the west side does have traffic issues, the jobs are mostly on the east side, there's an imbalance of jobs over here. And then also, the there's no transit service serving this road right here. So, it doesn't meet any other criteria, even of the IDO. And the IDO provided no protections were before the prior zone code had protections to meet those three criteria, and which the apartments did not meet, and now they changed it so it's just not commercial anymore it's completely apartments. So, and they, and to make it worse, just to make it worse, to be out of scale and character adjacent to single family homes like this. I agree this is not what planning is about, this is not what zoning is about. Zoning is to help protect the community to preserve the character of the community, to put compatible uses together, and we have not done that. And I do know that the IDO is new, because I was very involved in it and it was rushed, and that was our biggest concern was rushing it not thinking things through. And having unintended consequences. So, this is a prime example of those unintended consequences. And that these new need to be addressed. And I do know that they're shoving all the site plans to the DRB, and you're only allowed to look at certain things, and that is totally wrong because now. Even you are saying you can't deal with these unintended consequences. Well then, who does because this really puts the communities in a bad situation, and they should not be put in this bad situation. It also puts the applicant, in a bad situation to have to deal with all these conflicts because it was not thoroughly thought through. So, I don't know what's the best answer for this, but it's not thoroughly thought through. And if the DRB does approve it, they really need to put on the paper, and their findings or whatever that this was very problematic and it really shows that this, this proposal is a big problem that the IDO is not really thought through and needs to be addressed in a major way, because this site was zoned for a shopping center. This has no, right now, there's nothing that looks like a shopping center, it's like I said it's totally a multi-story very tall building adjacent to single family homes that are mainly single story and two story.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Ms. Horvath, can you please wrap up?

MS. HORVATH: And also, not only is it out of character, but it will create a negative impact with the sunshade issue I notice one of the prior speakers mentioned a sunshade analysis, and this will also create shade for the neighborhoods, which is another negative impact and this is what I noticed in that prior letter August 5th, I put a photo in there of apartments towering over those people, and they deal with the sun shade issue when the sun goes down in the afternoon so that's another issue. And I also agree, the wall issue is, it seems a little awkward like, where do you place that wall? But I think, I don't know how you would visually put the wall in the space and make it look presentable. That's just another thing that's kind of an awkward situation there. So, that's all I have to say for right now but I do agree these issues do need to be addressed.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Thank you. Okay. Thank you, Miss Horvath. And I know many of you kind of know this but I just want to repeat that part of the IDO passage, was to do a legislative rezoning of the entire city because new zoning categories were created. And so, during that process, there were conversion rules established by the City Council and under those conversion rules, this property was converted from C-2 to MX-M, and MX-M, would still allow commercial use on this property, and it also allows them multi-family use on this property. And under the legislative conversion, there was notice provided city
wide. There were numerous public meetings. There was not notice to every property in the city and
every one adjacent to every property in the city, because those are not the requirements of a legislative
conversion. When you convert your entire city all at one time and redo the zoning for the entire city,
there are different rules at play and those were the rules that were followed they were more generalized
notice to the city in general. Okay, I'm going to go to Mr. Stevenson and allow him to respond to these
comments. Is there anyone we missed that wishes to give public comments? Raise your hand now or
speak up.

M. WARD: My hand is raised.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay, I see, and who are you?

M. WARD: I'm from the Neighborhood Association,

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Somehow I'm not seeing you, but I'm hearing you so please identify yourself.

M. WARD: I'm calling on the phone.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: And your name?

M. WARD: It is Ward.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: M. Ward? Okay. And you wish to speak on item number three?

M. WARD: Yes, ma'am.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Miss Ward do you swear, affirm to tell the truth?

M. WARD: To the best of my knowledge.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Thank you. Go ahead, if you can take about three or four minutes at the most. Go
ahead and give us your comments.

M. WARD: Okay, two fairly quick comments. One is I do believe, currently for this project, addressing
adverse effects or adverse impacts is under the purview of the DRB. You may say that the City
Council's move that, but that was less than two weeks ago. And so, it probably is. I'm confident that it
doesn't apply to this project so it is part of your job to review and attempt to mitigate adverse effects of
this project. And I do want to disagree with Miss Horvath on one point that is regarding unintended
consequences. I believe that these consequences that we're seeing with uncontrolled high density,
particularly residential development on the west side, were not unintended. I think they were fully
intended as evidenced by the IDO architect's, own words, development at any cost, or development no
matter what, and to remove neighborhoods from the process. So, their goals are being played out now.
And I encourage the DRB to take the final opportunity it says it has, to address adverse impacts. Thank
you.
CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay, thank you Ms. Ward. Let me ask you a question, is there a particular adverse impact or... that you wish to consider.

M. WARD: I would recommend that you pay very close attention to recommendations of the people who live in that particular area. I've heard the wall, I've heard the sunshade issue. I've heard the diminution and destruction, essentially, of the character of a close-knit community. I think those are all three very legitimate adverse effects. You have it within your purview to address those. Thank you.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Thank you, Ms. Ward. Is there anyone else from the public that wishes to speak on item number three? Okay, hearing none let me go back then to Mr. Stevenson, and allow you as applicant to address some of the comments made by the public.

MR. STEVENSON: Thank you DRB Chair, this is Richard Stevenson with Tierra West. To make it clear on the record that we with this site plan are following the requirements listed in the IDO and the DPM. I want to also point out that the past six months since we had our very first neighborhood meeting with the community, we have worked to take on board legitimate recommendations and criticisms, and we have adjusted the plan where possible that would both benefit the adjacent neighbors and also the future residents of these apartments. Some of the items raised this morning, are beyond what the DRB and what we as the agent can discuss, so I'm not going to go into those higher-level policy issues. I will respond to some of the specifics in regards to the edge buffer, and the placement of the wall on the ponds. We agree with the planning memo that was sent out by Mr. Rodenbeck in regards to the IDO sections that permit us to install the wall and the detention pond in the 50-foot buffer. I also want to state that the intent of that six-foot wall is to provide screening again, between the apartments and the adjacent neighbors. So, I just want to acknowledge Mike, Renee and Ms. Ward for their comments. Thank you.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Thank you Mr. Stevenson. There’re a couple things I want to ask you. Number one, can you review the issue of notification to property owners, south of the subject site, and those would be people who are south of the arroyo, could you acknowledge your notification process and how you determined to notice or not notice those people?

MR STEVENSON: This is Richard. I believe we discussed this in the previous DRB meeting. As mentioned, we followed the IDO notification procedures. I recognize that some of the neighbors on the call today disagree with those procedures, but we have followed precisely. We notified the neighbors with the addresses that we received from City Planning. That's all I have to add. Thank you.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: And just to make the record clear. So, the notice to people south of the arroyo, they were considered to be beyond the 100 feet notice requirement, or did you notice anyone and I remember talking about this but I don’t remember it clearly. So, I just want to have that clarified once again. Were there properties within your buffer map area that you received for notice that were south of the arroyo?
MR. STEVENSON: This is Richard. Yes, there were properties south of arroyo on the buffer map that we received from City Planning that we did notify in regards to this application.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: So those would be property owners along Benton Avenue, as you see on this screen?

MR. STEVENSON: This is Richard. Yes, that is correct. Jay, also I think in the application packet you should see the buffer map that we submitted. If you can locate that quickly and easily maybe we can refer that.

MR. RODENBECK: This is Jay Rodenbeck, Richard do you have the notifications in the revised submittal or is this revised submittal?

MR. STEVENSON: This is Richard. Jay it should be the original submittal. Thank you.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Why don't we go to that a little bit later because I want to bring up some things while Jay is in this current submittal packet. Okay, I just wanted to mention and the community will find this in the response that staff did to some of the community concerns that the State Statutes do allow a city like Albuquerque that is under Home Rule, to be able to adopt a zoning ordinance customized to their community. And that's what the city council did in 2017 with the IDO. And so that's why the DRB is following that. With regard to sunshades, there is no requirement for this zoning district to account for solar access to adjacent properties. And that's, I don't have this site right here but I think Mr. Rodenbeck might, regarding solar access. The one area that I as DRB Chair has still have some concerns about does relate to the, not so much the wall being placed in the landscape buffer area, but the fact that the wall being placed five feet from the existing subdivision wall creates a five-foot, sort of a dead zone, if you will. And I am interested this morning, if the neighbors have any other ideas about how they would want that wall placed, or if they prefer having the wall as close to them as possible, how they feel about that. And Mr. Rodenbeck I'm going to have you go ahead and go through planning comments right now since so much of that is on the table. And we're going to kind of go out of order this morning and we'll do Planning comments and then we'll come back to some other DRB numbers and but could you go ahead and go through your planning comments?

MR. RODENBECK: This is Jay Rodenbeck. As Madam Chair alluded to, staff is concerned about the gap between the existing wall adjacent on the eastern boundary and the proposed six-foot wall along the boundary of the site because of possible maintenance issues and wanted access. It does look like the applicant has provided entry to that zone. Staff request the applicant consider maintaining the existing vegetation between the existing subdivision wall to the east and the proposed wall. And, staff believes that additional trees and shrubs appear to be possibly required going further south, to the storm water management pond between, the storm water management pond and the existing subdivision. Those are the requirements that we currently have.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Mr. Rodenbeck can you bring up your response to the public citizen comments up on the screen? We've got a couple people saying that they haven't seen that yet.
MR. RODENBECK: I can just go through this really quickly here. We already went through the state statute response. Regarding and correct me if I’m wrong, if I like cite something that's already been cited in detail regarding the placement of the storm water management pond, within the landscape buffer. The IDO 5-6C13A states that the required landscape and buffer areas, shall be designed to serve as storm water management areas to the maximum extent practicable consistent with their required locations of vegetation. Therefore, there is no restriction in the IDO on the storm water management pond being located inside within a landscape buffer as long as each buffer landscaping requirements are met and that's where we got into the content I just mentioned that (unintelligible) trees and shrubs appear to be required between storm water management pond, and the existing subdivision. I go on here to state that the walls may be constructed according to 5-70C1 of the IDO that walls may be constructed anywhere on a parcel, including but not limited to a front side or rear setback area, unless otherwise prohibited by this IDO. And then I state that there is no restriction in the area or DPM to the proposed wall being constructed within the landscape buffer so long as the intent of 5-6E1A to mitigate the impacts of significant differences in property use, size, or scale is met. And I will state and staff states that the five-foot dead space between the existing and proposed wall is still under review. And in our final comment address that we addressed was regarding a concerned citizen asserting that the proposed complex is contrary to community identity is spoken to in chapter 4 of the comprehensive plan and we just state that, we cite 6-2D of the IDO, which states the requirements of the DRB which states that the DRB reviews private development to ensure technical standards have been met pertaining to when you (unintelligible) infrastructure and transportation of the DRB, therefore reviews technical standards in the IDO and the DPM, but does not have responsibility or authority to interpret policy based standards in the comprehensive plan.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay, thank you Mr. Rodenbeck, that was really thorough, and we tried to make sure that we were considering the comments that you brought up as members of the public, and that we were then looking back in the IDO and seeing what those IDO requirements, guided us in terms of dealing with some of your concerns. This is kind of the list we came up with to generally respond to that. And I'll say that the one area that I remain I'm uncomfortable with and I need input from the neighborhood with regard to what they feel provides the best circumstance for them. With regard to that, where that wall is placed on the five-foot wall and what would be between the subdivision wall, and that new apartment building wall and the landscape buffer. That's the main issue I still feel concerned about and want to make sure we address in the best way. Okay let me go to Mr. Stevenson; do you want to talk about that issue for a moment?

MR. STEVENSON: This is Richard. Yes, I can address those three items, the first one being the restriction of access to that dead-space. So, we did modify the screen wall to provide service access. Jay if you could just zoom in on the staggered walls there on the east side please. This will allow the landscaping crews access to, to claim any debris or trash that may fall into this area. There is no landscaping proposed in that that dead space. And the second item was the existing vegetation that's currently on site so we did discuss this with the landscape architect. We decided not to utilize any of the shrub, we will be replacing that with the new landscaping as reflected on the landscaping plan for a couple of reasons that was featured in the response yesterday sent to start planning. And then in regards to the additional shrubs, or trees in the detention pond, Jays pulled up the revised landscaping
plan I sent in this morning that has some additional landscaping on the east side of the detention pond to address that comment. Thank you.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay, thank you Mr. Stevenson. So, if I understand it correctly you've modified the wall so it's not running five feet parallel to the subdivision wall of Seven Bar North, but rather it has, it's slightly at an angle and it has, its built in segments, so that there's access in there for maintenance?

MR. STEVENSON: This is Richard. Yes, that's correct.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: In some cases, it would be five feet away and then it would angle toward the subdivision wall, and then go back again for the next segment, will start five feet away on the south, and then veer closer to the subdivision wall of Seven Bar as it goes north.

MR. STEVENSON: This is Richard. Yes.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. So I need to get some feedback, which I'll do during cross examination to hear, particularly though, if there's anyone here that lives, immediately adjacent to that wall that's their backyard, adjacent to the subject site I would like to kind of hear their thoughts on that. And just a reminder that the landscape buffer that's required is 15 feet, it is intended that that buffer area mitigate the impacts of noise, and site, etc. on the adjacent neighborhood. In this case the applicant is proposing a 50-foot wide buffer area, correct Mr. Stevenson?

MR. STEVENSON: This is Richard. Yes.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: All right. Let's go now to the rest of our DRB member comments, and we will do question or cross examination at the end of those DRB comments and see where we are at that point so let's go to the Water Authority now.

MR. KRIS CADENA, WATER AUTHORITY ENGINEER: This is Kris Cadena with the Water Authority. I have had some ex-parte communication with the engineer regarding the agreement form; I just want to put that on the record. The serviceability letter, #200506 has been approved and provides the conditions for service. The Development Agreement has been approved by the board and needs to be signed by both the developer and executive director. This is required prior to approval, and that'll run you had made a comment that you're trying to get it out by Friday. I see my inbox. This morning so obviously hadn't had the chance to get that routed for signature. And with regards to the utility plan, Richard, there's a three-inch water meter that's proposed based on the standard drawing it's a continuous diameter from the main to the meter, you show yours as a six inch connection. I included that in my comments. Thank you very much.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay, any questions for Mr. Cadena.

MR. STEVENSON: This is Richard. Thanks, Kris for your comments. We did submit Monday morning the signed development agreement. I wanted to see if that has been routed for signature to the director.
MR. CADENA: This is Kris Cadena with the Water Authority. I have it sent this morning at 7:33.

MR. STEVENSON: This is Richard I actually re-sent it, if you see below the email I sent out on Monday. I just wanted to see if that was in the process of being routed to the director.

MR. CADENA: Correct. Okay I do see that (unintelligible) the executive director and we'll get to that. Thank you.

MR. STEVENSON: Thank you.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Oh, go ahead, Mr. Stevenson.

MR. STEVENSON: Thank you. Kris, is there any chance you can take delegation while that signature is pending?

MR. CADENA: This is Kris Cadena with the Water Authority. Yes.

MR. STEVENSON: Thank you. This is Richard. If I could address your second comment. Jay, if you could go into the utility plan, please. I’d just like to articulate the (unintelligible) detail, and I believe that caused some confusion. So, the (unintelligible) detail indicates both the six-inch water line for the first (unintelligible) but also the three inch (unintelligible). And I believe that note (unintelligible) 12 x12x16 inch valve that's for the six-inch fast pressure line. (unintelligible) So I think that maybe with that explanation that should resolve that comment.

MR. CADEDNA: Kris Cadena with the Water Authority. I agree.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay, Thank you. As we proceed on here I just want to make a comment to help guide the public understanding DRB comments. A lot of times we go through a project and several meetings, and you might hear the words like no objection. And that usually means that the DRB member has reviewed the case and found that the applicant has met all the specific requirements, or maybe by the second or third meeting at that point, they’ve met all the requirements. So, I just want you to understand that if a DRB member might say, no objection, it doesn't mean they didn't do a thorough review of the case, it just means that that thorough review has resulted in at this point in time they've found the applicant to meet all of the requirements of IDO. With that, let's go to Code Enforcement.

MR. CARL GARCIA, CODE ENFORCEMENT: This is Carl Garcia. I know we've discussed walls at length, but I just like confirmation that all fences on the property comply with section 5-7-D, and other than that, Code Enforcement has reviewed this project for compliance with the IDO, and has no additional comments or objections at this time.

MR. STEVENSON: This is Richard. Carl, I can confirm that we did comply with the wall, restrictions and heights as laid out in the IDO.

MR. GARCIA: Thank you, nothing further.
CHAIR WOLFLEY: Thank you, Parks and Recreation.

MS. CHERYL SOMERFELDT, PARKS AND RECREATION: This is Cheryl Somerfeldt with Parks and Recreation. I have written in my comments (unintelligible) previous comments from the open space division that asked for that to be removed because of the potential of it being an invasive species and, considering that this is a stream from major public open space. And we ask that that be changed. And then the next is to add that the Juniper species must be female only in order, in order to comply with the City of Albuquerque’s pollen control ordinance. And then there was another note that I had regarding the organic mulch that would be added to the landscape plan. So those are the changes for the landscaping.

MR. STEVENSON: This is Richard. Cheryl sorry, I’ve got some bad audio. Could you restate your first comment and point it out on the landscaping plan and please repeat it?

MR. SOMERFELDT: For the first part, I have the Chinese pistache?

MR. STEVENSON: This is Richard. Yes.

MS. SOMERFELDT: Okay, I was looking at what was provided and, I did see it again, but perhaps you made that change. Sorry I can't see it on the screen, I would need to see the tree list.

MR. STEVENSON: This is Richard. I cannot see it listed on a tree list. So perhaps if we could take the other comments and Cheryl if you wouldn't mind just reviewing it if that's possible.

MS. SOMERFELDT: Sure. I'll try. I'll send the version that I have.

MR. STEVENSON: This is Richard. Sorry we did resubmit this morning, it should be in your inbox and updated landscape plan to address your two subsequent comments. Sorry, I believe we do meet it and have addressed all of your comments.

MS. SOMERFELDT: Okay.

MR. RODENBECK: This is Jay Rodenbeck. Cheryl, Mr. Stevenson sent the email at 8:50am just for point of reference.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: I think I'm going to come back to Ms. Somerfeldt so that she has sufficient time to kind of look at those items, I did review those this morning and I notice that there have been some changes made. Let's go to, and I'll come back to you Ms. Somerfeldt. Let's go to Hydrology.

MR. ERNEST ARMijo, HYDROLOGY ENGINEER: This is Ernest Armijo, Hydrology. Hydrology has an approved conceptual grading drainage plan, engineer stamp date of June 26th, 2012. Hydrology has no comment or objection.
CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Thank you. Transportation?

MS. JEANNE WOLFENBARGER, TRANSPORTATION ENGINEER: Good morning, this is Jeanne Wolfenbarger with Transportation. Transportation comments have been addressed for transportation and transportation has no objections to the site plan. I would like to note again for the record that no traffic study was required for this development…it fell under the threshold, that's been stated before. We are providing street lighting on the Golf Course Road. That is shown on the infrastructure list. Westside Boulevard improvements are still scheduled to move forward, under the City, that will widen Westside. And if you need contact information regarding expansion of transit, feel free to get hold of me after the meeting.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Any questions Mr. Stevenson?

MR. STEVENSON: No thank you.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay, let's see if Ms. Somerfeldt is still studying things. Do you need a little more time Ms. Somerfeldt?

MS. SOMERFELDT: This is Cheryl Somerfeldt with Parks and Recreation. The first two appear to be corrected, I'm just checking for that note that's, that's been added as well?

MR. STEVENSON: This is Richard, yes the note was that it was actually updated to quote exactly your comment that we locate it on the plan.

MS. SOMERFELDT: Is it near the top right corner?

MR. STEVENSON? So, it's the fourth paragraph under General notes.

MS. SOMERFELDT: This is grab-over filter fabric to a minimum depth. And then there's a space. Is that the one you mean? So, the note about the organic mulch. This is Cheryl with Parks and Rec. Is that also on this?

MR. STEVENSON. This is Richard, I'm also looking, I believe it was added. I had confirmation from the landscape architect this morning. I'm on the left side, just below the Golf Course Road text. There is another planting note, and it is it is that specific comment regarding the organic mulch section, 5-6C of the IDO. Sorry about that.

MS. SOMERFELDT: So, this is Cheryl Somerfeldt with Parks and Rec. As long as that's added somewhere, then that, that's fine. We can go forward. I did want to mention also, I think there's a comment from the public about not wanting mowing in that buffer area. And from what I could tell, it would be a native seed mix that wouldn't require any mowing. And I just thought you might want to confirm that.
MR. STEVENSON: This is Richard, yes it was a general comment regarding the hours of maintenance, specifically, not on weekends. We passed all that information on to the developer who will consider that when the time is right with the maintenance crews on the property. To answer your question though, yeah, I believe it is a native seed in the 50-foot buffer area. So, it's not a solid (unintelligible) obviously, but there will be general landscaping maintenance for the buffer area.

MS. SOMERFELDT: But, not mowing necessarily would be like a, maybe even maybe a yearly mowing?

MR. STEVENSON: This is Richard. I would leave that up to the landscaping crew, to determine what frequency. It will be periodically and the concerns were, you know, not at 9 am on a Sunday morning during landscape maintenance.

MS. SOMERFELDT: This is Cheryl Somerfeldt, that's all I have. Thank you.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay, thank you Ms. Somerfeldt. I'm now going to ask Mr. Rodenbeck if he's located the notification map and he's going to bring that up on the screen.

MR. RODENBECK: Madam Chair, this is the notification map.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Let me turn to Mr. Stevenson and ask you how you use this map to identify with regard to the southern area, to notice properties.

MR. STEVENSON: This is Richard. So, per the IDO procedures, we made the request to the City for the hundred-foot buffer map. They provided this document. We are required to notify by mail any residents encroached in this in this (unintelligible) which is what we followed so any properties that form that shaded area we sent out notification. I also want to point out that we posted the signs, (unintelligible) procedures, and as well we had somewhat extensive outreach; a couple of neighborhood association meetings, facilitated meetings to try and understand all the concerns from the affected residents. So, I wanted to reference this because this is what we use to follow the application procedures.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay, and just kind of going left to right along that boundary line, can you just identify which properties were noticed.

MR. STEVENSON: This is Richard. Everyone within that envelope...we received the addresses from the city staff, and we sent out mailed notice. I do want to note that there was one address, I believe Mr. Sandoval, who lives on (unintelligible) Drive and did not receive notice due to a technical matter which I believe the City looked into, and we did provide a subsequent notice to Mr. Sandoval but he obviously has been previously involved in delegating so was aware of this request.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay so specifically it looks like you noticed two or three properties along Benton Avenue?
MR. STEVENSON: This is Richard. Yes I would have to refer back to the mailed notice. I believe there are scanned copies of those envelopes in the packet that was sent out to the specific, specific as to which residents did receive that notice.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay thank you. Now we need to go back to allow any member of the public that has spoken if they have a follow up question. This isn't to give additional testimony, but just if you have a follow up question of the applicant or anyone else who has given sworn testimony today. The one allowance I would like to make is that if you abut the subject site and want to give me some feedback on how the area immediately adjacent to your property is being treated and what you like or don't like, I would like to hear that feedback. Let me for instance ask Ms. Kearney, do you have any follow up questions or feedback on the wall?

MS KEARNEY: Yes I do. The question I have is, as I understand it, the arroyo is also a public right away. So, that brings in that notification line and increases it by at least eight different property owners from just a rough estimate I had, so my question is, is not the arroyo, a public right away?

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay, Ms. Gould, I'm going to go ahead and let you answer that question to the best of your knowledge.

MS. GOULD: This is Maggie Gould. So when, when we looked at this before, that arroyo property... so if Jay can bring back that notification map. If you look at the streets and if you look at the other chunk of the arroyo, they are all labeled as unclassified and they don't have zoning, and they show up clearly as easements of public right of way that piece of property there directly to the south of the subject site shows up as the same residential zone that R-1D zone, and when we look at the condition of public right of way, although drainage is in there, unclassified is also in there too. And I think the other part of this is that the notification, let me find the citation... so the other part of it is under 14-16-6-4-K7E which says that “if the applicant provides evidence that the required notices were timely provided, then the failure or property owner or Neighborhood Association receive actual notice due to changes of address since the latest update to the City or county real estate records or need to change the email addresses since those were last provided or due to errors in postal delivery, newspaper, publishing or other reasons, beyond the control of the applicant and the City, that shall not be grounds for delay of the application or the review.” And so I think, that's the issue with this property is that when that property buffer was done, they used I believe the right of way of Golf Course as the buffer but that chunk of the arroyo doesn't look like right of way.

MS. KEARNEY: That's hard for me to understand because people use it all the time as hiking and things like that and it would, if it got included within like the road is the right of way, it would push that notification to the south. And that is not part of Seven Bar North; it's actually the different community neighborhood that should have been contacted.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Ms. Gould, if I understand you correctly, that if we were further east where it says unclassified, that would on the buffer map, that would have triggered notice on the other side of the arroyo, you would have excluded the arroyo as public right of way and would have included the notice on the south.
MS. GOULD: This is Maggie. I believe that would be correct with the way the notification process works.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Mr. Biazar, go ahead.

MR. SHAHAB BIAZAR, CITY ENGINEER: So, the southern piece it's owned by AMAFCA. So that's a property of AMAFCA and it's an arroyo so it's not even owned by the City so it wouldn't be considered City right of way.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. I think for our purposes here we've talked about this and we've given a response. And the City created a buffer map for the applicant to use and they have followed that buffer map in doing their notification. If the applicant for any reason feels that they want to make sure that this in any way isn't an appealable item, then they, I would allow them to proceed in any way that they choose to. But I think in terms of our discussion of it this morning, that's as far as we can go. Ms. Kearney, do you have any other questions?

MS. KEARNEY: Yes, I do. Would you clarify for me, the neighborhood edge is supposed to be 15 feet, and the wall...after the 15 feet, and also that 15 feet need that retention pond, which is directly behind my house should be moved 15 feet before they start building a retention pond. I'd like to get clarification for that.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: I'd like to get clarification from Mr. Stevenson and have you respond to why the retention pond is located there, and if there are any other alternatives.

MR. STEVENSON: This is Richard. So, the site generally falls away to the south, and to the southeast. We're trying to match the natural drainage patterns with the topography. There's an existing concrete channel that ties into the AMAFCA arroyo channel down on the southeast corner of the property. And so this location for the retention pond makes the most sense. And it works for the development. And so that's why it is located in the buffer zone because we are allowed to do that. As previously mentioned, as well, it works with the topography for the proposed site.

MS. KEARNEY: So how are you going, my question then is, how are you going to protect the adjacent properties if during a flood where it could undermine our wall, and other situations.

MR. STEVENSON: This is Richard. So, we have adequately designed the overflow for that rundown and connection to the existing concrete channel plume that is tied to the arroyo, to be able to pass the design storm event, and so we, and larger and there is excess capacity on that channel, which is detailed in the grading and drainage report, which I believe I had previously sent to you as well. And so we are confident that we have designed this to be able to safely discharge any runoff, storm water runoff from the property into the arroyo.

MS. KEARNEY: And then I've got the question of, the 15 foot neighborhood buffer is put in for protection and reduction in noise and things like that. I don't understand has the wall been moved 15
feet out to 15 feet or does it still continue at the five feet and then go out and also I've got a great concern about fire management. If we see what's happening in California, and are the all the species, are they the type of species to help prevent I would call them what they call fire-wise species. Has this gone through fire management?

MR. STEVENSON: This is Richard so the wall is located within a 15 foot buffer zone. We also are required to provide a 50 foot buffer before we can place any parking. That has been very nicely detailed with the response by City Planning, and that response should be in your inbox which details the section in the IDO that allows us to place the wall in the 15 foot buffer. In regards to (unintelligible) so we are simplifying, what the recommended plans are. And so I can certainly take that comment back to the landscape architect, but we are not proposing to make any changes today on the landscaping plan.

MS. KEARNEY: I still have great concerns about that. (Unintelligible) Fire Management, and with all the vegetation that's being planned for there, it's critical that there be a plan in place for how they would deal with fire situations.

MR. STEVENSON: This is Richard so we have submitted a fire one plan that has been approved by the fire marshal which details the fire accessibility routes to fight any fire on the property, whether that's internal in a building or in a landscaping area.

MS. KEARNEY: The other question though is the security from the people living in the apartment area. I don't understand how they're going to protect the community with the present plan. And with the wall, they are now proposing there's access behind that wall it looks like. And that does nothing for the security of the neighborhood.

MR. STEVENSON: This is Richard so we have previously discussed crime as a general theme in regards to specific security of tenants being out of access any property to the east, I will point out that we are building that six foot wall and that yes, it is accessible, but there is also the existing boundary wall for those residents that varies in height. I believe the, when I walked the property with my measuring tape, the lowest wall was about four and a half feet, and in some sections, it was actually greater than eight feet if I recall correctly so I, I can rely that I comment back to the developer but I just want to point out that the people in this apartment complex. I don't believe will be causing problems to anyone. I would like to believe that they won't cause any problems to adjacent neighbors. I'm sure I can't offer a much, much better, more succinct answer than that.

MS. KEARNEY: So, that brings the final question, what are you doing to protect our neighborhood?

MR. STEVENSON: This is Richard, that's a fairly open ended question. We have had numerous public meetings, we've tried to articulate what the intent of the site plan in regards to the IDO and the DPM standards are. I can't comment, generally on a specific interaction with this development and the neighborhood as a whole. I don't have details to add.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Mr. Rodenbeck, can you zoom in on that wall area on the existing subdivision wall? Really zoom in just on one section of it is fine.
MR. RODENBECK: This is Jay. I'm pointing right now at the existing subdivision wall and this is the proposed wall.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: So I'd like the adjacent neighbors to realize that based on some of the comments, they have modified from just having a wall that's continuously five feet away from the existing subdivision wall, to this, which is segmented five feet and I guess going in maybe to about three feet or something, but to provide better access for maintenance of that area. And what I had hoped and I, I'm not sure the applicant agreed, but when I walked the site I noticed that there was mature bushy tall vegetation in that area. And if it couldn't be maintained it would be a deterrent to weed growth, as well as not be anywhere you'd want to crawl behind because it's just too thick full of brush. And, you know, a live brush, a healthy brush. And so, in response the applicant I think did this modification where the wall would have these gaps in it to allow for better maintenance. So, what is your response to that Ms. Kearney?

MS. KEARNEY: I don't understand, when the IDO says that wall has to be 15 feet away... I know that there is a proposed amendment coming up to decrease that but as the IDO states now, it's 15 feet from the property line that the wall has to be, so wouldn't he be required to have a variance, to put that, any wall, any structure within that 15 feet?

CHAIR WOLFLEY: No Ms. Kearney, that's what we've tried to point out in our comments, responding to neighborhood comments, is that the IDO requires a 15 foot landscape buffer area between single family and multifamily, and then you wanted to know, like, can you put a wall in there and so we researched it, and we found that the IDO does allow a wall within that landscape area, but we feel that the intent of that landscape buffer should be met so that the placement of the wall mitigates the impacts of the differences in property use size or scale. And so I wanted to understand how the neighborhood felt about where that wall is placed in relationship to what would happen to the land in between your wall and this multifamily wall.

MS. KEARNEY: And I, I know that's what you said but why then, are they proposing amendment to the IDO for the City Council, that would move that wall? It says 15 feet and the IDO, I forget that like page 186 or so, so I just, I don't know, it just in my mind, it would require a variance to move that anywhere closer than the 15 feet at this time, because the IDO is...

CHAIR WOLFLEY: So, when an applicant submits their application and it's deemed complete the rules of IDO at that time are the rules that we apply to an application and so there could be, I think there is some change to that rule that recently went before the City Council. But that was not, it's not currently in effect nor was it in effect when this application was deemed complete. And so what we're doing is...

MS. KEARNEY: That's why I said presently, it has to be 15 feet out. The proposed amendment would move it, where they would have to be 15 feet out the property line.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: staff has researched this and determined that there was an agreement that the wall will have to be 15 feet out. Do you have a specific provision that you're referring to?
MS. KEARNEY: It's the neighborhood edge. And that's, I think it was like 186. My computer's in another room, and don't have access to that document right now, but it was the neighborhood edge section, and it says, that the wall is to be built, 15 feet away, provide more protection for the neighborhood, and that the amendment will change that to being closer to our property but that amendment is not in place yet. So that's...

CHAIR WOLFLEY: I'm going read to you from the IDO, it's on page 260. It's development next to low density residential zone districts and 56E2A, which I think Mr. Rodenbeck might have up here but it says the landscape buffer area, at least 15, feet wide shall be provided. One deciduous or evergreen tree, at least six feet tall and three shrubs, shall be provided every 25 feet. But it does not talk about wall placement and that's why we looked carefully throughout the IDO, but we also need to meet the intent and that's why I was asking you all about where your preference for placing that wall would be, because there is this intent to mitigate the impacts of significant differences in property use, size and scale.

MS. KEARNEY: To us, the farther away from our, at least to myself and I think most of the others here, the farther away that wall is from our property line the better. You see, there's the 15...

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Ms. Kearney, we need to kind of keep moving our meeting along.

MS. KEARNEY: Yes, Okay, we'll deal with it at a later stage.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Thank you. Let me go to Mr. Mirabal. Did you have, I can allow you to ask questions to those speakers that have been sworn in, or, and also provide any comments you might have about that landscape buffer area with the wall.

MR. MIRABAL: I do have concerns with the proposed landscape wall. Marsha mentioned we're concerned about the safety of our neighborhood, by providing more access without law being broken up provides more access to our property. And if they were going to do a slanted approach with the wall, would want any openings to be gated to where they could lock those and restrict access to our property. This just provides more access to our property. That's what we're trying to prevent. I know Mr. Stevenson's assurances that, oh that you know we're looking at 30 years down the road, down the way. And he's, I mean he is confident that they're not going to break in from the apartment. That doesn't help us when we when our homes are broken into and destroyed. We need limited access. What I would like to see is to have a wall, if it's going to be five feet if you have gated access on each end and restrict any access into that area. This doesn't help us at all as far as safety goes. I'd prefer to see the wall out further, but according to your, your description, you're saying they can do that anywhere. And also I have a question about you were discussing notification. And you eliminate the arroyo as right of way, although we feel it is right of way. But street Correta (sp) itself, there are several neighbors on the other side of the street, according to your map should have been notified. They claim they were not notified and I don't have that list in front of me, but I know several of our neighbors have on the other side of the street are within that hundred foot boundary, and then if you exclude that street. Correta (sp) as a right of way that extends that out even further into the neighborhood, and they were not notified. So, it's still
a question that notification, but now as far as the fence, that's a big concern to me that they would now start allowing more access in there. And we want limited access.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay, thank you Mr. Mirabal. Let's go ahead and, Ms. Horvath Did you have any questions for any of the speakers that were sworn in?

MS. HORVATH: Oh, yes, I did. Can you hear me okay?

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Yes we can.

MS. HORVATH: Okay. Oh, well I did have a question about, for Tierra West. In this whole process, right from the start, the neighbors did ask that the scale of the building come down with the heights. And I was curious. They weren't thinking by stair step it down, possibly two stories next to them or three stories next to them. And step it up a story, you know the four story then a three story, or just two story overall or three story overall, so I'm just curious did Tierra West ask their client at all if he would be willing to accommodate some of those concerns, the size of the building adjacent to the residence, and what his answer was - the height of the building.

MR. STEVENSON: This is Richard. I can try to address your questions on the security and the design of that fence or the boundary screen wall. So, the intent is, it is a screen wall, it will have some good aesthetically pleasing. (Unintelligible) the architect to try and improve the aesthetics of that screen wall for both the residence in the apartments, but also for, for you and your neighbors. I will point out that your existing boundary walls are there today and currently providing the security. I see you shaking your head. My house is fenced. I've still been broken into here. It's not pleasant, so I can understand and relate to your security concerns. The apartment complex is a gated complex, and there will be security dates at the entrance on Golf Course road. I also want to remind you of that. In regards to Rene's comments, with the density and also the stepping of the buildings on the east side, to say two stories, we did take that back to the developer and the architect. That was, it wasn't able to be met. I did consider it but this is the density that the developer needs for this project to work. And so, staying with where we are, we have on the plans today. And we had provided that response, many months ago to you Rene.

MS. HORVATH: And so he did tell you no. He told you he could not accommodate the neighbor’s request?

MR. STEVENSON: This is Richard. Yes. He could not accommodate the request to decrease the number of stores, and therefore the number of apartments.

MS. HORVATH: Okay and then I have a question…

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Do you have another question?

MS. HORVATH: Oh yeah, on the, on the wall. Just curious, I'm assuming that the area between the two walls are out of grade so it's sloped towards the arroyo and the drainage has been figured out on that
between the two walls. And, and the wall, what is the material, maybe the wall is block, but it's not a stucco. And what is it a textured colored block, or is it a gray block or what do you, what is that gonna look like?

MR STEVENSON: This is Richard. So in regards to the drainage, yes those details have been considered and will be fine-tuned with the detailed grading plan required at the building permit stage. The block wall I believe is a textured skin block wall that will have a texture on it. I can check with the architect to see if he's got those details that he can share with you and the neighbors as well. And there may be some opportunity for additional input, perhaps, on colors or textures or styles for that wall at a later date.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay, thank you Ms. Horvath and Mr. Stevenson. All right I'll just kind of let you know Mr. Stevenson one leaning I have right now is to look at delegation for that whole area between the just call it the landscape buffer area I think the system for landscape buffer area that we can resolve some of the wall and landscaping issues through there. So at this point...

MR. STEVENSON: So at this point, we are happy to work with Planning and any neighbors that can provide legitimate input to try and nail down the detail on that screen wall over the next week or two.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay, because I think that often is the area of direct impact for the adjacent property owners. Mr. Mirabal, if you have something really short it should be in the form of a question.

MR. MIRABAL: My question is why, why couldn't they, if they're going to (unintelligible) that fence in to where you have all these openings, why couldn't they provide gates...restrict access to that area, they could put up a wrought iron gate and have it locked. And whenever they need access they can open it and get in there for maintenance. By leaving it open, puts us in jeopardy. And, you know, all the assurances in the world aren't going to help us when our property is stolen.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Mr. Mirabal I think that's something that we can resolve before I do final sign off. Okay? So, I will hope that there will be some discussions between Mr. Stevenson and you and Ms. Kearney, to work on that issue and then I will (unintelligible) before final sign off is the way I'm meaning. At this point, I will, Mr. Stevenson, do you have anything more?

MR. STEVENSON: DRB Chair this is Richard, I just wanted to point out that we do have the infrastructure list as well.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Oh, thank you. Okay Thank you very much Okay, Mr. Rodenbeck if you have easy access to the infrastructure list if you can bring it up but I think it hasn't been changing since the last resubmittal, or when it was the date of the most recent infrastructure Mr. Stevenson?

MR. STEVENSON: This is Richard. I believe it's the 24th.

MR. RODENBECK: This is Jay Rodenbeck. They submitted an infrastructure list with the resubmittal that we received this past week.
CHAIR WOLFLEY: Which is what you have on the screen…

MR. RODENBECK: Which is what I have pulled up, absolutely.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. All right, so this is the infrastructure list that we would be approving. At this point I will ask each board member to vote to approve or deny the site plan application with the associated infrastructure as shown on the screen. And if you’re accepting delegation, please summarize that delegation and the time needed. Okay, let’s start, this is voting now let’s go to Water Authority.

MR. CADENA: This is Kris Cadena with the water authority. I approve with delegation for execution of the development agreement.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Thank you, Kris, Code Enforcement?

MR. GARCIA: This is Carl Garcia, Code Enforcement, I approve.

MS. SOMERFELDT: This is Cheryl Somerfeldt with Parks and Rec. I approve on the condition that this, that a note is added.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Can you specify the note please Ms. Somerfeldt?

MS. SOMERFELDT: Pursuant to IDO 565B, organic mulch such as wood chips or pecan shells is required as ground cover for the portion of any landscape area surrounding the (unintelligible) as well as beneath the entire tree canopy or drip line in each required landscaped area.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay, thank you Ms. Somerfeldt, let’s keep voting, Hydrology?

MR. ARMIJO: This is Ernest Armijo, Hydrology, I approve.

MS. WOLFENBARGER: This is Jeanne Wolfenbarger with Transportation. I approve.

MS. WOLFENBARGER: This is Jeanne Wolfenbarger with Transportation. I approve.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: This is Jolene Wolfley, DRB Chair and I approve with delegation to address the 15 foot landscape buffer area with regard to placement of the wall and how the area will be treated between the existing subdivision wall, and the new wall. Okay. There is a consensus vote to approve item three Project 2020-4030, site plan SI-2020 -540 with the associated infrastructure list because the application meets all the applicable requirements of the IDO and DPM with delegation to Water Authority and Planning for 12 weeks to address the issues just stated.

MR. BIAZAR: Madam Chair, this is Shahab Biazar. I just have a quick question, I just wanted to make sure that the applicant had signed infrastructure list because I just want to make sure that the signature was on there before DRB signs.
MR. RODENBECK:  This is Jay; I’m pointing at it right now.

MR. BIAZAR:  Thanks.

CHAIR WOLFLEY:  Okay. Thank you everyone who participated today, we know the neighborhood is a great neighborhood and is interested in how things will be developed in the future. Thank you Mr. Stevenson for your work to try to accommodate the needs of the neighborhood, and we appreciate that.
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CHAIR WOLFLEY: We are going to move now to Agenda Item Number 3, which is Project 2020-4030, Site Plan SI-2020-540. This is for the Calabacillas Group on Golf Course Road between the Black Arroyo and Westside Boulevard. This is a site plan for an apartment with more than 50 units.

Would the applicant team please raise their hand. Okay. I see Tierra West and.

MR. BOHANNAN: So it's Ron Bohannan and Richard Stevenson.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Is it -- I'm sorry. Mr. Bohannan, I believe I couldn't quite hear you.

MR. BOHANNAN: Yeah. It's Ron Bohannan and Richard Stevenson from Tierra West.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Thank you, sir. Let me swear you in, starting with Mr. Bohannan.

Do swear or affirm to tell the truth?

MR. BOHANNAN: Ron Bohannan. I do.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Thank you.

And then, Richard Stevenson, do you swear or affirm to tell the truth?

MR. STEVENSON: I do, yes.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. There was quite a bit of material for you to work through when we saw you last time, which is July 22nd. Can you go ahead and give us an update on everything out there.

MR. STEVENSON: Thank you. Good morning, Richard Stevenson, Tierra West.

Yes. Firstly, if I can focus on the DRB -- DRB board members' comments. We have worked to address those, and we'd like to work through additional comments that we received on the resubmittal. And then, I believe, there are some members of the public that would like to speak and comment.

We have also worked to address a number of the concerns that we received that were either afforded to us by the DRB chair, or have been contacted directly from the neighborhood. We have provided the responses, and that is all covered in e-mails, which I believe are added to the project file.

With the interest of time, I -- I won't go through each of those comments, but I just want to note that we have worked hard to address -- provide some clarification on their comments.

And, as well, just to add, we have updated the infrastructure list to address transportation's comments in regard to street lights that we received.

Thank you.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Stevenson. As you noted there has been -- there have been quite a bit of e-mail comments that have come in. All of those e-mails have been circulated to all the DRB members. They've also been, if they're from the public, shared with Tierra West so that they could address them.
And I wanted to go ahead and just mention one off the bat. There was -- there were e-mails regarding notification. Could you address that, Mr. Stevenson, how you did your notification.

MR. STEVENSON: Yes. This is Richard Stevenson.

So we followed the IDO notification procedures that sit in the relevant section. We requested the ONC request for the 100-foot buffer. Neighbors -- we received that and we sent out mail notice as required, as we do for a lot of projects.

And we did receive a query from Mr. Sandoval on some lack of notice, and we responded back to the DRB chair yesterday. We proved that we followed exactly what the city had instructed us to do in terms of notification.

Thank you.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Thank you. So part of that work revealed that for some reason in the computer sweep of who should be notified, Mr. Sandoval was not included in that. But we do note that he did attend the July 22nd meeting, so he did find out about it.

And we apologize to Mr. Sandoval that he didn't receive the mailed notice. But that wasn't the applicant's lack of sending notice. It was more somehow there was a computer glitch in not including his address.

But once again, in the standard of reasonableness, we feel that the applicant did make all the required attempts to notify and that Mr. Sandoval was actually able to find out about the meeting and participate at the July meeting, and as well he's here in the room today and is welcome to bring up whatever matters he chooses.

I also just want to note that some of the public comment that has come in refers to the comprehensive plan and the adoption of the IDO. Those are matters that are not within jurisdiction of the DRB to deal with. The IDO was approved by the city council a couple of years ago, and the DRB can only do what the IDO prescribes it to do, which is to apply the IDO and the DPM to this particular project if it has the correct -- under the zoning that it has in place.

And under the DRB review and -- review criteria, it does not include review of comprehensive plan policy, and so matters in the comprehensive plan are not matters that the DRB can be looking at when they review a site plan. Rather, those comprehensive goals are institutionalized in the IDO requirements themselves, and it's those IDO requirements the DRB actually can do something about here today, and the DPM requirements. And so that would be the most effective place for us to work this morning, depending on where the public wants to go.

And let's go ahead now. We had speakers signed up for this item.

Ms. Gomez, who is the first speaker?

MS. WOLFLEY: First speaker I have is Mr. Mike Mirabal.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay.

MS. GOULD: Madam -- Madam Chair.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Yes.
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**MS. GOULD:** I'm sorry to interrupt. If I may, it looks like Rene Horvath also had her hand raised, and I don't believe we got her on the initial list.

**CHAIR WOLFLEY:** Okay. I was going to do sweep at the end for anyone we missed, but let's just go ahead and do that.

Anyone who did not sign up at the beginning of the meeting, I'm going to finish the speaker list.

And remind me, Ms. Gould, to go and check the room and see if there's anyone who didn't get signed up initially.

So let's go back to -- I don't know if it's Cathy or Mike Mirabal who wish just to speak first.

**MS. MIRABAL:** Cathy.

**CHAIR WOLFLEY:** Cathy. Okay. Let me swear you in.

Ms. Mirabal, do you swear or affirm to tell the truth?

**MS. MIRABAL:** I do.

**CHAIR WOLFLEY:** Okay. And please keep your comments to three minutes, if possible. Thank you.

**MS. MIRABAL:** Okay. I just had a quick question. We were wondering why the developer stated that the buildings will be 52 feet at certain points, and -- 52 feet height, and when 45 is the height limit. Why is there that difference, the 7-foot difference?

**CHAIR WOLFLEY:** Okay. And what we're going to do to manage our time the best way is, any questions or comments, the -- Mr. Stevenson, he is listening and taking notes, and I'm going to have him address everyone's comments and questions in one group at the end of the public comment. Okay?

**MS. MIRABAL:** Okay.

**CHAIR WOLFLEY:** Did you have anything else, Ms. Mirabal?

**MS. MIRABAL:** No.

**CHAIR WOLFLEY:** Okay.

And, Mr. Mike Mirabal, did you want to speak now?

**MR. MIRABAL:** It's fine. I can speak now. My comment --

**CHAIR WOLFLEY:** Can I swear you in, please, sir?

**MR. MIRABAL:** Yes.

**CHAIR WOLFLEY:** Okay. Do you swear or affirm to tell the truth?

**MR. MIRABAL:** Yes, I do.

**CHAIR WOLFLEY:** Okay. And then just go ahead and state your name as you start.

**MR. MIRABAL:** My name is Mike Mirabal. I live adjacent to the property in the proposed -- here in the proposed development.
DRB Minutes, Agenda Item 3
August 5, 2020

My questions relate to the fact -- the developer has -- has told
the neighborhood that the previous zoning of C-2 conditional use
was more permissive than MX-M, and from looking back at the
previous decision that was denied, the -- the limit was 26 feet
on these buildings. And it was denied because it was injurious
to the neighborhood.

This -- this project being four stories high is even more
injurious to the neighborhood, and it's -- it affects us in more
concentration. So I think there was a misrepresentation to the
neighborhood in trying to convince them that this was -- was less
injurious.

We still have the same issues that created the denial in the
first time, as far as schools, as far as streets and bridges, the
overcrowdedness that this will create. It -- the fact that
putting more additional homes on this site removes the
possibility of creating jobs by -- by putting true commercial
business on this site.

So we're -- we're adding to the congestion, which, again, has
been brought up numerous times as far as traffic, that is already
overcrowded. We're not providing jobs on this side of town.
We're now overcrowding our streets and our bridges because
people -- more people now are going to have to go across those
bridges that are already dangerously overcrowded at this time.
And there's no plan to build an additional bridge, that I'm aware
of.

I think -- I think that's it for right now. I guess to -- I
believe the previous ruling still exists, the conditions still
exist, and I'd like that to be considered in this decision.

Thank you.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. And, Mr. Mirabal, are you referring to
previous site plans?

MR. MIRABAL: I'm referring to the previous proposal to build 246
apartment -- apartments on this site. I believe it was in 2006,
and it -- it was ruled injurious to the community.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Mirabal.

Ms. Gomez, who is next?

MS. GOMEZ: Next speaker I have is Ms. Marsha Kearney.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Ms. Kearney, let's make sure you're
unmuted.

MS. Kearney: Yes, I'm unmuted, I believe.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Do you swear or affirm to tell the truth?

MS. Kearney: Yes, I do.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Thank you. If you can try to keep your comments
to three minutes. Thank you.

MS. Kearney: You're welcome.

What does Tierra West mean when they say "sufficient coordination
with Rio Rancho contact" -- it said "contract," but I think they
met contact -- "David Serrano made to confirm for additional
traffic items necessary."
I was kind of surprised by that statement because I had spoken with the Rio Rancho mayor on July 6th, and he talked to there being possibly traffic issues. So I would like to better understand what that coordination -- what that sentence means.

And my next statement goes back to the IDO and the purpose under the IDO on Part 14-16-1, under general provisions, and Item Number 1-3(D) says to protect the quality and character of residential neighborhoods.

And item 1-3(E) says to promote the economic development and fiscal sustainability of the city.

I feel this project is violent disagreement with that first statement, and I don't understand how it helps that second statement.

And my other question was, under notification of communities, I still feel it was incomplete, because you're supposed to take out public rights-of-way, and there's roads there and there's also an arroyo. And if those were taken out of that hundred-foot contact, you would have a large number of people that would also have to be contacted with this.

And my final question, I do not understand how the second lot is considered to be in a city core or a transportation corridor.

Thank you.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Thank you, Ms. Kearney. We're all taking some notes on your comments and we'll give the applicant an opportunity to address them.

Okay. Ms. Gomez, who's next?

MS. GOMEZ: Next speaker I have is Mr. Larry Sandoval.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Good morning, Mr. Sandoval. Do you swear or affirm to tell the truth?

MR. SANDOVAL: Yes, I do.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Thank you. If you can try to keep your comments to three minutes, we'd appreciate it.

MR. SANDOVAL: Okay. First let me start with I'd like to say that I object to the DRB meetings, both our July 22nd, today's meeting, and also future hearing that we might have. I believe that our citizens, our neighbors have a right to voice their concerns in an open public forum because we have stake in this matter. In these matters, we're making major decisions that will affect the quality of -- of the lives of our neighbors and our neighborhood.

I believe that the city has violated our rights according to the State of New Mexico's Open Meetings Act.

I'd also like to go to the -- to talk about the 440-foot high building, high-rise buildings. What has the city done to preserve, protect and enhance the character of our neighborhood? And why aren't the policies within the ABC-Z comp plan not incorporated in the IDO?

The other thing that really concerns me is how have we really addressed that glaring invasion of privacy. Take a look at my
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backdrop image, and you'll see the invasion, the invasion of a development upon a residential neighborhood. As hard as they have tried to block the privacy, nobody wins in this case. You have people that have their blinds closed. That's not going to be any different than what we are going to be facing with this development, with 24 balconies from the rearview side of this -- these -- these apartments facing us, with 20 windows. And this is just one apartment. Multiply that. A total invasion of privacy.

And then we're be given a cross-section from Tierra West showing the site view, pointing into trees that they are proposing to place that are mature, when in reality, they're 2-inch trees that are -- 2-inch diameter trees that are 6-foot tall, that will not give us privacy for 15 to 20 years.

Think of it this way, would anybody want drones flying in their backyard. In this case, we have drones flying in our backyard 24/7. We'll have no privacy. Our backyards are our sanctuaries.

Also want to say regarding public notification and the notification process, per the discussion that we had with Mr. Stevenson, I know that I was not on that list. I did attend the last DRB hearing. But I'd also like to note that there are others that have not been notified to date and should have been notified. And so I see this as a failure to comply on behalf of the applicant.

Again, we have pictures of the sign posting and that was definitely out of compliance with the sign laying down in the bushes. How does that serve the public when they don't know and they can't tell what it says because it's laying in the bushes? I'm upset about that, and I should be, and so should the public be.

Also, I'd like to know, and I don't know that we got an answer, regarding the traffic-impact study. What is that 247-unit threshold? What does that mean and where did it come from? Because that's a major -- that's a major thing for us. I'd like to know. Is that arbitrary? How is that determined? Because it does have a major role in the fact that not only is the lower lot owned by the same owner, the upper lot is also by the same owner, which should be combined in the one package, not two.

I'm going to close with -- with this: I believe that the IDO is a flawed document. It does force density, it does force highly populated buildings in an area that should not -- should not be. I'd also like to note that we are taxpayers. We deserve the right to know if our city is going to protect, preserve and enhance our communities.

That's all I have to say for now.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Sandoval. I've made a lot of notes. Let's go to our next speaker.

MS. GOMEZ: Next speaker I have is Ms. Rene Horvath.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Ms. Horvath, do you swear or affirm to tell the truth?

Let's see. We're going to unmute you.

All right. Ms. Gould, can you try to help unmute Ms. Horvath.

There you are. Ms. Horvath, do you swear or affirm to tell the
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truth?

**MS. HORVATH:** Yes, I do.

**CHAIR WOLFLEY:** Thank you. We can hear you well now.

**MS. HORVATH:** Okay.

**CHAIR WOLFLEY:** Go ahead, and if you can, keep to three minutes. That would be helpful.

**MS. HORVATH:** Okay. Well, I did send in some written comments yesterday, and -- and as the land-use director for the West side, the thing that I've noticed, we're getting a lot of applications for apartments, and they are three and four stories high.

And this is a great concern to me because it's starting -- I can see this is a trend that's going to create a lot of conflict with the neighborhoods, to have this tall of a building right behind their homes.

We normally keep things in scale and in character with the surrounding area, and that even in our previous plans, and even with the new IDO and comp plan, it's always been talked about keeping everything in scale and character with the surrounding neighborhood. And that we -- when it gets a little more intense, it's usually around a community activity center, where you have the shopping and you may have some apartments and then you have the sink. Family. But still, even in those areas, it was in scale and character for that area.

So this area right here along Golf Course is all on the east side of that road, heading into Rio Rancho, and continuing on to Southern Boulevard, it is single-family, primarily single-family residents on the east side of the road.

On the west side of the road, you see more commercial, more businesses, and for the most part, they're fairly in scale with each other. When you get further west, like where the Rust Hospital is, yeah, you see more taller buildings. This building is more appropriate in that area than where they're placing it right now.

And so right off the bat, I can see -- when I saw that they were planning to do four stories, I said, man, it's going to be a problem. To put it right behind people's home, right off the bat, it's a privacy issue.

And then not only that, it's a solar access issue on top of it. And I did send a photo with my written comments with these tall apartment buildings that were built about, I guess, four or five years ago, or maybe less, in this neighborhood, West side neighborhood, south of the freeway, between Under and 98th Street. I heard about these apartments, and when I went to drive and pick up a friend in that neighborhood and I saw them looming over the houses, I said, "Oh, man, this" -- "this is not right."

And when you look -- there are privacy issues. And this apartment complex is separated by a two-lane road. And when you drive there in the afternoon, all those homes are shaded by these apartments. So their solar access is also invaded, as well. So this is a quality-of-life issue.

So we -- I don't think -- so it is a solar access issue. It's a privacy issue. It's out of scale, out of character for the area.
And even though we have an MX-M zoning, it used to be C-2 zoning, which looked at -- it was a conditional use. It wasn't just permissive. We had to look at school capacity. We had to look at jobs-housing balance. We had to look at meeting usable open space. It just wasn't given.

But if the IDO says this now is MX-M and you can have 45-feet-tall buildings, does that mean everywhere gets a 45-foot-tall building? Don't you have to consider the comp plan and what the goals and policies are with the comp plan? Because I did list some of the -- some of the policies in the land-use section. It says that in areas of change and consistency are designated to be complementary to protect the scale and character of the neighborhoods, and accommodating new residents in jobs and areas well served by infrastructure and transit.

And I want to point out, this is not a community activity center. It doesn't have transit on that road. And so that's another thing to look at.

The second policy I wanted to mention was areas of consistency. Neighborhoods designated as areas of consistency will be protected by policies, will be protected by policies to limit densities and negative impacts and that development will need to be compatible in scale and character with the surrounding area.

So -- and then -- so I think that this board and commission needs to look at that. I don't -- I know you guys looked at mostly regulations, but these policies and the regulations go hand in hand to get the scale and character right. Otherwise, if you separate the two -- the goals and the regulations, then we're going to have problems.

And so I added also the state statute. It does say zoning regulations. Zoning and conformance to the comprehensive plan. It was always intended for the city to do that. That's why we have a comprehensive plan, and we have goals and policies. I do not think they should be ignored.

And so there is a problem here, and I think that we cannot go on because this really does affect the quality of life for our residents, and we do -- we're here to serve them also and take care of them and getting the right developments in the right place.

Because if you put this four-story up right here, not only are these people going to suffer, the whole community is going to look at, "Wow, where did this come from? This is so out of character for the area." They're going to ask, "Where is the planning in all this?"

So we need to combine what we're trying to achieve and put the right things in the right places with the right scale and character if we really want to have a nice community.

So I don't think we should move forward and approve this. This should not be as tall as it is. It shouldn't even be any taller than two stories. And I should look at being complementary with the surrounding area. So I don't think this should be approved at this point. I think further evaluation is needed on this project.

Thank you.

CHAIR WOLFPLEY: Thank you, Ms. Horvath. I can't remember if I actually swore you in. Did I swear you in at the beginning?
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MS. HORVATH: I think so but, I'm sworn in.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay.

MS. HORVATH: I told the truth.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Let me just ask you to affirm that everything you said is the truth.

MS. HORVATH: (Inaudible).

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Thank you, Ms. Horvath. Appreciate your passion for your area.

Let's hear now from our next speaker. Is there another speaker, Ms. Gomez?

MS. GOMEZ: I have Ms. Megan Fitzpatrick.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Ms. Fitzpatrick, let me find you in our Zoom room. Oh, there you are. Okay. Let's get you unmuted first. Let's see. All right. Can you -- do you know how to unmute yourself, Ms. Fitzpatrick? I'm trying to -- oh, there you are. Okay. Whoa, I don't know if our moderators were all cancelling each other out.

Okay. Ms. Fitzpatrick, do you swear or affirm to tell the truth?

MS. FITZPATRICK: I do.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Please try to keep your comments to three minutes, if you can. Thank you.

MS. FITZPATRICK: Of course. So much like Mr. Sandoval said, I also do object to this format of these Zoom meetings in making such massive decisions for my community. I do believe that it is a violation of the Open Meetings Act. I want that on the record.

Number two, in regard to the notification and it being a computer glitch, completely unacceptable. Again, yes, he did participate, Mr. Sandoval participated in the July meeting; however, that gave us no time to prepare.

So a computer glitch is not acceptable. I own a business. It wouldn't be if I had a computer glitch. I would be punished. I do believe that that's a violation of the notification that you guys were supposed to conduct.

Thirdly, I want to address crime. Again, I live on Rayado, which is the southeast corner of the Seven Bar north community. There is an arroyo behind me, and then behemoth four-story apartments called SkyStone Apartments. They too are luxury, they, too, start at 1500 a month. And, in fact, August 1st, there was a homicide in the SkyStone Apartments right behind me. Okay? Homicide. Crime has gone up on my block because of these apartments. I was living on Rayado before and the apartments and after, and I've noticed a spike in crime. Not only that, I've got a homicide in my backyard.

We don't want -- we are being surrounded by these behemoth apartment. Enough is enough. I would have never purchased my home knowing all this was going to happen.

You've got -- the IDO systematically is allowing for these massive, high density apartments to move into the suburbs and it
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is not fair to us. In fact, the federal government is even addressing this. Trump, thank God, came in and said no more low income in the suburbs. And that's what this is going to become. You can say it's luxury now, but eventually it will. You wouldn't want this in your backyard and nor do we.

Thank you.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Fitzpatrick.

Okay. Ms. Gomez, is there another speaker?

MS. GOMEZ: I have Mr. Roy Fassel.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Mr. Fassel, I see you.

Do you swear or affirm to tell the truth?

MR. FASSELL: I do.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Thank you. Go ahead. If you can keep it to three minutes, we'd appreciate it.

MR. FASSELL: I will keep it to three minutes.

The first public meeting we had that I went to, two subjects. One was the traffic flow as it's related to the school district at the entrance of Seven Bar, and -- and also the Westside single lane.

And now (inaudible) a subject that I haven't heard of and I haven't seen a permit, or at least a letter of intent with the Federal Aviation Administration. The airspace that PR-004 and 5 are in is (inaudible) airspace by the Federal Aviation agency. We have helicopter traffic going both north and south all from Lovelace, and Presbyterian east and west. And I live one block off of Benton and Golf Course in the first cul-de-sac.

And I'm telling you that they're low enough that a four-story built on PR-4, they're going to be sitting in somebody's front door if they also power.

So I don't know, is there -- the question is, has the FAA been advised of the -- the geographical area as far as the bottom of the controlled airspace or not? That's my main concern.

Everything's been talked about, and I'll expect some kind of an answer in the future.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Fassell.

Ms. Gomez.

MS. WOLFLEY: I have no other speakers, Madam Chair.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. And we'll just check the Zoom room really quickly. If you have not had a chance to speak, raise your hand now and I can give you a chance to speak.

Okay. So you need to raise your hand in Zoom. Raise your hand in video or if you're on audio, press star 9 and a hand goes up for us to see.

Okay. So far I'm not seeing anyone new. Okay.

Let's go now to Tierra West and Mr. Stevenson. And would you try
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to address the comments that you've heard from the public.

MR. STEVENSON: Yeah. Richard Stevenson with Tierra West.

I'm going to address some of the questions and the comments, and Ron Bohannan will also address the comments and questions.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Thank you.

MR. STEVENSON: So just going through the notes that I took, firstly, Mrs. Mirabal, I don't recall us ever presenting a 52-foot high apartment complex under the zoning MX-M.

The maximum zoning height is 45 feet, and everywhere that I'm aware of in our plans we've always stated 45 feet. And so this is the first you've brought that up to me. So just to clarify, the maximum building height is 45 feet, which is what we are proposing.

In regard Mr. Mirabal, I'm going to let Ron Bohannan discuss the previous zoning and the previous site plans that came through on this property.

MR. BOHANNAN: So under the C-2 zoning, under the old zoning code, you did do -- there were [sic] a site plan that was approved and denied. But under the C-2 zoning, as articulated in our facilitated meeting by Russell Brito, if you set back from the property line, you can exceed a 26-foot height, and you can actually exceed it quite a bit more than what we are exceeding under the C-2 use.

So the previous site was denied, and so that is off the table. It's never been considered, as well as the C-2 zoning.

As far as transportation, we did reach out to David Serrano, who is the traffic engineer for the City of Rio Rancho. We've had correspondence with David Serrano about the impacts of this site on -- on the corridor, and he did not feel that any additional impacts, other than what they've already identified, would be (inaudible) of that area. And we provided that in correspondence to Jeanne Wolfenbarger for that.

Golf Course is a corridor. It's a minor arterial corridor, and as such, has a little bit more traffic than what a residential corridor is. And so with that, that's where the corridor comes into -- to play.

As far as the traffic impact threshold, we reached out to the traffic engineer with Jeanne's office, Matt Grush, this is half the threshold, so it's not even close to meeting the threshold for a traffic study, and as such, one is not warranted.

As far as crime, crime is a problem in the City of Albuquerque. It is rampant throughout the entire city, and it is something that the City of Albuquerque needs to address. It's not as a result of people inhabiting different buildings within the city. So with that, we'll look at it. There's nothing really to address with crime as far as the IDO and the specific building.

As far as airspace, the two heliports, one at Lovelace Hospital and one at Rust Medical Center, the minimum airspace threshold over any parts of a populated area is 1500 feet. The threshold for the airspace for those two heliports we'll check into if they have an approach on both of those, and we should be well outside of that airspace. But we will check with the FAA, look at those airspace approaches to that area.
Do you want to address setbacks on landscaping?

MR. STEVENSON: Sure.

So there was some comments in regard to lack of protection for the adjacent neighborhood. I do want to just restate that in the IDO there are edge buffer requirements set up to protect any adjacent residential zoning from an MX-M or high density commercial, for example, zoned lot.

In this case, we do have the 50-foot buffer, plus we also have the hundred-foot minimum setback from the property edge to the buildings.

In this scenario on our plans, we do have 136 feet setback from the property line. It was -- there was some photos, and I noticed in one of the backdrops of Larry's -- with his presentation, he referred to an apartment that overlooked some residences. And then I also noticed in Rene Horvath's presentation, she referred to another complex on the West side.

We don't have addresses for those developments, but from the looks of it, it appears that they were built prior to the minimum setbacks. So trying to draw some parallels with what you've shown and what we're proposing, I think it's unfair and falls short, because it is quite different.

Just to go through some of the other comments and questions, in regard to the Open Meetings Act, I've asked that the city respond to that. And I notice that Ms. Gould has responded to a number of the concerns that are on file in regard to violation of the public meetings act. As well --

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: (Inaudible).

MR. STEVENSON: As well, I've touched on the notification.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: (Inaudible).

MR. STEVENSON: -- and still stand by what I said, in that we did follow the ONC requirements. And so if the city would like to comment on that further for Ms. Fitzpatrick, that would be good.

There was a reference to the cross-section. So what we tried to detail on that cross-section was the height of the trees at planting as well as the height of the trees at maturity, to try and give some sense of scale. So I did also list in the previous responses to the neighborhood questions size of -- the calibers that would be planted, minimum heights, minimum calibers, and then the overall maturity height for those trees and the shrubs.

In regard to Ms. Horvath's presentation, we received the comments last night. In regard to the five items, we are going to work to address Ms. Horvath's comments. I do note that they are more overarching, high level comments, rather than specific to this development. We will try to work and provide some clarification where it's possible with regard to our development and how we meet that.

For example, on the solar access, I previously mentioned that we do follow the IDO requirements in that section and we did meet all those -- those setbacks and the solar access requirements.

So I think, Madam Chair, if I can turn it back to you and hopefully we can proceed to get DRB board comments. Thank you.
CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Stevenson.

I just want to go through here quickly and maybe pick up a couple of things. Some of our speakers have talked about objecting to the DRB meeting, Zoom meeting, during this pandemic. I do note that we received several e-mails regarding that and we responded to all those e-mails with information from the declarations of public health emergency that the city has put out. We're in our seventh declaration of a public health emergency. And within that declaration, it refers to the State of New Mexico attorney general authorizing that public hearings can proceed in a video conference format and be in compliance with the Open Meetings Act.

And so we are doing everything possible to try to make sure this type of format is open to the public and that we're addressing your concerns.

I also just wanted to refer to concerns about the zoning entitlements that are on the property that do allow a 45-foot structure. It meets other criteria related to parking, landscaping, edge buffer treatments, et cetera. And those are entitlements that are in the MX zone which was approved for this project in a legislative zoning conversion done by the city council in 2018.

And that action in 2018 is what is current and gives the authorities the process and entitlements that we are functioning under today. Whereas, there may have been previous site plans and things in place or considered in the past, what the DRB must consider and has no authority to consider anything outside this, is what the city council approved with the zoning conversion to this property for MX-M, and with the process rules and design and use rules that are in place in the IDO.

And I think if you look at staff comments, especially from code enforcement and planning, you'll see that we combed through the IDO and all the provisions that we have found are applicable to this site and we've evaluated the project according to -- to those authorities. And the DRB does not have authority to step outside of the IDO and the DPM in considering other matters.

And I'd just like to refer to Page 396 of the IDO, policy 6-6(G)(3) sets out the review and decision criteria for a site plan DRB. And in particular, it says the site plan complies with all the applicable provisions of this IDO, the DPM, and other adopted city regulation and any conditions specifically applied to the development of the property in the prior permit or approval affecting the property.

The DRB also has to review infrastructure and public improvements, that there's adequate capacity to serve the proposed development, and that the site plan mitigates any significant adverse impacts on the surrounding area to the maximum extent practicable.

And those are the three decision criteria that the DRB can legally use to review a property owner's site plan. We cannot use criteria that the EPC reviews, which does include the comprehensive plan. That is not an area that the DRB has been authorized to review a site plan against.

I also just wanted to note that the property in play is a platted lot and it is separate from the property to the north, which is its own platted lot. Regardless of ownership, we can deal with
just the lot that is in this site plan because it is legally plotted as such.

Once again, just circling back to notification, we do not know why Mr. Sandoval's name was left out of the sweep that brought up all the addresses in the buffer map.

Mr. Rodenbeck, are you able to look up that buffer map really quickly for us?

So just because this question keeps coming up, I want to make sure people have the best understanding of how this works. An applicant works with the city in identifying a buffer map that shows those property owners that are within a hundred feet of the subject site. And from that buffer map, which draws a line and includes specific lots within the buffer area, then an address list is generated corresponding with those lots. And this is generated for the applicant by the city, and then the applicant is required to do mail notice. And the mailed notice is a three-day notice, so that you would have three days prior to a public meeting like this in order to be aware that that public meeting was going on.

And we do not know why Mr. Sandoval's address was not included. But we do know that Mr. Sandoval was able to participate July 22nd and then -- and in this meeting, and the mailed notice would have provided a three-day notice of such meetings.

So here is the buffer map which shows anything within that blue line. A portion of that property in that blue line would have triggered an address generated for the applicant to mail notice to. And Mr. Sandoval presented to staff a detailed listing of notice and staff went through that very carefully, conferring with the applicant, and we found that all the properties in this buffer map had received notice except for Mr. Sandoval's address.

Also on notice, there's been discussion about a sign that was in the bushes teetering away from where it was visible. When the applicant was made aware of this, they corrected the sign. I think the signs are still in place. And those signs are to help people be aware of the first public meeting that's going to be held on a project. And we understand that those signs are still there and people are becoming aware. DRB often reviews a case several times before approval. And so more people are able to participate in these meetings as they progress.

But once again, we have a standard of reasonableness with regard to notice, and we determined that the applicant had met that standard of reasonableness in their sign posting and in their mailed notice.

Okay. And some of the other issues I think will come up as we go through DRB comments. So let's do that now, going to water authority.

**MR. CADENA:** This is Kris Cadena with the water authority. *(Inaudible)* hearing a little bit of back feed. I don't know if that's on someone else's end.

So the property is outside the adopted service areas, so we'll need to get water authority board approved development agreement. And we provided you that boilerplate, so we'll get that going, and we'll make sure to send that to legal once we have all the other exhibits. We'll work together to get that resolved. With regard to the utility plan,
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If you can please label the existing public sanitary sewer along the southern frontage. Also label the appropriate private sanitary sewer along the southern property frontage, just so it's clear.

Also note -- there's a note that indicates a private -- a 20-foot private exclusive easement for public sewer, which is not correct. I think that should be written as a public easement.

And rather than extending public sanitary sewer to the proposed roundabout for future access to existing Tract G-1, in an effort to minimize on-site public sewer, it seems the public sanitary sewer may be better suited to extend due north. This would require the relocation of proposed dumpster enclosure near the northeast corner of the development. We could talk about this a little bit more, if you had discussion with the developer to the north and maybe a more appropriate alignment. I just wanted to get your thoughts on that.

Keep in mind that the vacation of the existing public sanitary sewer easement, as well as granting of the new public sanitary sewer easement will be required.

A previous comment that I had was to label all proposed on-site private waterline accordingly. There's a proposed 6-inch waterline that should be labeled or shall be labeled as private.

A proposed 8-inch water meter is being used to create the single correction for what seems to be private on-site waterline loop for both domestic and fire protection. Typically fire lines are unmetered and separate from metered service. I'd like for you, if you haven't done that already, confirm with the fire marshal that they approve fire protection downstream of a metered service. It's my understanding that they're really not in favor of that. And we can talk about that if we need to.

With regard to the infrastructure list, the proposed public sanitary sewer items indicated the northern terminus is the northern property boundary of existing Tract D-1, which is incorrect. I'm guessing you meant the southern boundary.

And that's all that I have. Thank you.

MR. BOHANNAN: Kris, this is Ron Bohannan. I've got a couple questions. Can -- if -- do we have to have board approval before you can take delegation on this site plan?

MR. CADENA: This is Kris Cadena with the water authority. Yeah, I wouldn't feel comfortable allowing a development to take place without the board approving it for service.

MR. BOHANNAN: Okay. So we've got the development agreement in front of the developer and working towards that. We can't make the August meeting, but we believe we can make the September meeting. Do you think that's feasible?

MR. CADENA: This is Kris Cadena with the water authority. What makes you think that we can't make the August meeting?

MR. BOHANNAN: Because it's August 19th. Do you think --

MR. CADENA: Yeah, give -- give -- this is Kris Cadena -- this is Kris Cadena with the water authority.

Give us a little credit. We'll do our best if we can. We can -- we can rush -- I mean, we -- our deadline to have everything in
for the board is on the 10th of August. I mean, if you already had your serviceability letter written, I just need Richard to provide me a couple quick exhibits, you know, a vicinity map with the areas shaded, a plat showing the subject property, staple those two together with the serviceability letter and get that to the -- the development agreement over to legal and in their hands and hopefully we can make it. So we can definitely try.

MR. BOHANNAN: And thank you for that. We were just trying to figure out where we're going to -- where we're going to defer to. So that was -- that was the reason for that comment.

The other comment that I have is what we were looking at doing is a compound meter, probably a 3-by-8 complete meter for that. And so we'll circle back around with the fire marshal. So with that compound meter, we would have a loop around the building for the fire protection line. That would remain private. And then we'd have the 3-inch domestic meter for the domestic service. That was the intent of that approach.

MR. CADENA: This is Kris Cadena with the water authority.

That makes sense. Just be mindful, and you may want to talk with our customer service group, I don't know what they'll charge you for as far as the UECs, because in the end you'll never use the full capacity. So your client may be incurring much greater UECs for opening up an account for a much larger meter than will he have be used unless there is a fire. Thus, really, the installation of unmetered fire lines.

But I can definitely understand what you're trying to do, maybe minimize on-site private infrastructure and accomplish it all by a single waterline as opposed to a parallel waterline. So that -- that makes sense, it's just you may want to do a cost analysis and see what's best for you and your client. Just keep that in mind, that UECs could be big.

MR. BOHANNAN: Yeah, and we are aware of that and we're working with the mechanical for the apartments to figure out the fixture units and to set that up.

I think we have all your other comments that we can address easily.

Richard, (inaudible).

MR. STEVENSON: This is Richard Stevenson.

Jay, is it possible to share my scene. I have a pending exhibit for Kris that I can show just in regard to coordinating with the engineer on the tract to the north and the alignment of the public sewer line.

MS. GOULD: This is Maggie Gould. It's now set up for Tierra West to share their screen.


So, Kris, I see this prior e-mail, and we can discuss our plan if that's possible. But what I wanted to show you is information that I've received for the northern tract is a future private roadway that's going to divide this Tract D-1 into two parcels. I'm not sure what the overall development would be for this parcel sometime in the future.

But I -- what we had discussed, myself and the other engineer,
was extending public sewer line to enable the future connections for any future subdivision within Tract D-1. So what I've done, actually, is realign the sewer line so it actually then connects well with that future roadway to the north.

So we think this is the best alignment. But, again, having it discussed further offline. And I did update the infrastructure list to show the terminus of the sewer line would be a certain distance offset from the northern property line.

What is showing in red is the proposed 20-foot-wide public sewer easement, which we were asked -- which we would prepare by document. And then we would also work to vacate the existing easement over on the east side of the property.

Obviously when future development comes to the tract to the north, they would have to do whatever easement is required for that sanitary sewer line.

So that is what I'd just like to bring and put on the record.

In regard to the infrastructure list, I'd still be taking a deferral, which we can discuss in a moment. But I did update the infrastructure list to correct the language for that public sanitary sewer extension.

And prior mentioned, I've addressed the other comments in regard to labeling.

So we would very much appreciate, and I'll do everything I can to get you the exhibits so we can push through the development agreement through legal. And then beyond to the board meeting for the 19th.

Thank you.

MR. CADENA: This is Kris Cadena with the water. Yeah, showing that future development to the north helps, and it gives me a -- a better idea. And I do like your proposed alignment. Just make sure all manholes are installed in areas where big (inaudible) trucks, those big behemoth vehicles are able to access and pull up to the manhole.

And I like your alignment, because it keeps it in the roundabout of the corridor, as opposed to now going north, what now looks like to be a side-yard easement on proposed Tract D-1-D to the north. So yeah, your alignment looks good. I assume or trust that you've looked at grades and made sure that appropriate slopes and covers can be achieved to serve future development to your northern neighbor.

And that's all that I have. Thank you.

MR. STEVENSON: Thank you for your comments.

MR. GARCIA: Good morning, this is Carl Garcia with code enforcement.

Just want to verify, there had been a previous comment that there was going to be a 6 -- up to a 6-foot wall in an area that was only allowed a 3-foot height. And it would be required a variance. I believe you stated that the record -- for the record that the fence is going to be lowered to 3 feet. And I just wanted to verify if that's the case.

MR. STEVENSON: This is Richard Stevenson. Good morning, Carl.
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Good to see you.

Yes, I did identify that. I actually modified the note, Note Number 19.

MR. GARCIA: Yes.

MR. STEVENSON: So we're placing a 3-foot -- 3-foot wrought-iron fence on top of the 3-foot (inaudible) block wall along the northwest and south perimeter of the property. And then as required by the IDO, on the eastern boundary, we would have the 6-foot opaque wall.

MR. GARCIA: Okay. So just want to be real clear. So any -- in the MX-M, any wall or fence in the front of street side can only be up to 3 feet high or any combination. So are you intending to have 3-foot block with 3-foot wrought iron above it, on top of it?

MR. BOHANNAN: Carl, this is Ron Bohannan with Tierra West. We'll modify that detail and look through that. We'll probably have a two-wall section along Golf Course and the north side.

MR. GARCIA: Okay. Just -- just for the record letting you know if there's any wall over 3 feet, and that's a combination of any type, in the front yard or street-side yard, that will require a variance. And either way, you'll still require a wall permit through our zoning permit counter here, so --

MR. BOHANNAN: Okay.

MR. GARCIA: -- separate from -- from your submittal for plans.

MR. BOHANNAN: This is Ron Bohannan. Thank you.

MR. GARCIA: Thank you. That's all I have. I have no further comments or no objections.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Garcia. I was trying to catch in between there, I made -- I left asking for something that's important. I'm going to go back to Mr. Cadena and go through all the DRB members. I would like you to disclose if you had any ex parte communications and the nature of those done for the July 22nd meeting. So this would just need to refer to ex parte communications between July 22nd and today's meeting now.

Mr. Cadena.

MR. CADENA: This is Kris Cadena with the water authority. Yes, I believe there had been some e-mails between Richard and myself talking about development agreements and possibly the comments for a utility plan through e-mail correspondence. Thank you.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Thank you.

Okay. Mr. Garcia.

MR. GARCIA: I have not had any ex parte communication with anybody on this project. I'm not 100 percent sure if my staff has, but I have not.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Thank you.

Ms. Somerfeldt.
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MS. SOMERFELDT: This is Cheryl Somerfeldt with parks and rec. I have not had any ex parte communication regarding this case.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Mr. Armijo.

MR. ARMJO: Ernest Armijo, hydrology. I have not had any ex parte communications on this case.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Ms. Wolfenbarger.

MS. WOLFENBARGER: This is Jeanne Wolfenbarger with transportation.

I have had ex parte communications through e-mail involving contact with Rio Rancho and verifying that David Serrano had no issues with this development.

I also -- we also discussed the need for the public street lighting, as well.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Thank you.

And this is Chair Wolfley. Since the July 22nd meeting, I've had no ex parte communications on the project.

Okay. We are still on board comments. And we are ready to go to parks and recreation.

MS. SOMERFELDT: This is Cheryl Somerfeldt with parks and recreation.

The last time I read the open space division comments, which primarily said that because this project abuts the Black Arroyo, which drains into the open spaces Calabacillas Arroyo, that they would prefer all native plants to be planted on the landscape, in the landscape design. So we would like to know, I guess, the reasoning for choosing plants that are not native.

One of the parks -- or the parks comments included that at a minimum, we would like the Chinese Pistache either removed or replaced because it is potentially invasive. And that the -- the City of Albuquerque's Pond Control Ordinance should be followed so that any junipers listed should be noted to be female only, in parentheses, after that name. But primarily, those are not native either. So I guess the question would be, you know, is it possible to move toward a more native palette.

That's all. Thank you.

MR. STEVENSON: Okay. This is Richard Stevenson. Yes, I'll work with the landscape architect to respond to your comment and, as required, update the landscaping, especially along the Black Arroyo to be natives, and we will update our landscaping plan to address.

Thank you.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. And just a note, Mr. Stevenson. You're just a little bit hard to hear. Mr. Bohannan comes through clearly. I don't know where your microphone is, but let's see if you can improve that. That would be good for our audience.

Okay. Let's go to hydrology.

MR. ARMJO: Ernest Armijo, hydrology.
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Hydrology has an approved conceptual grading and drainage plan with an engineer stamp date of June 26th, 2020. We have no objection.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Thank you.

Transportation.

MS. WOLFENBARGER: Good morning. This is Jeanne Wolfenbarger with transportation. I'm going to could have some of my comments first, and then move to the -- some of the neighborhood questions.

So -- so first of all, thank you for updating the walkway widths. I just wanted to make sure all of the walkway widths were shown. Minimum 6-foot pedestrian way is required from the -- from the main building to the right-of-way. It looked like it fell short just north of the main building.

Make sure all the curb ramps are labeled as needed through the site and for this 6-foot pedestrian crossing.

And then I just noted some areas where curb needed to be called out, such as the pathway in front of the clubhouse for the traffic circle, and then the radius for that traffic circle to the north of the site.

Clear sight triangles, I did get comments that there were some clear sight triangles, but I couldn't find them anywhere in the submittals.

I just wanted to make sure also that we would -- we were going to follow ASHTO requirements based on speed for those clear sight triangles at both access ways. And I just wanted to make sure, too, that the trees and bushes were out of the way out of that clear sight triangle.

I did make a comment on the public street lighting, and thank you for adding it to the infrastructure list that you just presented today.

I -- I do want to add, you know, street lighting and all that for tenants, and I also would like to see a street lighting exhibit showing some locations. It could also add a note that during DRC design, the street light locations will be finalized at that time based on the illumination design.

And then I just wanted to see if we could provide a distance between the property line and the walkway, just because the neighbors had some concerns about distance between the property line and the walkway. Just if you could add a dimension there.

And -- and also, you had given me a comment about -- about -- about across easement, which is fine per plat. But I didn't see the copy of that plat. If there is one that exists, that's fine. I just -- I would just like that for my records, and I couldn't find that in this package.

I would like to note again that this development does not meet the threshold for needing a traffic-impact study. It does fall below -- you know, fairly below -- the threshold -- fairly well below to threshold. The development to the north, as I understand, will be sold off at some point, and at that time we will review that development for traffic study requirements under the new -- under the new DPM requirements.

QuickScribe
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And oh, I just also wanted to note that there were some questions about the trip generation manual that was used to determine the threshold last time. I did want to note that that's -- the 10th edition is the most recent addition that's been used. And it was done in 2017. That trip generation manual is based on uses and data collected throughout the country to determine how many vehicular trips go in and out of a certain type of -- type of development.

And I think -- let's see. That -- that does conclude my -- conclude my comments.

CHAIR WOLFLER: Okay. Ms. Wolfenbarger, do you have a number of the trips generated in the a.m. peak hour or the p.m. peak hour for this project?

MS. WOLFENBARGER: So it was roughly about a hundred -- let's see. We've got -- we've got it up here on the screen. That's what -- that's what I was looking for.

CHAIR WOLFLER: Okay.

MS. WOLFENBARGER: So if you'll look, a.m. peak hour entering is 19, exiting is 55. And then the p.m. peak hour, entering, 56, exiting, 36. That's during the -- during one hour, the peak hour.

CHAIR WOLFLER: Okay. And I think that's kind of helpful, just for people to know what those actual numbers are.

And then thank you for providing the basis for where those numbers are coming from.

Okay. Mr. Stevenson, any questions for Ms. Wolfenbarger?

MR. STEVENSON: Thank you, Jeanne. This is Richard Stevenson.

Jeanne, just one clarification on the street lights. In your comments you provided, you didn't reference the street lighting exhibit. If that's something you would like to see in preparation for the resubmittal, can you just clarify that or provide an update on the comment sheet so I can make sure I addressed all of your comments and resolve those items?

MR. BOHANNAN: And -- and -- this is Ron Bohannan.

Jeanne, as well, are the street lights maintained by DMD, and would they be the agency to establish the criteria for spacing at street foot-candles?

MS. WOLFENBARGER: This is Jeanne Wolfenbarger with transportation.

Per the new DPM requirements, there will be an illumination design required with the LED lighting, and we will be coordinating with traffic operations on this.

MR. BOHANNAN: Okay. If you can send through the individual who we can coordinate with, we'll reach out to them.

MS. WOLFENBARGER: Okay. We can definitely do that. And Matt Grush may be able to help you with that, as well, as he has some street lighting design experience.

MR. BOHANNAN: We do, as well
DRB Minutes, Agenda Item 3
August 5, 2020

MS. WOLFENBARGER: And as far as the --

MR. BOHANNAN: This is Ron Bohannan. We do, as well.

MS. WOLFENBARGER: As far as the street lighting exhibit, I just was wanting to look at rough street light locations.

MR. BOHANNAN: Okay.

MS. WOLFENBARGER: For the purposes of putting the financial guarantee together, we just wanted to get a good enough cost for the financial guarantee for the infrastructure list.

Thank you.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Thank you. Let's now go to planning comments.

MR. RODENBECK: This is Jay Rodenbeck. We had a couple remaining comments. One of them was regarding the wall height, which code enforcement addressed.

Another -- the other remaining comment we have is regarding the presence of the proposed block wall on the eastern boundary of the site, and the gap between it and existing block wall along the adjacent subdivision, along that eastern boundary. We're just concerned because of possible maintenance issues and unwarranted access.

And that was -- that's all I have. Thank you.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Tierra West, do you have any comments on that? I'm sure you've kind of been thinking about that.

MR. BOHANNAN: No, and so the last -- this is Ron Bohannan.

The grounds are maintained through that area. What we will do is make sure that we include that in the maintenance portion. But that still be the responsibility of the land owner to maintain that, to maintain that area. We're familiar with those (inaudible) lands, so...

CHAIR WOLFLEY: This is Chair Wolfley again.

I'm kind of curious why you chose this option.

MR. BOHANNAN: One is it's required by the IDO. That's -- that's the main reason.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. And can -- this is Chair Wolfley again. Can you explain how complicated or possible it would be, and this would be to be with the homeowners' concurrence, but to raise the existing wall rather than build a new wall.

MR. BOHANNAN: This is Ron Bohannan with Tierra West. In my almost 40 years of experience, we've tried to raise walls on many projects, and it sounds like a good idea. But you have to have 100 percent concurrence.

The other issue is you don't the structural integrity of those existing walls, how they were built, what is the footing foundation on -- on those walls. And then, in a lot of instances, a lot of those walls are 6 feet, so you would end up exceeding that and have to do a wall variance.
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So with that said, it's just a lot easier to set back the wall and build a new wall to meet the IDO requirements.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. I'm going to ask our city engineer, Mr. Biazar, do you have any comments on this? Planning staff was just a little concerned about creating this sort of no-man's land here.

MR. BIAZAR: This is city engineer manager, Shahab Biazar.

Well, first I agree with Mr. Bohannan, touching that existing wall, it's hard to determine what is the integrity of that existing wall and -- and -- and it -- it -- it -- yeah, you don't want to be building a, you know, additional box on top of an existing wall.

And the 6-foot buffer, it will be -- I mean, I just refer back to the developer how they're going to maintain that. It is a tight space, but that's something that needs to be worked out with the property owner.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Thank you.

And, Mr. Stevenson, is it correct that you have, like, adjusted where your path is along that eastern edge?

MR. STEVENSON: This is Richard Steven.

Yes, I did shift that exercise trail further away, and I did note this morning the setback of that trail. So from the property edge at its closest point is 23 feet at the northern bend. So I did increase the setback of that trail, yes.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Thank you. Would you mind, for a second, just bringing up your cross-sections that we asked you to develop. Mr. Rodenbeck had those up a little while ago, and I think it might be helpful if you would just talk through what you learned from doing that.

MR. STEVENSON: This is Richard Stevenson. I can share my screen if that works (inaudible).

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Go ahead. And then you can kind of control what -- what you want to control there.

MR. STEVENSON: Okay. One moment. It seems I've lost my Zoom controls.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Yeah, they have a way of hiding when you get a lot of things open.

MR. STEVENSON: Okay. I've got it now. Thank you.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: And I think it would just be helpful for people to hear the explanation of what these diagrams mean. Because I appreciate Tierra West doing this work to try to help illuminate this -- this area of concern.

MR. STEVENSON: Okay. This is Richard Stevenson.

So this exhibit was prepared really to run a cross-section through the proposed apartment development based on the conceptual grading surface, and then review that surface as it sits with the adjacent single-family homes on the east side.

What I've tried to do is, based on the addresses for those homes,
if they're two story up, showing a two story building; if it's a single story, I've shown a single story.

I'd also like to note that when I did walk the perimeter, some of those cinder-block walls vary in height, so I've gone with typical 6-foot wall. But in some of the cases, I noticed that the actual residences dropped down on their side of the property wall (inaudible) 6 feet. So this is indicative and take it as such.

So what I've done is, really, from the four-story balcony, just run a sight line to clip the top of the proposed new 6-foot wall on the east side of the property. And then I'm showing the -- the plantings of trees when they're installed, and then the trees at mature height, to try and get some scale and context of what the cross-section will look like.

I also mentioned that we tried to, along the east side, grade a bench to provide additional screening protection. So you'll note here that this wall is actually going to be elevated when looking at the park here, the drive (inaudible) of the finished surface. So, for example, if we didn't do that, our finished surface would have been somewhere lower than what you see here. That's, again, just trying to provide some additional privacy, based on the feedback that we received from the neighbors.

As mentioned, we've got to meet the minimum 50-foot buffer. That's all going to be landscaped. We show these trees here. I can refer back to the landscape plan that details the species and shows the spacing, as well. When they are to maturity, they'll be 55 feet in height.

We also have to meet the 100-foot minimum setback from the building to the property line. So the -- the closest the buildings are is actually 135 feet, separated by a buffer. Then we've got head-in parking, drive-off parking, and then the 20-foot setbacks and the landscaping in front of the building.

So I hope these cross-sections have been helpful for the neighbors. I've tried to make them as accurate as possible. As I said, I tried to tailor based on the actual tree height of the single-family residence, and then, as well, the topography that I downloaded from Bernalillo County as to what the grades are on their side of the property to try and show that.

And so I've got the addresses here on this exhibit, so each of the members can take a closer look as to how it will affect their property. Here again, as I mentioned, some of these homes are set lower than how -- on the -- on the tract (inaudible) one side finished elevation, so I've tried, again, to reflect what is truly going to -- going to be seen.

So thank you.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Thank you, Mr. Stevenson for that detailed work. Can you just remind us the size of trees that will be planted in the beginning on that -- just along the eastern edge?

MR. STEVENSON: Yes. Let me pull up the landscaping plan. Let me refer to that in the -- this is Richard Stevenson.

Okay. So in the landscaping plan, in the top left corner, it details the species of trees and the size at install. So they either have a minimum height, for example, of the Austrian pines that on the buffer area that are going to be 6-foot or greater in height. At maturity, they're going to be 35 feet height by
around 25-foot for canopy. So that information was available here on the landscaping plan. (Inaudible) it's going to be a 2-inch-plus caliber trunk, so, again, it's -- these are -- these are typical of what the landscaper would install during the development of the project.

Thank you.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Thank you. One last thing. Some of the public comment has just kind of talked about the long term quality of the dwelling units. I notice that last time you had talked about interior features that the developer was willing to provide in the units. Could you -- do you have that offhand, that you can just clarify orally?

MR. STEVENSON: This is Richard Stevenson. Yes. I'm trying to find the (inaudible).

Okay. So this is what we're seeing from the architect (inaudible) working with the developer in regard to the level of finish for the apartments and the quality. And so I can -- I can run through the high-end finishes that are going to be proposed.

Granite, stainless steel, porcelain tile floors, 9-foot high ceilings, large balconies. Elevator within building. That's a big one. Obviously the clubhouse, again, is a great amendment and feature for the residents, with conference room, meeting rooms, gym, sauna. As well, there's a pool, hot tub.

There's three times as much landscaping than is required. The developer plans to put in water features and sculptures by a local artist. We talked about the exercise trail area and the covered parking, as well, previously.

So this developer has done many projects and he is very in sync with what a luxury apartment complex would be, so that's what he's trying to provide here for future residents.

Thank you.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Stevenson.

Most of these items are all reflected on the site plan. A couple that are not would be the - finishes, including granite, stainless steel, porcelain tile floors and 9-foot ceilings.

Would you be willing add a note to the site plan that specify those interior features?

MR. STEVENSON: Yes, we can do that. This is Richard Stevenson.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Okay. Thank you.

All right. At this point, I need to go back to the public comment and see if there's anyone who has a question to try to ascertain, really, the facts of the case. These aren't -- this isn't a time for additional public comment, because you did have that opportunity, but this would be something we call cross-examination. It means questions that try to ascertain factual information about the case.

Is there anyone who has spoken? If you'll raise your hand and I'll try to see, who needs this time. If you have questions of that nature, a few of them, raise your hand if you would like an opportunity to ask those questions. And this would be directed to the applicant.
Okay. I see one person, Mr. Mirabal. And I don't see others. Okay. Mr. Mirabal, go ahead and proceed. If you can try to keep this as concise as possible, since we've -- we've been at this a while now. But go ahead and ask the question, question or two that you need to. Okay?

MR. MIRABAL: Okay. My name is Mike Mirabal.

I'd just like to ask -- I know we put a lot of emphasis on the IDO restrictions and guidelines. I'd like to know as far as who wrote the IDO, did the developer in this process have any input as far as writing this IDO process, Mr. Bohannan?

MR. BOHANNAN: This is Ron Bohannan, Tierra West.

No, the developer did not have any input under the IDO. The IDO was actually drafted by a private consultant consortium, Dekker, Perich, Sabatini, a local architectural firm, with input from city staff; actually, all of the departments within city staff, and it took them approximately three years to draft the IDO and the comprehensive plan.

MR. MIRABAL: Now, I'd say the developer, but I mean you personally, did you contribute to writing the IDO?

MR. BOHANNAN: No, I did not contribute writing to the IDO.

MR. MIRABAL: Hmm. Interesting.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Mr. Mirabal --

MR. MIRABAL: Yeah.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: -- are those your questions? Okay. Thank you very much.

And because there has been some discussion about the IDO, I just wanted to point out that the IDO goes through annual updates. The 2019 annual update is still before the city council in the LUPZ committee. You might want to go to the city council website or the ABC-Z project page. You can Google ABC-Z, and there's a pretty robust project page. You can also find that from the city's website and become a little bit more informed about what is -- is going on with the IDO and that there are changes currently being considered by the city council.

Let's see. Ms. Horvath, did you want to ask a question?

MS. HORVATH: Can you hear me?

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Yes, we can.

MS. HORVATH: Okay. Yeah, I was just wondering, since we do have a comp plan, when do those policies kick in? When are they reviewed and kicked in to follow the goals and policies that the public was very interested in in getting desirable development?

MR. BOHANNAN: This is Ron Bohannan.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Go ahead, Mr. Bohannan.

MR. BOHANNAN: I can give you my opinion. But the plans and policies as we usually interpret those is when we are doing zone changes from one zone to another, when those plans and policies
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are applicable. The plans and policies were generated first, and the IDO generated second. And so the IDO came out of those plans and policies. And then the third step was the legislative action, where it changed all of the zoning throughout the entire city based on the comp plan and the IDO legislatively. And so that took approximately a three-year process, and there were literally hundreds of meetings with neighbors, property owners and the public. But I could defer to the city that may have a little bit more information.

MS. HORVATH: I have another question. When there was --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Just identify yourself as you're starting to speak, both of you. That one helpful. Thank you.

MS. HORVATH: Oh, this is Rene Horvath.

Okay. So during the IDO process, it sounds like these neighbors were not notified that there was going to be that process.

But also, in the zone conversion of the previous site plan, when did that take place, and where these neighbors notified?

MR. BOHANNAN: This is Ron Bohannan with Tierra West. I'll do this for staff.

The legislative action was globally. And so there was numerous -- during the IDO process and comprehensive plan update, it was advertised in the neighborhood. It was sent out to all of the recognized neighborhood associations. There was, I want to say, well over 300 meetings through that process.

The legislative process is not -- does not require individual notices to all the property owners. I would guess that we answer that question on a daily basis and not weekly at our office with property owners as they come in. But it is one that was done legislatively.

And the city attorney can weigh in on the legality of that process.

MS. HORVATH: And -- okay.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Do you have any question, Ms. Horvath? Just a question.

MS. HORVATH: Yes. And during the zone conversion that took place that you mentioned earlier, were the -- the neighbors notified on the zoning conversion, when that took place?

MR. BOHANNAN: This is Ron Bohannan (inaudible).

I don't know if that particular homeowners association was specifically notified. I doubt it because it was a legislative action. And under a legislative action, they do the normal publication, general public. But that is the purview of the city council, is to take that approach.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Thank you.

Ms. Fitzpatrick, did you have a question? And once again, this is to clarify facts of the case with the applicant. Thank you.

MS. FITZPATRICK: And I just want to clarify something. Our HOA was not notified of this IDO and even though they are recognized by the city, our HOA was never notified of this, and I have that
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in writing. Thank you.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. We need to wrap this up. I see Mr. Sandoval has his hand up.

Do you have one question, Mr. Sandoval?

MR. SAN D OVA L: I'll just take myself off of mute.

I do, and it's -- we -- we've had a number of people that speak about the notification. Again, all I can say is I feel like my rights and the rights of our neighbors have been trampled on by not being publicly notified, by missing an opportunity to convert back to C-2. We were not notified. Not notified by the HOA, not notified by the city.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Mr. Sandoval.

MR. SANO DOVAL: Yes.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Yeah, I can see your concern. I do have to restrict this to questions regarding the facts of the case. Did you have a question about that?

MR. SANO DOVAL: I -- other than going back to the -- again, the -- the true -- the sight line showing the -- this -- supposedly the 35-foot trees. That does not take care of the privacy issue. That still does not address our concerns with privacy. Trees aren't going to do it that are going to agree 20 years (inaudible) --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Mr. Sandoval, we're still not doing questions. And so in order for it to be a fair process, I'm going to need to move on. Okay?

MR. SANO DOVAL: Okay. That's fine.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Unless you -- unless you actually have a question.

MR. SANO DOVAL: I don't have any other questions.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Thank you for your participation and I think we're looking at a deferral for this project, and so --

MR. BOHAN NAN: Madam Chair, Ron Bohannan.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Mr. Bohannan.

MR. BOHAN NAN: Yeah, we would request a deferral to August 26th. That will allow us to get a development agreement in front of the water authority board on the 19th. And then that would be the following Wednesday of that ABCWUA board meeting on the 19th.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Thank you. And then if -- if matters aren't resolved for one reason or another, the DRB would just request that you be in touch with us about a better date if -- if the August 26th date doesn't look like it can be realized.

We're trying to have as much as possible all the something else items completed, all the other approvals needed from outside completed so that we can expeditiously do the work of the DRB.

Okay. Ms. Fitzpatrick is having a hard time hearing Tierra West. So they were just asking, Ms. Fitzpatrick, if they could be
considered for an August 26th deferral date. So they would be heard before this body again on August 26th.

**MS. FITZPATRICK:** That's (inaudible). I can't hear them at all. I haven't been able to hear them clearly this entire two and a half hours. And it was the same time with the last Zoom meeting. So if they can rectify that. Because there's a lot of important information I'm missing because I can't clearly hear them.

**CHAIR WOLFLEY:** Okay. Thank you, Ms. Fitzpatrick.

I -- Tierra West please note that with your facilities that you're using and your mics that you're using, and we can test that with you and make sure that's improved for next time.

There a motion to defer Item Number 3, which is project 2020-4030, Site Plan SI-2020-540 to the August 26th meeting of the DRB?

**MS. SOMERFELDT:** This is Cheryl Somerfeldt with parks and rec. I move to defer Item Number 3 till August 26th.

**MS. WOLFENBARGER:** This is Jeanne Wolfenbarger with transportation. I second the motion.

**CHAIR WOLFLEY:** Okay. DRB members, please vote.

**MR. CADENA:** Kris Cadena, water authority. I approve.

**MR. GARCIA:** Carl Garcia with code enforcement. I approve.

**MS. SOMERFELDT:** Cheryl Somerfeldt, parks and rec. I approve.

**MR. ARMISO:** Ernest Armijo, hydrology. I approve.

**MS. WOLFENBARGER:** Jeanne Wolfenbarger with transportation. I approve.

**CHAIR WOLFLEY:** And Jolene Wolfley, DRB chair approves.

There is a consensus vote of the DRB to defer Item Number 3 to the August 26th meeting. Thank you very much.

(Motion approved.)

(Conclusion of recording ref. Item 3.)
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CHAIR WOLFLEY: Thank you we are now on Item Number 2. And on the agenda it says Project 4030. The full project number is PR-2020-4030, site plan 2020-540, the Calabacillas Group for a project located at Golf Course, between Golf Course Road, the Black Arroyo, and Westside Boulevard.

Would the applicant team please raise your hand. Find you.

MR. BOHANNAN: (Inaudible) Tierra West.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Oh, there you are. You were so small, I couldn't find you. Okay. Tierra West. And that looks like -- is that your complete group this morning?

MR. BOHANNAN: Yes. It's Ron Bohannan, Richard Stevenson and Rick Bennett.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Mr. Bohannan, Ron Bohannan, do you swear or affirm to tell the truth?

MR. BOHANNAN: I do.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. And Mr. Richard Stevenson, do you swear or affirm to tell the truth.

MR. STEVENSON: I do.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: And remind me of the third person there.

MR. BOHANNAN: Rick Bennett.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: I'm sorry.

MR. BOHANNAN: Rick Bennett.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Oh, Rick Bennett. Okay. Yes. The mask is always a little concealing.

Okay. Mr. Rick Bennett, do you swear or affirm to tell the truth?

MR. BENNETT: I do.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Thank you.

Okay. Would one of you please, go ahead and give us an overview of your project.

MR. BOHANNAN: Yes.

Go ahead, Rick.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Oh, sorry to interrupt you. Before we start that, I want to go through each DRB member, and they have an opportunity to disclose any ex parte communications.

Let's start with water authority.

MR. CADENA: Kris Cadena, water authority. I have not.

MR. MONTANO: Vince Montano, code enforcement. I have not.

MS. SOMERFELDT: Cheryl Somerfeldt, parks and rec. I have not.

MR. ARMijo: Ernest Armijo, hydrology. I have not.
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MS. WOLLENBARGER: This is Jeanne Wollenbarger with transportation. I have had some communications over the last week regarding requiring street lighting infrastructure per the DPM requirements. And we also had some discussions about safety issues on Westside Boulevard, as well as discussing the upcoming city project that's going to be built along Westside.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. And this is Jolene Wolfley, DRB chair. And a couple weeks ago, I had a conversation with Ms. Kearney in which we talked about this property and the IDO and zoning conversion process, how the zoning was established for this property, and the scope of the DRB with regard to reviewing this case.

Okay. With that, let's go back to Mr. Bohannan, and you can introduce your case to us. Thank you.

MR. STEVENSON: Thank you, DRB chair. Good morning. Richard Stevenson with Tierra West. We are the agent or Calabacillas group. And so it's clear on the record, I would also like to ABQ Land, LLC.

So before you, we have a site plan for approval. We have a proposed four-story complex, with for a total of 208 units, as well as some associated buildings for the apartment complex.

This is a luxury gated apartment complex located just north of the Black Arroyo Channel and east of Golf Course Road. I do want to make it clear that we are not developing the (inaudible) on Westside Boulevard and Golf Course. I believe Jay's got the site outlined up on the screen for everyone to see.

I just want to run through a couple of items on the site plan. I'm going to give you some background. We have worked very hard with the homeowners association and adjacent neighbors directly east of this property.

So just to summarize, the site is zoned MX-M. We do meet all of the IDO and the DPM regulations associated with that zoning. The maximum building height is 45 feet. We meet all of the setback requirements, and most importantly the 50-foot buffer setback on the east side of the property adjacent to those existing single-family homes.

Again, we meet the parking requirements. And we also provide roughly three times the required landscaping square footage for this project. Again, it is a luxury upscale apartment complex.

A traffic-impact study is not warranted based on the number of apartments for this. We actually fall well short of requiring or meeting the threshold to require a TIS, so one is not being completed per the DPM requirements.

We've held three public meetings with the homeowners association and interested neighbors. Two of those meetings were facilitated, two of those meetings were online. And the last meeting, we actually held in person once the COVID restrictions were eased from the governor.

I do want to state that Tierra West, as the agent, has worked hard to listen to all the concerns of the neighbors. We've worked hard to incorporate, where possible, the suggestions and the recommendations from the neighbors. And so we ask you to consider the site plan that's before you.

We have received the comments from the departments. Thank you. We're working now to address those.
The one item I just want to bring to everyone's attention is we're still waiting on the availability study from the water authority. So as we go through the comments, we can discuss that as such. If a delegation from the water authority cannot be accepted today, we would like to then take a two-week deferral to the August 5th hearing. And I will also note that we understand a few neighbors and homeowners in the neighborhood have signed up to comment on the project, so we will listen to their concerns again today.

Thank you.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Stevenson. And just I think to help maybe some of the members of the public understand how this process goes, the DRB is not able to approve a site plan that does not have a water availability statement. And so there -- Mr. Cadena, can you correct me. There would not be an opportunity to approve this site plan today.

MR. CADENA: This is Kris Cadena with the water authority. Yes, the availability statement is -- is in the works. But one thing that might cause a little bit more of a delay is the need for water authority board-approved settlement agreement. But we can get into that once I start with my comments. Thank you.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. And I just wanted to bring that up so that members of the public that are wanting to speak kind of have an understanding of where the action might -- the scope of the action could occur today.

I'm going to now turn to public comment, and I want to give you some guidance to make your testimony as effective as possible.

The DRB, as I stated at the beginning of the meeting, can only cover application of the IDO and DPM to this property. The DRB cannot deal with past action of the city council to approve the IDO, and the zoning that was approved with the IDO process or any other matters that are not within the IDO and DPM.

And so if you can direct your comments to those items that the DRB can address, that will be the most productive way to express your comments today. And I also want to mention that we do have a lot of speakers. I want to make sure you feel you have time to give your comments. I would ask you, if you possibly can, to keep your comments to three minutes, and -- but know that I won't cut you off if you have something important that you're trying to express.

And if -- if someone has given a comment that you have, if you maybe can refrain from repetitious comments, that might help us as well today. But we know that this case is important to members of the public and we want to hear from you today.

So let me now turn to Ms. Gomez, and can you tell us who our first speaker is.

MS. GOMEZ: The first speaker I have this morning is Kathleen Adams.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. And, Ms. Adams, make sure you're unmuted and I will swear you in. Every speaker for this case will need to be sworn in.

All right. Okay. Ms. --
MS. ADAMS: So I -- I can't really see. The only thing on the screen that I can see right now is the site plan. Can that be removed, by any chance, so that we can see other participants?

CHAIR WOLFELEY: If -- yeah, if that is your wish, we can -- sometimes -- sometimes speakers like to be referring to something on the screen, but during your testimony, we certainly can have that removed.

Ms. Adams, do you swear of affirm to tell the truth?

MS. ADAMS: I certainly do.

CHAIR WOLFELEY: Okay. Go ahead.

MS. ADAMS: So I apologize that my comment is not specifically directed at the IDO, but I think it's still worth you hearing what I have to say.

And from a general viewpoint, from a consumer viewpoint, I would like to say that all decisions, particularly in this particular location, should be driven by consensus, and more importantly, by data.

And one of the things that we have not heard is the data supporting the decision to build a development of this size and scale. Since it is a very stable neighborhood, introducing this many new residents certainly changes the character of the neighborhood.

And I guess we would want to know about length of tenancy. We would want to know -- unfortunately, we can't know about the transportation, the impact on transportation, because a study is not required. But I think that it would really help the community if we could hear some of the background research that you did when you were deciding to begin this development.

Thank you very much.

CHAIR WOLFELEY: Okay. Thank you.

And I'll just note here that the applicant team, I would advise them to take notes of some of the questions the public has, and then they will have an opportunity at the end of public comment to address those questions. And that will help us along.

Ms. Gomez, our next speaker is?

MS. WOLFELEY: Mr. Mike Mirabal.

CHAIR WOLFELEY: Okay. Mike, can you go ahead and unmute yourself.

MR. MIRABAL: Yes, could I ask that Larry Sandoval speak first?

CHAIR WOLFELEY: Who is our speaker after Mr. Mirabal?

MS. GOMEZ: Next speaker is Cathy Mirabal.

MR. MIRABAL: Yeah.

CHAIR WOLFELEY: Okay. I don't see a problem with that.

Mr. Sandoval.
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MR. SANDOVAL: Yes. Yes, this is --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: All right.

MR. SANDOVAL: This is Larry.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: I was looking at you.

MR. SANDOVAL: Yeah. This (inaudible) --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: And just -- I'll let you continue speaking. If you would like the map of the project up when you speak, please let us know that and we'll put it back up.

MR. SANDOVAL: Okay.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Because sometimes it's helpful to be looking at what we're talking about.

MR. SANDOVAL: Sure. That would be fine.

My name is Larry Sandoval, homeowner for 14 years at Carreta Drive. And I do live adjacent to the 100-foot buffer of the proposed development.

I'm not going to go into the -- into the past regarding the one-year voluntary zoning reversion process. But I do want to say that we did have an opportunity, the homeowners of the Seven Bar North had an opportunity to go through that conversion process and we didn't. We were not given that opportunity.

I do want to say that --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Excuse me, Mr. Sandoval.

MR. SANDOVAL: Yes.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: I hate to interrupt. I forgot to swear you in.

MR. SANDOVAL: Yes.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Do you swear or affirm that what you said and what you will say now is the truth.

MR. SANDOVAL: Yes, it is.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Thank you, Mr. Sandoval. Proceed.

MR. SANDOVAL: I think it's vitally important for us to know -- that it is important to know the timeline, the basic timeline of events. We do know that April 7th, that Seven Bar North and APOA executive board had an initial meeting with Tierra West to talk about the planned complex. However, some very key people were not involved in that meeting, and it was the residents that live along that corridor, along that 100-foot buffer. They were excluded from that meeting.

April 14th, notice went out to the homeowners regarding an upcoming meeting, again, a virtual meeting, to talk about the proposed development. And, again, we waited almost a week to hear something. We waited ten days before there was -- before there was an actual meeting.

April 17th, the video teleconference is conducted with a small group of Carreta Drive homeowners. Not everybody was present. Mr. Mirabal was not never notified. He lives along the 100-foot
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buffer as well.

We were blindsided. This was the first time we had ever heard of a planned development. Again, we were all with the expectations of the C-2 zoning be in place. So yes, we were shocked to hear that apartments would be in our backwards.

May 1st, we had an informal meeting with the president of the HOA, Seven Bar HOA. But, again, it was just that, it was an informal gathering, which allowed us to have some dialogue. And it was at that meeting also we were told that we really didn’t have any representation from the HOA and we were kind of on our own.

So it was shortly after that that we began to do canvas, some canvassing within the neighborhood to kind of send the warning signal that: Hey, this is coming up in your neighborhood. Have you heard about this development?

I venture to say that many on the south side of the proposed development were totally caught off guard, they were totally unaware of this development. And so we had subsequent meetings with these families, with these neighborhoods, to let them know.

We also did some canvassing within our own neighborhood, again, to keep them abreast of the new development coming in.

May 21st, May 21st was another subsequent video teleconference, again, which was not very efficient. There were people that were not able to participate.

June 18th was the actual first meeting that we had, face-to-face public meeting with Tierra West, HOA members. This one seemed to be a lot more productive, however, many of our concerns have still not been addressed with that meeting.

And then, of course, here we are today with the development review board meeting.

I do want to also talk about the streamlined IDO process. The IDO process seems to be to the detriment of homeowners rights. (Inaudible) what seems to be off balance and in favor of the developers. Again, that is a personal opinion. My concern is with the balance here.

If homeowners go on through their neighborhood association or coalition, they do have some representation. If they do not, who represents them? They may have limited options for (inaudible). So it's not just about checking off the box, it really is about hearing about the lives of people that have lived in this long-established, (inaudible) neighborhoods.

Just because of the threshold of 247 units doesn't merely just give a green light that -- and just check the box. Again, I see no need for an environmental -- environmental planning commission review. I see that there is no need for traffic-impact study.

However, I do see a borderline section on the form. And I feel that strongly that this is one of those borderline issues. We do have traffic issues that are happening right now. And it's going to happen in the future as this land, this tract, lower tract gets developed and the upper tract gets developed by, again, the same owner.

Let me go on to say that there's no need for parking lot for cultural religious site study. My question for the city
archaeologist is this: How can you determine that a site has cultural or religious artifacts without conducting a study? How can data from historic Google or images reveal previous construction activity? And how can you determine that this property was disturbed, when was it disturbed, and do you have (inaudible) showing the disturbance.

We have, again, no crime statistical impact studies to show what is the effect of high density population such as a major -- four major complexes that are planning to be developed.

We have no study on the impact to schools. We do have some input from APS (inaudible) received yesterday.

As far as I know, I've seen nothing in terms of the wildlife, a wildlife impact study and a protection plan for all the many species of wildlife, dove, quail, road runners, hummingbirds, rabbits, squirrels and coyotes that occupy that plot of land.

And most of all, there's no property value impact study. Need I say more? We're just beginning to see the adverse impacts taking place before our very eyes. Neighbors have been here 20 years, the news got out, we are now seeing people beginning to sell their homes. We have two people, two families that have sold their homes, one sale is pending, and we know of others that are planning to move. So yes, there is a negative adverse impact to the news of a planned development moving in our backyards.

We talked about the plane, the view planes, but we haven't discussed that, and I think that needs further discussion with the applicant.

And let me close with this, the city center and civic corridors. The design and layout of this planned four-story apartment complex according to the IDO does not maintain the quality and character of Seven Bar North Neighborhood or the surrounding neighborhoods for that matter. This planned development will greatly affect the entire community. Again, this is not a city center or transportation corridor. There are no bus routes, no bus service. It's not a transit corridor. Why isn't this definition used in the IDO -- why is the definition of the IDO being used here for or applied here?

This proposed four-story apartment complex does not fit in the neighborhood. It's best suited for a city center or civic corridor. And I will close with this, reiterating my point of engagement and notification. My property is 100 feet away from the development buffer, and I was excluded from the neighborhood process. I did not receive an official letter by mail. I was not listed in this application to the DBR [sic]. The applicant has failed to notify. I'm not pleased that I have been excluded. I don't consider this application complete.

We have expressed many of our concerns to Mr. Stevenson. We also have submitted more detailed information and documents to the DBR, Ms. Wolfley.

Again, I close with this. DBR applicant, thank you for your attention. There are others that I think will be able to add to my concerns. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Ms. Wolfley, you're muted.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Yes, thank you. I've been muting myself a little bit more today because of some noise going on in my house.
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Mr. Sandoval, thank you for your comments.

Once again, I'm having the applicants and any DRB members (inaudible) some of the concerns that they with can address when they get to that point.

Ms. Gomez, who is our next speaker?

**MS. WOLFLEY:** Now it's Mr. Mike Mirabal.

**MR. MIRABAL:** Yes, can you hear me?

**CHAIR WOLFLEY:** Yes, we can, Mr. Mirabal.

**MR. MIRABAL:** Okay. My name is Mike Mirabal --

**CHAIR WOLFLEY:** Just one --

**MR. MIRABAL:** Turn it down.

**CHAIR WOLFLEY:** Do you swear -- could you stop?

**MR. MIRABAL:** Hold on.

**CHAIR WOLFLEY:** Just one second. Just find out where the echo is.

**MR. MIRABAL:** Turn it down.

Okay. Is that better?

**CHAIR WOLFLEY:** That sounds good to me. I wanted to point out to Ms. Adams and anyone else that you can have on the side the participant list. If you click on participant list, you can have a little window --

**MR. MIRABAL:** (Inaudible) over the air?

**CHAIR WOLFLEY:** -- of the participants and you can have it just in a thumbnail view, like a -- and have that to the side as you're looking at the site plan, as well. So we'll continue this way, unless someone objects.

Okay. Mr. Mirabal, do you swear or affirm to tell the truth?

**MR. MIRABAL:** I do

**CHAIR WOLFLEY:** Okay. Go ahead. If you can try to keep your comments to three minutes.

**MR. MIRABAL:** Okay. My name is Mike Mirabal. I live adjacent. I am within the 100 feet. I did -- I'd like to speak to the impact of this development that it's -- it's a major impact to the quality of life for the residents in our neighborhood. It's imperative that every consideration be given to isolate the development from the existing neighborhood.

The initial site plan, which was -- was previously negotiated before they applied for this, was C-2 zoning, conditional use. There was a site plan in place for this property that had some designations for this boundary that they have on the east side, the 50-foot boundary.

That was negotiated through the DRB. We, again, as Larry mentioned, we were never notified of a zoning change as required. Within the hundred feet, we should have been notified that there
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was changes being put in place.

As far as the barrier, we have asked that the -- in that 50-foot buffer that they eliminate the walking -- walking path, because that puts our neighborhood in jeopardy from people coming up to our fence. We would like the walls raised to 8 feet. This is what we've requested. And we'd like at least a minimum 8-foot barrier for sound and safety purposes.

They mention an opaque wall in their plan. We -- to my knowledge, that hasn't been explained. I'm not sure what that opaque wall means.

The walking path, we would like it to be eliminated to prevent walking up against our property lines.

West -- landscaping, we have requested, as per the previous site plan, large river rock that prevents people from walking in that area.

Also, we would -- we would like them not to plant grass because that creates noise; the mowing and landscaping, that's one reason. Plus the water usage that would be required to keep that grass going.

The trees that are suggested are small. They don't provide any protection for privacy for our -- for our neighbors. We've asked that trees be made more mature. We're looking at, you know, 10- to 15-year maturity for those trees to grow up to where they provide some kind of line of site protection from the balconies that are going to be facing our property.

Trash containers that are showing there need to be moved away from our property line and put somewhere else on the property. The lighting, I don't know if the lighting has been addressed, but the lighting needs to be directed away from our properties.

Every -- everything should be done to try and protect that -- that border. I understand, you know, there was a proposal -- well, not a proposal, but Richard Stevenson had suggested moving the -- the walking path to 40 feet away from our wall. But as of yet, I still continue to see that the walking path has not changed. At a minimum, I would like to see that walking path pulled away from our wall and put the 40 feet away towards the parking lot.

As I -- as I say, it's a major impact. Our privacy, the noise, traffic congestion, safety for our residents, crime, school overcrowding, all of this has been ignored because they were able to bypass all of -- all of the protections that should be provided to us through the process, but everything has just been ignored and bypassed on technicalities.

Street, traffic control, they -- the issue on their entrance, if you look at the plat, that entrance is right on a bend in the road and it causes visibility issues. If you look at citations at that location, city police citations, there are numerous citations that have been given at that location. Speeding is a major problem coming down off that hill from Ellison and Golf Course. That entrance needs to be moved.

That's -- I guess that's about it for now. (Inaudible). Okay.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay.

MR. MIRABAL: That's about it. But I may want to add some
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CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. You would have -- the way this works for all speakers is you have an opportunity now where we encourage you to get in your comments and your questions. If after you hear everything later today, if you have some additional questions particularly for the applicant, then you would have another opportunity. But this is your opportunity for comment.

MR. MIRABAL: So I'd also like to state that we have submitted several letters for -- to -- to be put on the record that covers a lot of the comments.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay.

MR. MIRABAL: And I'd like those to be considered in this decision-making process.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Mirabal. And those e-mail correspondence is all being funneled to Ms. Garcia -- or Ms. Gómez so that she can route that to the DRB and also make sure that the record is complete with comments.

Okay. Ms. Gómez, who is our next speaker?

MS. GOMEZ: Ms. Cathy Mirabal.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. And I think I see you there --

MS. MIRABAL: Yeah.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: -- Cathy. Ms. Cathy Mirabal, do you swear or affirm to tell the truth?

MS. MIRABAL: I do.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Go ahead and try to keep your comments to three minutes.

MS. MIRABAL: Okay. Good morning. There's a few things I want to address. One of them is the signage notification that was supposed to be put on the property, it was not visible for at least a week. We actually contacted -- let Ms. Wolf [sic] know about that, and I guess she contacted the developer and the developer went up and set up those -- those signs, what, two or three days ago. I'm not sure when. So just signage was not visible to anyone about this meeting.

Also, Mike did mention on Golf Course. On -- I don't remember if he did mention this or not. The lighting on Golf Course is terrible. At night, you cannot see anything. The traffic is just really bad. Coming in and out there, as he said, but the traffic is -- the lighting is one big issue on Golf Course.

As far as schools, we do know that our elementary school has been to the point of overcrowding. Last year at the end of the year, there was 699 students in there. And it was made for 660 students. That was -- now, if we get this, according to the plans, or the prospects, there's an additional 53 students that will be going to our elementary school. It will also affect Cibola, it will affect James Monroe. And these are important things that need to be considered.

We -- right now, we have terrible traffic coming in and out of Westside. We know that -- I believe that Rio Rancho should be contacted also because the Westside Road is undeveloped and
it's -- it's a -- makes our lives miserable, and with this development it will further make our lives miserable.

We also have, like Mike said, asked for numerous things, and we were supposed to be contacted by the developer to let us know if any of these things were feasible or could be done. We've never heard from them prior to this meeting.

We have lived here 21 years. We are within the 100 feet -- of the development. And we have never been notified of anything. We do not have a neighborhood association. We have an HOA. So they've notified the HOA, but the HOA has not notified us. They don't feel that this is their issues.

So I just want to let you know, we have an established neighborhood. We have looked at the plans for this four-story, which is -- I mean, it's -- it's terrible. We have no privacy. We are worried about crime. We are worried about the change to our neighborhood. These are all feelings, correct, but they are important to us because it's a wonderful neighborhood that we've lived in and we don't want to move. And I just hope that you listen to everything that we're saying.

We did submit something on the -- the -- what's it called, the Open Meetings Act -- the Open Meetings Act. We do not feel this fulfills that. You say it does. And that could be -- that's what it is. But this is a forum that is very difficult to get on, very -- not always --

MR. MIRABAL: Limiting.

MS. MIRABAL: Huh?

MR. MIRABAL: Limiting.

MS. MIRABAL: Yes, it's very limiting. But that are our concerns.

So I am -- I believe I'm done with this, my statement, or my concerns at this point. And I appreciate this meeting. Thank you.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Thank you, Ms. Mirabal.

MS. MIRABAL: Just call me Cathy.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Once again, I'm taking -- I'm taking some notes.

MS. MIRABAL: Okay.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Let's go to our next speaker.

MS. GOMEZ: Next speaker is Megan Fitzpatrick.

Ms. Fitzpatrick, do you swear or affirm to tell the truth?

MS. FITZPATRICK: I do. I do. Can you hear me in.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Yes, I can now. Go ahead and please try to keep your comments to three minutes.

MS. FITZPATRICK: I'll do my best. First of all, I have a question for you. When you first started speaking about this, you said there was something about a water permit or something, so you guys couldn't make a definitive decision today?
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CHAIR WOLFLEY: Yes. And that will be detailed a little bit more when we get to the DRB comments.

MS. FITZPATRICK: Okay.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: So I was just trying to give you an early understanding that there wouldn't be a final action taken today on this project, as -- as far as I can tell from the needs of the water authority.

MS. FITZPATRICK: Okay. So then basically, this will be postponed until further notice; is that what you're kind of saying?

CHAIR WOLFLEY: If -- I apologize for the noise in the background at my home.

MS. FITZPATRICK: It's okay.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: This -- the development review board has to take an official action to refer the case. So I can't say that it will be deferred, but typically, if the water availability statement is not in place, the DRB cannot approve a case. And I just wanted to give you a sense of that. But it's not a final decision until the DRB acts.

MS. FITZPATRICK: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Is that clear?

MS. FITZPATRICK: Yeah.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay.

MS. FITZPATRICK: Thank you for explaining that.

So I'm Megan. I live in Seven Bar community, as well. My home is further east, so this is not going to directly impact, you know, me and my views of anything else.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Madam Chair.

Oh, sorry. Go ahead. Go ahead, Ms. Sanchez, I think -- are you -- I think you're about to say what I'm about to say.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: (Inaudible) Sanchez.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Did you actually swear to tell the truth, Ms. --

MS. FITZPATRICK: Yes.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: I lost track of you. Fitzpatrick. Okay. So let me just make that perfectly clear. What you said and what you will say, do you swear that it is the truth?

MS. FITZPATRICK: Yes.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Thank you. Please proceed. I'm sorry for the interruption.

MS. FITZPATRICK: That's okay. So, again, I've lived through this before, because where my home is Rayado in the Seven Bar community, there are three- and four-story apartments that have come up, been built within the last three years. So there's an arroyo that separates my home from these -- this huge
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Development. My views have been completely ruined. Crime has skyrocketed. The traffic is an absolute nightmare because of these apartments.

So I've lived through this, I know what this is. So for my neighbors that are on Carreta, my neighbors that are west of me, that are going to be butted up against this monstrosity, I know what they're -- they're facing. And it's not pleasurable.

And I think that you guys here in the DRB, you wouldn't want this. You wouldn't want this moving in your backyard either. And that's what we're trying to say. We want you to consider things like our property values, our sight lines, and our community in general. People are moving. We -- we're business owners. We work hard to own homes. And we -- people have to move because of this coming into our backyards? It's not fair. It's not fair at all.

Now, one other thing. We understand that something's going to go here. Okay? We totally get that. Four stories is completely unnecessary. Completely unnecessary. We don't want four stories, nor would you, nor would anybody else. We understand something's going to come in, but we think this needs to be rethought out.

So -- oh, also one more thing. I do believe that this format is limiting. I think it's difficult, and I think for such a massive decision that's going to impact residents like myself and my bottom line during a pandemic, that we're doing it in this forum, I believe this violates the Open Meetings Act and I do not appreciate such a massive decision being conducted in this -- in this manner.

Oh, also and -- and one -- sorry, one more thing. The Westside expansion that's been proposed, the City of Albuquerque has absolutely given the go-ahead on that. Has Rio Rancho? And also, if the construction is supposed to start in the spring, and we're dealing with a pandemic and our city is bankrupt, who -- do you think this construction is going to happen? Absolutely not. So we're going to have incredible traffic problems because I guarantee you, Westside Boulevard is not going to be expanded come this spring. We have no money to do it.

And that's it.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Fitzpatrick. I appreciate your comments.

MS. FITZPATRICK: Okay.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Our next speaker, Ms. Gomez.

MS. WOLFLEY: I have Marlene Marquez.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Ms. Marquez, can you speak up, and you'll --

MS. MARQUEZ: I'm here.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: -- pop up on my Zoom.

MS. MARQUEZ: This is Marlene Marquez.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Ms. Marquez, do you swear or affirm to tell the truth?
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MS. MARQUEZ: I do.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Try to keep your comments to three minutes, please.

MS. MARQUEZ: Thank you. So I'm in the Seven Bar North Neighborhood, but I'm somewhere between Megan and the Mirabals. I'm in Stowe Road, pretty much in the middle of this. So I have a couple of comments that kind of are related to them.

The first one is the traffic. I realize you're not going to do a study, but I've lived here for over 20 years. When we first moved in, the development wasn't even developed to Westside, and Westside wasn't even there. Just the single-family homes being built up to Westside and opening up Westside is only a single lane in each direction, that became an issue.

Our access from this neighborhood to Westside is Seven Bar North or Sierrita. Now, what I see in this document that you posted here, this new development will have easy access to Westside. They'll come up on Golf Course and their best way into the city will be Westside, because there's a light there. They can easily access Westside from their apartment.

Once they hit Westside, what happens to us, especially in rush hour, is being a single lane, it back ups all the way past Sierrita. You can't even get on Westside from our neighborhood because we don't have lights. They will add to that -- that backup on Westside, meaning that our only access out will have to be -- we'll have to be diverted to Ellison to try and get to a light to get out of our neighborhood, because those are the only two exits to our neighborhood. So that's one of my biggest concerns. The timing of this being before Westside is addressed, because we'll be locked into our neighborhood traffic-wise. That's -- that's vehicle traffic.

My other concern is pedestrian traffic. And I want to kind of lean into what Megan mentioned, because we were here when the multi complex apartment complex came in on Coors, on the east side of our neighborhood. And you'd think that it wouldn't impact me in the middle of the neighborhood, but it did, because our neighborhood has multiple walking trails, so people can access our neighborhoods much easier than driving through. It also makes them kind of invisible coming through our neighborhood. It's like somebody jumping into your backyard and you not noticing it.

So what we saw when that east-side apartment complex come in, we saw more traffic through our trails. And what I saw, because we have cameras now in our -- our home because the crime did go up, vandalism went up and small crime went up. They started coming into our garages, they started coming into our vehicles. And what happens, what I see on our cameras is they go through the trail, come in walking into the neighborhood and disappear out the trail, so you can't even see the crime driving in through your neighborhood. So that's a real concern for me.

Also, because of the location of this, you have traffic. If anyone goes to Cibola, they will walk through our neighborhood. And the vandalism will probably go up because for whatever reason, Cibola brings a lot of the vandalism to our general area. So I have an issue with that as well.

And to mention what -- what Megan also mentioned about having this four-story apartment complex for the Mirabals and everybody else on the back corridor, when they expanded our neighborhood,
behind us was level (inaudible). And then they (inaudible) behind is two-story buildings that are raised 2 feet. And they have perfect views into our home now. You can't build a wall big enough. Now you'll have to -- that neighborhood will have to just keep their curtains closed. So the multiple people, the multiple families all along that corridor who can look out, can't look into their -- their back windows. I know that only because that happened top us. We had to raise our back wall because the trail went up 2 feet. And then we just had to build a patio and put up curtains so our back neighbors couldn't look directly into our house.

So those are three issues: Pedestrian issues; traffic issues; the -- the views into your home that eliminate your privacy.

But then I have a question, and this would be between our HOA and Tierra West. This multi-family home, if they're not in the HOA grouping, if they're not in our HOA, their access to enjoyment, sort of suburban enjoyment will be our trails and it will be our parks. We're the ones who pay to keep -- upkeep that. And I'm not sure if they'll just be adding use to the parks and use to the trail, but we will have to be cleaning up after, fixing because of the extra traffic. I don't know who's going to be paying or if they will be able -- if they'll be paying for use for that. Because around -- everything else around them is commercial. So their access to enjoyment will be through our neighbors.

That's all.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Thank you, Ms. Marquez.

And once again, we're taking notes.

Ms. Gomez, who is next?

MS. GOMEZ: Next person I have is Marsha Kearney.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay, Ms. Kearney --

MS. KEARNEY: Yes.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: -- if you can unmute yourself. Do you swear or affirm to tell the truth?

MS. KEARNEY: Yes, I do.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Please try to keep your comments, if you can, to three minutes. But we do want you to feel like you get a chance to speak.

MS. KEARNEY: Okay.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Thank you.

MS. KEARNEY: I will do that. Actually, what everyone's been talking about, they've covered a lot of the topics, but first of all, I am really upset that the zoning was changed without us knowing, because the change in the zoning is very detrimental to the community and to myself. I live right adjacent to the property.

And also, I've been trying to read through the IDO process, and what I see is this just literally gets rid of community involvement and planning as it's meant to be, considering all the issues, concerns, opportunities together.
And my first area is notification. And I'm extremely concerned because this is happening during the pandemic. Yet we only had three and a half weeks where only the people with adjacent land were notified. And we -- and we knew the issues involved a lot more people, the entire community here and also Rio Rancho. And yet, during the pandemic, we're supposed to do the outreach and review. During normal times -- three and a half weeks for this is -- is not enough time. And especially with it being the pandemic, when -- and we're at a process where judicial processes have been put on hold. The virus is spiking once again. And to say this is essential business is a travesty.

And on notification, Tierra West had a meeting with HOA executives early April, yet nobody along this street in our neighborhood was invited to that meeting.

And also, Tierra West executive board were sent certified letters from Tierra West after that meeting. But when we got notification, it was just first class mail. So how do they know everyone was contacted? And as you heard, one of our residents didn't get contacted at all.

All they had to do was put a sign up at the site. And we looked -- I looked for that sign for a week and a half, and finally when I slowed down and parked on the side could I see the sign. It was very inconspicuous. That sign was supposed to be up starting July 7th. Yet, this was on -- they didn't move it to another sign, which by the way is very visible. It's attached to the Youngblood sign. But that was on Monday, the 20th. So, there's a whole span of time when people were not notified about this project.

And community engagement, this is not community engagement. They did most of their correspondence with the HOA, which doesn't even represent us in this situation. And I don't understand why they waited so long to contact us.

Also, Youngblood Realty Company, which has all the for sale signs up long this area, they still list the properties as C-2. And also with speaking to them, they indicated there are plans for development of the second half of the vacant lot behind us, which is owned by the same owners.

So I'm asking the question, why aren't these being considered at the same time? Because the impacts are -- what impacts are from this is just going to be exemplified when you consider both lots.

Also, on May 21st, Tierra West said on their website -- they had something up about another project, The Castles. And this is a quote from there: Numerous appeals filed by the neighborhoods were successfully defended through city council and on to district courts.

That was on their website. And for them to say they -- they've done all the notification and working with us, these to me, are indications that's not the truth. And the meeting in June, there were promises made, there were proposed changes. None of them that I could see were included in this package that was sent forward.

I also have a concern about water flow, especially the runoff. We're at the lowest level of the site. And right now, we get runoff that goes by during the storms. Like we had one last night. How's this project going to implement -- affect that? And we've seen the plans, but they're not very specific. And that's a major concern.
With the schools, I do have a question, because I saw the APS comments, and it's -- for the school system, this is a very bad move. You'd be putting 99 -- the estimate is 99 kids into the school system that's already full. And there's no plan to expand the existing schools. So my question to you is how is that input being acted on in this process? And so I'll wait to get an answer on that. But also, with the traffic situation, if you have 99 students on average, they would -- that are thrown into the system, all those students have to go south in the morning to go to schools, because they're all in the Albuquerque system. How is that going to be looked at as far as traffic goes? I notice they are looking at some numbers which won't display that effect.

And basically, once again, having this going on during the pandemic, is just a travesty. We have people in the neighborhood who aren't on this call because they're working. They're nurses; they're saving lives. And you have others -- I'd only -- I couldn't even get on Zoom. And to say that you're -- the public's being involved at the level they should, it's not occurring. It's a travesty.

And I just want to ensure that our voices are heard and that all input, written and verbal, is considered. This project, as planned, is destroying our neighborhood.

Thank you.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Thank you, Ms. Kearney. You brought up a lot of questions and you brought up a lot of questions in numerous e-mails, and we'll talk about some of those a little bit later. But hopefully, you've seen some of those answers by e-mail.

MS. KEARNEY: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Ms. Gomez, who is next?

MS. GOMEZ: The last speaker I have is Rene Horvath.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Ms. Horvath?

MS. HORVATH: Yes.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Do you swear to tell the truth?

MS. HORVATH: Yes, I do.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. If you can try to keep your comments to three minutes. Thank you.

MS. HORVATH: Okay. Thank you.

Well, I'm with the Westside Coalition, and I'm the contact person that receives notifications. So I did get notified, because I am the contact person, and I -- I travel this area quite often to get to Rio Rancho, and so I did attend the two facilitated meetings.

But I guess what I'm -- what struck me most of all was the four-story building. It just seems very out of scale for that area. Because, you know, this is a single-family neighborhood. They're all single-family neighborhoods on the east side of Golf Course. And, you know, a tall building did seem really out of place right there, out of scale and out of place.
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So -- and then if you look to the west of Golf Course, yeah, you have taller buildings, like the Rust Hospital over there by Unser, and there are some taller buildings. It would seem a more appropriate scale for that area versus this area.

So as, you know, a person with the Westside Coalition, we do see a lot of applications for apartments. And I'm kind of wondering -- you know, we have a lot of MX-M zones around the West side. And it used to be C-2 zones. And a C-2 zone was a community commercial area and that apartments were conditional uses and they did have to consider school capacity and the ratio of jobs-to-housing balance to address some of the traffic issues. And those are issues the West side does face with overcrowded schools and traffic and also preservation of open space and such.

But I'm more interested in the scale and getting the character right for the area. And so as we've done this IDO change to -- from C-2 to MX-M, did we not consider the context of the area? Do we not look at scale? Do we not look at the area constraints anymore? Do we not look at traffic or overcrowded school issues? Do we not look at the character?

And in addition, you know, looking at the ABC-Z comp plan on 5-25 in the land-use section, it does have this area as area of consistency, and -- and when it says that development will need to be compatible in scale and character of the surrounding area, so I'm wondering, does that play into this also? Do we only look at IDO rules, or do we not consider other things, as well, that we always have in the past?

And I do think we do have some things that should play into this to get this right so that the -- the neighbors are happy with the final results. Because this is not going to be the only case that's going to come down the road being right behind people's homes. And I can understand their concern for privacy. I would be concerned too with a four-story building behind my house.

So I'd just like for that to -- you know, the IDO is new and it needs some work. And do we just go ahead and start ignoring all the things we used to consider in the past, or do we take these into consideration?

So that's what I want to bring up today as we examine this project. Thank you.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Thank you, Ms. Horvath.

Let me do one quick check in the Zoom room. Some people may have joined. We're on Item Number 2, which is a site plan at Golf Course Road for apartments more than 50 units. Is there anyone else to -- from the public who wishes to speak on this case?

Okay. Ms. Gould, do you see anyone.

MR. REES: Paul Rees --

MS. GOULD: This is Maggie Gould. Oh, sorry.

MR. REES: Sorry. This is Paul Rees, I just had a real short comment, if I was allowed to do that.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Mr. Rees, do you swear of affirm to tell the truth?

MR. REES: Yes, ma'am.
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CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Please give us your short comment.

MR. REES: Sure. And I won't touch on anything anybody else has already said. But I've lived here for over 20 years. I had my house built here, so I'm in the same boat as a lot of the people on Carreta.

There's been several proposed developments here in the past, and I -- I find it very odd, because we had ample opportunity and ample notice on the intentions of the developers in the past, and we had numerous meetings. And I'm -- pandemic aside, there shouldn't be any reason why we didn't get a lot more notice on this.

So I don't know if it's our HOA's fault for not letting us know. Obviously it's the developer's. Like several people brought up, they could have blasted us with e-mails as well as postcards, and certified mail certainly would have been beneficial so they would prove that they actually sent us notice.

But we didn't get any notice until very recently. And I remember getting notice in the past probably up to a year before people were even going to plan on breaking ground, so we had multiple opportunities to voice our concerns. And I thought with all the zoning laws, that the community edges thing gave us certain amount of time to dispute things and bring up our concerns. And I don't feel like that's been adhered to at all in this, so -- I understand this is a new type of process.

But that's basically all I have. Everybody all touched on some good points, but I appreciate the opportunity to speak.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Rees.

We're going to go -- how we're going to handle this, I think, is we're going to go back to the applicant team, and we may have been taking some notes, I've been taking some notes, and I particularly would like the applicant team to address notice and anything else that they have on their list that they would like to address from the public speakers.

And then I might have a couple comments and at that point I might ask if the development review board members would like to take a recess in order to have a break and be alert to come back and do the DRB comments.

So let's start with the applicant team now.

Mr. Stevenson, is that going to be you?

MR. STEVENSON: Thank you, Jolene. This is Richard Stevenson with Tierra West. So I've got about five pages of notes. And thank you, and good morning to all the neighbors who commented on this case.

In terms of the notification procedures and the IDO process, we would like to pass that over to the city to be able to respond.

We have involved Russell Brito, the planning manager, in the previous neighborhood association meeting that was held online. And we had him involved because there were a lot of concerns about the notification procedures. We've also, after the meeting, sent out e-mails, summarizing that process and providing some additional details. So in terms of any of the IDO notification procedures and comments, that's something that we would offer the city the opportunity to address.
Similarly, when it comes to the zoning, the scale, the process for which the IDO was prepared and the consultation with the homeowners association and neighborhood associations.

What I'd really like to focus on as the applicant is the specific items to the project and the site plan.

And before I go into those details, I would also like to comment that a number of these topics had been discussed in the previous meetings that we held online but also in person. Two of those meetings were facilitated, and so there is a record of the minutes as well as the action items and the responses to a number of these questions, such as the schooling issues, the crime issues, the view issues, the surrounding traffic issues on Westside and Golf Course, the cut-through concerns that were raised through the neighborhood, as well as the property values. And we also try very hard to address, again, the IDO notification procedures and that process.

In terms of site specific, we did originally present to the neighborhood association and the neighbors that were on the call a walking path that was adjacent to the eastern boundary line. We did receive feedback that they wanted that pushed further to the west away from the property line, so we did make that modification to the site plan. And as well, with the dumpster locations, we have relocated those from which were previously on the east side where the parking stalls are, further away, another 25 feet, so it's approximately 70 feet from the property line.

We also took into consideration a number of comments on the landscaping in the 50-foot buffer zone. We changed the species of trees and increased the density. And the intent, again, was to try and preserve and provide some additional screening both for the residents of this apartment complex to the adjacent single family, but, as well, at the same time, provide some screening from the single family to the apartment complex.

So there are -- there are those items. We also talked about the 6-foot wall along the eastern boundary. We have located that approximately 5 feet off the property line and have worked to bench or create a raised bench on which that 6-foot wall will then be built upon.

So we have worked hard to take some of the valid concerns that we received from the neighbors and incorporate this into the site plan. So I do want to point that out.

But as I said, I've taken a number of pages of notes, and we'd like to kind of go through those in detail off the call and respond by our e-mail to the e-mail group that we have, any new comments that we receive this morning.

Again, a lot of these comments were expressed at the neighborhood meetings and were responded to and we have that on the record with the facilitator notes. So I guess if the interest of time, if we can go through the board's comments. I know we mentioned taking a break, but we have (inaudible) comments. We -- as I mentioned at the beginning, we're working to address those.

The only specific question that I would ask is to the water authority on the timeline for the availability statement. But I think everything else, you know, we can work offline with each member and work to address those over the next week and a half.

Thank you.
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CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Stevenson. Can I clarify when you mention that you an e-mail group that you wanted to respond back to on your notes you've taken from this meeting? Is that e-mail group the public?

MR. STEVENSON: Yes. So when we had our --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay.

MR. STEVENSON: -- two facilitated meetings, we had, obviously, the signed sheet, and so everyone that has signed into that meeting, we had their e-mail contacts --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay.

MR. STEVENSON: -- and the last couple of days, for example, we've been providing some additional information, following up specifically in regard to traffic and timeline for the improvements on Westside.

So we're viewing that as an active conversation and a stream for us to be able to provide additional information to the neighbors.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay.

MS. KEARNEY: Jolene, can I ask -- this is Marsha Kearney. They must have the incorrect e-mail for me.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Ms. Kearney, I'll -- we'll -- we'll try to do that offline, if you can make sure you send your correct e-mail to Tierra West. But I apologize, it's not appropriate for the public to speak --

MS. KEARNEY: Okay. Sorry.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: -- at this point in time.

MS. KEARNEY: Sorry.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: There will be another opportunity for you to ask questions.

MS. KEARNEY: Okay.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Thank you.

So let me go ahead and ask the development review board members, is there a motion to take a ten-minute recess, that would be until 11:10, since we've been in session for two hours. Is that a motion to take a recess?

MS. WOLFENBARGER: This is Jeanne Wolfenbarger with transportation. I motion to take a 10-minute break.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Is there a second?

MS. SOMERFELDT: This is Cheryl Somerfeldt with parks and rec. I second.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Please vote, starting with water.

MR. CADENA: Kris Cadena, water authority. I approve.

MR. MONTANO: Vincent Montano, code enforcement. I approve.
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MS. SOMERFELDT: Cheryl Somerfeldt, parks and rec. I approve.

MR. ARMIGO: Ernest Armijo, hydrology. I approve.

MS. WOLFENBARGER: Jeanne Wolfenbarger with transportation. I approve.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: And Jolene Wolfley, DRB chair approves.  
(Motion approved.)

CHAIR WOLFLEY: So there's a consensus vote of the DRB to take a recess. We are still on Item Number 2. We will reconvene at 11:10. And the focus will be at that point to be going through DRB member comments.

Please go ahead and mute yourself and turn off your videocamera during the break. That will help. And so we'll see everyone again at 11:10. And thanks for your patience.

(Recess held.)

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Mr. Cadena, are you present?

MR. CADENA: This is Kris. Yes, I am.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. This is Jolene Wolfley, DRB chair. We were just on a recess. We are still on Item Number 2, which is Project PR-2020-4030, located at Golf Course Road, between Golf Course, Black Arroyo and Westside Boulevard.

We have had applicant presentation, we've had applicant or we've had public comment, we've had applicant response to that comment. And we are going to now move to DRB member comments.

I wanted to start out just saying a couple of things. First of all, I think as many of the members of the public who are near this site are learning, that in 2018, the city council approved a new zone code called the Integrated Development Ordinance, and that new zone code also included new zone districts and there was a conversion that went through a legislative process to convert many zone districts, which included this site and it converted from a C-2 zoning district to an MX-M zoning district. And in part of that city council approval, there were changes made to some of the development parameters that would affect a project such as the one that we're reviewing today.

And so the development review board must work within that city council approved structure on how to review this site at this point in time. And I know that the staff, the planning staff worked pretty carefully to look at previous site plans that existed on the site to see if there was anything still in place that applied and determined that any previous site plan work on the site had expired and therefore the application could go forward under the IDO rules approved by the city council.

I also want to address one other issue before we start. Let's see. I'm trying to share my screen. And many people have brought up the -- the school capacity as it relates to this project, and I want you to know that, and I think some of you have seen this in the case file, that Albuquerque Public Schools does comment on their school capacity and they did an estimation of -- for this number of apartment units, how many elementary middle and high school students would be estimated to come as a result of this new development.
And see if I can -- so you can see for elementary students, there is 17 slots available and 53 students estimated for middle school. 23 students produced, but there's 106 spaces available. For high school students, 23 produced, and 256 available.

So the APS showed that maybe there would be more students for the elementary school. But they further provide that they will address those -- any additional students -- I mean, these aren't, you know, absolutely students, these are projections. But any additional students coming to their school, they address them using these potential changes to the school in order to address additional capacity.

So the planning department has received an okay from the school district for a project such as this.

Stop sharing my screen at this point.

So anyhow, in terms of heights and number of dwelling units, those are items that the planning staff has applied. The height limitations, the parking requirements, the neighborhood buffering, things like that will address how large a project can be built on this site, and we're going to be talking through some of those details now.

But I'd like to first turn to the water authority, and they can begin their comments. And the applicant, at this time it's the DRB members conversing with the applicant, going through DRB comments.

And after we go through each DRB member, there would be an opportunity to check in with the public to see if you have any follow-up questions.

So let's start now with the water authority.

MR. CADENA: Hello. This is Kris Cadena with the water authority. Hello, Ron. Hello, Rick. And hello, Richard.

The serviceability letter for this project is 200506, and that's currently being researched. It's about done. We are just putting together the maps. Then we'll provide the direction as far as the infrastructure needed for this project. And public water and/or sewer lines may be required.

The property will require a development agreement prior to site plan approval. And the serviceability letter will provide a -- or be an exhibit to that development agreement.

And regard to the utility plan, I have just multiple comments. Please show and label the existing public waterline along the west and south frontages. I think you showed connection points, but if you can just show the existing lands themselves and label accordingly.

Also, if you -- there seems to be a parallel private power line along the west and north drive aisles. Please confirm and label accordingly. I don't know if that was maybe more of a drafting error. So just take a look at that.

Also, please show and label all proposed water meters, both domestic and/or irrigation. It will be helpful just to understand what -- what you're intending for the site.

Please label all proposed on-site public and private sanitary sewer accordingly. And I'll get into sewer here in a bit.
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Label all proposed on-site private waterlines accordingly. Understood that's all on-site waterlines is indeed private, as well as private hydrants, et cetera.

So the public sanitary sewer extensions are currently being researched. And I've worked with my engineers internally, and I think we've got a good path moving forward. The intent is to provide the existing lot, D-1 to the north, the ability to connect to public sewer.

Do you -- have you had any coordination with that property?

MR. STEVENSON: Morning, Kris. It's Richard Stevenson with Tierra West.

I have spoken to the engineer who has worked on some conceptual overall development plans for the utilities to service the tract to the north. It's my understanding that the intent will be to connect to the sewer to the west of our site in approximately the location where the driveway entrances on the west side of Golf Course, and therefore, that does not require an extension of a public sewer line through the -- through our property on the east side, as had previously been identified.

So thank you for working diligently with that and to Chris Gustafson, as well.

MR. CADENA: So this is Kris Cadena with the water authority.

So Richard, I just want you to note that -- or I want to note that the serviceability letter will -- will indicate what will essentially be required. So I don't know -- in conversations I've had with my engineering group, we've talked about different -- different options. But the serviceability letter, and after discussing with my group internally, it makes sense -- there is an existing 30-foot easement along the eastern property line of proposed Tract D-1, or existing Tract D-1 and E-1, which is your subject site.

I really feel that the -- rather than going along the east, which is where the easement is, it would make the most sense to utilize your north -- your easternmost north/south driveway corridor for that public sewer extension to then daylight into -- or have the ability today light into the northern tract.

I went back and forth and it just makes the most sense to me. I mean, the other option leaves Tract E-1 having to cross Golf Course and finagle their way through an existing waterline easement on the west. It's cleaner and I think provides the best option. And that's what the serviceability letter will include.

So having the sewer line where you're proposing it along the eastern property line is along landscaping and tree, not very conducive to operation and maintenance of the line. I think it really works for all parties when it's in that easternmost north/south drive aisle. So just keep that in mind.

Also, the -- you propose a pond within your proposed sewer line for public, and that won't be acceptable. So once again, moving it to that north/south drive aisle I think works best for everybody.

Based on the serviceability letter, as we talked about, you know, the drive aisle is going to be a helpful corridor. The serviceability letter will provide the official infrastructure...
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requirement. And as we talked about previously, would then be an exhibit to the development agreement. So that e-mail -- yes.

MR. BOHANNAN: Kris, this is Ron Bohannan. Do you have an estimate of when we would get that letter?

MR. CADENA: Yeah. It's definitely burning a hole in our maps and records department so that they can get us a map. And hopefully in the next week is what we're shooting for. But it's -- it's been written, you just got to get that sent off for -- for signature once we get the map so --

MR. BOHANNAN: Great.

MR. CADENA: -- that --

MR. BOHANNAN: So okay. Two-weeks deferral, then we would have that. But we would have a higher probability of having that letter in two weeks?

MR. CADENA: I would hope so, Ron. This is Kris Cadena with the water authority. I would hope so. (Inaudible) --

MR. STEVENSON: Kris, this is Richard Stevenson. Sorry to interrupt. Can I ask one other question?

MR. CADENA: Sure.

MR. STEVENSON: Is it possible for the water authority to take delegation on the site plan approval if the development agreement is still pending signatures within the water authority?

MR. CADENA: This is Kris Cadena with the water authority. I wouldn't -- I wouldn't be comfortable. It would put obviously myself in an awkward situation, understanding that it has to go and be approved since it -- since it's outside of the adopted service area by the water authority board. So I wouldn't -- I would think that we would just need to -- to pick a different date.

But I have a few extra comments I just wanted to go through.

In regard to the north/south drive aisle that we discussed, the proposed dumpster enclosure may need to be relocated. So just be mindful of that.

We talked about the landscaping along your proposed corridor which I don't think offers the best alignment.

And just make sure that continuous access for maintenance and operation is provided for all on-site public sewer lines. It's the cleanest opportunity, and it allows this property to the north to get service. And I think that easement was placed at some point just to kind of act as more of a placeholder. But now that we actually have a tangible development, that corridor is looking very (inaudible) at this point.

So that's all that I have. Thank you very much.

MR. BOHANNAN: Kris, this is Ron Bohannan. One more question. So if we do move the easement over to the north/south, and we're -- we're in agreement with that, we could grant that easement in that location and then do a subsequent vacation action of that easement on the east property line?

MR. CADENA: This is Kris Cadena.
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Was that a question, or are you just agreeing?

**MR. BOHANNAN:** Well, I'm just -- it's a question if you would agree to that protocol and approach.

**MR. CADENA:** Yes. This is Kris Cadena with the water authority.

Yeah, the easement definitely would need to be in place, vegetation. Yeah, we can have easements all over different areas of the property, as you know. And it's beneficial or more advantageous for you as a developer to remove those so that you're able to install other things that are more specific to your develop.

So that -- that process sounds fine, but if it is a water authority easements, before you install or put any encroachments in that area, you would want to vacate first.

Thank you.

**MR. BOHANNAN:** This is Ron Bohannan. One last -- hopefully last question.

In two weeks, once we have your serviceability letter and we really know the infrastructure that's required, we could have an infrastructure list, realizing that you would still need the development agreement, then that would be the only thing that would be remaining on your part if we address all these other questions.

And so we might be looking for an e-mail from you saying we're in approval except for the development agreement.

**MR. CADENA:** You're -- it -- this is Kris Cadena with the water authority.

What are the e-mails that you're looking?

**MR. BOHANNAN:** So --

**MR. CADENA:** -- (inaudible) development?

**MR. BOHANNAN:** -- just that we've met all of your other concerns except for the development agreement, and then once that's signed, that you would be able to move forward (inaudible).

**MR. CADENA:** Sure. Yeah. This is Kris Cadena with the water authority.

Yeah, you have my comments here from DRB. And once we get all the items that can be confirmed. Just simply the utility plan and the infrastructure list, yes. The major item will be the development agreement.

Thank you.

**MR. BOHANNAN:** Thank you.

Ms. Wolfley, you're still muted.

**CHAIR WOLFLEY:** Code enforcement, please.

**MR. MONTANO:** Vince Montano, code enforcement. I did have a couple comments.
A variance would be required for the wall over 3 feet in that front yard area, as well as I didn’t see any open space calculations for this project; if you can include that on your site plan, as well as a note if any standards are silent in your site plan that the IDO prevails or standards apply.

MR. STEVENSON: Thank you.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Parks and recreation.

MS. SOMERFELDT: This is Cheryl Somerfeldt with parks and recreation.

Open space -- the open space division commented that this property abuts the Black Arroyo, which drains into open spaces Calabacillas Arroyo and eventually into the Rio Grande. So there is concern about flows from the site and nonnative plantings. Therefore, native plants would be the best choice for landscape materials.

And one of the higher concerns species was the Chinese Pistach. We were -- PRD requests that you remove the Chinese Pistach from the plant list.

Also, Golf Course is a minor arterial that requires street trees, so it should have trees based per the street tree ordinance.

MR. BOHANNAN: Cheryl, this is Ron Bohannan. I believe we are showing street trees along Golf Course.

And we do have a (inaudible) pond that we're working with Ernest for the drainage, as just standard operating procedure for hydrology.

We will look at the species and -- and make changes accordingly.

MS. SOMERFELDT: Thank you.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Hydrology.

MR. ARMIJO: Ernest Armijo, hydrology. Hydrology has an approved conceptual grading and drainage plan with engineer stamp date of June 26, 2020. We have no objection.

MR. BOHANNAN: Thank you.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Thank you.

Transportation.

MS. WOLFENBARGER: Yes, good afternoon. This is Jeanne Wolfenbarger with transportation. I'm going to first start off by going over the comments that I had earlier, and then ending with the neighborhood concerns. Some of these comments actually overlap.

So make sure you label all the walkway widths on-site. I need to see the clear sight triangle at access points for both the site plan and the landscaping plan.

Please follow ASHTO guidelines in accordance with the -- you know, the speed limit. And I just need to make sure that that's a safe entrance coming in and out as far as site distance and speed limit.

Show how the access points along Golf Course line up with the
DRB Minutes, Agenda Item 2  
July 22, 2020

west side. I believe I know how your north access lines up, but I would just like to see that on a graphic as well as the Golf Course right-of-way width just to determine sufficiency of the right-of-way width for -- for Golf Course.

I will also need to have a turning template designed at the median cuts just to ensure that median opening is wide enough for the left turns. And I also need to make sure that the left turn bays into the -- into the access points are -- are long -- are long enough to handle the traffic. If you could provide a short analysis on that, as well.

Let's see. I -- I did ask for a vehicular trip generation for p.m. and a.m. peak hour, and -- and you did provide that yesterday morning. Thank you for that. What you did show was that your -- your thresh- -- vehicular trips, traffic trips fall under the threshold needed for a traffic study. And it's roughly about half of the DPM requirements for the -- for the traffic study.

The -- we -- we do need some street lighting on Golf Course as we discussed. Just follow the DPM requirements. It appears as though one is needed at the access way, obviously. But we'll need to have street lighting requirements on an infrastructure list. And because this is so close to the City of Rio Rancho, I do need concurrence from Rio Rancho on this to make sure they didn't have any additional concerns or traffic concerns related to transportation.

I wanted to cover some of the -- the neighborhood comments. I believe I already touched on site triangles and street lights, which were brought up at today's -- today's meeting, and contacting Rio Rancho.

The walkway path, I believe you could move that 40-foot away from -- from the wall, could you not?

MR. STEVENSON: Yeah, we can -- we can review that -- it's Richard from -- Richard Stevenson, Tierra West.

We can review that walkway park that meanders through the 50-foot buffer and see if we can shift that further away from the residents based on the comments we received from them this morning.

MS. WOLFENBARGER: Okay. Thank you for that.

And -- and like I had mentioned earlier, I did review the vehicular trips. The vehicular trips based on 208 apartment units does fall well under the threshold needed for a traffic study.

The -- the concerns about Westside Boulevard, I do understand those. I did speak with the department of municipal development, who is heading the Westside Boulevard widening project from two lanes to four lanes just the other day. And as far -- you know, from my discussions with them, they still plan on moving forward with that project in the spring of 2021, there's some funding set aside for it. The design plans are almost 100 percent complete, so they are actively moving in that direction.

And that's -- I believe that's all I have for now.

CHAIR WOLFLY: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Wolfenbarger. And I'm just going to have you follow up on an item.
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On the traffic-impact study, could you help the public understand what the purpose of a traffic-impact study is and what it's trying to accomplish.

MS. WOLFENBARGER: All right. Yes, certainly, Madam Chair. This is Jeanne Wolfenbarger with transportation.

First -- first of all, I'll -- I'll point out that the threshold under the current DPM that's active as of now states that a traffic-impact study is required when you have a hundred vehicles going into the site, or a hundred vehicles going out of the site during the p.m. or a.m. peak hour.

And based on the vehicle or trips that I have, we were showing well under those numbers. And the reason those numbers are set is because it gives us some sort of feel for what off-site improvements may be required.

So just to give some perspective, Richard Stevenson e-mailed the other day, you know, 50 trips or 55 trips coming out of in one case, and just during peak hour. To give you some perspective, that's approximately one vehicle every minute. With that type of rate, we wouldn't expect to have to do any off-site traffic improvements because the purpose of the traffic study is to identify the impact of the development on the roads and at rates that are quite that low, you wouldn't expect that there to be a significant result as far as any off-site improvements for roadways in that case.

And that's part of why the threshold is set up that way.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Wolfenbarger, that was very clear. I think it's helpful to understand what the purpose of that study is in understanding how it fits into the review process.

Okay. I'd like to turn now to planning comments.

MR. RODENBECK: This is Jay Rodenbeck. I just want to note that there's no code enforcement signature block on this sheet, on the cover sheet. The applicant needs to verify if a sensitive lands analysis as required.

Regarding the landscaping, the landscape buffer along the eastern property boundary does meet the IDO requirements, however, the applicant could add additional trees in the landscape buffer to provide additional screening between the site and the adjacent single-family residential dwellings to the east of the site to provide in two full layers of trees within that buffer.

As code enforcement noted, we noticed that there were no open-space calculations provided.

We'd recommend park benches be placed in landscape open space near the sidewalks and trails within the proposed development.

We need to see outdoor exterior lighting depicted on the plan.

Regarding the screen wall, I believe code enforcement noticed this, as well. The screen wall cannot be more than 3 feet in height in the front yard.

Staff requests the applicant provide a plan angle illustration depiction of the proposed apartments and the residences to the east of the site depicting the scale, the height of the proposed apartments and the residences and the distance between them.
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Staff -- and I believe the applicant (inaudible) this. But staff wants the applicant to consider (inaudible) dumpsters away from the residential development.

And we want you to provide an elevation key so that we can determine each elevation for each building.

And the final comment we had is the unit table -- unit mix table is difficulty to read, and the letters are blurry, so if you could please update that so that it's more clear, that would be great.

And we'll just note that the facade is consistent with 5-11(E)(2) of the IDO because it does have a clear distinction between the ground floor and other floors.

And the carports are consistent with 5-11(D)(4) of the IDO, although some of them are located between the street and building, most of them are dispersed throughout the site. And -- and the street-facing carports are screened by a row of trees, row of street trees.

And finally, the landscaping plan exceeds the requirements by providing a total of 144,000 square feet of landscaping, when approximately 48,000 square feet are required.

And I would just like to note the staff could have future comments and the site plan is still under review. Thank you.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. So first off, Mr. Stevenson, do you have any questions on those comments?

MR. STEVENSON: No, I don't. Just thank you. Richard Stevenson, Tierra West.

Thank you, Jeanne, for transportation comments. We will work with you to address and add those items in the infrastructure list.

And Jay, thank you for your comments and your review on the site plan. And, again, we'll work to address those. Thank you.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. I'm going to share my screen for just a second here. And I'm going to bring up these planning comments. And I just kind of want to point out some things that I think are important.

As I was mentioning to the public, the DRB is working with the scope that the city council set forward for the DRB to work in. And I think some of these areas are where the public is interested. So -- so basically, on this, the sensitive lands analysis, we -- there are some features we're a little unsure about and just want you to report on whether they fit the IDO requirements related to that.

The other one I wanted to -- okay. Oh, I'm sorry. On this one right here, staff requests the applicant provide an angle plane illustration. Where this is coming from, the neighbors had expressed a lot of concern about what was previously allowed on the site and also just concerns about how this will scale alongside their single-family residential area.

This is not a requirement, but it was something we thought if the developers were willing to do, it might help provide some clarity to -- to the site. Because a lot of people don't realize that
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the C-2 zoning did allow, I think, up to a hundred feet depending on a certain angle calculation.

Is that understandable, Mr. Stevenson?


We had previously provided a cross-section exhibit to do exactly what you asked for on that comment. So we will look to update it with any additional landscaping that we can add to the buffer zone, depending on how much additional the developer is prepare to -- to add to that area. And we can then provide that back to the city and also to that e-mail group I previously mentioned that we are --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay.

MR. STEVENSON: -- (inaudible). Thank you.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Thank you. That would be really helpful. And then I know there's been some discussion from different DRB members regarding the dumpster locations and the public. I don't think we need to settle that right now, but just kind of some more attention to dumpsters.

And then I want to talk about facades a little bit.

Mr. Rodenbeck, can you bring up facades from the -- do you have access to those easily?

MR. RODENBECK: This is Jay Rodenbeck. I do. Just one moment here.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay.

MR. RODENBECK: Got to drag it over.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: And if you could -- yeah, go to the renderings. I think those are particularly helpful.

MR. RODENBECK: Well, when they show up. Let me see here.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Sometimes it just takes a while to load off the Internet.

MR. RODENBECK: I don't know why that's not showing up.

MR. BOHANNAN: Jolene, this is Ron Bohannan. We have them on our screen, if you want us to --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Oh, okay.

MR. BOHANNAN: -- (inaudible) our screen.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Yeah, please do. And, Ms. Gould, can give you screen sharing privileges.

MR. BOHANNAN: As soon as she gives them to, I'll pull them up.

MS. GOULD: This is Maggie Gould.

Madam Chair, Mr. Bohannan, you should have screen sharing privileges now.

MR. BOHANNAN: Is this the elevation you're looking for? This is
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Ron Bohannan.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Yes. And then I think there is one that shows a little bit more three-dimensional perspective.

MR. BOHANNAN: That one?

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Yeah, that one. Okay.

So one thing I wanted to point out is that with -- within the IDO, we were reviewing this very carefully. And the facades that the applicant is putting forward really do exceed the IDO requirements.

I think some of the things you can see here is how the roof line is articulated. We have balconies with a very nice steel wrought-iron guardrail.

Over at these windows there is -- there's a change in material. It's -- I believe it's a tile.

Is that correct? Mr. Bennett, that under the windows, there's tile?

MR. BENNETT: That's correct.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: And so I just want to kind of clarify with the applicant. These are the materials that you're intending to use for this project?

MR. BENNETT: That's correct.

MR. BOHANNAN: Madam Chair, Ron --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: The illustration?

MR. BOHANNAN: Yes, it is. And it's also -- we have not made it as a statement, but this is going to be a first-class facility. It's a gated facility. Not only are you seeing those materials on the exterior, but the owner is also committed to a lot of the upgrades on the interior, making this a very first-class facility.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. And -- okay. And then if you can go back, Mr. Stevenson to your colored site plan that shows your landscaping.

MR. STEVENSON: One moment. Let me get that.

MR. BOHANNAN: We're engineers, Jolene, so we always put the landscaping at the end.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Oh, there it is. Okay.

And, Mr. Stevenson, would you just kind of describe, and maybe you have in many of these neighborhood meetings, but just kind of point out what type of your amenities in your landscaping plan are going to be there available for the residents who will live here. Just briefly.

MR. STEVENSON: Sure. So this is Richard Stevenson. As my colleague Ron just mentioned, this is proposed to be a first-class luxury gated apartment complex, so as such, the residents can expect some nice amenities on the site.

Some of those items include pond features with water elements, as
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Well as a pool area; lounge, outdoor lounge seating area. That then also extends out onto a patio with other site features, such as some open area for a barbecue, patios, gazebos, open-space gathering areas.

Another important site element identified by the developer is the actual perimeter trail for fitness and dog walking. Which also brings up the point that there will be a potty park for the animals that live on-site with their residents.

Really, a big effort has been gone into providing an enhanced landscaping area. As you mentioned, there's almost three times the required landscaping area on this site plan. So it is an important part of our proposed plan to note that this is definitely a first-class apartment project.

Thank you.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Thank you. And there was a lot of discussion about this buffer area along the east, with some of the public that has given comment today. And you just pointed out that this helps to create a perimeter trail for the entire apartment complex. And planning staff noted that that was quite a nice feature for the livability of the apartments, that you would be able to have a trail all the way around.

And so trying -- and that the 50 -- that's a 50-foot wide landscape area, correct?

MR. STEVENSON: This is Richard Stevenson.

That is correct. It's a 50-foot landscape buffer per the IDO requirements.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. And that exceeds the 15 feet that would be required by the IDO --

MR. STEVENSON: As of today --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: -- and so --

MR. STEVENSON: Sorry. It's Richard Stevenson. As of today, the IDO requires a 50-foot buffer MX-M zoning adjacent to the residential zoning.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Oh, okay.

MR. STEVENSON: And so that's what we have proposed, a 50-foot buffer.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Thank you. So as we're looking at sort of balancing the needs of the property owners who are to the east, we also want to balance the livability for those who would live here. And we would like to -- for -- you know -- you consider what the neighbors have said, but also we felt that that was a really nice amenity for the apartment dwellers, that they would be able to have this perimeter path.

And so there might be some opportunity to move it a little to the west in some places, but also respect what you're trying to accomplish here in terms of the future residents here.

Okay. I just want to go through a few my notes. And I might need code enforcement to help me, but if there was some desire to make a higher wall along the eastern property line, is that something that you would consider, Mr. Stevenson?
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MR. STEVENSON: Hi, Jolene. It's Richard Stevenson. Currently, we have proposed a 6-foot opaque wall. As I mentioned earlier, we have designed a grading plan, where we have a benched area offset at the existing perimeter wall that those single-family residents have at their property line. And we will show that in the sight line exhibit they have asked us to prepare, how that wall is set and how it is elevated.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay.

MR. STEVENSON: We can take back to the developer their request to increase the wall height to 8 feet.

Thank you.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Yeah, just take all of those elements between the planning suggestion for additional trees and the -- the wall and -- and just sort of look at how all of that could combine to help make a more acceptable treatment between the two properties.

And then I think we didn't highlight, but in Mr. Rodenbeck's comments, it talked about considering a view fencing for the top half of the wall that's along the Black Arroyo. If you would just take that into consideration.

MR. STEVENSON: Yes.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. One other thing I wanted to point out to the neighbors is that there's been a lot of response to your concerns that have come in through e-mails. There's been city council staff and other planning staff that have responded to some of your concerns. Many of those have gone to Ms. Kearney. And I hope that she will share those responses, because they're very thoughtful.

And they include discussion about how the office of neighborhood coordination and registering as a homeowners association or a neighborhood association connects with this process. And that will outline for you.

And Mr. Sandoval had brought up that there were a number of studies he felt that should be conducted in conjunction with this development request. We've tried to go through the studies that are required by the IDO, and some of the things that you're talking about, including property value evaluation, those are things that are not prescribed by the IDO and that staff cannot consider.

And finally, I want to make sure that -- Mr. Sandoval said he did not receive notice. I think he testified that he lived on Carreta, I think if that's the correct street.

And would you just make sure, Mr. Stevenson, that you go through your records on notice and make sure that -- I think there were a couple people mentioned today that they didn't receive notice. And I just wanted to make sure that, since we have more time, all that notice is provided. There are requirements in the IDO that some people receive mail notice, some people receive e-mail notice, and there is sign posting notice.

And so, Mr. Stevenson, would you also make sure that your sign postings remain up, according to your sign posting agreement through this deferral period, so that -- normally once a case is...
heard, that is sort of where the notice requirement ends. But since there's been some question about signs being visible, signs being tilted, signs being behind a bush or whatever, if you can just make sure that those posted signs are very clear to the public that are out on the property.

MR. STEVENSON: Jolene, this is --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Would that be okay?

MR. STEVENSON: Yeah. And this is Richard Stevenson.

Yes, I will keep the yellow posted signs up for another two weeks. And I'll also confirm that Mr. Sandoval, if he was on the list from the ONC, did receive notice. And I'll confirm that and provide an update at the next DRB meeting. Thank you.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Thank you.

So we've heard a lot of information. I think there's some additional things that the applicant is willing to address and that there's going to be additional dialogue with the DRB.

But at this point in time, if there's any member of the public that has a question that they feel needs to be addressed right now, could you raise your hand. And this will need to be streamlined, because we're several hours into this case already, and we have a -- a number of items still to do on our agenda.

So let me give you -- I see Mr. Mirabal. And that's the only hand I see raised.

So if you have a couple of questions, Mr. Mirabal, and I see -- or Mrs. Mirabal, go ahead and --

MS. GOULD: Madam Chair.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Yeah.

MS. GOULD: It looks like Larry Sandoval also has his hand raised. This is Maggie Gould.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Thank you. Ms. Mirabal, you have --


CHAIR WOLFLEY: If you have a couple questions --

MS. MIRABAL: Yes.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: -- you can ask them. And these -- these should be not your comments, because we've heard those. But these should be questions to clarify facts within the case today.

MS. MIRABAL: Yes. I'm questioning the traffic study, because right now we are under a pandemic, a lot of people are working out of the house, out of their homes. So you're not seeing the traffic that we see when there's not a pandemic.

So the study that was done I do not feel is accurate. Once this pandemic is over, you will then again see the increase in traffic. So I feel the traffic study was incorrect, because we live here and we've seen it for 20 years. So I truly believe, because of the pandemic, we are all under house order and people are working out of their home, so it's truly not correct.
CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Ms. Mirabal, this is an opportunity only for questions, and --

MS. MIRABAL: Well, that's my question. Is this not -- is -- is -- I mean, is this not (inaudible) --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: I think I've got your question. Let's circle back to the applicant and see if they would like to give an answer to that question.

Mr. Stevenson, can you address Ms. Mirabal's question about the -- the traffic situation, or anyone on the applicant team.

MR. BOHANNAN: Yeah, Jolene --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Yes.

MR. BOHANNAN: -- this is Robert Bohannan. Let me address it. The trip generation studies and all those studies that we do for the City of Albuquerque are all outlined in the institute of traffic engineering, just the latest edition. So all of the trip generations that we use to converse with -- with Jeanne Wolfenbarger are from those manuals.

So there was -- there's not an actual traffic count. These are estimates of the trips that are coming out. And those -- those are the impacts that are done. So it's based on city-approved standards and national standards that we've been using for decades.

MS. MIRABAL: But -- but it would be different if we were not under pandemic.

MR. BOHANNAN: No, it would not. The trips --

MS. MIRABAL: It would not?

MR. BOHANNAN: If I may. The trip generation that's estimated is based on the ITE studies that are done around the country. They were done for years and years and years without the pandemic in place.

What you're looking at is the amount of traffic that are on the streets today versus what they were prepandemic.

MS. MIRABAL: Do you know when the last study was done prepandemic?

MR. BOHANNAN: I'd have to look and we can get that study date when that was done.

MS. MIRABAL: Okay. That was my question.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Thank you. I'm going to ask Ms. Wolfenbarger, even though the question isn't directly to her, but Ms. Wolfenbarger, can you just help -- you heard what Ms. Mirabal's concern was. Can you just help clarify those kind of traffic generation studies that might be different from the impact study, I think?

MS. WOLFENBARGER: Yes. I had asked Tierra West -- this is Jeanne Wolfenbarger with transportation.

I had asked Tierra West to perform a trip-generation calculation so I could determine the estimated number of vehicular trips coming in and out based on 208 apartment units.
And we did review their results and compared them against the trip generation manual, the Institute of Transportation Engineer's manual, and then do match up pretty well.

This -- this manual, it's based on the 10th edition, so I'm not sure exactly what year it came out, but it is before the pandemic. It's not really related to what's expected or not expected during a pandemic, therefore.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: And -- and just to clarify, so the -- the trip generation that Ms. Wolfenbarger asked for is just to help us identify the number of trips that would come out of a project like this.

The traffic study, which is not required, would deal with the existing traffic on the roadway. And that's where you might be thinking it would be changed by the pandemic. And a traffic-impact study would look at the a.m. and p.m. peak hour existing trips and how these new trips would interact with the existing trips, and if additional transportation infrastructure is required.

But I think what we're trying to say is only the step to determine what trips are being generated and did they fall under that benchmark where a traffic-impact study is not required.

And so no traffic-impact study is required, but that doesn't mean, Ms. Wolfenbarger, in her review, will not be looking at some of the entrances and things and what kind of improvements might be needed there.

Okay. Let's move to Mr. Sandoval.

And what is your question?

MR. SANDOVAL: My question is, have we adequately -- we, the applicant, adequately looked at the view plane analysis. I don't know that we've received the full analysis yet. And the other item I do have, again, it goes back to traffic, is it possible that we could exercise the borderline option that is listed in -- on your form? I feel that you're just under that threshold of 247 units.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Tierra West.

MR. STEVENSON: Thank you, Jolene. This is Richard Stevenson.

In regard to the question about the view plane exhibit and the studies, so we, as the applicant, prepared a cross-section that we showed early on in the process. This was something that we prepared on the applicant's behalf to provide some additional clarity and information to those single-family residents.

As we previously provided to Mr. Sandoval over e-mails, we have indicated that there's no protection of view planes, as listed in the IDO. And I can resend that clarification back out to you. As mentioned earlier, we will be updating the cross-sectional view plane exhibit, and, again, distributing that to the neighbors.

In -- and the other question --

MR. SANDOVAL: If we could just go back again to the view plane analysis. I bring that up only because other apartment complexes that are out -- developments in the city, they have the same concerns. And, again, from the viewpoint of an apartment,
they're looking into the backyards of people. There is no privacy (inaudible), again, to Ms. Wolfley's point, doing everything that we can to make sure that everybody is satisfied. And the viewpoint analysis I think is a really critical (inaudible) of this development.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Yeah, and I just want to -- this is Chair Wolfley. I just want to make sure we're clear on terms.

So because the IDO does have something called a view plane analysis, I just want to make sure that's not what we're talking about here. Because that only applies when you're in a view protection overlay area, and this is not a view protection overlay area.

But I think, Mr. Sandoval, what you're getting at is the sight line between the four story of the apartments and the residences; is that correct?

MR. SANDOVAL: That is correct.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. And this would be something that would be kind of a courtesy of the applicant to provide. It sounds like they are willing to provide it.

Is that correct? Mr. Stevenson?

MR. STEVENSON: This is Richard Stevenson. Yes, that's correct.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: And that is part of what he -- Mr. Stevenson said he would be providing into this cluster group of e-mails that he has for those of you who have been participating in the project.

And I'm sure you'll also copy the -- Ms. Gomez on behalf of the DRB to those materials, as well.

Okay. Thank you, everyone for --

MR. MIRABAL: I have one quick question.

MR. STEVENSON: Sorry, Jolene. I just need to answer Mr. Sandoval's second question, which was --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Oh, I apologize.

MR. MIRABAL: Yeah, but the -- it's there because of you.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Mr. Mirabal, you do not have the floor at this time. Mr. Stevenson does. Thank you.

MR. STEVENSON: Just to answer Mr. Sandoval's second question in regard to whether the TIS falls into the borderline category.

As the transportation manager mentioned earlier, it's actually about half of what is required to be able to hit that threshold to require a TIS. So we did inquire as the applicant to see what constitutes a borderline, and the response was no, this is not borderline and it is not required. The TIS is not required. Thank you.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Mirabal, we've kind of had an opportunity here for questions. Is there something urgent that you need to address as a question?

MR. MIRABAL: Yes. I would like, if possible, to minimize the
junipers in the boundary area. It's a -- junipers are very -- a lot of people have problems with allergies, and junipers that are proposed will affect a lot of the neighbors in our community.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. We'll have Tierra West take that under advisement.

At this point in time, I'd like to circle back with the applicant. There's quite a bit of material to process here, and let's look at a good deferral -- sorry, I'm losing track of my Zoom conference on my computer.

What -- what do you think is a probable good day to come back to the DRB, having resolved many of the things that we've been talking about here today?

MR. STEVENSON: Jolene, this is Richard Stevenson.

Based on the information that Kris Cadena with the water authority provided in regard to the timeline for the availability statement, we would like to request a two-week deferral to the August 5th hearing. That, I believe, will give us enough time as well to address the new comments that we got from the neighbors.

As I mentioned earlier, a lot of comments were previously put to us and we responded at the neighborhood public meetings, as well as over e-mail correspondence. But we will try to again respond back to those same comments. So if we could take a two-week deferral, please.

Thank you.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. And, Mr. Stevenson, you realize that any new materials you need to submit would have to be in by the Friday before, so that really gives you a week and a half to --

MR. STEVENSON: This is Richard Stevenson. Yes, thank you.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. All right. There a motion to defer Item Number 2 to the August 5th meeting of the development review board.

MR. MONTANO: Vincent Montano, code enforcement. I move to move Item Number 2 to August 5th, 2020.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Thank you.

MS. SOMERFELDT: This is Cheryl Somerfeldt of parks and rec. I second.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Let's do a vote, starting with water authority.

MR. CADENA: Kris Cadena, water authority. I prove.

MR. MONTANO: Vincent Montano, code enforcement. I approve.

MS. SOMERFELDT: Cheryl Somerfeldt, parks and rec. I approve.

MR. ARMIJO: Ernest Armijo, hydrology. I approve.

MS. WOLFENBARGER: Jeanne Wolfenbarger with transportation. I approve.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: And Jolene Wolfley, DRB chair approves.
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There's a consensus vote of the DRB to defer Item Number 2 to the August 5th meeting of the DRB.

(Motion approved.)

CHAIR WOLFLEY: And I just want to explain to the public that once the initial notice requirements have been done to initially put the case before the DRB, it is up to the public to continue following the case. You can do that by contacting Ms. Gomez, and the phone number that's on the website. You can also find these agendas on the city website and contact any one of our DRB planning staff members, Ms. Gould, Mr. Rodenbeck or myself. But it will kind of be up to you to keep track of this case and follow it as you choose to.

Okay. I'm just going to make a note here.

MR. BOHANNAN: Thank you, Madam Chair.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: All right. And thanks to all the members of the public. Thanks to Tierra West for their cooperation.

And I saw a chat note about: Is the public allowed to participate on August 5th?

Yes, you will be. But you will not receive any special notice about that except what you are hearing right now.

MR. MIRABAL: Thank you, Madam Chair.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: But it will run similarly to the way it has today.

(Conclusion of recording ref. Item 2.)
RE: CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD MEETING MINUTES OF JULY 22, 2020, Item 2

TRANSCRIPTIONIST'S AFFIRMATION

I HEREBY STATE AND AFFIRM that the foregoing is a correct transcript of an audio recording provided to me and that the transcription contains only the material audible to me from the recording and was transcribed by me to the best of my ability.

IT IS ALSO STATED AND AFFIRMED that I am neither employed by nor related to any of the parties involved in this matter other than being compensated to transcribe said recording and that I have no personal interest in the final disposition of this matter.

IT IS ALSO STATED AND AFFIRMED that my electronic signature hereto does not constitute a certification of this transcript but simply an acknowledgement that I am the person who transcribed said recording.

DATED this 20th day of November 2020.

________________________________________
Kelli A. Gallegos

Kelli A. Gallegos
AGENDA ITEM NO: 3

DRB PROJECT NUMBER: PR-2020-004030
(1002566, 1004501, 1004503)
SI-2020-00540 - SITE PLAN

PROJECT NAME:
TIERRA WEST, LLC agent(s) for CALABACILLAS GROUP C/O DONALD HARVILLE request(s) the aforementioned action(s) for all or a portion of: A-12 & A-13, zoned MX-M, located at GOLF COURSE RD NW between GOLF COURSE RD NW, BLACK ARROYO and WESTSIDE BLVD containing approximately 8.77 acre(s). (A-12,13)[Deferred from 7/22/20, 8/5/20, 8/26/20]

REQUEST:
1. SITE PLAN FOR APARTMENT WITH MORE THAN 50 UNITS

COMMENTS:
1. Please confirm that fence complies with 5-7-(D)
2. CE has no additional comments or objections at this time.

FROM: Carl Garcia, Code Supervisor
Planning Department
924-3838 eagarcia@cabq.gov

DATE: 9/30/2020

ACTION:
APPROVED ___; DENIED ____; DEFERRED ___; COMMENTS PROVIDED ___;
WITHDRAWN ___

DELEGATED: (TRANS) (HYD) (WUA) (PRKS) (PLNG) (CE)
DRB Project Number:  4030  
AGENDA ITEM NO:  3  
Golf Course Apartments

SUBJECT:  Site Plan

ENGINEERING COMMENTS:

1. The Transportation Department has no objection to the site plan approval.

   If new or revised information is submitted, additional comments may be provided by Transportation Development.

FROM:  Jeanne Wolfenbarger, P.E.  
DATE:  September 30, 2020  
Transportation Development  
505-924-3991 or jwolfenbarger@cabq.gov

ACTION:

APPROVED __;  DENIED __;  DEFERRED __;  COMMENTS PROVIDED __;  WITHDRAWN __

DELEGATED:  ___________  TO: (TRANS) (HYD) (WUA) (PRKS) (CE) (PLNG)
Development Review Board (DRB)
Review Comments
Utility Development Section
Reviewer: Kristopher Cadena, P.E.
Phone: 505.289.3301

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DRB Project No:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Item No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PR-2020-004030</td>
<td>09/30/20</td>
<td>#3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone Atlas Page:</th>
<th>Legal Description:</th>
<th>Location:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-12 &amp; A-13</td>
<td>A-12 &amp; A-13</td>
<td>GOLF COURSE RD NW between GOLF COURSE RD NW, BLACK ARROYO and WESTSIDE BLVD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Request For:
SI-2020-00540 - SITE PLAN

ABCWUA Comment:

Please provide written description of how the following comments were addressed with the next submittal.

1. Serviceability Letter #200506 has been written and provides the conditions for service.
2. The development agreement has been approved by the Board and needs to be signed by both the developer and Executive Director. This is required prior to approval.
3. Utility Plan
   a. The 3” water meter requires the same diameter from main to meter. Refer to Std. Dwg. 2370. The utility plan indicates a 12”x12”x6” tee and 6” valve.
MAJOR CASES

1. Project # PR-2019-002651 SD-2020-00159 – EXTENSION OF PRELIMINARY PLAT
TIERRA WEST, LLC agent for AIRPORT PARKING/KATHLEEN CHAVES request(s) the aforementioned action(s) for all or a portion of: PARCEL 2A BLK 4 PARK PLAT OF LTS 1A, 1B, 2B IN BLK 3, PARCELS 1A1, 1A2, 1B1 IN BLK 4, PARCELS 2A, 2B, 2C & 2D OF SUNPORT PARK, zoned NR-BP, located at 1501 AIRCRAFT AVE SE between UNIVERSITY and I-25, containing approximately 48.6651 acre(s). (M-15)
PROPERTY OWNERS: AIRPORT PARKING/KATHLEEN CHAVES
REQUEST: EXTENSION OF PRELIMINARY PLAT
No Comment. No objection to extension.

RESPEC agent(s) for RAINBOW PASEO, LLC request(s) the aforementioned action(s) for all or a portion of TRACT A PLAT OF TRACTS A, B AND C CANTATA AT THE TRAILS UNIT 2 (BEING A REPLAT OF TRACT OS-4 THE TRAILS UNIT 2 & TRACT A TAOS AT THE TRAILS UNIT 2), zoned R-ML, located on OAKRIDGE ST NW between OAKRIDGE ST NW and TREE LINE AVE NW, containing approximately 3.26 acre(s). (C-9)
[Deferred from 8/15/19, 10/9/19, 12/4/19, 2/5/20, 3/4/20, 4/15/20, 6/3/20, 8/5/20]
PROPERTY OWNERS: RV LOOP LLC
REQUEST: 52 UNIT TOWNHOME DEVELOPMENT
** AGENT HAS REQUESTED DEFERRAL TO OCTOBER 7TH.

3. Project # PR-2020-004030, (1002566, 1004501, 1004503), SI-2020-00540 - SITE PLAN
TIERRA WEST, LLC agent(s) for CALABACILLAS GROUP C/O DONALD HARVILLE request(s) the aforementioned action(s) for all or a portion of: A-12 & A-13, zoned MX-M, located at GOLF COURSE RD NW between GOLF COURSE RD NW, BLACK ARROYO and WESTSIDE BLVD containing approximately 8.77 acre(s). (A-12,13)[Deferred from 7/22/20, 8/5/20, 8/26/20]
PROPERTY OWNERS: CALABACILLAS GROUP C/O DONALD HARVILLE
REQUEST: SITE PLAN FOR APARTMENT WITH MORE THAN 50 UNITS
Chinese Pistachio has been removed from the plant list. The City of Albuquerque’s Pollen Control Ordinance only calls out male Juniper species as allergens and therefore asks the Landscape Plan to specify “(female only)” for Juniper species.
Please add note: Pursuant to IDO 5-6(C)(5)(b) Organic mulch, such as wood chips or pecan shells, is required as ground cover for the portion of any landscaped area surrounding the vegetation root ball, as well as beneath the entire tree canopy or dripline, in each required landscape area.

4. PR-2019-003169
SD-2020-00115 – PRELIMINARY PLAT VA-2020-00192 – TEMPORARY DEFERRAL OF SIDEWALK
(Sketch Plat 12/18/19)
RON HENSLEY/THE GROUP agent(s) for CLEARBOOK INVESTMENTS INC. request(s) the aforementioned action(s) for all or a portion of: 01 UNIT 3 ATRISCO GRANT EXC NW'LY POR TO R/W, zoned MX-M, located at SAGE RD between COORS and 75TH ST, containing approximately 9.56 acre(s). (L-10)[Deferred from 7/22/20, 8/5/20, 9/2/20]
PROPERTY OWNERS: CLEARBOOK INVESTMENTS INC, HENRY SCOTT TRUSTEE HENRY RVT
REQUEST: SUBDIVISION OF TRACT INTO 62 LOTS AND 2 TRACTS AND SIDEWALK DEFERRAL
Sage is a Major Collector and will require street trees upon development. Will additional landscaping be provided in HOA tracts?

MINOR CASES

5. Project # PR-2020-004465 SD-2020-00163 – PRELIMINARY/FINAL PLAT
ALDRICH LAND SURVEYING agent(s) for JEANETTE L. MONAHAN, TRUSTEE – MONAHAN FAMILY TRUST request(s) the aforementioned action(s) for all or a portion of: LOTS 15 & 16 BLOCK 14, RAYMONDS ADDITION, zoned R-ML, located at 1105 SILVER AVE SW between 11TH ST SW and 12TH ST SW, containing approximately 0.1616 acre(s). (K-13)
PROPERTY OWNERS: MONAHAN FAMILY TRUST
REQUEST: LOT LINE ELIMINATION
No comments. No objection.

6. PR-2020-003455 SI-2020-00824 – FINAL SITE PLAN SIGN-OFF
CONSENSUS PLANNING agent(s) for DYNAMIC INVESTORS request(s) the aforementioned action(s) for all
or a portion of: B-3-A, KOA, UNIT 2, zoned PD, located at 540 PAISANO STREET NE between JUAN TABO BLVD and I-40, containing approximately 5.04 acre(s). (K-22) [Deferred from 9/2/20, 9/16/20]
PROPERTY OWNERS: DYNAMIC INVESTORS INC
REQUEST: FINAL SIGN-OFF OF EPC APPROVED SITE PLAN
Trail connection at west property line to the north of the cul-de-sac is provided as conditioned by the EPC
process and shown on Site Plan shall be constructed per DPM standards. PRD supports the Transportation
Section’s comment for the applicant to provide an entrance ramp (and bollard) from street level to the trail.
Defer to Sept 30.

PRELIMINARY/FINAL PLAT SD-2020-00072 – VACATION OF PUBLIC EASEMENT SD-2020-00075 –
VACATION OF PUBLIC EASEMENT (Sketch Plat 10/9/19)
COMMUNITY SCIENCES CORPORATION agent(s) for JOHN R. DeBASSIGE FOR RIGHT ANGLE HOMES
BY DeBASSIGE request(s) the aforementioned action(s) for all or a portion of: LOTS 43 THRU 47, BLOCK 4
UNIT 4, PARADISE HEIGHTS, zoned R-1A, located on BROOKLINE DR. NW between ARDMORE AVE NW and
ENDEAVOR RD NW, containing approximately 1.1320 acre(s). (A-10) [Deferred from 4/29/20, 5/13/20,
6/24/20, 8/26/20]
PROPERTY OWNERS: JOHN DeBASSIGE FOR RIGHT ANGLE HOMES BY DeBASSIGE
REQUEST: DIVIDE 5 EXISTING LOTS INTO 10 NEW LOTS, VACATE EXISTING EASEMENTS
No comments. No objection to requested Variance or Plat or Vacation.

8. PR-2020-003626 SD-2020-00130 – PRELIMINARY/FINAL PLAT (Sketch Plat 4/22/20)
ARCH + PLAN LAND USE CONSULTANTS agent(s) for JULIAN & SUSANA CULL request(s) the
aforementioned action(s) for all or a portion of: 7A & 7B, VAN CLEAVE ACRES zoned R-A, located at 1540
VAN CLEAVE NW between SAN ISIDRO ST and GRIEGOS LATERAL, containing approximately 0.8233
acre(s). (G-13) [Deferred from 7/15/20, 7/29/20, 8/12/20, 9/2/20]
PROPERTY OWNERS: JULIAN & SUSANA CULL
REQUEST: LOT LINE ADJUSTMENT BETWEEN 2 EXISTING LOTS
No comments. No objection to requested plat.

9. PR-2019-002905 SD-2020-00132 – PRELIMINARY/FINAL PLAT (Sketch Plat 1/15/20)
ARCH + PLAN LAND USE CONSULTANTS agent(s) for SUNPORT PARK HOSPITALITY LLC request(s) the
aforementioned action(s) for all or a portion of: 2-A-2, SUNPORT PARK, zoned NR-BP, located at
WOODWARD RD between UNIVERSITY BLVD and TRANSPORT ST, containing
approximately 2.0473 acre(s). (M-15) [Deferred from 7/15/20, 7/29/20, 8/19/20, 9/16/20]
PROPERTY OWNERS: SUNPORT PARK HOSPITALITY LLC REQUEST: CREATE 2 LOTS FROM 1
EXISTING LOT, GRANT ADDITIONAL RECIPROCAL CROSS ACCESS, DRAINAGE EASEMENT
No comments. No objection to requested plat.

VACATION OF PRIVATE EASEMENT (Sketch Plat 7/17/19)
ARCH+ PLAN LAND USE CONSULTANTS agent(s) for JOHN O. PEARSON request(s) the aforementioned
action(s) for all or a portion of: LOT 8-B PLAT OF LOTS 8-A & 8-B UNIT 1 ALVARADO GARDENS CONT
0.8967 AC, zoned R-A, located on RIO GRANDE BLVD between ARTESANOS CT and CAMPBELL RD,
containing approximately 0.8967 acre(s). (G-13) [Deferred from 1/29/20, 2/26/20, 4/8/20, 5/20/20, 7/8/20,
7/29/20, 8/26/20, 9/16/20]
PROPERTY OWNERS: JOHN D PEARSON
REQUEST: CREATE 2 LOTS FROM 1 EXISTING LOT
No comments. No objection to request.
11. Project # PR-2020-004180 VA-2020-00289 – BULK LAND VARIANCE SD-2020-00151 - PRELIMINARY/FINAL PLAT (Sketch Plat 8/5/20)
BOHANNAN HUSTON/MICHAEL BALASKOVITS agent for MESA DEL SOL INVESTMENTS, LLC request(s) the aforementioned action(s) for all or a portion of: A-1-A-1, MESA DEL SOL INNOVATION PARK, zoned PC, located SOUTH OF BOBBY FOSTER ROAD, EAST OF I-25, NORTH OF TRACT 3 BULK LAND PLAT of MESA DEL SOL TRACTS 1-15 and WEST OF STATE LAND OFFICE LA SEMILLA PRESERVE, containing approximately 1673.9117 acre(s). (R14-R17, S14-S17, T15-T17) [Deferred from 9/23/20]
PROPERTY OWNERS: MDS INVESTMENTS
REQUEST: CREATE NEW 75 ACRE TRACT FROM EXISTING 1673 ACRE TRACT
No objection to request.

SKETCH PLAT

12. Project # PR-2020-004451 PS-2020-00085 -SKETCH PLAT
CSI – CARTESIAN SURVEYS, INC. agent(s) for LA-Z-BOY FURNITURE GALLERIES request(s) the aforementioned action(s) for all or a portion of: LOTS 7 THRU 10, BLOCK 22, THOMAS ADDITION, zoned MX-M, located at MONTGOMERY BLVD NE between MOON ST NE and HILTON PL NE, containing approximately 0.5277 acre(s). (G-20)
PROPERTY OWNERS: ENDORPHINS GROUP LLC
REQUEST: SKETCH PLAT REVIEW AND COMMENT
Montgomery would require street trees if development meets applicability in IDO Section 5-6(B). No objection to requests.

13. Project # PR-2020-004452 PS-2020-00086 -SKETCH PLAT
JASON COCHRAN agent(s) for MERRILY ROCCO request(s) the aforementioned action(s) for all or a portion of: LOT 22 & 23, BLOCK 2 UNIT 1, CASA GRANDE ESTATES, zoned R-1C, located at 3100 PALO ALTO between CANDELARIA and COMANCHE, containing approximately 0.4967 acre(s). (G-23)
PROPERTY OWNERS: BRUCE PAUL CHARLES & MERRILY ROCCO & SUE GOTTSCHALK TRUSTEE
REQUEST: SKETCH PLAT REVIEW AND COMMENT
No Comment.

14. Project # PR-2020-004457 PS-2020-00087 -SKETCH PLAT
RIO GRANDE ENGINEERING agent(s) for JENNIFER SOULE request(s) the aforementioned action(s) for all or a portion of: LOT 22, VOLCANO CLIFFS UNIT 6, zoned RA, located at QUIVIRA DR between VISTA VIEJA AVE and RETABLO RD, containing approximately 6.0 acre(s). (D-09)
PROPERTY OWNERS: BARBARA A MUELLER
REQUEST: SKETCH PLAT REVIEW AND COMMENT
Property adjacent to MPOS across southern property line. Section x of the IDO requires applicant to consult Open Space Division regarding 20-foot buffer or seek a Variance. Existing trail across Vista Vieja should not be affected by this request.

15. Project # PR-2020-004443 PS-2020-00083 -SKETCH PLAT
MARK BURAK, PE agent(s) for SHARIF RABADI request(s) the aforementioned action(s) for all or a portion of: LOT 20, 21A, 22A, 22B, 23A, 23B, 24A, 24B, 25B, 26B, 27B, 28B, 29B, UNIT 1, PARADISE HILLS INVESTMENT PROPERTIES, zoned MX-T, located at LYON/GLUCKMAN/LILIENTHAL between UNSER BLVD and PARADISE, containing approximately 6.76 acre(s). (B-11)
PROPERTY OWNERS: SHARIF & SAMIA RABADI
REQUEST: SKETCH PLAT REVIEW AND COMMENT
No Comments.

17. ACTION SHEET MINUTES: September 23, 2020
HEARING DATE/AGENDA ITEM  3

Project Number: PR-2020-004030
Application Number: SD-2020-00540
Project Name: Wintergreen Luxury Apartments
Request: Site Plan for Apartment with more than 50 Units

COMMENTS (requirements that need to be met):

- There is no Code Enforcement signature block

- The applicant needs to verify if a sensitive lands analysis is required

- The landscape buffer along the eastern property boundary meets the IDO requirements. However, the applicant could add additional trees in the landscape buffer to provide additional screening between the Site and the adjacent single-family residential dwellings east of the Site to provide two full layers of trees within the buffer.

- Open space calculations need to be provided.

- Staff recommends park benches be placed in the landscaped open space and near the sidewalks and trails within the proposed development.

- Outdoor/exterior lighting needs to be depicted.

- The CMU screen wall along the boundary of the Site is depicted as 6-feet in height. However, this screen wall cannot be more than 3 feet in height in the front yard. The Zoning Enforcement Officer (ZEO) must make an exception to this height standard for security reasons due to specific site conditions or the nature of the land use or related materials and facilities on the site according to 5-7(D)(3)(c) of the IDO. Along the southern boundary of the site adjacent to the arroyo running alongside the southern boundary of the Site, the applicant should consider 3-feet of wrought iron on top of 3-feet of CMU blocks in lieu of 6-feet of CMU blocks.

(see comments on the next page)
• Staff is concerned about the gap between the existing CMU wall along the adjacent subdivision east of the Site and the proposed 6-foot CMU wall along the eastern boundary of the Site because of possible maintenance issues and unwanted access.

• Staff requests the applicant consider maintaining the existing vegetation between the existing subdivision wall and the proposed wall along the eastern boundary of the Site.

• Additional tree(s) and shrubs appear to be required between the stormwater management pond and the existing subdivision.

• Staff requests the applicant provide a plane-angle illustration/depiction of the proposed apartments and the residences to the east of the Site depicting to scale the height of the proposed apartments and the residences and the distance between them.

• Consider moving the dumpsters farther away from the residential development.

• Please provide an elevation key so that we can determine each elevation of each building.

• The unit mix table is difficult to read, the letters are blurry can you update so that is more clear.

• COMMENTS (requirements that are met):

• The façade is consistent with 5-11(E)(2) because it has a clear distinction between the ground floor and upper floors, windows on upper floors, primary pedestrian entrances, wall projections and changes in plane and material (see IDO for full citation).

• The carports are consistent with 5-11-(D)(4) although some of them are located between the street and building most of them are disbursed throughout the site and there street facing carports are screened by a row of street trees.

• The landscaping plan exceeds the requirements by providing a total of 144,030 square feet of landscaping when 48,141 square feet are required.

• Please note that staff could have future comments and the Site Plan is still under review.

Disclaimer: The comments provided are based upon the information received from the applicant/agent. If new or revised information is submitted, additional comments may be provided by Planning.

FROM: Jay Rodenbeck  DATE: 9/30/2020
Planning Department
HEARING DATE/AGENDA ITEM  3

Project Number: PR-2020-004030
Application Number: SD-2020-00540
Project Name: Wintergreen Luxury Apartments
Request: Site Plan for Apartment with more than 50 Units

These comments are a response to citizen concerns that have been submitted to the DRB.

Concerned Citizen Comment:

A concerned citizen asserts that the proposed Wintergreen Apartments are not in compliance with NM State Statute:

Staff Response:

The City of Albuquerque is a home-rule municipality. By state law, the City may adopt ordinances that regulate zoning and planning procedures. The City Council approved the IDO in 2017 which governs site plan review.

Concerned Citizen Comment:

A concerned citizen asserts that both the proposed wall within 5 feet of the adjacent property and construction of the retention pond adjacent to the homeowners’ properties need to be moved at least past a landscape buffer of 15 feet.

Staff Response:

5-6(C)(13)(a) of the IDO states that the required landscape and buffer areas shall be designed to serve as stormwater management areas to the maximum extent practicable and consistent with their required locations and vegetation. Therefore, there is no restriction in the IDO on the stormwater management pond being located inside/within the landscape buffer as long as edge buffer landscaping requirements are met. Additional tree(s) and shrubs appear to be required between the stormwater management pond and the existing subdivision.
5-7(C)(1) of the IDO states that walls may be constructed anywhere on a parcel, including but not limited to any front, side, or rear setback area, unless otherwise prohibited by this IDO, by Articles 14-1 and 14-3 of ROA 1994 (Uniform Administrative Code and Uniform Housing Code), Article 14-2 of ROA 1994 (Fire Code), or by clear sight triangle requirements in the Development Process Manual (DPM). There is no restriction in the IDO or DPM for the proposed wall being constructed within the landscape buffer so long as the intent of 5-6(E)(1)(a) to ‘mitigate the impacts of significant differences in property use size, or scale’ is met. The 5 foot dead space between the existing and proposed wall is still under review.

Concerned Citizen Comment:

A concerned citizen asserted that the proposed Wintergreen Apartment Complex is contrary to Community Identity as spoken to in Chapter 4 of the Albuquerque/Bernalillo County Comprehensive Plan.

Staff Response:

6-2(D) of the IDO states that the Development Review Board (DRB) is a board made up of staff members from City Departments and Agencies relevant to reviewing private development to ensure technical standards have been met pertaining to land use, zoning, infrastructure, and transportation. The DRB therefore reviews technical standards in the IDO and DPM, but does not have responsibility or authority to interpret policy-based standards in the Comprehensive Plan.

Disclaimer: The comments provided are based upon the information received from the applicant/agent. If new or revised information is submitted, additional comments may be provided by Planning.

FROM: Jay Rodenbeck
Planning Department
DATE: 9/30/2020
AGENDA ITEM NO: ______________ 6 ______________

DRB Project Number: __PR-2020-004030

Application Number: __________________________

Project Name: ________________________________

REQUEST: Site Plan

COMMENTS:

1) Please verify that fence will be 3 ft.
2) CE has reviewed this plan for compliance with the IDO and has no objections.

(Comments may continue onto the next page)

Disclaimer: The comments provided are based upon the information received from the applicant/agent. If new or revised information is submitted, additional comments may be provided by Planning.

FROM: Carl Garcia, Code Supervisor               DATE: 8/26/2020
Planning Department
924-3838 cagarcia@cabq.gov

ACTION:

APPROVED ___; DENIED ____; DEFERRED ____; COMMENTS PROVIDED _X_; WITHDRAWN ___

DELEGATED: (TRANS) (HYD) (WUA) (PRKS) (PLNG) (CE)

8/26/2020
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD - HYDROLOGY SECTION
Renée Brissette, PE, Senior Engineer | 505-924-3995 rbrissette@cabq.gov

DRB Project Number: 2020-004030  Hearing Date: 08-26-2020
Project: Golf Course Apartments  Agenda Item No: 6

☐ Sketch Plat  ☐ Minor Preliminary / Final Plat  ☐ Preliminary Plat  ☐ Final Plat
☐ Temp Sidewalk Deferral  ☐ Sidewalk Waiver/Variance  ☒ Site Plan for Bldg. Permit  ☐ Site Plan for Subdivision  ☐ Bulk Land Plat
☐ SIA Extension  ☐ DPM Variance  ☐ Vacation of Public Easement  ☐ Vacation of Public Right of Way

ENGINEERING COMMENTS:

- Hydrology has an approved Conceptual Grading & Drainage Plan with engineer’s stamp 06/26/20.
- Hydrology has no objection to the SPBP.

RESOLUTION/COMMENTS:

Code Enforcement:

Water:

Transportation:

Planning:

☐ APPROVED  DELEGATED TO: ☐ TRANS  ☐ HYD  ☐ WUA  ☐ PRKS  ☐ PLNG
☐ DENIED
Delegated For: ____________________________
SIGNED: ☐ I.L.  ☐ SPSD  ☐ SPBP  ☐ FINAL PLAT
DEFERRED TO ________________
DRB Project Number: 4030  AGENDA ITEM NO: 6
Golf Course Apartments

SUBJECT: Site Plan

ENGINEERING COMMENTS:

1. Include “all appurtenances” as part of the streetlighting requirements shown on the infrastructure list.

2. Indicate clear sight triangles on landscaping plan. There are some plants within the sight distance triangle on the landscaping plan.

. If new or revised information is submitted, additional comments may be provided by Transportation Development.

FROM: Jeanne Wolfenbarger, P.E. DATE: August 26, 2020
Transportation Development
505-924-3991 or jwolfenbarger@cabq.gov

ACTION:

APPROVED __; DENIED __; DEFERRED __; COMMENTS PROVIDED __; WITHDRAWN __

DELEGATED: ____________ TO: (TRANS) (HYD) (WUA) (PRKS) (CE) (PLNG)
Development Review Board (DRB)
Review Comments
Utility Development Section
Reviewer: Kristopher Cadena, P.E.
Phone: 505.289.3301

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DRB Project No:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Item No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PR-2020-004030</td>
<td>08/26/20</td>
<td>#6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone Atlas Page:</th>
<th>Legal Description:</th>
<th>Location:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-12 &amp; A-13</td>
<td>A-12 &amp; A-13</td>
<td>GOLF COURSE RD NW between GOLF COURSE RD NW, BLACK ARROYO and WESTSIDE BLVD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Request For:
SI-2020-00540 - SITE PLAN

ABCWUA Comment:

Please provide written description of how the following comments were addressed with the next submittal.

1. Serviceability Letter #200506 has been written and provides the conditions for service.
2. The property is outside of the Adopted Service Area. A Water Authority Board approved development agreement will be required prior to Site Plan approval. The serviceability letter will serve as an exhibit to the development agreement.
3. Utility Plan
   a. Previously, an 8” water meter was proposed for a single connection for a private onsite loop for both domestic and fire protection. Current proposal is a separate water service and fire line. The fire line as shown is going through the proposed large water meter vault which is not acceptable.
REQUEST: Site Plan

COMMENTS:

1) Please verify that fence will be 3 ft.
2) CE has reviewed this plan for compliance with the IDO and has no objections.

(Comments may continue onto the next page)

Disclaimer: The comments provided are based upon the information received from the applicant/agent. If new or revised information is submitted, additional comments may be provided by Planning.

FROM: Carl Garcia, Code Supervisor
Planning Department
924-3838 cagarcia@cabq.gov

DATE: 8/5/2020

ACTION:

APPROVED ___; DENIED ___; DEFERRED ___; COMMENTS PROVIDED __; WITHDRAWN ___

DELEGATED: (TRANS) (HYD) (WUA) (PRKS) (PLNG) (CE)

8/5/2020
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD - HYDROLOGY SECTION
Renée Brissette, PE, Senior Engineer | 505-924-3995 rbrissette@cabq.gov

---

**DRB Project Number:** 2020-004030  
**Hearing Date:** 08-05-2020  
**Project:** Golf Course Apartments  
**Agenda Item No:** 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>☐ Sketch Plat</th>
<th>☐ Minor Preliminary / Final Plat</th>
<th>☐ Preliminary Plat</th>
<th>☐ Final Plat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ Temp Sidewalk Deferral</td>
<td>☐ Sidewalk Waiver/Variance</td>
<td>☒ Site Plan for Bldg. Permit</td>
<td>☐ Site Plan for Subdivision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ SIA Extension</td>
<td>☐ DPM Variance</td>
<td>☐ Vacation of Public Easement</td>
<td>☐ Vacation of Public Right of Way</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**ENGINEERING COMMENTS:**

- Hydrology has an approved Conceptual Grading & Drainage Plan with engineer’s stamp 06/26/20.
- Hydrology has no objection to the SPBP.

---

**RESOLUTION/COMMENTS:**

**Code Enforcement:**

Water:

Transportation:

Planning:

---

☐ APPROVED  
☐ DENIED

DELEGATED TO: ☐ TRANS ☐ HYD ☐ WUA ☐ PRKS ☐ PLNG
Delegated For: __________________________________________

SIGNED: ☐ I.L. ☐ SPSD ☐ SPBP ☐ FINAL PLAT
DEFERRED TO _______________
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD
TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT

DRB Project Number: 4030
Golf Course Apartments

AGENDA ITEM NO: 3

SUBJECT: Site Plan

ENGINEERING COMMENTS:

1. Label walkway widths to buildings, too. A minimum 6-foot sidewalk is required from main building to right-of-way. This requirement falls short adjacent to the building to the north. Label curb ramps as needed for the 6-foot pedestrian crossing across the driving aisle.

2. At least one minimum 5-foot wide sidewalk is required between buildings.

3. Does curb need to be called out where there seems to be a median cut for the ADA path in front of the clubhouse? Also call out curb as needed for the proposed traffic circle, and list radius of circle.

4. Where are the clear sight triangles at access points for both the site plan and the landscaping plan shown under AASHTO guidelines? I could not find these.

5. There was a statement regarding turn bay sufficiency on the left turn lane. How many vehicular trips is this based on? I could not find an analysis. It is sufficient to just have the apartments as part of the analysis, as stated.

6. The City is requesting public streetlighting on the infrastructure list along frontage. We realize that the old Golf Course Road Improvements did not have them, but this was a separate department that oversees the project, and we don’t know the reasoning at the time as to why they were not included. Additionally, traffic has increased since that time.

7. Provide distance shown between east property line and walkway along east side of site since neighbors had concerns about this.

8. If the plat shows a cross easement, that will definitely work for Transportation, but I did not find it in the new submittal package.

If new or revised information is submitted, additional comments may be provided by Transportation Development.

FROM: Jeanne Wolfenbarger, P.E.
Transportation Development
505-924-3991 or jwolfenbarger@cabq.gov

DATE: August 5, 2020

ACTION:

APPROVED __; DENIED __; DEFERRED __; COMMENTS PROVIDED __; WITHDRAWN __
DELEGATED: _____________ TO: (TRANS) (HYD) (WUA) (PRKS) (CE) (PLNG)
Development Review Board (DRB)
Review Comments
Utility Development Section
Reviewer: Kristopher Cadena, P.E.
Phone: 505.289.3301

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DRB Project No:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Item No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PR-2020-004030</td>
<td>08/05/20</td>
<td>#3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone Atlas Page:</th>
<th>Legal Description:</th>
<th>Location:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-12 &amp; A-13</td>
<td>A-12 &amp; A-13</td>
<td>GOLF COURSE RD NW between GOLF COURSE RD NW, BLACK ARROYO and WESTSIDE BLVD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Request For:
SI-2020-00540 - SITE PLAN

ABCWUA Comment:

Please provide written description of how the following comments were addressed with the next submittal.

1. Serviceability Letter #200506 has been written and provides the conditions for service.
2. The property is outside of the Adopted Service Area. A Water Authority Board approved development agreement will be required prior to Site Plan approval. The serviceability letter will serve as an exhibit to the development agreement.
3. Utility Plan
   a. Please label the existing public sanitary sewer along the southern frontage.
   b. Label the proposed private sanitary sewer along the southern property line.
   c. Note indicates 20’ private exclusive easement for public sanitary sewer which is not correct.
d. Rather than extending public sanitary sewer to the proposed roundabout for future access to existing Tract D-1, in an effort to minimize onsite public sanitary sewer, it seems the public sanitary sewer may be better suited to extend due north. This would require the relocation of the proposed dumpster enclosure near the northeast corner of the development. Has the proposed alignment been coordinated with existing Tract D-1?
   i. Vacation of the existing public sanitary sewer easement as well as granting of the new public sanitary sewer easement will be required.

e. PREVIOUS COMMENT: Label all proposed onsite private waterline accordingly. There is a proposed 6” waterline that shall be labeled as private.

f. A proposed 8” water meter is being used to create a single connection for a private onsite loop for both domestic and fire protection. Typically, fire lines are unmetered and separate from metered service. Please confirm with the Fire Marshal that they approve fire protection downstream of a metered service.

4. Infrastructure list
   a. The proposed public sanitary sewer item indicates the northern terminus is the northern property boundary of existing Tract D-1 which is incorrect.
AGENDA ITEM NO: 2

DRB Project Number: PR-2020-004030

APPLICATION NUMBER: ________________________________

PROJECT NAME: _______________________________________

REQUEST: Site Plan

COMMENTS:

1) **Variance required for wall over 3’ in front yard area.**
2) **Provide calculations for required open space.**

(Comments may continue onto the next page)

Disclaimer: The comments provided are based upon the information received from the applicant/agent. If new or revised information is submitted, additional comments may be provided by Planning.

FROM: Vince Montano, Code Supervisor
Planning Department
924-3825 vmontano@cabq.gov

DATE: 7/22/2020

ACTION:

APPROVED ___; DENIED ____; DEFERRED __; COMMENTS PROVIDED _X_; WITHDRAWN ___

DELEGATED: (TRANS) (HYD) (WUA) (PRKS) (PLNG) (CE)

7/22/2020
July 20, 2020

Angela Gomez
Administrative Assistant Development Review Services
City of Albuquerque
P.O. Box 1293
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87103

Subject: Comments for Design Review Board on July 22, 2020
Albuquerque, Bernalillo County, District Three

Dear Mrs. Gomez:

Attached are the New Mexico Department of Transportation (NMDOT) comments on the cases that were submitted by your department for our input.

Project Number: 4030
Case Description: Site Plan
Location: Between Westside Blvd and Black Arroyo
Type of Development (Residential/Commercial): Commercial
Possible Impacted NMDOT roadway(s): NA
Department Comments:
NMDOT does not have any comments at this time

If there are any questions, please feel free to contact Peter Kubiak at 505.249.5718 or Peter.Kubiak@state.nm.us
Sincerely,

Peter Kubiak, D3 Engineering Coordinator

cc: Nancy Perea, D3 Traffic Engineer (email)
cc: Margaret Haynes, D3 Assistant Traffic Engineer (email)
To: Angela Gomez, Development Review Board Secretary
City of Albuquerque

From: Nicole M. Friedt, P.E., Development Review Engineer
AMAFCA

RE: DRB COMMENTS for PR #4030

TR D-1 & E-1 PLAT OF TRS D-1, E-1 AMAFCA BLACK ARROYO CHANNEL ROW PARADISE HEIGHTS UNIT 1 (Wintergreen Luxury Apartment Complex):
ZAP: A-12 & 13

SI-2020-00540 Site Plan • Ensure that existing concrete rundown provides capacity for proposed flows while still meeting AMAFCA maintenance and traversability standards.
MEMORANDUM

To: Development Review Board
c/o Angela Gomez, Administrative Assistant, DRB Board

Cc: Kizito Wijenje AICP, Executive Director, APS Capital Master Plan
Karen Alarid, Executive Director APS Facility Planning & Construction
Amanda Velarde, Director, APS Real Estate
John Valdez, AICP, Facilities Master Planner, State of NM Public Schools Facilities Authority
Elizabeth Halpin AICP, Senior Planner Manager, APS Capital Master Plan

From: Rachel Hertzman, AICP, Planner II, APS Capital Master Plan

Re: CABQ Development Review Board Cases to be heard on July 22, 2020, case 2 of 2, Project 4030

2. Project #4030 (1002566, 1004501, 1004503)
   a. DRB Description:
      i. SI-2020-00540—SITE PLAN
   c. Site Location: At Golf Course Road between Black Arroyo and Westside Boulevard.
   d. Request Description: This is an application for a site plan for an apartment building with
      more than 50 units on approximately 8.77 acres, zoned MX-M (Mixed Use, Moderate Intensity).
   e. APS Case Comments: Residential development at this location will have impacts to Seven
      Bar Elementary School, James Monroe Middle School, and Cibola High School. Enrollment
      at Seven Bar Elementary School is approaching capacity and development will be a strain on
      this school.
         i. Residential Units: 209
         ii. Est. Elementary School Students: 53
         iii. Est. Middle School Students: 23
         iv. Est. High School Students: 23
         v. Est. Total # of Students from Project: 99
         *The estimated number of students from the proposed project is based on an average student generation rate for the entire APS district.
To address overcrowding at schools, APS will explore various alternatives. A combination or all of the following options may be utilized to relieve overcrowded schools.

- **Provide new capacity (long term solution)**
  - Construct new schools or additions
  - Add portables
  - Use of non-classroom spaces for temporary classrooms
  - Lease facilities
  - Use other public facilities
- **Improve facility efficiency (short term solution)**
  - Schedule Changes
    - Double sessions
    - Multi-track year-round
  - Other
    - Float teachers (flex schedule)
- **Shift students to Schools with Capacity (short term solution)**
  - Boundary Adjustments / Busing
  - Grade reconfiguration
- **Combination of above strategies**

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

To: Angela Gomez, DRB Hearing Monitor

From: Laura Kuehn, NCPS, ICPS - Crime Prevention/Crime Free Programs

Subject: PR 2020-004030 The Hilltop

Regarding the proposed site plan for The Hilltop, I respectfully submit the following comments based on Crime Prevention through Environmental Design:

- Ensure adequate lighting throughout the project, to include parking areas, pedestrian walkways, and common areas such as courtyards.
- Ensure natural surveillance and clear lines of sight throughout the property. Natural surveillance requires a space free from natural and physical barrier (i.e. open picket vs. solid fences). Establish a clear line of sight from the parking areas to the buildings and from the buildings to the parking areas.
- Ensure that landscaping is installed so as not to obstruct windows, doors, entryways, or lighting.
- Ensure that landscaping is maintained to provide natural surveillance, trimming trees up to create a canopy of at least six feet; and trimming shrubs and bushes down to three feet.
- Ensure adequate locking devices (i.e. deadbolt locks) on residential units.
- Ensure that addresses are posted and clearly visible.
- Ensure eye-viewers on primary and secondary entrance doors to residential units.
- Limit and clearly delineate access to the property; i.e. Resident Parking and Visitor Parking.
- Clearly delineate public, semi-public, semi-private, and private space throughout the project.
- Install No Trespassing signs that cite the City Ordinance so that they are visible immediately upon entering the property.

If you have any questions regarding these CPTED recommendations, please call me at 768-2006. I am also available to do an on-site security survey after the project is complete.
HEARING DATE/AGENDA ITEM 2

Project Number: PR-004030
Application Number: SD-2020-00540
Project Name: Wintergreen Luxury Apartments
Request: Site Plan for Apartment with more than 50 Units

COMMENTS (requirements that need to be met):

- There is no Code Enforcement signature block
- The applicant needs to verify if a sensitive lands analysis is required
- The landscape buffer along the eastern property boundary meets the IDO requirements. However, the applicant could add additional trees in the landscape buffer to provide additional screening between the Site and the adjacent single-family residential dwellings east of the Site to provide two full layers of trees within the buffer.
- Open space calculations need to be provided.
- Staff recommends park benches be placed in the landscaped open space and near the sidewalks and trails within the proposed development.
- Outdoor/exterior lighting needs to be depicted.
- The CMU screen wall along the boundary of the Site is depicted as 6-feet in height. However, this screen wall cannot be more than 3 feet in height in the front yard. The Zoning Enforcement Officer (ZEO) must make an exception to this height standard for security reasons due to specific site conditions or the nature of the land use or related materials and facilities on the site according to 5-7(D)(3)(c) of the IDO. Along the southern boundary of the site adjacent to the arroyo running alongside the southern boundary of the Site, the applicant should consider 3-feet of wrought iron on top of 3-feet of CMU blocks in lieu of 6-feet of CMU blocks.
• Staff requests the applicant provide a plane-angle illustration/depiction of the proposed apartments and the residences to the east of the Site depicting to scale the height of the proposed apartments and the residences and the distance between them.

• Consider moving the dumpsters farther away from the residential development

• Please provide an elevation key so that we can determine each elevation of each building

• The unit mix table is difficult to read, the letters are blurry can you update so that is more clear

• COMMENTS (requirements that are met):

  • The façade is consistent with 5-11(E)(2) because it has a clear distinction between the ground floor and upper floors, windows on upper floors, primary pedestrian entrances, wall projections and changes in plane and material (see IDO for full citation).

  • The carports are consistent with 5-11-(D)(4) although some of them are located between the street and building most of them are disbursed throughout the site and there street facing carports are screened by a row of street trees

  • The landscaping plan exceeds the requirements by providing a total of 144,030 square feet of landscaping when 48,141 square feet are required.

  • Please note that staff could have future comments and the Site Plan is still under review.

Disclaimer: The comments provided are based upon the information received from the applicant/agent. If new or revised information is submitted, additional comments may be provided by Planning.

FROM: Jay Rodenbeck
Planning Department

DATE: 7/22/2020
TO: Jolene Wolfley

FR: Bianca Borg, Transportation Planner

RE: MRMPO Comments for Development Review Board Applications Scheduled for July 22, 2020

July 21, 2020

The following staff comments relate to transportation systems planning within the Albuquerque Metropolitan Planning Area (AMPA). Principal guidance comes from the 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) and the maps therein; Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for FFY 2016-2021; the Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Regional Architecture; and the Roadway Access Policies of the Transportation Coordinating Committee (TCC) of the Metropolitan Transportation Board (MTB).

**Project #4030 - SI-2020-00540**

MRMPO has no adverse comments.

For informational purposes:

- Westside Blvd. is functionally classified as and Existing Principal Arterial in the project area.
- Golf Course Rd. NW is functionally classified as an Existing Minor Arterial in the project area.
- Golf Course Rd. NW is an Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) Corridor. Please consult the reviewing agency's Traffic Engineering and/or ITS Department with any questions regarding ITS infrastructure.
- Golf Course Rd. is identified as a Secondary route in the Target Scenario Transit Network. Secondary routes have frequencies of 15 minutes or less. MRMPO supports the development of high density housing options in areas that are supported by transit to reduce peak hour Vehicle Miles Travelled (VMT).
- MRMPO supports a diverse mix of housing, in cost, unit types, and neighborhood settings.
- The Transportation Improvement Project (TIP) project A301050 will modify Westside from a two to a four lane road between Golf Course Rd. and NM Hwy 528.
- Appendix G of the MTP recommends the following as it relates to this request:
  - Improve the user experience for cyclists, pedestrians, and transit riders with thoughtful connections and design
  - Require that newly developing areas have a well-connected multi-modal transportation network for internal circulation
If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me by phone at (505)724-3608, or e-mail bborg@mrcog-nm.gov.
ABCWUA Comment:

Please provide written description of how the following comments were addressed with the next submittal.

1. Serviceability Letter #200506 is currently being researched. It will provide the conditions for service. Public water and/or sanitary sewer extensions may be required.
2. The property is outside of the Adopted Service Area. A Water Authority Board approved development agreement will be required prior to Site Plan approval. The serviceability letter will serve as an exhibit to the development agreement.
3. Utility Plan
   a. Please show and label existing public waterline along the west and south frontages.
   b. There seems to be parallel private fire lines along the west and north drive aisles. Please confirm and label accordingly.
   c. Please show and label all proposed water meters (domestic and/or irrigation).
d. Label all proposed onsite public and private sanitary sewer accordingly.

e. Label all proposed onsite private waterline accordingly.

f. The public sanitary sewer extensions are currently being researched as part of the serviceability letter.
   i. The intent is to provide the existing Lot D-1 to the north the ability to connect to public sanitary sewer.
      1. There is an existing 30’ public sanitary sewer easement along the entire eastern frontage of the subject property. The proposed pond within this easement is not acceptable.
      2. Based on the serviceability letter, a possible alignment of the public sanitary sewer may be the easternmost north/south drive aisle. The serviceability letter will provide the official requirements.
         a. This would require vacation of the existing 30’ sanitary sewer easement, as well as granting new public sanitary sewer easement in a manner that provides access to existing Lot D-1.
         b. The proposed dumpster enclosure may need to be relocated.
         c. Given that landscaping is proposed along the existing 30’ public sanitary sewer easement, this may not be the best alignment.
         d. Continuous access for maintenance and operation shall be provided for all onsite public sanitary sewer.
Hello Larry,

Yes, I can review our emails and forward over the correspondence we received outside of the neighborhood meetings. I will work to get that to you by cob today or tomorrow.

Regards,
Richard Stevenson, PE
Tierra West LLC
(505) 858 3100

Dear Mr. Stevenson,

We do not have copies of all of the neighborhood input and concerns that were sent to you on the proposed development. We are requesting all documents and emails sent to you per the May 6, 2020 direction from Scott Templeton, Seven Bar HOA President to Mike Mirabal. He stated, “Well I think the best way for you to communicate your concerns is directly with Engineering firm.” Reiterating the same information at the May 8, 2020 informal neighborhood gathering that Richard Stevenson, PE with Tierra West, LLC. would be the point of contact to funnel the neighbors input and concerns.

We are requesting a copy of all the people who submitted input & concerns and the content of the content they sent to you through email with attached documents. Please feel free to contact us if you have questions.

Sincerely,
Larry Sandoval

This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
From: Wolfley, Jolene  
Sent: Monday, November 09, 2020 4:30 PM  
To: Gomez, Angela J.  
Subject: FW: [#2020013] PR-004030/SD-2020-00540 5-7(D)(3) Exceptions to Maximum wall height 5-7(D)(3) Exceptions to Maximum wall height

Please check to see if this email made it in the record for PR 4030.

From: Richard Stevenson <rstevenson@tierrawestllc.com>  
Sent: Tuesday, September 1, 2020 12:17 PM  
To: Aranda, James M. <jmaranda@cabq.gov>  
Cc: Wolfley, Jolene <jwolfley@cabq.gov>; Gould, Maggie S. <MGould@cabq.gov>; Ron Bohannan <rrb@tierrawestllc.com>; Garcia, Carl A. <cagarcia@cabq.gov>; Brito, Russell D. <RBrito@cabq.gov>  
Subject: RE: [#2020013] PR-004030/SD-2020-00540 5-7(D)(3) Exceptions to Maximum wall height 5-7(D)(3) Exceptions to Maximum wall height

James,

Thanks for taking time to review and provide a determination.

Regards,
Richard Stevenson, PE  
Tierra West LLC  
(505) 858 3100

From: Aranda, James M. <mailto:jmaranda@cabq.gov>  
Sent: Tuesday, September 1, 2020 12:12 PM  
To: Richard Stevenson  
Cc: Wolfley, Jolene; Gould, Maggie S.; Ron Bohannan; Garcia, Carl A.; Brito, Russell D.  
Subject: RE: [#2020013] PR-004030/SD-2020-00540 5-7(D)(3) Exceptions to Maximum wall height 5-7(D)(3) Exceptions to Maximum wall height

Hello Richard,

Thank you for your request for an exception for to the provisions of IDO §5-7(D)(1) and IDO Table 5-7-1 for a proposed gated apartment complex located at the Northeast corner of Golf Course Road NW and the AMAFCA Black Arroyo. Based on the information in your email dated August 20, 2020, you are proposing a gated apartment complex, and in doing so, also proposing a 6-ft high CMU/wrought iron fencing around the perimeter (6-ft opaque wall on the east side against the residential zone) for security purposes. In justifying your request for a fence height exception, you explained that the subject property lies along a drainage channel that transients use to travel and congregate. In addition, the proposed development will also have an open pool, which in your view can potentially become an “attractive nuisance” if an adequate security fence of 6-ft is not installed in order to protect the safety of the public if trespassing occurs.

The subject property is zoned MX-M. Pursuant to IDO §5-7(D)(1) and IDO Table 5-7-1, an 8-foot tall wall/fence is permitted on the interior side or rear yard abutting a major arroyo. A 3-foot tall wall/fence is permitted in the front yard or street side yard. Pursuant to IDO §6-5(J)(3)(a), The Zoning Enforcement Officer (ZEO) can make an exception to the height standards of 5-7(D)(1) and Table 5-7-1 for security reasons due
to specific site conditions or the nature of the land use or related materials and facilities on the site pursuant to 6-5(J) (Wall or Fence Permit – Minor)

6-5(J)(3)

Review and Approval Criteria

An application for a Wall or Fence Permit shall be approved if it complies with all applicable standards in this IDO, the DPM, other adopted City regulations, and any conditions specifically applied to development of the property in a prior permit or approval affecting the property.

6-5(J)(3)(a)

The ZEO may approve a wall or fence that is taller than allowed by Subsection 14-16-5-7(D) if necessary for security reasons due to specific site conditions or the nature of the land use or related materials and facilities on the site.

Based upon the information provided by you, the nature of the proposed land use for the subject property is multifamily apartments and an outdoor pool. The proposed land use as detailed does not appear to require additional or heightened security above and beyond what is currently afforded under the provisions of the IDO. Furthermore, there appear to be no particular site conditions, proposed materials or facilities onsite that would require heightened security or meet the criteria for an exception to the front yard wall height prescribed in IDO Table 5-7-1. Therefore, based upon my review of the request and all available information at hand, it is my determination as ZEO that an exception to the height standards of IDO §5-7(D)(1) and Table 5-7-1 for security reasons is not warranted in this particular situation and the proposed 6-foot tall perimeter fence around the entire subject property is not an acceptable exception to IDO §5-7(D)(1) and Table 5-7-1. Please note that a Variance—ZHE is the appropriate path forward for approval of the proposed security fence. For additional information regarding required fence/wall permits, please contact the Building Safety and Permits Division at (505) 924-3964 or (505) 924-3320.

Respectfully,

JMA

JAMES M. ARANDA, MCRP
él/he/him/his
deputy director | planning department
o 505.924.3361
m 505.803.6378
e jmaranda@cabq.gov
cabq.gov/planning

On Aug 20, 2020, at 10:20 AM, Richard Stevenson <rstevenson@tierrawestllc.com> wrote:

PR-004030/SD-2020-00540
5-7(D)(3) Exceptions to Maximum wall height

Hello James,
We have an exciting new gated apartment development proposed on the west side of town, see attached vicinity map and site renders. We are currently tracking through the DRB review process under PR-004030.

Per Section 5-7(D)(3)(c) of the IDO on page 274, I am writing to you as the ZEO to request an exception to the maximum wall height standard listed in Table 5-7-1 for security reasons due to specific site conditions.

As mentioned the site is a gated complex, and we are proposing a 6-ft high CMU/wrought iron fencing around the perimeter (6-ft opaque wall on the east side against the residential zone) for security purposes. Per Table 5-7-1 the maximum wall height along the street side yard (being Golf Course Rd) for the mixed-use zone is restricted to 3-ft in height. Due to security reasons for this site, given that the development is under a gated condition, we are requesting an exception in height from 3-ft to 6-ft. The site lies along a drainage channel where known transients use to travel and congregate. In addition, the development will also have an open pool and we believe it will be an attractive nuisance if an adequately security fence of 6-ft is not installed in order to protect the safety of the public if trespassing occurs.

Can you please review and let me know if you need any additional information or have any questions on the exception request?

Kind Regards,

Richard Stevenson, P.E.

Tierra West LLC
5571 Midway Park Pl., NE
Albuquerque, NM 87109
505-858-3100 ext. 232

PRIVILEGED AND CONFIDENTIAL
The information contained in this electronic mail message is confidential, may be privileged, and is intended only for the use of the individual(s) named above or their designee. If you are not the intended recipient of this message, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. Any unauthorized interception of this message is illegal under the law. If you have received this message in error, please immediately notify me by return message or by telephone and delete the original message from your email system. Thank you.

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

<PR-004030 Vicinity map and renders for ZEO.PDF>

=======================================================
This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
Attached is the scanned document we made prior to mailing out the 100-ft buffer notices as proof the notices were sent to the homeowners on the ONC list of addresses.

I also marked up the map provided by the neighbors, see attached.

All IDO notice requirements were met and we followed the ONC list of addresses to mail out letters. I do note that 10943 Carreta Dr home owner was not on the provided list but has been involved with all public meetings and we have correspondence dating back to May in regards to the proposed development. There is no doubt that the homeowner is aware of the proposed development.

The yellow sign was posted per the sign posting agreement. We were made aware on Monday July 20 from DRB Chair that the yellow sign was leaning over at a 45 degree angle. We correct this immediately that same day, and re-erected the sign (see attached photo of the sign re-erected on July 20). Please note the neighbor who reported the ‘sign leaning’ did not include the applicant with their first and second notice that was sent to the City on Saturday and Sunday the 18th and 19th July respectively. I kindly informed the neighbor if they had provided the applicant the courtesy notice, it would have been re-erected on the 18th for the benefit of the public! Email correspondence attached.

Regards,
Richard Stevenson, PE
Tierra West LLC
(505) 858 3100
Mail was sent. Refer scan addressed to 10923 owner for notification letter - 10932 Carreta Dr. Morgan Kristen (pg 9 of pdf)

not included by City for 100-ft buffer see email 6/24 list of property owners.
SANDOVAL NICK A & DEBBIE L
12009 SULLIVAN CT NW
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87114-6535

CALDERON MARY LOU C
10915 CARRETA DR NW
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87114

MIRABAL MICHAEL D & MIRABAL CATHY F
10951 CARRETA DR NW
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87114-6504

RAINWATER KATHRYN M & CHARLES T CO-TRUSTEES RAINWATER FAMILY TRUST
4509 NOCHE CLARA AVE NW
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87114-5599

MARSHA E KEARNEY & JOHN R
10927 CARRETA DR NW
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87114-6504

SERNA MIKE R IRREVOCABLE LVT
10812 OLYMPIC ST NW
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87114-5429

MORGAN KRISTEN
10923 CARRETA DR NW
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87114-6504

MAGGIO MICHAEL & JOANN
10920 CARRETA DR NW
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87114

HUTCHINSON TERRY SCOTT
10947 CARRETA DR NW
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87114-6504

LOPEZ DAVID M & CASSANDRA F
11008 CARRETA DR NW
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87114

VIOLA STEPHEN W & KAREN C
11001 CARRETA DR NW
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87114

WHEELER STEPHEN C & MARCIA L
4524 BENTON AVE NW
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87114

MURRIETA JAMES P JP TYRA J TRUSTEES MURRIETA RVT
10940 CARRETA DR NW
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87114-6506

FIFE JOHN WAYNE & MARSHA YVETT
10932 CARRETA DR NW
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87114

LOPEZ STEVEN C & GOLDBERG MELANIE A
10935 CARRETA DR NW
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87114-6504

REES PAUL J & DEBORAH A
10931 CARRETA DR NW
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87114

TRUJILLO CARLOS & GALLEGOS CAROLINE A
10928 CARRETA DR NW
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87114-6506

SUNNY PROPERTIES LLC
528 TRES LAGUNAS LN NE
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87113

MCCORMACK DANIEL J & VICTORIA M
10919 CARRETA DR NW
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87114-6504

THIERJUNG NELSON P & EVA S
12005 SULLIVAN CT NW
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87114-6535

SERDA ADRIANA M
4520 BENTON AVE NW
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87114-5042

FISHER TINA R
11005 CARRETA DR NW
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87114-6517

COFFMAN ERIN M
11000 CARRETA DR NW
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87114

WARD LARRY A & GERALDINE S
4501 NOCHE CLARA AVE NW
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87114

BACA DEBORAH
4505 NOCHE CLARA AVE NW
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87114-5599

JAEGGER JACK J II
4516 BENTON AVE NW
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87114

AMAFCA
2600 PROSPECT AVE NE
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87107-1836

ISSUES JAMES A & MARY JO
4424 CAMPO DE MAIZ RD NW
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87114

GREENWOOD REBEKAH SULTEMEIER
11009 CARRETA DR NW
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87114-6517

MCMILLAN BEVERLY A & LENNARD C
10939 CARRETA DR NW
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87114

348
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Contact Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GARCIA LARRY M &amp; AMY C</td>
<td>10936 CARRETA DR NW ALBUQUERQUE NM 87114</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALABAC ILLAS GROUP C/O DONALD HARVILLE</td>
<td>3301R COORS BLVD NW 305 ALBUQUERQUE NM 87120-1229</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMAFCA</td>
<td>2600 PROSPECT AVE NE ALBUQUERQUE NM 87107-1836</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALABACILLAS GROUP</td>
<td>3301R COORS BLVD NW 305 ALBUQUERQUE NM 87120-1229</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TIERRA WEST, LLC
5571 MIDWAY PARK PLACE NE
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87109

LOPEZ STEVEN C & GOLDBERG
MELANIE A
10935 CARreta DR NW
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87114-6504

TIERRA WEST, LLC
5571 MIDWAY PARK PLACE NE
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87109

WARD LARRY A & GERALDINE S
4501 NOCHE CLARA AVE NW
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87114

TIERRA WEST, LLC
5571 MIDWAY PARK PLACE NE
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87109

FIFE JOHN WAYNE & MARSHA YVETT
10932 CARREA DR NW
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87114
TIERRA WEST, LLC
5571 MIDWAY PARK PLACE NE
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87109

BACA DEBORAH
4505 NOCHE CLARA AVE NW
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87114-5599

TIERRA WEST, LLC
5571 MIDWAY PARK PLACE NE
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87109

ISSUES JAMES A & MARY JO
4424 CAMPO DE MAIZ RD NW
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87114

TIERRA WEST, LLC
5571 MIDWAY PARK PLACE NE
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87109

MURRIETA JAMES P JP TYRA J
TRUSTEES MURRIETA RVT
10940 CARRETA DR NW
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87114-6506
MIRABAL MICHAEL D & MIRABAL CATHY F
10951 CARRETA DR NW
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87114-6504

SANDOVAL NICK A & DEBBIE L
12009 SULLIVAN CT NW
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87114-6535

MARSHA E KEARNEY & JOHN R
10927 CARRETA DR NW
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87114-6504
TIERRA WEST, LLC
5571 MIDWAY PARK PLACE NE
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87109

CALABACILLAS GROUP
3301 R COORS BLVD NW 305
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87120-1229

TIERRA WEST, LLC
5571 MIDWAY PARK PLACE NE
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87109

RAINWATER KATHRYN M & CHARLES T
CO-TRUSTEES RAINWATER FAMILY
TRUST
4509 NOCHE CLARA AVE NW
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87114-5599

TIERRA WEST, LLC
5571 MIDWAY PARK PLACE NE
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87109

WHEELER STEPHEN C & MARCIA L
4524 BENTON AVE NW
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87114
TIERRA WEST, LLC
5571 MIDWAY PARK PLACE NE
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87109

HUTCHINSON TERRY SCOTT
10947 CARRETA DR NW
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87114-6504

TIERRA WEST, LLC
5571 MIDWAY PARK PLACE NE
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87109

CALABACILLAS GROUP C/O DONALD HARVILLE
3301R COORS BLVD NW 305
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87120-1229

TIERRA WEST, LLC
5571 MIDWAY PARK PLACE NE
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87109

MORGAN KRISTEN
10923 CARRETA DR NW
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87114-6504
GARCIA LARRY M & AMY C
10936 CARRETA DR NW
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87114

SUNNY PROPERTIES LLC
528 TRES LAGUNAS LN NE
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87113

AMAFCA
2600 PROSPECT AVE NE
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87107-1836
Can you please address all of the public notice requirements and 100 foot notice buffer and verify that proper notice was mailed to all property owners within the 100 foot buffer?

Thank you,

MAGGIE GOULD
planning manager
land development coordination
o 505-924-3880
c 505-553-0682
e mgould@cabq.gov
cabq.gov/planning

Dear Ms. Wolfley,

Please see documents related to the Notification Process, also note Tierra West’s notification to property owners who live 100-feet from the proposed development buffer and those partially along the development buffer. Documents #4 and #5 indicate homeowners, Larry Sandoval and Kristen Morgan live on Carreta Dr. are located within the 100-feet proposed development buffer were not officially notified by letter per IDO requirements. There are other consistencies as to why some were notified and others were not. The Sign Posting Agreement notification was also in violation and finally corrected two days before the July 22nd DRB hearing. Therefore, the application by Tierra West does not meet full compliance. Ms Wolfley, please confirm when you receive these documents.

Contents:

1. City of Albuquerque’s Public Notification Process per the IDO
2. Tierra West’s Area Map of Notification to property owners (as submitted to DRB on July 22, 2020)
3. Tierra West’s List of property owners (as submitted to the DRB on July 22, 2020)
4. Our Map of property owners Notified and Not Notified
5. Our List of property owners Notified and Not Notified
6. Sign Posting Agreement non-compliance

Sincerely,

Larry Sandoval

This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
From: Richard Stevenson <rstevenson@tierrawestllc.com>  
Sent: Tuesday, September 29, 2020 11:45 AM  
To: Rodenbeck, Jay B. <jrodenbeck@cabq.gov>  
Cc: Gould, Maggie S. <MGould@cabq.gov>; Ron Bohannan <rrb@tierrawestllc.com>  
Subject: RE: [#2020013] Wintergreen Apartments (PR-2020-004030)

Mr. Rodenbeck,

We discussed with the landscape designer, and below are his comments. Considering these comments, and considering the grading of the site will be ±1-2-ft in difference from the existing grade today, we will remove the existing shrubs/vegetation and shall replace with new plating along the buffer area, as its reflected in the landscape plan.

“Looks like some well-established sand sage / Artemisia filifolia. I think I also see a few fourwing saltbrush / Atriplex canescens, or at least I would expect some in the area. We could certainly plan to keep as many as possible, they are native shrub material that would require no supplemental irrigation. Building a serpentine wall without disturbing them will be a bit tricky, I imagine. From a landscape perspective, the area between the two walls will need periodic, annual or semi-annual maintenance so leaving large shrubs could set the project up for needing a more labor-intensive cleanup later after the wall is constructed. Conversely, larger shrub material would provide groundcover to suppress weed growth so perhaps leaving the shrubs would lessen maintenance needs. On the other side of the wall, between the wall and the parking lot, how and where to place the pines and junipers intended to offer visual buffers between towers and the residential backyards may not be as effective if planned around existing shrubs. Irrigation will also need to be buried for the trees and will disturb existing roots.”

Per 5-6(E)(2)(a) the 15-ft landscape buffer is provided with landscaping per the requirements, and per 5-9 we have the 50-ft buffer before we start the parking area which has shrubs, and smaller plant species scattered throughout.

Regards,  
Richard Stevenson, PE  
Tierra West LLC  
(505) 858 3100
We do not have a record of your response the request below to consider maintaining the existing vegetation between the existing subdivision wall and your wall. If you are able to maintain this vegetation, then this should qualify as a landscape buffer area.

The Seven Bar neighborhood comments received on 9/28/20 are questioning what can be placed in the landscape buffer that is the 15 feet immediately adjacent to their homes. We need you to clarify what will be immediately adjacent to the existing subdivision wall.

---

From: Rodenbeck, Jay B.
Sent: Friday, August 21, 2020 4:26 PM
To: 'Richard Stevenson' <rstevenson@tierrawestllc.com>
Subject: PR-2020-004030

Hi Richard,

Staff was wondering for the apartments at Golf Course and Black Arroyo (PR-2020-004030) if you have received Water Board approval yet? Also, staff has some ideas regarding the natural shrubbery against the residential wall of the 7Bar neighborhood to the east, and some pictures are attached of the shrubbery.

Planning staff feels that a break in the shrubs is about 5-8 feet from the residential wall and is somewhat continuous. Staff feels that this would be a perfect place to put the wall, allowing it to meander.

Again, please let us know about the Water Board approval status.

Thanks,

---

Jay Rodenbeck
Planner
o 505.924.3994
e jrodenbeck@cabq.gov
cabq.gov/planning
This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
From: Richard Stevenson [mailto:rstevenson@tierrawestllc.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 04, 2020 1:55 PM
To: Marsha Kearney
Cc: p crump; Ron Bohannan; rick@rba81.com; gnh5976@gmail.com; 1garciagang@gmail.com; mdmiraba@msn.com; meganfitz@live.com; bcreel@msn.com; frandimarco@msn.com; cfmirabal@gmail.com; ruffkat@yahoo.com; david.m.lopez@msn.com; garnard_lu@yahoo.com; kmcvey124@comcast.net; tjmurieta@msn.com; nenaperkin@gmail.com; avalgman12@gmail.com; scott.templeton@comcast.net; chavezdyx4@yahoo.com; mccormackdj@comcast.net; erin.coffman@yahoo.com; huerta.lorettas8@gmail.com; gayle.binkley@me.com; marshakearney@gmail.com; nauticalhutch@gmail.com; miladybutler@yahoo.com; rfasel@fed.net; Gomez, Angela J.; Wolfenbarger, Jeanne; Gould, Maggie S.
Subject: RE: [#2020013] Wintergreen Apartments DRB questions (PR-2020-004030)

Good Afternoon,

In regards to notification, including signage, we followed the requirements listed in Section 6-4(K) of the IDO. This included sending notices to the adjoining property owners based on the City provided ONC list, posting the yellow sign per the sign posting agreement, and sending out notices to the recognized Home Owner Associations. If you have concerns with the IDO notification procedures that applicants are required to follow, please email DRB Chair Ms. Wolfley jwolffey@cabq.gov. Annual updates of the IDO are submitted every year into the City’s review and approval process, so the City can consider your feedback and concerns.

Cobble rock, or equivalent, will be placed in the 5-ft setback between the CMU wall and the property line. The apartment landscape maintenance crew will maintain all areas on the property. Additional trees and vegetation density were added to the buffer area, and the walking trail has been shifted to the west further away from the property line.

We previously discussed crime in prior correspondence and at the public meetings.

All Solar Access requirements per IDO Section 5-10 are met.

The market research and studies completed by the developer are proprietary and will not be shared.

The tree sizes at planting and at maturity are shown in the cross sections to provide a scale and orientation of the apartment building relative to the single family homes and detail the buffer area. As previously mentioned the IDO requires a 50-ft landscape buffer (IDO Section 5-9(F)) to provide a setback between the improvements and the single family homes to increase the privacy and to reduce sight-lines from adjoining properties. Based on the proposed building height there is also a minimum 100-ft offset from the property line (IDO Section 2-4(C)), to provide protection to the adjacent home owners. Please refer to the landscaping plan which details the tree spacing, heights at maturity etc. which is included in the plans (link provided in previous email).

The Comprehensive Plan provides the guiding framework in establishing the zoning designations throughout the City. The zoning allowable uses is then specifically defined in the IDO and by the specific zone classification. The IDO also defines the development standards and the City’s planning system and procedures. This project meets the
requirements listed in the IDO, to the best of our knowledge. This is not a zone change, and as such, when the City Council placed the MX-M zoning designation on the property it was guided by the Comprehensive Plan Goals and Policies. The assessment for MX-M zoning was completed by City Planners, property owners, neighborhood associations and members of the public during the adoption of the IDO. You can find more information on the City website https://abc-zone.com/

Regards,
Richard Stevenson, PE
Tierra West LLC
(505) 858 3100

---

From: Marsha Kearney [mailto:rmeek1978@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, August 3, 2020 9:02 PM
To: Richard Stevenson
Cc: p crump; Ron Bohannan; rick@rba81.com; gnh5976@gmail.com; 1garciagang@gmail.com; mdmiraba@msn.com; meganfitz@live.com; bcreel@msn.com; frandimarco@msn.com; cfmirabal@gmail.com; ruffkat@yahoo.com; david.m.lopez@msn.com; garnandlu@yahoo.com; kmcvey124@comcast.net; tjmurieta@msn.com; nenaperkin@gmail.com; avalgman12@gmail.com; scott.templeton@comcast.net; chavezdyx4@yahoo.com; mccormackdj@comcast.net; erin.coffman@yahoo.com; huerta.loretta58@gmail.com; gayle.binkley@me.com; marshakearney@gmail.com; nauticalhutch@gmail.com; miladybutler@yahoo.com; rfasel@fed.net; Gomez, Angela J.; jwolfenbarger@cabq.gov; Maggie Gould
Subject: Re: [#2020013] Wintergreen Apartments DRB questions (PR-2020-004030)

After reading Tierra West’s response I have several comments/questions I would like included in the record.

1. No mention of lack of notification and the dealing with the signage not being in line with the IDO requirements until two days before the first hearing. How is that matter remedied? Also the 100 feet from the property does NOT include public right-of-ways. Would not that expand the number of residents that needed to be contacted?
2. The residents talked about “river rock,” not “river walk” to discourage people from getting near the adjacent properties. What is planned for the 5 feet between the Planned wall and existing walls? Would not that collect trash and debris? How would that be managed? Also hard to understand how you would build up the six foot wall with 2 foot raised ground where possible. You talk about changes in the buffer, yet there are no displays of what that would look like.
3. The crime has greatly increased in the areas where other apartment complexes have been built on the Westside. What makes this complex different?
4. The statement that 10 story buildings would be allowed in the area under the C-2 zoning is INCORRECT. The previous zoning only allowed for 2 story building with the conditional clause.
5. There is no mention of “solar access.” How does this project impact solar access for the residents?
6. The Developer declined to share the market research to support the building of luxury apartments in this area. This is a critical issue to the residents and when considering the comprehensive plan. There are already a number of apartments on the Westside with “space available.” To say that this information will not be shared is NOT answering questions/concerns.
7. The cross-sections provided are inadequate when speaking to the privacy and noise barriers needed for the residents. Cross-sections show trees. Where exactly are they planted, spacing, heights, etc. We have no clear view of what will be in the buffer and how it will protect the adjacent property owners.
8. When considering the Guiding Principles in Chapter 4 of the Comprehensive Plan, this project is totally out of line with the guidance given by this overarching document. Please answer how this project meets those principles.

Please share your responses with all on this mailing list.
Good Afternoon,

The intent of this email is to provide responses to the questions raised by neighbors at the DRB hearing on July 22nd 2020, in regards to the proposed Wintergreen Apartment project City project number PR-2020-004030.


Below is a list of questions from the DRB meeting on July 22nd that I heard. Any duplicates were consolidated into a single question/theme. If you have specific project questions not previously addressed in the public meetings, please email us so we can work to respond to your questions rstevenson@tierrawestllc.com.

- **Will a Traffic Impact Study (TIS) be prepared by the applicant?**
  Response: This development does not meet the City threshold to require a Traffic Impact Study. Additional traffic review was completed including the Trip Generation Worksheet based on the ITE Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition for Multifamily Housing (Mid-Rise) apartments, Sub-Area Map as a basis of the trip distribution, Trip Distribution Worksheet and Map, which were submitted to the City Traffic Engineer and send to you on July 21 2020. Ms. Mirabel asked at the DRB hearing for the chart which was used to determine the trips, and I have attached to this email. The attachment provides an overview on how the trips are determined based on historical data (pre Covid-19). The development is also subject to payment of City impact fees for transportation, drainage, City facilities, parks, and public safety. Impact fees are a charge of assessment imposed by the City on new development in order to generate revenue for funding or recouping the costs of capital improvements rationally related to new development in accordance with applicable law.

- **Please provide the market research supporting the decision to proceed with luxury apartments?**
  Response: The developer is unwilling to share the market study for this development.
• We have requested sound barriers, Line of sight barriers, fencing barriers, landscape barriers, lighting barriers.
  Response: A 6-ft CMU block wall is proposed to be installed 5-ft offset the property boundary.

• We requested a sound and visibility wall at least 8 feet along the East end of the property boundary.
  Response: Where feasible we are proposing 2-ft earth bench to elevate the 6-ft wall to include the effective height.

• Will an archeology study, crime impact study, wildlife impact study property value impact study be provided by the applicant?
  Response: Following a sensitivity review of the project site in regards to IDO Section 5-2 Site Design and Sensitive Lands, the following assessment was made by the applicant that Tract E-1 does not meet any of the sensitive land elements, as described further below:
    o 5-2(C)(1)(a) Floodplains and flood hazard areas – the site is not with in a floodplain or flood hazard area per FEMA FIRM Map 35001C0108G dated 9/26/2008
    o 5-2(C)(1)(b) Steep slopes – Steep slopes is not defined by the IDO but generally considered steep if the slope is greater than 20%. The average slope of the undeveloped site is 4.5%
    o 5-2(C)(1)(c) Unstable soils – per USGS the soil is bluepoint loamy fine sand 98.1%
    o 5-2(C)(1)(d) Wetlands – per FEMA FIRM map no evidence of wetlands.
    o 5-2(C)(1)(e) Arroyos – per FEMA FIRM map no evidence of recorded arroyos.
    o 5-2(C)(1)(f) Irrigation facilities (acequias) – no
    o 5-2(C)(1)(g) Escarpments – there are no escarpments on the property
    o 5-2(C)(1)(h) Rock outcroppings – there are no rock outcroppings on the property
    o 5-2(C)(1)(i) Large stands of mature trees – not present, the site is in an undeveloped condition with vegetation typical of the west mesa with areas of scrub, small vegetation and some minor disturbance by dumping of soils.
    o 5-2(C)(1)(j) Archaeological sites – certificate of no effect provided by the COA dated May 6, 2020 on file.

A crime impact, wildlife and property value impact study is not required with the application and will not be completed.
An archeological certification of no effect was provided by the Albuquerque City Archaeologist for this site.

- **We have requested that the recreational walking trail adjacent our properties be removed.**
  Response: The walking trail has been shifted to the west further away from the east property line but remains for the residents to utilize for recreational exercise.

- **Please provide a view plan exhibit?**
  Response: A view plan exhibit was prepared to show the sections along the east half of the property and is attached to this email.

- **We have requested Large River walk as opposed to Grass to discourage foot traffic.**
  Response: Native seed is proposed as ground cover in the 50-ft landscape buffer area, along with shrubs and trees, as detailed on the landscape plans.

- **Concern with the scale and intensity of the development.**
  Response: The subject site is zoned MX-M (Mixed Use Medium intensity) and the proposed multi-family use is allowed permissively. The proposed plan meets applicable development standards (height, setbacks, parking, etc.) and the technical standards (drainage, vehicular access, etc.). The site was previously zoned C-2 (Community Commercial), which allowed multi-family development at a much more intense scale of development (higher density and over 10 stories in height were possible under C-2 zoning).

This development and proposed density also aligns with the infill development of the City with the City of Albuquerque Comprehensive Plan Goal and policy listed in Chapter 5: Land Use, regarding development patterns: *Goal 5.3-Efficient Development Patterns: Promote development patterns that maximize the utility of existing infrastructure and public facilities and the efficient use of land to support the public good, and Policy 5.3.1-Infill Development: Support additional growth in areas with existing infrastructure and public facilities.* The project will facilitate development of a portion of a site already served by existing infrastructure that is available for use (Golf Course Rd, Black Arroyo Channel, ABCWUA water and sewer) thereby maximizing the utility of existing infrastructure and using land in an efficient manner. Using infrastructure and land in this way generally supports the public good because it is more efficient than adding infrastructure and/or developing residential developments on the urban fringe.
• We also would like the landscape plan to include more mature trees, to protect immediate privacy. The current plan has at least 10-year maturity
Response: 6-ft plus high trees will be installed at install for the Austrian Pine species, Chinese Juniper planted as 5 gal shrubs, the other tree species shall have a 2-inch plus caliper.

• We would like plants that do not affect allergies. Juniper plants are a major contributor to allergies.
Response: The two types of evergreens are selected for the eastern edge of the landscape:
  o Austrian Pines / Pinus nigra. Uncommon tree allergen, minimal needle drop with regular irrigation.
  o Chinese Juniper / Juniperus chinensus – ‘Spartan’ (narrow) variety, planted as 5 gal shrubs. FEMALE TREES ONLY per compliance with City Aeroallergen Ordinance.
  o The city tracks and puts out daily air quality pollen counts. Junipers, a common allergen, are included. Pines, an uncommon allergen, are not included.

• We want Trash Bins moved away from the East side of the development, away from homeowners' properties.
Response: Limited in placement due to Solid Waste and ABCWUA requirements, located dumpsters outside of the buffer area and as far away as possible from the residents.

• Lighting must be directed away from private properties.
Response: All outdoor lighting for the project is controlled by the New Mexico Night Sky Protection Act and regulated by the IDO section 5-8. No light source for any outdoor light fixture shall be directly visible from any public right-of-way or any adjacent property. Light poles will have a max height of 16-ft.

• Privacy Concerns
Response: The City has no specific standards to protect privacy of backyards such as preventing sight-lines from adjoining properties but does require a 50-ft landscape buffer to provide setback and landscaping between this development and the single family residence. The IDO Neighborhood Edge requirements (height limitations, buffer requirements, etc.) are met with this development.
- We discourage Grass on the East side buffer, being that the noise generated by maintenance and mowing would impose on the neighborhood.
  Response: All property owners in the City of Albuquerque must follow the Noise Control Ordinance https://www.cabq.gov/environmentalhealth/noise

- Concern on Crime increasing in the area:
  Response: Site design and building design standards are reflected in the Integrated Development Ordinance (IDO) which incorporate the basic tenets of CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design), such as adequate lighting, minimizing “hiding places,” providing opportunities for passive surveillance, and restricting access to sites and buildings to only residents (gating, doors with controlled access, etc.). AFR (Fire & Rescue) and APD (Police Department) provided comments on the site plan with those elements considered with the design. As this is a gated apartment community the residents will be as concerned for crime prevention across Albuquerque as any other good neighbor is.

- Water runoff and drainage has not been addressed adequately to the neighborhood concerns.
  Response: Tierra West is unaware of any outstanding questions or concerns regarding drainage.

As the applicant we consider the Site Plan complies with all applicable provisions of the IDO, the DPM, other adopted City regulations, all of which is being reviewed thoroughly by the DRB. We have followed the procedures outlined in the IDO document for notice provisions. If you have specific project questions relating to the development, please email us so we can work to respond to your questions rstevenson@tierrawestllc.com.

This application has not bypassed any City agency/s or committee/s and is following the City of Albuquerque process. If you have process questions, i.e. specific to the IDO notification procedures, or any other City process matter please email the DRB Chair Ms. Wolffey at jwolffley@cabq.gov.

The upcoming DRB meeting to review the re-submittal to address DRB member’s comments is this Wednesday, 5 August 2020. The project number is PR-2020-004030, and is number three on the agenda. The agenda is posted online and the call in details are as follows:
Join Zoom Meeting (9:00 am Wednesday 8/5/2020)
https://cabq.zoom.us/j/93846895555
Meeting ID: 938 4689 5555
By phone +1 312 626 6799 or find your local number: https://hes32-ctp.trendmicro.com:443/wis/clicktime/v1/query?url=https%3a%2f%2fcabq.zoom.us%2fu%2faLqNrlNh&umid=bf9560d4-8082-455f-879e-918097b2d550&auth=c5e193b2792d33bbda0d14ee5f909adbb398f028-7bd720b599cdc0aa00b62e43bc1f6c8fb408738b
Here is a downloaded link to the City of Albuquerque 95% plans detailing the Westside Blvd widening from Golf Course Rd to NM 528. Funding has been authorized with construction scheduled to start in spring 2021.

https://1drv.ms/b/s!Ah_cf8IHlL3ogkmvdAAIpPHseyTI

Regards,
Richard Stevenson, PE
Tierra West LLC
(505) 858 3100
Hello All,

Please find attached the following items relating to the traffic queries for this project:

- Trip Generation Worksheet based on the ITE Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition for Multifamily Housing (Mid-Rise) apartments
- Sub-Area Map as a basis of the trip distribution
- Trip Distribution Worksheet
- Trip Distribution Map
- Westside Blvd. widening project timing and financials which is in the current Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for FFY 2020 and 2021. According to MRCOG TIP Coordinator, this is a high priority project for the City of Albuquerque and City of Rio Rancho. This project will more than likely be completed over the next few years considering the amount of construction that is involved. Here is a link to MRCOG website where you can find the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (which includes project lists), as well as the TIP: https://www.mrcog-nm.gov/233/Metro-Planning.

Grading and Drainage
- Here is the downloadable link to the drainage plan
  https://1drv.ms/b/s!Ah_cf8HL3ogkDpTWEqdmDVXFo

Kind Regards,

Richard Stevenson, P.E.

Tierra West LLC
5571 Midway Park Pl., NE
Albuquerque, NM  87109
505-858-3100     ext. 232

PRIVILEGED AND CONFIDENTIAL
The information contained in this electronic mail message is confidential, may be privileged, and is intended only for the use of the individual(s) named above or their designee. If you are not the intended recipient of this message, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. Any unauthorized interception of this message is illegal under the law. If you have received this message in error, please immediately notify me by return message or by telephone and delete the original message from your email system. Thank you.

From: p crump [mailto:phcrumpsf@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2020 9:33 AM
To: Ron Bohannan; Richard Stevenson; rick@rba81.com; gnh5976@gmail.com; 1garciagang@gmail.com; mmdmiraba@msn.com; meganfitz@live.com; bcreel@msn.com; frandimarco@msn.com; cfmirabal@gmail.com; ruffkat@yahoo.com; ruffkat@yahoo.com; david.m.lopez@msn.com; garnand_lu@yahoo.com; kmcvey124@comcast.net; tjmurieta@msn.com; tjmurieta@msn.com; nenaperkin@gmail.com; avalorman12@gmail.com; scott.templeton@comcast.net; chavezdyx4@yahoo.com; mccormackdj@comcast.net; erin.coffman@yahoo.com; huerta.loretta58@gmail.com; gayle.binkley@me.com; marshkearney@gmail.com; nauticalhutch@gmail.com; miladybutler@yahoo.com; rfasel@fed.net
Cc: Jocelyn Torres; Gomez, Angela J.; Maggie Gould; Tyson Hummell ABQ LUF
Subject: [#2020013] Emailing: Facilitated Meeting Wintergreen 6 18 20.docx

Dear All:

Attached please find the Report for the meeting held Thursday evening, June 18th, regarding the proposed Wintergreen Apartments. Please review it carefully.
If there are errors of either Omission (something important said but left out) or Commission (something important misquoted), please let us know and we will issue correcting Amendments. You may send potential corrections to phcrumpsf@gmail.com.

Also, instructions for submitting additional comments to the DRB are included near the end of the report under Hearing Details.

Also, you may let the City know your impression of the meeting and the facilitator(s) by going to one of the following evaluations:


or


Thank you very much for your participation.

Philip Crump and Jocelyn Torres, Facilitators

<ITE_Land_Use_221_Mid_Rise.pdf>
<2020013_Building C & D Cross Section Exhibit B-C1 C2.pdf>

This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
Attached is a photo of the sign re-erected.

Regards,
Richard Stevenson, PE
Tierra West LLC
(505) 858 3100

-----Original Message-----
From: Richard Stevenson
Sent: Monday, July 20, 2020 3:31 PM
To: 'Wolfley, Jolene'; Larry Sandoval
Cc: Gould, Maggie S.; Gomez, Angela J.; Ron Bohannan
Subject: RE: [#2020013] Sign Posting Agreement - Part I

Jolene, Thanks for forwarding on the emails and bringing it to our attention. We will have the sign reset this afternoon- either attached to the real estate sign or reset into the ground.

Larry, You have my contact information so include me if you see it blown over again. I could have gone out Saturday and fixed it.

Regards,
Richard Stevenson, PE
Mr. Sandoval,
We have received these emails and they will be included in the record for PR 4030.
This email is also forwarded to the applicant.

Good afternoon Ms. Wolfley,

The original file was too large to email. So I’ll be sending this to you in parts. Part I, II and III. Please let me know if you receive these documents.
Thank you.
Respectfully,

Larry Sandoval

This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
Jolene, Thanks for forwarding on the emails and bringing it to our attention. We will have the sign reset this afternoon- either attached to the real estate sign or reset into the ground.

Larry, You have my contact information so include me if you see it blown over again. I could have gone out Saturday and fixed it.

Regards,
Richard Stevenson, PE
Tierra West LLC
(505) 858 3100

-----Original Message-----
From: Wolfley, Jolene [mailto:jwolfley@cabq.gov]
Sent: Monday, July 20, 2020 3:15 PM
To: Larry Sandoval
Cc: Richard Stevenson; Gould, Maggie S.; Gomez, Angela J.
Subject: FW: Sign Posting Agreement - Part I

Mr. Sandoval,
We have received these emails and they will be included in the record for PR 4030.
This email is also forwarded to the applicant.
Good afternoon Ms. Wolfley,

The original file was too large to email. So I’ll be sending this to you in parts. Part I, II and III. Please let me know if you receive these documents. Thank you.

Respectfully,

Larry Sandoval

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

Please find attached the following items relating to the traffic queries for this project:

- Trip Generation Worksheet based on the ITE Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition for Multifamily Housing (Mid-Rise) apartments
- Sub-Area Map as a basis of the trip distribution
- Trip Distribution Worksheet
- Trip Distribution Map
- Westside Blvd. widening project timing and financials which is in the current Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for FFY 2020 and 2021. According to MRCOG TIP Coordinator, this is a high priority project for the City of Albuquerque and City of Rio Rancho. This project will more than likely be completed over the next few years considering the amount of construction that is involved. Here is a link to MRCOG website where you can find the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (which includes project lists), as well as the TIP: https://www.mrcog-nm.gov/233/Metro-Planning.

Grading and Drainage
- Here is the downloadable link to the drainage plan https://1drv.ms/b/s!Ah_cf8IHL3ogkDpTWEqdmjDVXFo

Kind Regards,

Richard Stevenson, P.E.

Tierra West LLC
5571 Midway Park Pl., NE
Albuquerque, NM 87109
505-858-3100 ext. 232

PRIVILEGED AND CONFIDENTIAL
The information contained in this electronic mail message is confidential, may be privileged, and is intended only for the use of the individual(s) named above or their designee. If you are not the intended recipient of this message, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication is
Dear All:

Attached please find the Report for the meeting held Thursday evening, June 18th, regarding the proposed Wintergreen Apartments. Please review it carefully.

If there are errors of either Omission (something important said but left out) or Commission (something important misquoted), please let us know and we will issue correcting Amendments. You may send potential corrections to phcrumpsf@gmail.com.

Also, instructions for submitting additional comments to the DRB are included near the end of the report under Hearing Details.

Also, you may let the City know your impression of the meeting and the facilitator(s) by going to one of the following evaluations:


or


Thank you very much for your participation.

Philip Crump and Jocelyn Torres, Facilitators
CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE  
LAND USE FACILITATION PROGRAM PROJECT MEETING REPORT

Project #: 2020013; Pre-application 
Property Description/Address: Wintergreen Apartments at Tract E-1, east of Golf Course Rd. and north of the Black Arroyo Channel.
Date Submitted: June 22, 2020
Submitted By: Philip Crump and Jocelyn M. Torres
Meeting Date/Time: June 18, 2020, 6:30-8:00 PM
Meeting Location: First Baptist Church, 3906 19th Ave. SE, Rio Rancho, NM
Facilitator: Philip Crump
Co-facilitator: Jocelyn M. Torres
Applicant: Calabac Illas Group c/o Donald Harville (owners)
Agent – Tierra West LLC (TW), Ronald Bohannan, President and Richard Stevenson, Engineer
Neighborhood Associations/Interested Parties - Seven Bar North Homeowners Association (HOA), West Side Coalition of Neighborhood Associations, Neighbors

Background/Meeting Summary: The proposed gated community site location is the undeveloped Tract E-1, east of Golf Course Rd. and north of the Black Arroyo Channel. This is a pre-application meeting. The property is approximately eight acres and is zoned MX-M. The developer proposes four apartment buildings with 52 units in each building, totaling 208 units. This equates to a density of 24 units per acre. Each building will have a mix of studio, one and two-bedroom apartments. Vehicular access is off Golf Course Rd. at the existing driveway entrance, near the northwest corner of the property, which is intended to be a shared driveway when the currently vacant northern Tract D-1 is developed. There is also an emergency exit onto Golf Course Rd. proposed at the midblock as required by the Fire Marshall.

The development will also have a 5,000 sq. ft. clubhouse with porte-cochere. The clubhouse includes amenities such as a pool, spa, conference and meeting rooms, barbeque, and lounge areas. The residents’ gated entryways will be on each side of the entrance. There is extensive landscaping, with open space between the apartment buildings. Total square footage of each apartment building is 59,716 ft. with a maximum building height of 45 feet in elevation. One parking space for each apartment will include a covered parking stall. There are 379 parking spaces including the covered stalls and handicap spaces.

Setbacks for the apartments are: Front 5-feet, Side 0-feet (Table 2-4-5 on page 27 IDO), and Rear 50-ft landscape buffer (IDO Section 14-16-5-9(F) on page 287). The buildings themselves will be significantly farther from the property lines, as they are surrounded by parking. The eastern buildings will be approximately 134 feet offset the eastern property line. This site does not meet the traffic impact threshold to require a traffic study.

A prior meeting was conducted April 7, 2020 to discuss the DRB and ZHE request, of which the developer canceled the variance request. A second online meeting was held May 21, 2020 to discuss the DRB application. The Developer delayed the submittal to DRB to provide an in-person meeting on June 18, 2020 to discuss the DRB application, following easing of restrictions from the COVID-19.

Outcomes:

- Areas of Agreement:
- All participants agreed to meet in person.
- Participants were encouraged to attend the DRB Hearing of July 22, 2020.
- TW will address action plan items.

- **Unresolved Issues & Concerns:**

- Several issues were discussed in this meeting.
- Neighbors remain opposed to the proposed development.

- **Key Points:**

- Neighbors continue to have strong concerns regarding the apartment location, height, privacy, views, traffic and schools.
- Neighbors also voiced concerns regarding the apartment landscaping, wall height, construction, vibration, noise, maintenance, walking paths, arroyo access, drainage, wildlife plan and potential development of northside eight acres.

**Meeting Specifics:**

1) **Introduction.**

Facilitator: Philip Crump: phcrumpsf@gmail.com. Those who signed in legibly, with their name and affiliation, will receive a meeting report. Philip Crump and Jocelyn M. Torres are neutral facilitators for the City of Albuquerque. TW Engineer Richard Stevenson, President Ron Bohannan and Architect Richard Bennett are in attendance. Richard Stevenson provided the project overview presented in prior meetings.

2) **Building Height, Privacy, Views, Landscaping and Trash Bin Locations.**

a) Neighbors stated the proposed design is not consistent with the property location and intent. The four-story height is inconsistent with this community.

   i) They asked that the building height be reduced to two stories.

      (1) TW – This height and design meets the IDO requirements. It took three years to amend the zoning code, with a goal of preventing urban sprawl. This property has a 50-foot buffer with a 134-foot setback distance of the buildings from the residential homes. It is near market development. The guidelines of the IDO motivated the Developer, who wants four stories.

   ii) View, wall height, buffer and landscaping concerns were expressed by neighbors. Neighbors are concerned that their views will be blocked, that the apartment residents will congregate near their property, that the wall should be eight-feet instead of six-feet high, that there should not be an eastside walking path, that landscaping should include river rock instead of native grass and that 6.5 foot specified barrier trees will not provide privacy until they mature. Trash containers should be moved to the center of the property and should not be located on the corners near the neighborhood. Juniper trees cause pollen and pine trees will shed.
3) Traffic.

a) Neighbors expressed several concerns about traffic congestion on Golf Course and Westside. This Development does not require a traffic study. There is a need for a traffic light on Westside at 7 Bar Loop Road. There are cut-through problems. There are problems with Rio Rancho traffic on Westside. This apartment complex will likely result in an additional 376 cars traveling south on Golf Course or East on Westside. School traffic will negatively impact existing roadways. The Lovelace Hospital is already overloading Westside.
   
i) TW – The biggest problem is Westside Drive. Sandoval County has not built up their side of the roadway. TW will look at these traffic concerns closely and will reach out to the New Mexico Department of Transportation (NMDOT) regarding traffic problems expressed by neighbors. TW will review and report on traffic studies done within the past three years regarding the clear-sight triangle on Golf Course and Westside Drive intersection (See Action Item).
   
ii) TW – Neighbors can protest cut-through problems via the City’s cut-through ordinance. The City can quantify traffic thresholds and implement a means of slowing the traffic, such as roundabouts and speed bumps.
   
iii) TW - Rio Rancho has always had traffic problems. MRGCD gets funding for major corridors. The Intersection of 528 and Unser is under consideration for funding. This Development is under CABQ jurisdiction so we are not consulting with Rio Rancho. Development impact fees vary depending on the proposal. We only have 208 apartments and 250 are required for a traffic impact study.
   
iv) TW - Will prepare a trip generation (hours) and trip distribution (network) study regarding Golf Course and Westside traffic in this location. (See Action Item).

4) Schools.

a) Neighbors stated that schools will be stressed because of this development. They are concerned that an estimated 300 kids will further overload the schools.

b) School traffic concerns were addressed in above Section 3.

5) Development of Northside Eight Acres.

a) Neighbors are concerned about the development of the property north of the project consisting of eight acres. Will this developer be involved in a phase two development of that site? There is already a traffic problem on 7 Bar Loop and development of that site will increase traffic problems. It is unknown what type of development will be placed on that site.

i) TW – This Developer is separate to the northern tract. MX-M Zoning allows for many permissive uses of the northern tract. Depending upon the use, the development of that site may require a traffic study. The neighborhood will be notified when that site is developed as required by the IDO notification procedures. TW will take the traffic impact study question to the apartment developer (See Action Item).

a) Neighbors asked several questions. Why wasn’t a Southwest style used for these apartments? What is the anticipated construction duration? Will there be vibration and noise problems associated with the construction? Will there be utility problems due to construction? Will there be noise problems with the apartment complex?
   i) TW – The anticipated construction duration is 12-16 months. The dirt work contractor will monitor vibrations. The construction site is 135 feet from the neighborhood. We are in contact with the Water Department and will contact PNM and NMGC regarding utilities. We don’t anticipate blasting. The contractor will determine the foundations. We will use standard techniques for determining vibration and settling. We will write the specification and these standard techniques will be included in the specification (See Action Item.)
   ii) TW – The Developer, Contractor and Apartment Complex will abide by the CABQ Noise Ordinance requirements.

7) Apartment Maintenance, Management and Pest Control.

a) Neighbors requested that apartment maintenance and repairs not be conducted on weekends and that they be conducted at a reasonable hour. They asked that gas blowers not be used. They asked about pest control.
   i) TW – Will take these concerns to the Owner (See Action Item). Noise ordinance day and time requirements will be met. TW recommends this project and believes they will do their best to comply with these requests.

8) Drainage.

a) Neighbors asked about the drainage plan.¹
   i) TW – We do have a drainage plan and it will be shared with all. The grading plan will show where the runoff area is located and will be provided. Site drainage will enter into the AMAFCA Black Arroyo Channel to the south of the property. The drainage plan will be distributed at time of application to DRB to attendees of the meeting (See Action Item).

9) Arroyo Access.

a) Neighbors asked about apartment arroyo walking access.
   i) TW – There will be pedestrian gates so residents can access the arroyo paths.

10) Apartment Need.

¹ In the May 21, 2020 Meeting, TW explained the property drainage plan as follows: “The property design allows for water remediation prior to entering the arroyo or the Rio Grande (RG) per the City of Albuquerque Drainage Ordinance and based upon the EPA Clean Water Act. This allows for the collection of trash, oil, and sediment before the water runoff enters the RG. The first flush pond holds the first portion and the excess runoff goes into the arroyo (See May 26, 2020 Report).”
a) Neighbors asked whether there is a need for these apartments. There are 1,400 homes available to buy rather than the usual amount of 4,000-6,000 homes. Because of Covid-19 people want to buy instead of renting.
   i) TW – There is currently a 30 day wait to get into rental housing. There is a need for additional rental housing.

11) Wildlife plan.
   a) Neighbors asked about the wildlife plan.
      i) TW – Will look at wildlife issues for this development (See Action Item).

Next Steps and Action Plan:

- TW will complete action items.
- Application will be submitted June 26, 2020.
- DRB hearing will be held July 22, 2020.

Action Items:

- TW will take concerns regarding the buffer area to the Developer and will ask that the trash bin locations be changed, so they are not adjacent to the neighborhood.
- TW will review and report on traffic studies done within the past three years regarding the clear-sight triangle on Golf Course and Westside Drive intersection.
- TW will prepare a trip generation (hours) and trip distribution (network) study regarding Golf Course and Westside Drive intersection traffic in this location.
- TW will ask if a traffic impact study would be performed by Developer.
- TW will use standard techniques for determining vibration and settling and will include them in the specification for grading and drainage of the site.
- TW will consult with Owner and report on apartment maintenance, management and pest control plans.
- TW will provide the drainage plan at time of submittal to DRB.
- TW will consult with Owner regarding necessity of following CABQ Noise Ordinance regarding maintenance schedule, vehicles and other pertinent matters.
- TW will review Wildlife issues pertaining to this development.

Application Hearing Details:

- The Development Review Board hearing will be conducted on July 22, 2020. The agenda will be posted by Friday afternoon July 17th.
- Development Review Board meetings, a portion of which are public hearings, are held each Wednesday beginning at 9 a.m. in the Plaza del Sol Hearing Room at 600 2nd NW. Free 2-hour parking for Plaza del Sol customers is available on the north side of the building. The DRB, as with all City boards and commissions, is holding online meetings via Zoom. “The DRB ‘remote’ public meetings are using the Zoom software. All participants – DRB members, applicants, and the public – participate from the safety of their homes. You can choose to participate by video or audio only. Participants can listen to the meeting and may also speak during the public comment period.
The agenda for the DRB meeting is posted on the City website by Friday afternoon ahead of the Wednesday meeting. The agenda includes information on accessing the DRB meeting. Participants can call the number listed on the agenda from their phone to be connected to the meeting. Participants may also can click on the link on the agenda to participate via computer (a microphone is required; a camera is optional.) Participants are not required to create a Zoom account, but may choose to do so.”

- The six members of the DRB are City staff representing the Planning Department, Parks and Recreation Department, Code Enforcement, City Engineer, Traffic Engineer, and Water/Sewer Utilities Engineer.
- The chairperson is the City Planner representative. Each member is authorized to sign plats.
- Jolene Wolfley, DRB Chair, Planning Department; Email: jwolfley@cabq.gov
- Additional comments may be sent to Planner Maggie Gould <MGould@cabq.gov>
- For questions, contact the Development Review Board Administrative Assistant Angela Gomez at (505) 924-3946.

Meeting Adjourned.

Names & Affiliations of Attendees:
Ron Bohannon Tierra West
Richard Stevenson Tierra West
Rick Bennett Richard Bennett Architects
Gary Hirsch 7 Bar North HOA
Amy Garcia 7 Bar North HOA
Mike Mirabal 7 Bar North HOA
Megan Fitzpatrick 7 Bar North HOA
Bruce Creel 7 Bar North HOA
Fran DiMarco 7 Bar North HOA
Cathy Mirabal 7 Bar North HOA
Cheryl Ruff 7 Bar North HOA
Kathy Vigil 7 Bar North HOA
David Lopez 7 Bar North HOA
Lucille Lopez 7 Bar North HOA
Ken McVey 7 Bar North HOA
JP Murrieta 7 Bar North HOA
Tyra Murrieta 7 Bar North HOA
Nena Perkin 7 Bar North HOA
Lillian Werntz 7 Bar North HOA
Scott & Jae Templeton 7 Bar North HOA
Debbie Chavez 7 Bar North HOA
Dan McCormack 7 Bar North HOA
Erin & Tim Zinsmeyer 7 Bar North HOA
Loretta Huerta 7 Bar North HOA
Gayle M Binkley 7 Bar North HOA
Marsha & John Kearney 7 Bar North HOA
T Scott Hutchinson 7 Bar North HOA, Pres
Sandra Kruzich 7 Bar North HOA
Hilary Butler
Roy Fassel
Lennard Mc???
Hello Maggie,

Yes, I can prepare an email summarizing the notices issued, and include any evidence (such as photos) to show that we met all notice provisions required for this application.

Regards,
Richard Stevenson, PE
Tierra West LLC
(505) 858 3100

Richard and Ron,

We received this inquiry from a neighbor regarding the notice for this case (see below).
Can you please address all of the public notice requirements and 100 foot notice buffer and verify that proper notice was mailed to all property owners within the 100 foot buffer?

Thank you,

MAGGIE GOULD
planning manager
land development coordination
o 505-924-3880
c 505-553-0682
e mgould@cabq.gov
cabq.gov/planning
Dear Ms. Wolfley,

Please see documents related to the Notification Process, also note Tierra West’s notification to property owners who live 100-feet from the proposed development buffer and those partially along the development buffer. Documents #4 and #5 indicate homeowners, Larry Sandoval and Kristen Morgan live on Carreta Dr. are located within the 100-feet proposed development buffer were not officially notified by letter per IDO requirements. There are other consistencies as to why some were notified and others were not. The Sign Posting Agreement notification was also in violation and finally corrected two days before the July 22nd DRB hearing. Therefore, the application by Tierra West does not meet full compliance. Ms Wolfley, please confirm when you receive these documents.

Contents:

1. City of Albuquerque’s Public Notification Process per the IDO
2. Tierra West’s Area Map of Notification to property owners (as submitted to DRB on July 22, 2020)
3. Tierra West's List of property owners (as submitted to the DRB on July 22, 2020)
4. Our Map of property owners Notified and Not Notified
5. Our List of property owners Notified and Not Notified
6. Sign Posting Agreement non-compliance

Sincerely,

Larry Sandoval

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

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

The intent of this email is to provide responses to the questions raised by neighbors at the DRB hearing on July 22nd 2020, in regards to the proposed Wintergreen Apartment project City project number PR-2020-004030.

The updated plans to address DRB comments from the July 22nd hearing are available on the City website: http://data.cabq.gov/government/planning/DRB/PR-2020-004030/DRB%20Submittals/PR-2020-004030_Aug_5_2020_Supp/Application/DRB%20Resubmittal%207.31.2020/2020013%20Wintergreen%20Luxury%20Apartments%20Resubmittal%207.31.2020.pdf

Below is a list of questions from the DRB meeting on July 22nd that I heard. Any duplicates were consolidated into a single question/theme. If you have specific project questions not previously addressed in the public meetings, please email us so we can work to respond to your questions rstevenson@tierrawestllc.com.

- Will a Traffic Impact Study (TIS) be prepared by the applicant?

Response: This development does not meet the City threshold to require a Traffic Impact Study. Additional traffic review was completed including the Trip Generation Worksheet based on the ITE Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition for Multifamily Housing (Mid-Rise) apartments, Sub-Area Map as a basis of the trip distribution, Trip Distribution Worksheet and Map, which were submitted to the City Traffic Engineer and send to you on July 21 2020. Ms. Mirabel asked at the DRB hearing for the chart which was used to determine the trips, and I have attached to this email. The attachment provides an overview on how the trips are determined based on historical data (pre Covid-19). The development is also subject to payment of City impact fees for transportation, drainage, City facilities, parks, and public safety. Impact fees are a charge of assessment imposed by the City on new development in order to
generate revenue for funding or recouping the costs of capital improvements rationally related to new development in accordance with applicable law.

- Please provide the market research supporting the decision to proceed with luxury apartments?
  Response: The developer is unwilling to share the market study for this development.

- We have requested sound barriers, Line of sight barriers, fencing barriers, landscape barriers, lighting barriers.
  Response: A 6-ft CMU block wall is proposed to be installed 5-ft offset the property boundary.

- We requested a sound and visibility wall at least 8 feet along the East end of the property boundary.
  Response: Where feasible we are proposing 2-ft earth bench to elevate the 6-ft wall to include the effective height.

- Will an archeology study, crime impact study, wildlife impact study property value impact study be provided by the applicant?
  Response: Following a sensitivity review of the project site in regards to IDO Section 5-2 Site Design and Sensitive Lands, the following assessment was made by the applicant that Tract E-1 does not meet any of the sensitive land elements, as described further below:
    - 5-2(C)(1)(a) Floodplains and flood hazard areas – the site is not within a floodplain or flood hazard area per FEMA FIRM Map 35001C0108G dated 9/26/2008
    - 5-2(C)(1)(b) Steep slopes – Steep slopes is not defined by the IDO but generally considered steep if the slope is greater than 20%. The average slope of the undeveloped site is 4.5%
    - 5-2(C)(1)(c) Unstable soils – per USGS the soil is bluepoint loamy fine sand 98.1%
    - 5-2(C)(1)(e) Arroyos – per FEMA FIRM map no evidence of recorded arroyos.
    - 5-2(C)(1)(f) Irrigation facilities (acequias) – no
    - 5-2(C)(1)(g) Escarpments – there are no escarpments on the property
    - 5-2(C)(1)(h) Rock outcroppings – there are no rock outcroppings on the property
    - 5-2(C)(1)(i) Large stands of mature trees – not present, the site is in an undeveloped condition with vegetation typical of the west mesa with areas of scrub, small vegetation and some minor disturbance by dumping of soils.

A crime impact, wildlife and property value impact study is not required with the application and will not be completed.
An archeological certification of no effect was provided by the Albuquerque City Archaeologist for this site.

- **We have requested that the recreational walking trail adjacent our properties be removed.**
  Response: The walking trail has been shifted to the west further away from the east property line but remains for the residents to utilize for recreational exercise.

- **Please provide a view plan exhibit?**
  Response: A view plan exhibit was prepared to show the sections along the east half of the property and is attached to this email.

- **We have requested Large River walk as opposed to Grass to discourage foot traffic.**
  Response: Native seed is proposed as ground cover in the 50-ft landscape buffer area, along with shrubs and trees, as detailed on the landscape plans.

- **Concern with the scale and intensity of the development.**
  Response: The subject site is zoned MX-M (Mixed Use Medium intensity) and the proposed multi-family use is allowed permissively. The proposed plan meets applicable development standards (height, setbacks, parking, etc.) and the technical standards (drainage, vehicular access, etc.). The site was previously zoned C-2 (Community Commercial), which allowed multi-family development at a much more intense scale of development (higher density and over 10 stories in height were possible under C-2 zoning).

  This development and proposed density also aligns with the infill development of the City with the City of Albuquerque Comprehensive Plan Goal and policy listed in Chapter 5: Land Use, regarding development patterns: **Goal 5.3-Efficient Development Patterns: Promote development patterns that maximize the utility of existing infrastructure and public facilities and the efficient use of land to support the public good, and Policy 5.3.1- Infill Development: Support additional growth in areas with existing infrastructure and public facilities.** The project will facilitate development of a portion of a site already served by existing infrastructure that is available for use (Golf Course Rd, Black Arroyo Channel, ABCWUA water and sewer) thereby maximizing the utility of existing infrastructure and using land in an efficient manner. Using infrastructure and land in this way generally supports the public good because it is more efficient than adding infrastructure and/or developing residential developments on the urban fringe.

- **We also would like the landscape plan to include more mature trees, to protect immediate privacy.** The current plan has at least 10-year maturity
Response: 6-ft plus high trees will be installed at install for the Austrian Pine species, Chinese Juniper planted as 5 gal shrubs, the other tree species shall have a 2-inch plus caliper.

- **We would like plants that do not affect allergies. Juniper plants are a major contributor to allergies.**
  Response: The two types of evergreens are selected for the eastern edge of the landscape:
  - Austrian Pines / Pinus nigra. Uncommon tree allergen, minimal needle drop with regular irrigation.
  - Chinese Juniper / Juniperus chinensis – ‘Spartan’ (narrow) variety, planted as 5 gal shrubs. FEMALE TREES ONLY per compliance with City Aeroallergen Ordinance.
  - The city tracks and puts out daily air quality pollen counts. Junipers, a common allergen, are included. Pines, an uncommon allergen, are not included.

- **We want Trash Bins moved away from the East side of the development, away from homeowners’ properties.**
  Response: Limited in placement due to Solid Waste and ABCWUA requirements, located dumpsters outside of the buffer area and as far away as possible from the residents.

- **Lighting must be directed away from private properties.**
  Response: All outdoor lighting for the project is controlled by the New Mexico Night Sky Protection Act and regulated by the IDO section 5-8. No light source for any outdoor light fixture shall be directly visible from any public right-of-way or any adjacent property. Light poles will have a max height of 16-ft.

- **Privacy Concerns**
  Response: The City has no specific standards to protect privacy of backyards such as preventing sightlines from adjoining properties but does require a 50-ft landscape buffer to provide setback and landscaping between this development and the single family residence. The IDO Neighborhood Edge requirements (height limitations, buffer requirements, etc.) are met with this development.

- **We discourage Grass on the East side buffer, being that the noise generated by maintenance and mowing would impose on the neighborhood.**
  Response: All property owners in the City of Albuquerque must follow the Noise Control Ordinance https://www.cabq.gov/environmentalhealth/noise

- **Concern on Crime increasing in the area:**
  Response: Site design and building design standards are reflected in the Integrated Development Ordinance (IDO) which incorporate the basic tenets of CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design), such as adequate lighting, minimizing “hiding places,” providing opportunities
for passive surveillance, and restricting access to sites and buildings to only residents (gating, doors with controlled access, etc.). AFR (Fire & Rescue) and APD (Police Department) provided comments on the site plan with those elements considered with the design. As this is a gated apartment community the residents will be as concerned for crime prevention across Albuquerque as any other good neighbor is.

- Water runoff and drainage has not been addressed adequately to the neighborhood concerns.

Response: Tierra West is unaware of any outstanding questions or concerns regarding drainage.

As the applicant we consider the Site Plan complies with all applicable provisions of the IDO, the DPM, other adopted City regulations, all of which is being reviewed thoroughly by the DRB. We have followed the procedures outlined in the IDO document for notice provisions. If you have specific project questions relating to the development, please email us so we can work to respond to your questions rstevenson@tierrawestllc.com.

This application has not bypassed any City agency/s or committee/s and is following the City of Albuquerque process. If you have process questions, i.e. specific to the IDO notification procedures, or any other City process matter please email the DRB Chair Ms. Wolfley at jwolfley@cabq.gov.

The upcoming DRB meeting to review the re-submittal to address DRB member’s comments is this Wednesday, 5 August 2020. The project number is PR-2020-004030, and is number three on the agenda. The agenda is posted online and the call in details are as follows: Join Zoom Meeting (9:00 am Wednesday 8/5/2020) https://cabq.zoom.us/j/93846895555

Meeting ID: 938 4689 5555
By phone +1 312 626 6799 or find your local number: https://hes32-ctp.trendmicro.com:443/wis/clicktime/v1/query?url=https%3a%2f%2fca...
Here is a downloaded link to the City of Albuquerque 95% plans detailing the Westside Blvd widening from Golf Course Rd to NM 528. Funding has been authorized with construction scheduled to start in spring 2021.

https://1drv.ms/b/s!Ah_cf8IHIL3ogkmvdAAIpPHseyTI

Regards,
Richard Stevenson, PE
Tierra West LLC
(505) 858 3100

Hello All,

Please find attached the following items relating to the traffic queries for this project:

- Trip Generation Worksheet based on the ITE Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition for Multifamily Housing (Mid-Rise) apartments
- Sub-Area Map as a basis of the trip distribution
- Trip Distribution Worksheet
- Trip Distribution Map
- Westside Blvd. widening project timing and financials which is in the current Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for FFY 2020 and 2021. According to MRCOG TIP Coordinator, this is a high priority project for the City of Albuquerque and City of Rio Rancho. This project will more than likely be completed over the next few years considering the amount of construction that is involved. Here is a link to MRCOG website where you can find the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (which includes project lists), as well as the TIP: https://www.mrcog-nm.gov/233/Metro-Planning.

Grading and Drainage
- Here is the downloadable link to the drainage plan https://1drv.ms/b/s!Ah_cf8IHIL3ogkDpTWEqdjmDVXFo

Kind Regards,

Richard Stevenson, P.E.

Tierra West LLC
5571 Midway Park Pl., NE
Dear All:

Attached please find the Report for the meeting held Thursday evening, June 18th, regarding the proposed Wintergreen Apartments. Please review it carefully.

If there are errors of either Omission (something important said but left out) or Commission (something important misquoted), please let us know and we will issue correcting Amendments. You may send potential corrections to phcrumpsf@gmail.com.

Also, instructions for submitting additional comments to the DRB are included near the end of the report under Hearing Details.

Also, you may let the City know your impression of the meeting and the facilitator(s) by going to one of the following evaluations:


or


Thank you very much for your participation.

Philip Crump and Jocelyn Torres, Facilitators

==============================================
This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
Please add to the record for this case.

-----Original Message-----
From: Richard Stevenson <rstevenson@tierrawestllc.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 22, 2020 2:40 PM
To: Marsha Kearney <rmeek1978@gmail.com>; Nauticalhutch@gmail.com
Cc: mike mirabal <mdmiraba@msn.com>; Larry Sandoval <larrysandoval75@gmail.com>; Wolfley, Jolene <jwolfley@cabq.gov>; Ron Bohannan <rrb@tierrawestllc.com>
Subject: RE: [#2020013] E-mail lists (Wintergreen Apartment project DRB PR-2020-004030)

Marsha, I have forwarded the information that was sent out to the facilitated meeting group participants to your email address "rmeek1978@gmail.com". I will make sure this address is included with future correspondence.

Regards,
Richard Stevenson, PE
Tierra West LLC
(505) 858 3100

-----Original Message-----
From: Marsha Kearney [mailto:rmeek1978@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, July 22, 2020 2:25 PM
To: Nauticalhutch@gmail.com; Richard Stevenson
Cc: mike mirabal; Larry Sandoval
Subject: E-mail lists

Scott - please had me to the e-mail list for the HOA. I never got the e-mail sent out. Mr. Stevenson, I never received the June meeting notes. Please Add this e-mail address.
Thanks,
Marsha Kearney
rmeek1978@gmail.com

======================================================================
This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
Thank you, Mr. Stevenson. In regards to crime, please look at this. This homicide occurred at the Sky Stone apartments a few days ago, yes, the other 4 story apartment complex that butts up against Seven Bar North and my backyard. You failed to give any concrete discussion to the crime that most undoubtedly will occur in our community. We are being surrounded by apartments, which was never the intention of the community. You wouldn’t want this in your backyard, and nor do we.


Thank you

Megan Fitzpatrick
Good Afternoon,

In regards to notification, including signage, we followed the requirements listed in Section 6-4(K) of the IDO. This included sending notices to the adjoining property owners based on the City provided ONC list, posting the yellow sign per the sign posting agreement, and sending out notices to the recognized Home Owner Associations. If you have concerns with the IDO notification procedures that applicants are required to follow, please email DRB Chair Ms. Wolfley jwolfe@cabq.gov. Annual updates of the IDO are submitted every year into the City’s review and approval process, so the City can consider your feedback and concerns.

Cobble rock, or equivalent, will be placed in the 5-ft setback between the CMU wall and the property line. The apartment landscape maintenance crew will maintain all areas on the property. Additional trees and vegetation density were added to the buffer area, and the walking trail has been shifted to the west further away from the property line.

We previously discussed crime in prior correspondence and at the public meetings.

All Solar Access requirements per IDO Section 5-10 are met.

The market research and studies completed by the developer are proprietary and will not be shared.

The tree sizes at planting and at maturity are shown in the cross sections to provide a scale and orientation of the apartment building relative to the single family homes and detail the buffer area. As previously mentioned the IDO requires a 50-ft landscape buffer (IDO Section 5-9(F)) to provide a setback between the improvements and the single family homes to increase the privacy and to reduce sight-lines from adjoining properties. Based on the proposed building height there is also a minimum 100-ft offset from the property line (IDO Section 2-4(C)), to provide protection to the adjacent home owners. Please refer to the landscaping plan which details the tree spacing, heights at maturity etc. which is included in the plans (link provided in previous email).

The Comprehensive Plan provides the guiding framework in establishing the zoning designations throughout the City. The zoning allowable uses is then specifically defined in the IDO and by the specific zone classification. The IDO also defines the development standards and the City’s planning system and procedures. This project meets the requirements listed in the IDO, to the best of our knowledge. This is not a zone change, and as such, when the City Council placed the MX-M zoning designation on the property it was guided by the Comprehensive Plan Goals and Policies. The assessment for MX-M zoning was completed by City Planners, property owners, neighborhood associations and members of the public during the adoption of the IDO. You can find more information on the City website https://abc-zone.com/

Regards,  
Richard Stevenson, PE  
Tierra West LLC  
(505) 858 3100

From: Marsha Kearney [mailto:rmeek1978@gmail.com]  
Sent: Monday, August 3, 2020 9:02 PM  
To: Richard Stevenson  
Cc: p crump; Ron Bohannan; rick@rba81.com; gnh5976@gmail.com; 1gariagang@gmail.com; mdmiraba@msn.com; meganfitz@live.com; bcreel@msn.com; frandimarco@msn.com; cfmirabal@gmail.com; ruffkat@yahoo.com; david.m.lopez@msn.com; garnand_lu@yahoo.com; kmcvey124@comcast.net; tjmurieta@msn.com;
After reading Tierra West’s response I have several comments/questions I would like included in the record.

1. No mention of lack of notification and the dealing with the signage not being in line with the IDO requirements until two days before the first hearing. How is that matter remedied? Also the 100 feet from the property does NOT include public right-of-ways. Would not that expand the number of residents that needed to be contacted?

2. The residents talked about “river rock,” not “river walk” to discourage people from getting near the adjacent properties. What is planned for the 5 feet between the Planned wall and existing walls? Would not that collect trash and debris? How would that be managed? Also hard to understand how you would build up the six foot wall with 2 foot raised ground where possible. You talk about changes in the buffer, yet there are no displays of what that would look like.

3. The crime has greatly increased in the areas where other apartment complexes have been built on the Westside. What makes this complex different?

4. The statement that 10 story buildings would be allowed in the area under the C-2 zoning is INCORRECT. The previous zoning only allowed for 2 story building with the conditional clause.

5. There is no mention of “solar access.” How does this project impact solar access for the residents?

6. The Developer declined to share the market research to support the building of luxury apartments in this area. This is a critical issue to the residents and when considering the comprehensive plan. There are already a number of apartments on the Westside with “space available.” To say that This information will not be shared is NOT answering questions/concerns.

7. The cross-sections provided are inadequate when speaking to the privacy and noise barriers needed for the residents. Cross-sections show trees. Where exactly are they planted, spacing, heights, etc. We have no clear view of what will be in the buffer and how it will protect the adjacent property owners.

8. When considering the Guiding Principles in Chapter 4 of the Comprehensive Plan, this project is totally out of line with the guidance given by this overarching document. Please answer how this project meets those principles.

Please share your responses with all on this mailing list.

Marsha Kearney

On Aug 3, 2020, at 5:10 PM, Richard Stevenson <rstevenson@tierrawestllc.com> wrote:

Good Afternoon,

The intent of this email is to provide responses to the questions raised by neighbors at the DRB hearing on July 22nd 2020, in regards to the proposed Wintergreen Apartment project City project number PR-2020-004030.

Below is a list of questions from the DRB meeting on July 22nd that I heard. Any duplicates were consolidated into a single question/theme. If you have specific project questions not previously addressed in the public meetings, please email us so we can work to respond to your questions rstevenson@tierrawestllc.com.

- **Will a Traffic Impact Study (TIS) be prepared by the applicant?**
  Response: This development does not meet the City threshold to require a Traffic Impact Study. Additional traffic review was completed including the Trip Generation Worksheet based on the ITE Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition for Multifamily Housing (Mid-Rise) apartments, Sub-Area Map as a basis of the trip distribution, Trip Distribution Worksheet and Map, which were submitted to the City Traffic Engineer and send to you on July 21 2020. Ms. Mirabel asked at the DRB hearing for the chart which was used to determine the trips, and I have attached to this email. The attachment provides an overview on how the trips are determined based on historical data (pre Covid-19). The development is also subject to payment of City impact fees for transportation, drainage, City facilities, parks, and public safety. Impact fees are a charge of assessment imposed by the City on new development in order to generate revenue for funding or recouping the costs of capital improvements rationally related to new development in accordance with applicable law.

- **Please provide the market research supporting the decision to proceed with luxury apartments?**
  Response: The developer is unwilling to share the market study for this development.

- **We have requested sound barriers, Line of sight barriers, fencing barriers, landscape barriers, lighting barriers.**
  Response: A 6-ft CMU block wall is proposed to be installed 5-ft offset the property boundary.

- **We requested a sound and visibility wall at least 8 feet along the East end of the property boundary.**
  Response: Where feasible we are proposing 2-ft earth bench to elevate the 6-ft wall to include the effective height.

- **Will an archeology study, crime impact study, wildlife impact study property value impact study be provided by the applicant?**
Response: Following a sensitivity review of the project site in regards to IDO Section 5-2 Site Design and Sensitive Lands, the following assessment was made by the applicant that Tract E-1 does not meet any of the sensitive land elements, as described further below:

- 5-2(C)(1)(a) Floodplains and flood hazard areas – the site is not within a floodplain or flood hazard area per FEMA FIRM Map 35001C0108G dated 9/26/2008
- 5-2(C)(1)(b) Steep slopes – Steep slopes is not defined by the IDO but generally considered steep if the slope is greater than 20%. The average slope of the undeveloped site is 4.5%
- 5-2(C)(1)(c) Unstable soils – per USGS the soil is bluepoint loamy fine sand 98.1%
- 5-2(C)(1)(e) Arroyos – per FEMA FIRM map no evidence of recorded arroyos.
- 5-2(C)(1)(f) Irrigation facilities (acequias) – no
- 5-2(C)(1)(g) Escarpments – there are no escarpments on the property
- 5-2(C)(1)(h) Rock outcroppings – there are no rock outcroppings on the property
- 5-2(C)(1)(i) Large stands of mature trees – not present, the site is in an undeveloped condition with vegetation typical of the west mesa with areas of scrub, small vegetation and some minor disturbance by dumping of soils.

A crime impact, wildlife and property value impact study is not required with the application and will not be completed.

An archeological certification of no effect was provided by the Albuquerque City Archaeologist for this site.

We have requested that the recreational walking trail adjacent our properties be removed.

Response: The walking trail has been shifted to the west further away from the east property line but remains for the residents to utilize for recreational exercise.

Please provide a view plan exhibit?

Response: A view plan exhibit was prepared to show the sections along the east half of the property and is attached to this email.
• We have requested Large River walk as opposed to Grass to discourage foot traffic. Response: Native seed is proposed as ground cover in the 50-ft landscape buffer area, along with shrubs and trees, as detailed on the landscape plans.

• Concern with the scale and intensity of the development.
Response: The subject site is zoned MX-M (Mixed Use Medium intensity) and the proposed multi-family use is allowed permissively. The proposed plan meets applicable development standards (height, setbacks, parking, etc.) and the technical standards (drainage, vehicular access, etc.). The site was previously zoned C-2 (Community Commercial), which allowed multi-family development at a much more intense scale of development (higher density and over 10 stories in height were possible under C-2 zoning).

This development and proposed density also aligns with the infill development of the City with the City of Albuquerque Comprehensive Plan Goal and policy listed in Chapter 5: Land Use, regarding development patterns: Goal 5.3-Efficient Development Patterns: Promote development patterns that maximize the utility of existing infrastructure and public facilities and the efficient use of land to support the public good, and Policy 5.3.1-Infill Development: Support additional growth in areas with existing infrastructure and public facilities. The project will facilitate development of a portion of a site already served by existing infrastructure that is available for use (Golf Course Rd, Black Arroyo Channel, ABCWUA water and sewer) thereby maximizing the utility of existing infrastructure and using land in an efficient manner. Using infrastructure and land in this way generally supports the public good because it is more efficient than adding infrastructure and/or developing residential developments on the urban fringe.

• We also would like the landscape plan to include more mature trees, to protect immediate privacy. The current plan has at least 10-year maturity
Response: 6-ft plus high trees will be installed at install for the Austrian Pine species, Chinese Juniper planted as 5 gal shrubs, the other tree species shall have a 2-inch plus caliper.

• We would like plants that do not affect allergies. Juniper plants are a major contributor to allergies.
Response: The two types of evergreens are selected for the eastern edge of the landscape:
  o Austrian Pines / Pinus nigra. Uncommon tree allergen, minimal needle drop with regular irrigation.
- Chinese Juniper / Juniperus chinensus – ‘Spartan’ (narrow) variety, planted as 5 gal shrubs. FEMALE TREES ONLY per compliance with City Aeroallergen Ordinance.
- The city tracks and puts out daily air quality pollen counts. Junipers, a common allergen, are included. Pines, an uncommon allergen, are not included.

- **We want Trash Bins moved away from the East side of the development, away from homeowners’ properties.**
  Response: Limited in placement due to Solid Waste and ABCWUA requirements, located dumpsters outside of the buffer area and as far away as possible from the residents.

- **Lighting must be directed away from private properties.**
  Response: All outdoor lighting for the project is controlled by the New Mexico Night Sky Protection Act and regulated by the IDO section 5-8. No light source for any outdoor light fixture shall be directly visible from any public right-of-way or any adjacent property. Light poles will have a max height of 16-ft.

- **Privacy Concerns**
  Response: The City has no specific standards to protect privacy of backyards such as preventing sight-lines from adjoining properties but does require a 50-ft landscape buffer to provide setback and landscaping between this development and the single family residence. The IDO Neighborhood Edge requirements (height limitations, buffer requirements, etc.) are met with this development.

- **We discourage Grass on the East side buffer, being that the noise generated by maintenance and mowing would impose on the neighborhood.**
  Response: All property owners in the City of Albuquerque must follow the Noise Control Ordinance https://www.cabq.gov/environmentalhealth/noise

- **Concern on Crime increasing in the area:**
  Response: Site design and building design standards are reflected in the Integrated Development Ordinance (IDO) which incorporate the basic tenets of CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design), such as adequate lighting, minimizing “hiding places,” providing opportunities for passive surveillance, and restricting access to sites and buildings to only residents (gating, doors with controlled access, etc.). AFR (Fire & Rescue) and APD (Police Department) provided comments on the site plan with
those elements considered with the design. As this is a gated apartment community the residents will be as concerned for crime prevention across Albuquerque as any other good neighbor is.

- Water runoff and drainage has not been addressed adequately to the neighborhood concerns.

Response: Tierra West is unaware of any outstanding questions or concerns regarding drainage.

As the applicant we consider the Site Plan complies with all applicable provisions of the IDO, the DPM, other adopted City regulations, all of which is being reviewed thoroughly by the DRB. We have followed the procedures outlined in the IDO document for notice provisions. If you have specific project questions relating to the development, please email us so we can work to respond to your questions rstevenson@tierrawestllc.com.

This application has not bypassed any City agency/s or committee/s and is following the City of Albuquerque process. If you have process questions, i.e. specific to the IDO notification procedures, or any other City process matter please email the DRB Chair Ms. Wolfley at jwolfley@cabq.gov.

The upcoming DRB meeting to review the re-submittal to address DRB member’s comments is this Wednesday, 5 August 2020. The project number is PR-2020-004030, and is number three on the agenda. The agenda is posted online and the call in details are as follows:

Join Zoom Meeting (9:00 am Wednesday 8/5/2020)
https://cabq.zoom.us/j/93846895555
Meeting ID: 938 4689 5555
By phone +1 312 626 6799 or find your local number: https://hes32-ctp.trendmicro.com:443/wis/clicktime/v1/query?url=https%3a%2f%2fcabq.zoom.us%2fu%2faLqNrlNh&umid=32057433-94b8-4fdb-a21a-056e4ec2aa42&auth=c5e193b2792d33bbda0d14ee5f909adbb398f028-6d0e4a7df508df08c0dd6d11236b96ec1d7dae98

Kind Regards,

Richard Stevenson, P.E.

Tierra West LLC
5571 Midway Park Pl., NE
Albuquerque, NM  87109
505-858-3100     ext. 232

PRIVILEGED AND CONFIDENTIAL
The information contained in this electronic mail message is confidential, may be privileged, and is intended only for the use of the individual(s) named above or their designee. If you are not the intended recipient of this message, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. Any unauthorized interception of this message is illegal under the law. If you have received this message in error, please immediately notify me by return message or by telephone and delete the original message from your email system. Thank you.

From: Richard Stevenson
Sent: Tuesday, July 21, 2020 4:36 PM
To: 'p crump'; Ron Bohannan; 'rick@rba81.com'; 'gnh5976@gmail.com'; '1garciaagang@gmail.com'; 'mdmiraba@msn.com'; 'meganfitz@live.com'; 'bcreel@msn.com'; 'frandimarco@msn.com';
Hello All,

Please find attached the following items relating to the traffic queries for this project:

- Trip Generation Worksheet based on the ITE Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition for Multifamily Housing (Mid-Rise) apartments
- Sub-Area Map as a basis of the trip distribution
- Trip Distribution Worksheet
- Trip Distribution Map
- Westside Blvd. widening project timing and financials which is in the current Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for FFY 2020 and 2021. According to MRCOG TIP Coordinator, this is a high priority project for the City of Albuquerque and City of Rio Rancho. This project will more than likely be completed over the next few years considering the amount of construction that is involved. Here is a link to MRCOG website where you can find the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (which includes project lists), as well as the TIP: https://www.mrcog-nm.gov/233/Metro-Planning.
• Here is the downloadable link to the drainage plan
  https://1drv.ms/b/s!Ah_cF8HIL3ogkDpTWEqdmDVXFo

Kind Regards,

Richard Stevenson, P.E.

Tierra West LLC
5571 Midway Park Pl., NE
Albuquerque, NM 87109
505-858-3100 ext. 232

PRIVILEGED AND CONFIDENTIAL
The information contained in this electronic mail message is confidential, may be privileged, and is intended only for the use of the individual(s) named above or their designee. If you are not the intended recipient of this message, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. Any unauthorized interception of this message is illegal under the law. If you have received this message in error, please immediately notify me by return message or by telephone and delete the original message from your email system. Thank you.

From: p crump [mailto:phcrumpsf@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2020 9:33 AM
To: Ron Bohannan; Richard Stevenson; rick@rba81.com; gnh5976@gmail.com; 1garciagang@gmail.com; mdmiraba@msn.com; meganfitz@live.com; bcreel@msn.com; frandimarco@msn.com; cfmirabal@gmail.com; ruffkat@yahoo.com; ruffkat@yahoo.com; david.m.lopez@msn.com; garnand_lu@yahoo.com; kmcvey124@comcast.net; tjmurieta@msn.com; tjmurieta@msn.com; nenaperkin@gmail.com; avalgman12@gmail.com; scott.templeton@comcast.net; chavezdyx4@yahoo.com; mccormackdj@comcast.net; erin.coffman@yahoo.com; huerta.loretta58@gmail.com; gayle.binkley@me.com; marshalkearney@gmail.com; nauticalhutch@gmail.com; miladybutler@yahoo.com; rfasel@fed.net
Cc: Jocelyn Torres; Gomez, Angela J.; Maggie Gould; Tyson Hummell ABQ LUF
Subject: [#2020013] Emailing: Facilitated Meeting Wintergreen 6 18 20.docx

Dear All:

Attached please find the Report for the meeting held Thursday evening, June 18th, regarding the proposed Wintergreen Apartments. Please review it carefully.

If there are errors of either Omission (something important said but left out) or Commission (something important misquoted), please let us know and we will issue correcting Amendments. You may send potential corrections to phcrumpsf@gmail.com.

Also, instructions for submitting additional comments to the DRB are included near the end of the report under Hearing Details.

Also, you may let the City know your impression of the meeting and the facilitator(s) by going to one of the following evaluations:


or
Thank you very much for your participation.

Philip Crump and Jocelyn Torres, Facilitators


This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
Angela,
Can you please add this to the file for 4030? Thanks!

-----Original Message-----
From: Marsha Kearney <rmeek1978@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, August 2, 2020 7:44 PM
To: Marsha Kearney <rmeek1978@gmail.com>; Wolfley, Jolene <jwolfley@cabq.gov>; Morris, Petra <pmorris@cabq.gov>; Gould, Maggie S. <MGould@cabq.gov>
Cc: mike mirabal <mdmiraba@msn.com>; larry Sandoval <larrysandoval75@gmail.com>; Megan Fitzpatrick <meganfitz@live.com>
Subject: # 2020013 Wintergreen Apartments on Golf Course RD.

Jolene,

Just making sure this is added to the documentation for the Wintergreen Apartments. One of the “cc’s” said that it did not go through the first time.. I would appreciate notification that this was received. That you kindly.

Marsha Kearney
Please add to the record for PR 4030.

---

From: Erin Coffman <erin.coffman@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:02 PM
To: Wolfley, Jolene <jwolfley@cabq.gov>
Subject:

Hi Jolene,

I would like to respectfully request the postponement of the DRB meeting for the Wintergreen Apartment development by Tierra West scheduled for July 22, 2020. The Zoom or virtual meeting has not proven to be effective and in turn does not constitute a true public meeting. This is a violation of the Open Meeting Act.

Thank you,

Erin Zinsmeyer (Coffman)

=======================================================
This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
Please distribute to DRB members and add to the record. 
Maggie will followup with Ms. Kearney.

From: Marsha Kearney <rmeek1978@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, July 19, 2020 10:07 PM
To: Wolfley, Jolene <jwolfley@cabq.gov>
Cc: Larry Sandoval <larrysandoval75@gmail.com>; mike mirabal <mdmiraba@msn.com>
Subject: Fwd: Addendum

Please add this to the record. I had to have Larry Sandoval put the Addendum in a document, as I don’t have those capabilities (or should I say, knowledge to use). The name of the website Larry spoke about is Haynes Park Next Door. I posted an alert about the public meeting and there was concern/interest in what is going on from Rio Rancho down to Paradise. Most of the concerns were about traffic and crime. Some were concerned about more apartment buildings and how that can bring jobs and growth to the city. There were several that remarked “we should have known this when we moved in,” and a couple that feel economic growth is the best. The main thing to me was getting the word out to those affected. This project affects them all, yet the community involvement is most limited. I also spoke with Mayor Greg Hull on July 6th and he said they would not be commenting on the project, but speaking to Albuquerque about traffic concerns.

It’s greatly concerning when the President of our HOA says they are only responsible for covenants enforcement, yet they willingly pay for half a room for us to meet with Tierra West on June 18th. Since the first meetings on the rezoning/IDO process the HOA never informed the residents of the the original process or opportunity to respond to the rezoning in 2018. If they had, a number of us would have gotten involved. Now the property owners or developer can request a zoning amendment, but the adjacent residents have no ability to do such. Just considering the HOAs - about a third never responded to the conversion opportunity. When adding those who do not have an HOA or neighborhood association, you have a great number of residents that are not being allowed to provide input to the planning process, be it the IDO or project itself. Yet they greatly affect their everyday life and future. This is a major prejudice of people like myself.

There was an initial meeting in early April of the neighborhood coalitions, Jack Corder (who does not represent the residents, but works for the HOA), and the HOA President, (who says this is not the responsibility of the HOA). NO residents with homes adjacent to the property were invited to that meeting. The people invited to that initial meeting were sent “certified letters,” yet none of them represented the people within 100 feet of the project. Tierra West just sent first class letters on June 26, 2020 to the homeowners within 100 feet - it was not important to verify whether they were received or not. Jack Corder knew about this project and the rezoning, yet he nor the HOA never moved to contact the involved residents until later in April. Then on May 20th one of the residents went to Tierra West’s website and saw the write-up for Huning Castle Apartments (attached). Their website stated that “Numerous appeals filed by the neighborhoods were successfully defended through City Council and on to District Court.” This has since been removed, but the unwillingness to even listen to the residents and community and to allow a project that does not consider the effects of the project on people and the environment goes totally against what democracy is all about.
Please ensure at a minimum that all homeowners within 100 feet of this

This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
From: Wolfley, Jolene
Sent: Monday, August 03, 2020 9:12 AM
To: Gomez, Angela J.
Cc: Gould, Maggie S.
Subject: FW: Document Request - Neighborhood Input/Concerns PR 2020-4030

Please include in the Record for PR 2020-4030.
Note this email is to Mr. Stevenson.

From: Larry Sandoval <larrysandoval75@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, August 2, 2020 6:36 PM
To: Richard Stevenson <rstevenson@tierrawestllc.com>
Cc: Wolfley, Jolene <jwolfley@cabq.gov>; mike mirabal <mdmiraba@msn.com>; Larry Sandoval <larrysandoval75@gmail.com>
Subject: Document Request - Neighborhood Input/Concerns

Dear Mr. Stevenson,

We do not have copies of all of the neighborhood input and concerns that were sent to you on the proposed development. We are requesting all documents and emails sent to you per the May 6, 2020 direction from Scott Templeton, Seven Bar HOA President to Mike Mirabal. He stated, “Well I think the best way for you to communicate your concerns is directly with Engineering firm.” Reiterating the same information at the May 8, 2020 informal neighborhood gathering that Richard Stevenson, PE with Tierra West, LLC. would be the point of contact to funnel the neighbors input and concerns.

We are requesting a copy of all the people who submitted input & concerns and the content of the content they sent to you through email with attached documents. Please feel free to contact us if you have questions.

Sincerely,

Larry Sandoval

This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
Gomez, Angela J.

From: Wolfley, Jolene
Sent: Monday, August 03, 2020 9:12 AM
To: Gomez, Angela J.
Cc: Gould, Maggie S.
Subject: FW: Document Request - Neighborhood Input/Concerns PR 2020-4030

Please include in the Record for PR 2020-4030.
Note this email is to Mr. Stevenson.

From: Larry Sandoval <larrysandoval75@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, August 2, 2020 6:36 PM
To: Richard Stevenson <rstevenson@tierrawestllc.com>
Cc: Wolfley, Jolene <jwolfley@cabq.gov>; mike mirabal <mdmiraba@msn.com>; Larry Sandoval <larrysandoval75@gmail.com>
Subject: Document Request - Neighborhood Input/Concerns

Dear Mr. Stevenson,

We do not have copies of all of the neighborhood input and concerns that were sent to you on the proposed development. We are requesting all documents and emails sent to you per the May 6, 2020 direction from Scott Templeton, Seven Bar HOA President to Mike Mirabal. He stated, “Well I think the best way for you to communicate your concerns is directly with Engineering firm.” Reiterating the same information at the May 8, 2020 informal neighborhood gathering that Richard Stevenson, PE with Tierra West, LLC. would be the point of contact to funnel the neighbors input and concerns.

We are requesting a copy of all the people who submitted input & concerns and the content of the content they sent to you through email with attached documents. Please feel free to contact us if you have questions.

Sincerely,

Larry Sandoval

=======================================================
This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
Please add to the record for PR 4030.

Good evening Mr. Wolfley, I live in North Seven Bar, Albuquerque. I am writing this email in concern that the City Planning DRB is holding a virtual meeting. I understand the current situation with COVID and the need to maintain quarantine/isolation/masks; however, this is an extremely important issue that has huge economic and safety concerns for our neighborhood. Because of the importance and impact on our community to what is being consider I ask that you re-schedule the July 22nd City Planning DRB meeting to time in the future when we can truly have an open forum to discuss our concerns about the Apartment Project that is being considered. Virtual meetings do not constitute a true a public meeting and they by nature limit participation, which I feel would severely handicap an open discussion considering all the impact this project may have on the surrounding area. Thank you for considering my request.

Respectfully,
Patrick

Patrick Garcia
12022 Sullivan Court NW
Albuquerque, NM 87114
Phone: (505)453-2479

This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
Please add to the record for PR 4030.

-----Original Message-----
From: Larry Garcia <lmgcolortinc@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 6:03 PM
To: Wolfley, Jolene <jwolfley@cabq.gov>
Cc: larrysandoval75@gmail.com; rmeek1978@gmail.com; mdmiraba@msn.com
Subject: Drb zoom meeting for July 22nd be rescheduled

Jolene Wolfley,

My name is Larry Garcia. I am a resident in the Estrella Del Norte community and I live on Carreta Drive. I would like to ask that the Drb meeting scheduled for the 22nd of July, in regards to the building of the apartment complex on Golf Course, be delayed and rescheduled until a time that we are able to meet in an open meeting. I do not feel that a Zoom meeting meets the requirements of the Open Meetings Act. I would like you to consider a delay until we can meet in person. Under these Zoom meetings, the public input is at an extreme disadvantage. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Best regards,
Larry Garcia
This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
Maggie,
Please provide a response to Paul Rees.

Angela,
Please include this email in the record for PR 4030

I am a resident in the north seven bar loop neighborhood that borders the mesa at Golf Course and Westside. There is an apartment complex proposed to be built there, and I have an objection to the zoom Drb meeting on July 22,2020, in reference to this complex. During the covid-19 pandemic, I have attended 2 virtual online meetings in reference to this complex, and have voiced my concerns to the developer and meeting moderators. It should be noted that the majority of my neighborhood was unaware of any proposed development, or any related meetings that they could voice their opinions at. Furthermore, the developer allegedly mailed postcards informing nearby residents about the proposed development 2 years ago, yet I've still not met any neighbors who had received these postcards, including myself. I fear that this development is being rushed in order to bypass possible opposition by neighbors. I am concerned that not many people surrounding this proposed development are aware of it at all. Please consider postponing this meeting so that neighbors have an opportunity to educate themselves on the development, as well as voice concerns. Thank you for your consideration. Paul Rees (505) 553-2260
Please add to the record for PR 2020-4030.

Ms. Wolfley,
Just a quick question on process. Most of my neighbors are not familiar with ZOOM type meetings. I myself am unfamiliar. What opportunities are going to be afforded for rebuttal? How do we request to present or speak? This virtual meeting puts the community at a big disadvantage for being involved. Just trying to prepare. The developer tried having one of these virtual meetings on May 21, and it was totally unproductive. We had to schedule a face to face meeting.

Get Outlook for Android

This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
I think this was already included in the Record for PR 4030. Would you please check?

-----Original Message-----
From: Larry Sandoval <larrysandoval75@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 20, 2020 3:21 PM
To: Wolfley, Jolene <jwolfley@cabq.gov>; Gould, Maggie S. <MGould@cabq.gov>
Cc: Larry Sandoval <larrysandoval75@gmail.com>
Subject: Information File - Part I (re-send)

Ms. Gould here is a second mailing of Information File - Part I. Please let me know if you receive this document. Thank you. Larry

This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
Please add to the record for PR 4030.

From: Lucille Lopez <garnandlu@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:07 PM
To: Wolfley, Jolene <jwolfley@cabq.gov>
Subject: July 22 DRB meeting for proposed apartment complex

Hello,
I am writing to ask the DRB meeting on July 22 for proposed apartment complex by Tierra West be postponed. The Zoom meeting format violates the Open Meeting Act. A video meeting doesn't allow for good public participation. Please postpone the meeting until a time in person meetings can occur.

Thank you,
Lucille and David Lopez
Residents of Seven Bar North neighborhood

Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android

This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
Ms. Kearney,
This is to let you know that this email will be part of the record for PR 2020-4030.

-----Original Message-----
From: Marsha Kearney <rmeek1978@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 2:42 PM
To: Wolfley, Jolene <jwolfley@cabq.gov>
Subject: Notification

I am not sure if I was reading this correctly (it’s really difficult trying to go through the IDO, especially when one lacks computer skills like myself), but did Tierra West need to post a sign at the site? There are only For Sale signs that have been seen. Appreciate this getting into the written record.
Thank you.
Marsha Kearney

=======================================================
This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
Dear Ms. Wolfley,

I want to express my genuine opposition to the July 22nd planned zoom meeting for the DRB in reference to the subject project. We homeowners will not be able to adequately lay out our positions on this project in a zoom environment. We tried that with the developer once before and the meeting devolved into an unproductive exercise in futility. We then had an in person meeting with them that provided both sides the opportunity to adequately discuss the relevant issues. A zoom meeting with the DRB and developer will inevitably leave the homeowners concerns inadequately addressed and that is simply unfair to the homeowners.

Please postpone this meeting until all parties can safely meet to discuss the concerns of the homeowners. That is the only fair hearing that is possible.

Respectfully,

Daniel J. McCormack
10919 Carreta Drive NW
505-730-3507

This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
Please send Ms. Long the email regarding DRB holding remote meetings and add her email to the Record.

-----Original Message-----
From: Kathie Long <kathielong@mac.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 21, 2020 9:54 PM
To: Wolfley, Jolene <jwolfley@cabq.gov>
Subject: PR-2020 004030

In reference to the meeting scheduled for 7/22/20 regarding apartments on golf course road Tierra West LLC. I would like to attend but I am unable to do a virtual meeting will it be rescheduled when concerned neighbors will be able to attend? Thank you Kathie Long 505-239-4687

Sent from my iPad=

This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
Please provide Debra with the email regarding DRB remote meetings and add her email to the record for PR 4030

-----Original Message-----
From: Debra Skinner-Belyeu <debskinnerbelyeu@hotmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 21, 2020 7:58 PM
To: Wolfley, Jolene <jwolfley@cabq.gov>
Subject: Proposed apartments

I formally request you reschedule the zoom meeting scheduled for 9:00 am tomorrow July 22, 2020.

It is important that we do not proceed with virtual meetings as a replacement for open public meetings. It is essential that we have public involvement and community engagement at any DRB.

Zoom meetings and virtual meetings are not the most effective methods of communication which does not constitute a true public meeting. This is our only chance to get involved in the process in which there are critical decisions being made that affect my community and property.

- Debra Skinner Belyeu
4308 Dry Creek PL NW
Albuquerque NM 87114=

This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
Please add to the record for this case.

-----Original Message-----
From: Marsha Kearney <rmeek1978@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 21, 2020 11:24 AM
To: Wolfley, Jolene <jwolfley@cabq.gov>
Subject: Re: Request for a hard copy of the IDO and permit application-PR 2020-4030

Thanks Jolene. For a person that does not own an e-reader and is visual-this is sad news (about the documents). Glad to see #4, though I hope they are not rushing through that process, as I see the IDO stifling/eliminating community involvement - especially if a project is below the 250 unit threshold. I guess I will have to learn how to use technology if I am to get more involved with this all. Appreciate the “head’s up” on the staff reviews. And responding on the meeting room rental.
Marsha Kearney

> On Jul 21, 2020, at 10:42 AM, Wolfley, Jolene <jwolfley@cabq.gov> wrote:
> 
> > Ms. Kearney,
> > 
> > Thank you for all your work to try to understand the DRB application in your neighborhood. Here are a few answers to your questions:
(1) DRB applications have been moving to a digital format over the past year or so. The pandemic has made that conversion complete. Applicants submit their applications digitally (no hard copies) and staff and the public can review that same online application. Hopefully you found the link from the DRB agenda that we directed you to. If we can do anything to help you with the format of the file, we will be happy to do that.

(2) The Integrated Development Ordinance (IDO) is available from the City's website.

https://hes32-ctp.trendmicro.com:443/wis/clicktime/v1/query?url=http%3a%2f%2fdocuments.cabq.gov%2fplanning%2fIDO%2fIDO%2dEffective%2d2018%2d05%2d17.pdf&umid=d6246218-a6f4-4594-8834-6b244450a758&auth=c5e193b2792d33bbda0d14ee5f909adbb398f028-843202662886e19f000b5d4abf2d496f420bd726

It sounds like you have found it. Notice that there is a search field (top left, fifth icon from the left, magnifying glass icon) where you can put in the word you are looking for and the search engine will take you to that passage in the IDO.

(3) The DRB staff has the responsibility to review the IDO and the Development Process Manual (DPM) and evaluate the relevant provisions for an application. Those comments--for PR #2020-4030 located on Golf Course--from each of the DRB respective areas (Hydrology, Transportation, etc.) will be available this afternoon for you to review. The DRB comments will be sent to you and might help you in your review of the application. Please feel free to share those comments with other neighbors.

(4) We will be looking at ways to make the IDO more accessible to the public when we complete the first Annual Update of the IDO.

(5) For your information, a neighborhood group is not obligated to pay for a room when there is a neighborhood facilitated meeting.
developer may ask, but the neighborhood is not obligated to pay for the room.

> Thank you,

> JOLENE WOLFLEY
> associate director
> e jwolfley@cabq.gov
> cabq.gov/planning

-----Original Message-----
> From: Marsha Kearney <rmeek1978@gmail.com>
> Sent: Tuesday, July 21, 2020 10:04 AM
> To: Wolfley, Jolene <jwolfley@cabq.gov>; Renz-Whitmore, Mikaela J. <mrenz-whitmore@cabq.gov>; Larry Sandoval <larrysandoval75@gmail.com>; mike mirabal <mdmiraba@msn.com>; Brito, Russell D. <RBrito@cabq.gov>; Schultz, Shanna M. <smschultz@cabq.gov>
> Subject: Request for a hard copy of the IDO and permit application

> It’s been an extremely difficult task trying to understand the IPO and reviewing the application on the computer. I know I missed items, such as the hydrological and erosion concerns, etc. If we were not in a pandemic I would be able to come to the city offices and review the items, getting copies of pertinent pages. I am asking for a hard copy of both the IPO and DRB application. I will be glad to have that readily accessible for others who are in the process of reviewing the material.
> I would like that to be sent to
> Marsha Kearney
> 10927 Carreta Drive NW
> Albuquerque, NM 87114
>
> If there is a charge I would like an explanation of why, especially during the pandemic.
>
> Thank you for your attention to this matter.
> Marsha Kearney
>
>  =======================================================
> This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
>  =======================================================

This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
Please include in the Record for PR 2020-4030.

Ms. Kearney, all of your questions except #2 below are questions that the Office of Neighborhood Coordination (ONC) should answer. I’ve asked for Shanna’s assistance in getting responses to those.

I’m sorry that my email wasn’t below wasn’t clear. The vacant lot on Golf Course where the apartments are proposed WAS eligible for the 1-year voluntary zoning conversion process that followed the adoption of the Integrated Development Ordinance (IDO) BUT DID NOT GO THROUGH THAT PROCESS.

Instead, its zoning was converted along with all properties in Albuquerque when the IDO first went into effect in May 2018. The IDO was drafted between 2015 and 2018 with many public meeting opportunities to review standards and proposed zones, and it was in the City’s review and decision process from December 2016 through May 2018, with multiple public hearings at each step in the approval process.

That review/decision process was considered legislative. For legislative decisions, the City does not provide notice to every property owner but instead puts an ad in the legal notices in the Albuquerque Journal and sends emails/letters to representatives on file with the Office of Neighborhood Coordination, be they Neighborhood Associations or HOAs. These representatives are responsible for disseminating that information to residents within their association boundary. That requirement is set by the Neighborhood Association Recognition Ordinance (NARO) and generally administered by the Office of Neighborhood Coordination.

I hope this is helpful.

Best,

Mikaela Renz-Whitmore

(she/hers)

o 505.924.3932
e mrenz@cabq.gov
From: Marsha Kearney <rmeek1978@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 11:45 AM
To: Renz-Whitmore, Mikaela J. <mrenz-whitmore@cabq.gov>
Cc: Schultz, Shanna M. <smschultz@cabq.gov>; Wolffey, Jolene <jwolffey@cabq.gov>; Brito, Russell D. <RBrito@cabq.gov>; mike mirabal <mdmiraba@msn.com>; Larry Sandoval <larrysandoval75@gmail.com>
Subject: Re: Request for information - rezoning/IDO process

Mikaela,

Several requests/questions:

1. Can you send me copies of the North Bar 7 Compliance report for the past two years? 2018 and 2019?
2. Could you tell me if the vacant lot on Golf Course is included in the “likely eligible for conversion” map. I could not get the map to open up on my computer to go to our part of the map. This is one of the problems of this process proceeding during the pandemic.
3. Is it appropriate for 7 Bar HOA to pay half of the meeting room with Tierra West (to discuss their proposed project)?
4. Is the 7 Bar HOA considered a neighborhood association?
5. This is a question I asked of Ms. Carmona. Why is Public Notice Inquiry document listing Jack Corder under Seven Bar North HOA? He does work for the HOA, but is not a member or representative. I understand he was well aware of the proposed project months before April 17th, yet NO attempt was made to contact any residents.

Our HOA President keeps telling us they only had responsibility for covenant enforcement, yet they are recognized by the city. Also trying to figure out why we (residents) were not sent one of the postcard/notification of the zone conversion process. Thanks again for any help. Once again, there is a sense of urgency as we need to get our written comments in by today.

Sincerely,
Marsha Kearney

On Jul 15, 2020, at 3:00 PM, Renz-Whitmore, Mikaela J. <mrenz-whitmore@cabq.gov> wrote:

Prior to the Integrated Development Ordinance, this property was zoned C-2, and that was converted to MX-M when the IDO was adopted and went into effect in May 2018. That was considered a legislative process, so notice was not sent to every property owner but rather given via a legal ad and emails/letters to neighborhood associations.

To advertise the zoning conversion process, we sent inserts in the County property tax bill that went to all property owners and an ad in the ABCWUA water bill.

The follow-up zoning conversion process was to fix zoning conversions for 1 of 5 errors, explained on this webpage:
https://abc-zone.com/post-ido-voluntary-zone-conversion-process

Here is a map showing all the properties that we found were likely eligible for a zoning conversion and received a postcard (approximately 18,000 properties):
http://cabq.maps.arcgis.com/apps/View/index.html?appid=00cdf10884314904a635d7c59bd7a8b4&ext=106.7142,35.0597,-106.5910,35.1319
The property with the proposed apartments was eligible for the zoning conversion process because they had a floating zone line.

Here is the property owner request form: https://abc-zone.com/document/zoning-conversion-property-owner-form

PDFs of the postcard, the tax bill, and the water bill are attached.

Thanks,

MIKAELA RENZ-WHITMORE
(she/hers)
o 505.924.3932
e mrenz@cabq.gov

-----Original Message-----
From: Marsha Kearney <rmeek1978@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 15, 2020 1:14 PM
To: Renz-Whitmore, Mikaela J. <mrenz-whitmore@cabq.gov>
Subject: Re: Request for information - rezoning/IDO process

Mikaela,

The postcard notification could have been to High Desert residents and involve a piece of property of concern to the residents there. I live on 10927 Carreta Drive NW and adjacent to vacant lot on Golf Course Road where Tierra West is proposing a 208 unit apartment complex. We the adjacent landowners are preparing for the hearing on Wednesday. None of us knew of the rezoning change/IDO process until now (and many of us have been long term residents). The change is very negative as it changes the allowance of 2 story apartments to 4 story apartments With balconies overlooking residences (completely out of character with the area). Looking for any other similar situations and how they were handled. I hope that provides more clarification. Thank you very much. This situation is much more difficult for us with the pandemic and our limited computer skills. Marsha Kearney

> On Jul 15, 2020, at 12:54 PM, Renz-Whitmore, Mikaela J. <mrenz-whitmore@cabq.gov> wrote:
> 
> Hi Marsha,
> 
> I'm happy to look for this information. Can you give me your address? Do you have the address for the proposed apartment complex?
> 
> Thanks,
> 
> MIKAELA RENZ-WHITMORE
> (she/hers)
o 505.924.3932
e mrenz@cabq.gov

> -----Original Message-----
> From: Marsha Kearney <rmeek1978@gmail.com>
> Sent: Wednesday, July 15, 2020 12:47 PM
> To: Renz-Whitmore, Mikaela J. <mrenz-whitmore@cabq.gov>; Schultz, Shanna M.
<smschultz@cabq.gov>; Wolfley, Jolene <jwolfley@cabq.gov>
> Subject: Request for information - rezoning/IDO process
>
> Mikaela and Shawna,
>
> A group of us were talking with Dan Regan yesterday about the proposed 208 Apartment development at Golf Course Road and the rezoning/IDO process and Dan thought you could be of help. Dan mentioned postcard Notification being sent to about 20,000 residents speaking to “voluntary conversion” of property that had been rezoned. He also mentioned that the conversion opportunity ended last September (so I assume the original postcards were sent out in 2018). He also talked about a request form that was put together. How can I get a copy of the postcard, request form and who received the notifications. The lot behind our property was rezoned in 2018, yet none of the adjacent landowners or HOA were made aware of that change. As we need to get our comments in about the proposed project by the end of this week, I need this information as soon as possible.
> Sincerely,
> Marsha Kearney
>
> ==============================================================
> This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
> ==============================================================
> This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.

<Postcard-5x7-FINAL-printmarks.pdf>
<Bernalillo County Tax Bill insert.pdf>
<ABCWUA-insert.pdf>

 ==============================================================
This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
Please provide this to all DRB members and add to the record for PR 4030.

-----Original Message-----
From: Larry Sandoval <larrysandoval75@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, July 18, 2020 4:38 PM
To: Wolfley, Jolene <jwolfley@cabq.gov>
Cc: Wolfenbarger, Jeanne <jwolfenbarger@cabq.gov>; mike mirabal <mdmiraba@msn.com>; Marsha Kearney <rmeek1978@gmail.com>; Larry Sandoval <larrysandoval75@gmail.com>
Subject: Request for Traffic Impact Study

Good afternoon Ms. Wofley,

Please include this pdf document as part of our record to the Board. Thank you.

This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
Request for Traffic Impact Study (TIS)

In the submittal to the DRB, there is a reference as to whether a Traffic Impact Study has been requested or completed for this project. To our knowledge a traffic study has not been done.

As one of the options in the application there is a borderline option.

Per our understanding if an apartment complex were more than 247 units it would be required. In this case, there would be 209 units and supporting building structures and amenities. While borderline is a subjective statement, we would like to formally request that the applicant be required to submit a Comprehensive traffic study, due to our belief that this project meets the definition of borderline.

All roads and intersections in this area are feeder roads for Rio Rancho to gain access to the bridges that get them across the river for work and business. There are no river crossings in Rio Rancho. The road network here is currently overburdened especially at peak periods and rush hours. There is no clear matrix of cross roads to alleviate traffic flow in the event of emergencies. These roads are primary access roads for two major hospitals and several other senior care facilities that require emergency access. The roads are only two lanes, one in each direction, that tend to block emergency vehicles and put the public safety in jeopardy.

There are many reasons related to traffic that need to be addressed prior to approval of this complex. The Project location poses numerous difficulties to surrounding neighborhoods. The affected major intersections are Golf Course/Westside, Golf Course/McMahon, 528/Westside, and Unser/Westside. Plus, numerous other smaller neighborhood roads that feed these intersections. Golf Course road does not have any lighting, which poses a problem for any entry or exit from this complex. The entry for this project is on a bend in the road that creates blind spots in the daytime, not to mention at night or low visibility.

Eastbound Westside road at Golf Course has two lanes immediately merging into one. This causes traffic to immediately merge and create road rage situations at high traffic and rush hour periods. The roads further west that feed this intersection has already been improved and funnel additional traffic into this intersection. In the evenings traffic traveling west on Westside road often backs up to 528/Westside, creating more issues. The intersection of Westside and 7 Bar North often limits our exit from our neighborhood, and if we want to go west from 7 Bar it’s almost impossible.
Golf Course and McMahon is also impacted by Rio Rancho traffic trying to get to the Paseo Del Norte river crossing. Traffic backups at that intersection create several access problems for the local surrounding neighborhoods. Heading North on Golf Course is a downhill street that inadvertently encourages speeding, and if you research the volume of speeding citations at that location, you will find they are excessive.

All of the congestion that currently exists, will be intensified by this project and poses additional problems for our neighborhoods. People will use our internal neighborhood streets to take shortcuts through our neighborhood whenever traffic becomes congested. The noise created, the traffic, the safety of our families, and quality of life will be negatively impacted and the character of our neighborhood will be changed.

We continue to raise these issues and concerns, but the Developer and our city representatives fail to listen and take action to mitigate the impact to our residents. We keep getting told per the IDO, that that’s no longer their problem; it’s some other governmental agencies responsibility. This project has bypassed all the other safeguards that used to provide some semblance of protection for existing residents.

We respectfully request that a Comprehensive Traffic Study be required under the borderline option. There has to be some consideration for the property owners that have been living there in a neighborhood that has been in existence for over twenty years.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike D. Mirabal
Please add to the record for PR 4030.

From: Randy Kearney <rmeek9@live.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 15, 2020 8:47 PM
To: Wolfley, Jolene <jwolfley@cabq.gov>
Subject: Scheduled DRB Zoom Meeting for July 22, 2020

I am requesting that the DRB meeting scheduled for July 22 at 9:00 am be delayed and rescheduled at a time where it is safe to meet in an open meeting. I do not have Zoom capabilities and feel that meetings like this put the public input at a great disadvantage. I do not agree that Zoom meetings meet the requirements of the Open Meetings Act. Thank you for your consideration of this matter.

Sincerely,
John R. Kearney

This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
Please add to the record for PR 4030.

From: mike mirabal <mdmiraba@msn.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 15, 2020 2:44 PM
To: Wolfley, Jolene <jwolfley@cabq.gov>; Larry Sandoval <larrysandoval75@gmail.com>; Marsha Kearney <rmeek1978@gmail.com>; mike mirabal <mdmiraba@msn.com>
Subject: Scheduled DRB Zoom meeting for the 22nd of July.

I would like ask that the Drb meeting scheduled for the 22nd of July be delayed and rescheduled until a time that we are able to meet in an open meeting. I don't feel that a Zoom meeting meets the requirements of the open meetings act. While this is my opinion, I would like you to consider a delay until we could meet in person. Thank you! Under these Zoom meetings the public input is at an extreme disadvantage.

Get Outlook for Android

This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
Please add to the record for PR 4030.

From: Amy Garcia <1garcigang@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 9:34 AM
To: Wolfley, Jolene <jwolfley@cabq.gov>
Cc: mmdmiraba@msn.com; Marsha Kearney <rmeek1978@gmail.com>; larrysandoval75@gmail.com
Subject: Scheduled DRB Zoom meeting for the 22nd of July

Jolene Wolfley,
My name is Amy Garcia. I am a resident in the Estrella Del Norte community and I live on Carreta Drive. I would like to ask that the Drb meeting scheduled for the 22nd of July, in regards to the building of the apartment complex on Golf Course, be delayed and rescheduled until a time that we are able to meet in an open meeting. I do not feel that a Zoom meeting meets the requirements of the Open Meetings Act. While this is my opinion, I would like you to consider a delay until we can meet in person. Thank you! Under these Zoom meetings, the public input is at an extreme disadvantage. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Best regards,
Amy Garcia

================================
This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
Gomez, Angela J.

From: Wolfley, Jolene
Sent: Friday, July 24, 2020 9:38 AM
To: Gomez, Angela J.
Subject: FW: Tierra West apartment development at Golf Course and Westside. 10800 Golf course Rd. PR 2020-4030
Attachments: Buffer Area Adjacent to Homeowners.pdf

Please add to the Record for PR 2020-4030

From: mike mirabal <mdmiraba@msn.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 2:42 PM
To: Wolfley, Jolene <jwolfley@cabq.gov>
Subject: Tierra West apartment development at Golf Course and Westside. 10800 Golf course Rd.

Ms. Wolfley,
Just writing to express some concerns that were brought up in our facilitated meeting with Tierra West. We were promised a follow up meeting to provide answers to our concerns, but Tierra West never came through with the promised meeting. The other concerns are in the facilitated meeting minutes, that should have been provided to the DRB. Please share with your board. Thank You!

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

I am writing to you to ask you to postpone the Wintergreen apartment development by Tierra West on June 22. This type of meeting format violates the Open Meeting Act.

Thank you,

Rachel Romero
7 Bar HOA Member

This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
Please add this to the Record for PR 2020-4030 and distribute to the DRB members.

From: mike mirabal <mdmiraba@msn.com>
Sent: Sunday, August 2, 2020 7:25 PM
To: Wolfley, Jolene <jwolfley@cabq.gov>
Subject: Wintergreen Apartments DRB

Jolene,
I would like to add a comment to the record for this submittal. This project denies opportunities for jobs on the west side of the river. Where higher density housing on this side of the river without future plans for additional bridges contributes to gridlock. Also utilizing commercial property for housing as opposed to business defeats opportunities for jobs on this side of the river. This constitutes poor planning, and defeats the purpose of the Comp plans. I would like our Commercial property to be used to enhance neighborhood needs for jobs.
Thank You for adding this to the record.
Mike Mirabal
Thank you!

Get Outlook for Android

=================================================================================================
This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
Please add to record for PR 4030. Maggie please send her the email response regarding holding DRB during the public health emergency.

From: Susanna Padilla <purdygirl1233@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, July 18, 2020 7:55 AM
To: Wolfley, Jolene <jwolfley@cabq.gov>
Subject: Zoom Meeting scheduled for July 22, 2020

I feel it is not wise to hold a Zoom meeting on July 22nd and need too reschedule this when we can have an OPEN Public meeting. Critical decisions are being made that affect the community and THE homeowners Property. We as homeowners NEED to be involved in important decisions that affect us here and around our community. Thank you for your reconsideration in this important matter. Susanna Padilla.

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

I have included the attached documents into the record.

Jay Rodenbeck
Planner
o 505.924.3994
e jrodenbeck@cabq.gov
cabq.gov/planning

From: Rene' Horvath <aboard111@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 29, 2020 5:02 PM
To: Wolfley, Jolene <jwolfley@cabq.gov>; Gould, Maggie S. <MGould@cabq.gov>; Rodenbeck, Jay B. <jrodenbeck@cabq.gov>
Subject: Comments for DRB hearing - Wintergreen Apts.

Dear Jay,
Here are my comments for the DRB tomorrow regarding the wintergreen apts. Please see attached. I am also resending my prior letter as well.
Rene' Horvath

Virus-free. www.avg.com

=======================================================
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This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
For the August 5th, 2020 DRB hearing

Regarding the Wintergreen Apts.

Dear DRB Board members,

I am the Land Use Director for the Westside Coalition. I receive the notifications of west side projects. I have attended two online facilitated meetings regarding the Wintergreen apartment proposal.

Here are my Comments regarding the proposed Four Story Wintergreen Apartments:

1) Solar Access: The Westside has received a lot of applications for Apartments, recently. These applications are proposing 3 to 4 story apartments; mostly 4 stories. If we don’t do this right, we end up with very incompatible apartments adjacent to single family residents, which is creating a lot of conflicts with the neighbors. The size of a building adjacent to single family homes does affect the quality of life for the existing residents in terms of privacy and solar access. In the case of the wintergreen Apts., solar access for the neighbors will especially be affected when the afternoon sun goes down.

2) Neighborhood scale and Character: One of the biggest concerns regarding the proposed Winter Green Apartments is the size of the four story building behind single family neighborhoods. Four stories is completely out of scale and character for the surrounding area. There are no other 4 story buildings along this stretch of Golf Course, heading into Rio Rancho, that are this tall. This site is completely surrounded by single family homes. Four stories will appear out of place, as if a mistake was made in the zoning. Would this be called spot zoning? I’m sure this was not the original intent for this site.

3) Prior C-2 zoning: The prior zone code listed this site as a C-2 zone, Community Commercial. Apartments were a conditional use, under the C-2 Zoning. At the time it had to consider 3 criteria: school capacity, jobs to housing balance, and meeting the usable open space requirement. The residents who purchased their homes, were expecting commercial type businesses similar in scale as the other businesses up the road from them. They did not expect a large apartment complex behind their homes. We do not want this project to set a bad precedent that undermines the scale and character of the surrounding area, upsetting the community.

4) IDO MXM zoning: The IDO is a new zoning ordinance. This site was changed to a MXM zone in the IDO. It now allows apartments permissively, buildings can go up to 45 ft. high. Does this mean that a 45 ft. high building is allowed at all locations? Shouldn’t an application meet the goals policies of the ABC-Z Comp Plan which promotes development to blend with the scale and character of the surrounding area? Also note most of the apartments in the area, are near Activity Centers and have transit nearby. Ex: The apartments near the North west Area command are 2 to 3 story buildings, not 4 story. There is a lot of activity around that area, including the cottonwood shopping area, Cibola high school and a bus transit system. Note: The Wintergreen site is in an Area of Consistency, 2) it is not in an Activity Center, 3) It does not have transit service on Golf Course. All these things need to be considered when evaluating this proposal.
The ABC-Z Comp Plan goals and policies are to guide development to fit with the surrounding area:

5) ABC-Z Comp Plan: Pg. 5-23 5.1.2.5 CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE DEVELOPMENT AREAS: Directing growth to Areas of Change is intended to help preserve and protect established neighborhoods in Areas of Consistency. **Areas of Change and Consistency are designed to be complementary to protect the scale and character of distinctive neighborhoods while accommodating new residents and jobs in areas already well served by infrastructure and transit.**

**Areas of Consistency: Pg. 5-23 (City only)** Neighborhoods designated as Areas of Consistency will be protected by policies to limit densities, new uses, and negative impacts from nearby development. While these areas may see some infill development and new uses, new development or redevelopment will need to be compatible in scale and character with the surrounding area.

NOTE: The development proposal should fit with the above goals and policies of the ABC-Z Comp Plan. It needs to limit its size and height to avoid privacy issues, solar access issues, and blend with the surrounding area. I recommend further evaluation of this apartment complex to meet these goals and policies, by going down in height to two stories, to protect the neighbors privacy, solar access, and blend with the community.

I am including the State Statute (below): It emphasizes that the Zoning and the Comprehensive Plan, go together in meeting the goals and the vision of the community to obtain complementary and compatible developments adjacent to one another to preserve the quality of life for our citizens.

### 2019 New Mexico Statutes

**Chapter 3 - Municipalities**

**Article 21 - Zoning Regulations**

**Section 3-21-5 - Zoning; conformance to comprehensive plan.**

Universal Citation: NM Stat § 3-21-5 (2019)

A. The regulations and restrictions of the county or municipal zoning authority are to be in accordance with a comprehensive plan and be designed to:

1. *lessen congestion* in the streets and public ways;

2. secure safety from fire, flood waters, panic and other dangers;

3. promote health and the general welfare;

4. provide adequate light and air;
(5) prevent the overcrowding of land;

(6) avoid undue concentration of population;

(7) facilitate adequate provision for transportation, water, sewerage, schools, parks and other public requirements; and

(8) control and abate the unsightly use of buildings or land.

B. The zoning authority in adopting regulations and restrictions shall give reasonable consideration, among other things, to the character of the district and its peculiar suitability for particular uses, and to conserving the value of buildings and land and encouraging the most appropriate use of land throughout its jurisdiction.


ANNOTATIONS

Comprehensive planning. — A comprehensive plan need not be contained in one document. It may be comprised of several or no documents. It may be found within the ordinance itself where the zoning authority has not enacted a prior comprehensive plan and that absence of a formally adopted comprehensive plan does substantially weaken the presumption of regularity of any zoning ordinance enacted without it. Watson v. Town Council of Town of Bernalillo, 1991-NMCA-009, 111 N.M. 374, 805 P.2d 641.

Comprehensive plan may be found within zoning ordinance itself where the zoning authority has not enacted a prior comprehensive plan. Board of Cnty. Comm'r's v. City of Las Vegas, 1980-NMSC-137, 95 N.M. 387, 622 P.2d 695.

Major reason for requiring comprehensive plan is to ensure that there will not be loose determinations of land utilization of comparatively small sections of the community. Board of Cnty. Comm'r's v. City of Las Vegas, 1986-NMSC-137, 95 N.M. 387, 622 P.2d 695.

Advisory nature of master plan. — The phrase "in accordance with", in Subsection A, requires land use planning regulations to be guided by, and consistent with, a master plan, but it does not mean that the legislature intended city master plans to be strictly adhered to in the same manner as a statute, ordinance, or agency regulation. West Bluff Neighborhood Ass'n v. City of Albuquerque, 2002-NMCA-075, 133 N.M. 97, 61 P.3d 806.


Ordinance invalid absent evidence of plan. — Where there was no evidence before the trial court demonstrating that a county land fill ordinance included a comprehensive plan, but, to the contrary, both the express statements in the ordinance and the evidence before the trial court show that the disputed ordinance was not enacted in accordance with such a plan, the ordinance was struck down as invalid. Board of County Comm'r's v. City of Las Vegas, 1980-NMSC-137, 95 N.M. 387, 622 P.2d 695.

Comprehensive planning. — A county zoning ordinance was valid where the county had a comprehensive plan in substance if not form at the time the ordinance was enacted. Bogan v. Sandoval Cnty. Planning and Zoning Comm'n, 1994-NMCA-157, 119 N.M. 334, 890 P.2d 395, cert. denied, 119 N.M. 168, 889 P.2d 203.

Presumption of validity. — A zoning ordinance is attached with a presumption of validity. The burden is on a sign owner to overcome this presumption by proving that an ordinance is not reasonably related to its stated purpose. Temple Baptist Church, Inc. v. City of Albuquerque, 1982-NMSC-055, 98 N.M. 138, 646 P.2d 565.

Presumption of correctness regarding initial zoning. — There is a presumption that the initial determination of the type of zoning for a given property is the correct one. Miller v. City of Albuquerque, 1976-NMSC-052, 89 N.M. 503, 554 P.2d 665.

There is a substantial distinction between amendments to a zoning ordinance as contrasted to ordinances enacting comprehensive zoning; the fundamental justification for an amendatory or repealing zoning ordinance is a change of conditions making the amendment or repeal reasonably necessary to protect the public interest, with another function being the covering and perfecting of previous defective ordinances or correcting mistakes or injustices therein. Miller v. City of Albuquerque, 1976-NMSC-052, 89 N.M. 503, 554 P.2d 665.

Ordinance establishing exceptions. — A county ordinance which among other things establishes certain limited special exceptions is an integral part of the plan required under this section, and the main objectives of requiring that a special permit be obtained before a use of land is commenced are to protect adjoining property and to insure the orderly and efficient development of the community. Burroughs v. Board of Cnty. Comm'r's, 1975-NMSC-051, 88 N.M. 303, 540 P.2d 233.
Aesthetics justify exercise of police power. — Aesthetic considerations alone justify the exercise of the police power. Ordinances must still, however, be construed for their reasonableness in relation to aesthetic purposes. Moreover, if the ordinance in question impinges on a fundamental right, then the ordinance must "directly advance" the interests of aesthetics. Temple Baptist Church, Inc. v. City of Albuquerque, 1982-NMSC-055, 98 N.M. 138, 646 P.2d 565.

Sign ordinance held reasonably related to proper governmental goals. — A sign ordinance regulating the size, height and number of signs is reasonably related to the proper governmental goals of aesthetics and traffic safety. Temple Baptist Church, Inc. v. City of Albuquerque, 1982-NMSC-055, 98 N.M. 138, 646 P.2d 565 (1982).


Judicial review. — The district court may not substitute its judgment for that of the board of commissioners, but when it was made to appear by the affidavits and other matters in the record that the board may have improperly failed to consider the matters which it was required to consider in making the zoning change, then a question of fact was presented on the issue of the arbitrariness of the board in granting the special use permit, and it was improper for the court to grant summary judgment and thereby resolve this issue as a matter of law. Cinelli v. Whitfield Transp., Inc., 1971-NMSC-103, 83 N.M. 205, 490 P.2d 463.


See photo on next page:

A friend sent me a picture of this Westside neighborhood below. These recently built apartments now block homeowners view at the edge of the City to the West. He said homeowners don’t even want to use their backyards anymore due to the feeling of being watched from the looming apartments.

We don’t want to see this type development to happen again.

Thank you.

Rene' Horvath
WSCONA Land use Director
For the September 30th, 2020 DRB hearing

Regarding the Wintergreen Apts.

Dear DRB Board members,

I would like to add additional comments regarding the Wintergreen Apartments proposal.

In my previous letter dated August 5th, I expressed that the 4 story Wintergreen Apartments are out of place for the surrounding neighborhood and thereby does not meet many of the ABC-Z comp Plan policies; as the apartments are out scale and character.

It should be noted that the **primary purpose of zoning:** is to segregate uses that are thought to be incompatible. In practice, zoning is used to prevent new development from interfering with existing uses and/or to preserve the character of a community, Zoning laws - Wikipedia.

In summary:

1. The site was zoned C2. The IDO converted it to MXM. Apartments were a condition use in the C zone. Now apartments are permissive in the newly adopted IDO. This feels more like a zone change

2. A MXM zone, allows building height to go up to 45 ft. high. Four stories that will tower over the nearby residents, as shown in the August 5th letter/ photo. This size will affect neighbors privacy, loss of views and solar access........

   Would like to request a sunshade analysis for this site, since the building height would shade the adjacent residents, as the sun goes down in the afternoon.

3. The IDO is a new ordinance that replaced the prior zone code. The zone code - C2 Conditional use had 3 criteria for approval which were eliminated in the IDO/ MXM zone. The 3 criteria were, jobs to housing balance, school capacity and meeting the usable open space requirement.

4. The adjacent neighbors were not notified of the IDO zone changes, that will now impact them.

5. APS estimates the proposed apartments will generate 53 elementary students which is over the 17 remaining elementary school space for Seven Bar elementary. The west side overall has a high rate of overcrowded schools, "How will APS overcrowding be addressed when it becomes a problem?"

6. Most of the site plans are now going to DRB who said they cannot address the ABC-Z Comp Plan policies, only the EPC has discretionary authority to address policy. Please note Wintergreen site is in an Area of consistency, there is no transit service for this area, traffic is an issue for the west side with limited river crossings, school capacity is an issue. City Council removed the adverse criteria from DRB review. How will adverse impacts now be addressed?

7. When does the ABC-Z Comp Plan policies address protections for the neighborhoods? These are the issues that need to be addressed.

   Thank you,
   Rene' Horvath
   WSCONA Land Use Director
Please provide to DRB members and add to the Record for PR 2020-4030.

---

Hello Ms. Wolfley-

This email exchange is in reference to the Seven Bar North HOA never being informed of the proposed IDO. This tied our hands as Seven Bar North residents and now we are to be afflicted by 4 story apartment homes. I live on Rayado, and had the SkyStone apartments move into by backyard a few years ago. Yes, it is the same Sky Stone apartments where a homicide occurred August 1, 2020: [https://www.kob.com/albuquerque-news/apd-investigating-homicide-on-west-side/5813739/](https://www.kob.com/albuquerque-news/apd-investigating-homicide-on-west-side/5813739/)

We were not properly notified by the city about the IDO, and when Tierra West proposed the project, my HOA was told in March, I only found out in May. Additionally, the ineffective and rushed Zoom meeting format, which I believe to be a violation of the Open Meetings Act, has not given us time to prepare, nor get the much needed information we, as affected residents, need.

These apartments do not belong in our neighborhood, we will be surrounded by crime, you wouldn't want this in your backyard, and neither do we.

I am calling on you and the DRB to reject Tierra West’s application.

Thank you

Megan Fitzpatrick
I’ll let you know as soon as I have specific information.

Sincerely,
Brennon Williams

From: Megan Fitzpatrick <meganfitz@live.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 29, 2020 1:28 PM
To: Williams, Brennon <bnwilliams@cabq.gov>
Subject: Zoning MX-M 10800 Golf Course Inquiry

Hello Mr. Williams-

I am a homeowner in Seven Bar North, and am writing to inquire into the city’s IDO that passed in 2018. Of specific concern is the vacant parcel located at 10800 Golf Course Rd that is being considered for a 4 story apartment complex, directly behind our homes, which under the IDO is now zoned MX-M.

I contacted my HOA, Seven Bar North HOA to figure out when the city first alerted them to the IDO and zoning changes. The HOA is telling me they were never notified even though they are a recognized HOA. The residents of Seven Bar North were never notified of these zoning and planning changes either. Can you please confirm that, and if so, why were we not notified of such drastic changes?

Thank you for your time.

Megan Fitzpatrick

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

========================================================================================================
This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
Going through my e-mails and just wanted to make sure this has gotten into the record. Thank you much!
Marsha Kearney

Begin forwarded message:

From: Marsha Kearney <rmeek1978@gmail.com>
Subject: Fwd: Addendum
Date: July 19, 2020 at 10:06:30 PM MDT
To: Jolene Wolfley <jwolfley@cabq.gov>
Cc: Larry Sandoval <larrysandoval75@gmail.com>, mike mirabal <mdmiraba@msn.com>

Please add this to the record. I had to have Larry Sandoval put the Addendum in a document, as I don’t have those capabilities (or should I say, knowledge to use). The name of the website Larry spoke about is Haynes Park Next Door. I posted an alert about the public meeting and there was concern/interest in what is going on from Rio Rancho down to Paradise. Most of the concerns were about traffic and crime. Some were concerned about more apartment buildings and how that can bring jobs and growth to the city. There were several that remarked “we should have known this when we moved in,” and a couple that feel economic growth is the best. The main thing to me was getting the word out to those affected. This project affects them all, yet the community involvement is most limited. I also spoke with Mayor Greg Hull on July 6th and he said they would not be commenting on the project, but speaking to Albuquerque about traffic concerns.

It’s greatly concerning when the President of our HOA says they are only responsible for covenants enforcement, yet they willingly pay for half a room for us to meet with Tierra West on June 18th. Since the first meetings on the rezoning/IDO process the HOA never informed the residents of the the original process or opportunity to respond to the rezoning in 2018. If they had, a number of us would have gotten involved. Now the property owners or developer can request a zoning amendment, but the adjacent residents have no ability to do such. Just considering the HOAs - about a third never responded to the conversion opportunity. When adding those who do not have an HOA or neighborhood association, you have a great number of residents that are not being allowed to provide input to the planning process, be it the IDO or project itself. Yet they greatly affect their everyday life and future. This is a major prejudice of people like myself.

There was an initial meeting in early April of the neighborhood coalitions, Jack Cor
der (who does not represent the residents, but works for the HOA), and the HOA President, (who says this is not the responsibility of the HOA). NO residents with homes adjacent to the property were invited to that meeting. The people invited to that initial meeting were sent “certified letters,” yet none of them represented the people within 100 feet of the project. Tierra West just sent first class letters on June 26, 2020 to the homeowners within 100 feet - it was not important to verify whether they were received or not. Jack Corder knew about this project and the rezoning, yet he nor the HOA never moved to contact the involved residents until later in April. Then on May 20th one of the residents went to Tierra West’s website and saw the write-up for Huning Castle Apartments
(attached). Their website stated that “Numerous appeals filed by the neighborhoods were successfully defended through City Council and on to District Court.” This has since been removed, but the unwillingness to even listen to the residents and community and to allow a project that does not consider the effects of the project on people and the environment goes totally against what democracy is all about.

Please ensure at a minimum that all homeowners within 100 feet of this

This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
From: Marsha Kearney <rmeek1978@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 12, 2020 1:10 PM
To: Gomez, Angela J.; Gould, Maggie S.
Cc: mike mirabal; Megan Fitzpatrick; Larry Sandoval
Subject: Fwd: Request for Correspondence between Tierra West
Attachments: REQUEST TO INSPECT PUBLIC RECORDS.pdf; ATT00001.htm; Mail Attachment.eml; ATT00002.htm; Mail Attachment.eml; ATT00003.htm

Ms. Gomez, I would like this to be added to the record of project #2020013 Wintergreen Apartments on Golf Course Drive. This is concerning the traffic issue and coordination with the City of Rio Rancho. Please notify me once this is added.

Thank you,
Marsha Kearney

Begin forwarded message:

From: Marsha Kearney <rmeek1978@gmail.com>
Subject: Fwd: Request for Correspondence between Tierra West
Date: August 12, 2020 at 1:01:24 PM MDT
To: ljohn@rrnm.gov, dserrano@rrnm.gov

Dear Mayor Hull,

I am greatly saddened by Mr. Serrano’s response to Mr. Bohannan’s e-mail. I contacted several of your staff concerning the traffic issue with the proposed apartment complex on Golf Course Rd. just south of Westside, including contact information for Tierra West beginning on June 21, 2020. Your staff got back to me quickly with responses on Monday, June 22 and 30th. You were kind enough to call me on July 6th and talk to me over 40 minutes on the traffic issues related to the proposed project. At the initial Albuquerque DRB Hearing on July 22nd the Board requested that Mr. Bohannan contact the City of Rio Rancho concerning the traffic concerns (see attached request). At the next hearing on August 5th Mr. Bohannan said there were no concerns (see attachment below). I requested documentation of that correspondence, which your staff quickly provided as seen below. Mr. Serrano’s response of “I am not sure why the city of Rio Rancho would be involved” is contrary to what was said in our conversation and concerns brought forward. Please help me to better understand Mr. Serrano’s response.

Sincerely,
Marsha Kearney

This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
Gomez, Angela J.

**From:** Marsha Kearney <rmeek1978@gmail.com>

**Sent:** Sunday, August 16, 2020 7:00 PM

**To:** Gomez, Angela J.; Gould, Maggie S.

**Subject:** Fwd: Request for Correspondence between Tierra West

**Attachments:** Mail Attachment.eml; ATT00001.htm; Mail Attachment.eml; ATT00002.htm

Ms. Gomez - I think I may have forgotten to add the attached e-mails to my correspondence with Mayor Hull the I requested to be added to the record for the Tierra West Proposed Apartment Complex on Golf Course Road. You added that e-mail to the record on 8/12/20. Sorry about that. I am not computer savvy and caught that as I was putting together documentation for this case.

Thank you kindly,
Marsha Kearney

---

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** DANIEL VALENZUELA <DVALENZUELA@RRNM.GOV>

**Subject:** RE: Request for Correspondence between Tierra West

**Date:** August 6, 2020 at 10:39:27 AM MDT

**To:** Marsha Kearney <rmeek1978@gmail.com>

Ms. Kearney -

Good morning, please see the attached email correspondences between Mr. Serrano of the City Of Rio Rancho and Mr. Bohannan of Tierra West LLC. There are no other records or correspondence responsive to this particular request. This will complete our response to your request.

Thank you and have a nice day.

Daniel Valenzuela
IPRA Compliance Administrator
Office of the City Clerk
City of Rio Rancho
505-891-5004

-----Original Message-----

From: Marsha Kearney <rmeek1978@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, August 3, 2020 12:33 PM

To: DANIEL VALENZUELA <DVALENZUELA@RRNM.GOV>; Clerk <CLERK@rrnm.gov>

Subject: Request for Correspondence between Tierra West

******************************************************************************************
CAUTION: This email was received from an EXTERNAL source, use caution when clicking links or opening attachments.

My mistake (I am NOT computer literate). Document I sent was in pages. Try one of the below

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

Doing well, hope you are as well. I am not sure why the City of Rio Rancho would be involved as Westside/Golf Course intersection is COA maintained. Can you direct me to the COA contact I can call to discuss the concern?

Thanks,
David D. Serrano, P.E.
Engineering Division Manager
Development Services Dept.
City of Rio Rancho
3200 Civic Center Circle NE
Rio Rancho, NM 87144
Mobile: (505) 235-5512
Phone: (505) 891-5059
dserrano@rrnm.gov

David

Hope you are doing well. We are proposing to develop 208 apartments on a vacant site within the City of Albuquerque, on the northeast corner of Golf Course Rd and AMAFCA Black Arroyo channel (see attached vicinity map and site plan). Attached is the trip generation and distribution that we have provided to City who wanted us to coordinate with you and the City of Rio Rancho. We have been in discussions with the Department of Municipal Development (DMD) who has indicated they are still tracking the widening of Western Trails early next year.

We are getting a lot of neighborhood opposition and so the City wanted us to coordinate with your department. We want to confirm we are to follow the City of Albuquerque DPM process for traffic review/improvement consideration?

If you have any other questions please feel free to reach out to either Richard Stevenson or myself.

Thanks

Ronald R. Bohannan, P.E.
Tierra West LLC.
5571 Midway Park Place, NE
Albuquerque, NM 87109
505-858-3100
From: Richard Stevenson
To: DAVID SERRANO, Wolfenbarger, Jeanne
Cc: Ron Bohannan
Subject: RE: [#2020013] 2020013 - Apartment Complex Golf Course and Western Trails Albuquerque
Date: Thursday, July 23, 2020 11:04:09 AM

David,

I have included Ms. Jeanne Wolfenbarger who is the Manager for Transportation in this email. Her telephone number is 924-3991.

Thanks for the quick response.

Regards,
Richard Stevenson, PE
Tierra West LLC
(505) 858 3100

From: DAVID SERRANO [mailto:DSERRANO@RRNM.GOV]
Sent: Thursday, July 23, 2020 10:59 AM
To: Ron Bohannan
Cc: Richard Stevenson
Subject: RE: [#2020013] 2020013 - Apartment Complex Golf Course and Western Trails Albuquerque

Ron,

Doing well, hope you are as well. I am not sure why the City of Rio Rancho would be involved as Westside/Golf Course intersection is COA maintained. Can you direct me to the COA contact I can call to discuss the concern?

Thanks,
David D. Serrano, P.E.
Engineering Division Manager
Development Services Dept.
City of Rio Rancho
3200 Civic Center Circle NE
Rio Rancho, NM 87144
Mobile: (505) 235-5512
Phone: (505) 891-5059
dserrano@rrnm.gov

From: Ron Bohannan <rrb@tierrawestllc.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 23, 2020 9:18 AM
To: DAVID SERRANO <DSERRANO@RRNM.GOV>
Cc: Richard Stevenson <rstevenson@tierrawestllc.com>; Ron Bohannan <rrb@tierrawestllc.com>
Subject: FW: [#2020013] 2020013 - Apartment Complex Golf Course and Western Trails Albuquerque

CAUTION: This email was received from an EXTERNAL source, use caution when clicking links or opening attachments.

David

Hope you are doing well. We are proposing to develop 208 apartments on a vacant site within the City of Albuquerque, on the northeast corner of Golf Course Rd and AMAFCA Black Arroyo channel (see attached vicinity map and site plan). Attached is the trip generation and distribution that we have provided to City who wanted us to coordinate with you and the City of Rio Rancho. We have been in discussions with the Department of Municipal Development (DMD) who has indicated they are still tracking the widening of Western Trails early next year.

We are getting a lot of neighborhood opposition and so the City wanted us to coordinate with your department. We want to
confirm we are to follow the City of Albuquerque DPM process for traffic review/improvement consideration?

If you have any other questions please feel free to reach out to either Richard Stevenson or myself.

Thanks

Ronald R. Bohannan, P.E.
Tierra West LLC.
5571 Midway Park Place, NE
Albuquerque, NM 87109
505-858-3100
Angela,

Enclosed are 5 documents (two e-mails) concerning Tierra West’s Wintergreen Apartments Proposal. With the Edge Buffer input I could not figure how to attach the drainage pond plats - do you need them? Also, please let me know if all the documents came through (I have a Mac and had to convert the documents to word and pdf. The following documents are included:

1. City Center and Corridor Issues
2. Edge Buffer

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

Enclosed are 5 documents concerning Tierra West’s Wintergreen Apartments Proposal. With the Edge Buffer input I could not figure how to attach the drainage pond plats - do you need them? Also, please let me know if all the documents came through (I have a Mac and had to convert the documents to word and pdf. The following documents are included:

1. City Center and Corridor Issues
2. Edge Buffer
3. Notification
4. Comp Plan
5. State Statutes
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This is a follow-up document to Larry Sandoval’s document submittal on July 17, 2020 addressing City Centers and Corridors (pages 9-11). We would like to correct the statement about “no bus stops.” There are stops for the 96 commuter line, which is not running at this time, and had limited operations before the pandemic.

Also need to speak further to the Wintergreen Apartment Complex proposal and the purpose of the MX-M zone.

As stated in the IDO, 2-4(C)(1)

“The purpose of the MX-M zone district is to provide for a wide array of moderate-intensity retail, commercial, institutional and moderate-density residential uses, with taller, multi-story buildings encouraged in Centers and Corridors.”

This vacant land is not located in a city center, but next to a Low-density Residential Zone District. Golf Course Road is classified as an “Existing Minor Arterial,” as stated in the Mid-Region Metropolitan Planning Organization memo to Jolene Wolfley, dated July 21, 2020. Reading through the glossary below and the ABQ/Bernalillo County Comprehensive Plan we could not find where the vacant lot proposed for development fits the definition of Center or Corridor, where multi-story buildings are encouraged.

Tierra West response to the Seven Bar North HOA President during the April 7, 2020 meeting was incorrect, about the previous zoning and effects of the rezoning to the neighborhood. Below is the section of of the Tierra West/ Seven Bar North HOA Meeting Notes

• Scott - What was the zoning at that time before the IDO?
  TW Response: The previous zoning was C-2. So it was basically a high intensity commercial use on that property.
  • Scott - What was the density for C-2 zone?
  TW Response: C-2 zoning you basically could go up to a floor area 1.0 there are very few apartment complexes in the city of Albuquerque that reach that high of floor area ratio that is use. In large respect this was actually down zoned from the previous old zoning to the new zoning.

This lot was previously classified as C-2, with conditional use apartments, meaning no higher than two story apartments. The zoning change is the opposite of “down zoned.” There is no reason a four-story complex should be allowed on this lot. The rezoning has great negative effects to the adjacent property owners, yet we were not notified - both during the IDO process and the Voluntary conversion process.
The definitions for Centers and Corridors are as follows

Center and Corridor Definitions

Activity Center (AC)
The area designated as an Activity Center in the ABC Comp Plan, as amended.

Center
An area designated as a Center in the ABC Comp Plan, as amended, excluding Old Town. For the purposes of the IDO if any portion of a parcel is within the Center, the Center regulations apply to the entire parcel.

Corridor
A street and adjoining land designated in the ABC Comp Plan, as amended, as one of 5 Corridor types designated based on travel modes and development intensity, excluding Commuter Corridors. See also Measurement Definitions for Corridor Area.

Downtown Center (DT)
The area designated as the Downtown Center in the ABC Comp Plan, as amended.

Employment Center (EC)
The area designated as an Employment Center in the ABC Comp Plan, as amended.

Main Street (MS)
A Corridor designation from the Comprehensive Plan. See also Measurement Definitions for Corridor Area.

Major Transit (MT) Corridor
A Corridor designation from the Comprehensive Plan. See also Measurement Definitions for Corridor Area.

Premium Transit (PT) Corridor
A Corridor designation from the Comprehensive Plan. See also Measurement Definitions for Corridor Area.

Urban Center (UC)
The area designated as an Urban Center in the ABC Comp Plan, as amended.
EDGE BUFFER LANDSCAPING
Tierra West Wintergreen Apartment Complex

Referencing 5-6(E)(2) Development Next to Low-density Residential Zone Districts, the proposed Wintergreen Apartment Complex site plan is not adhering to the Development Standards in the IDO. Both the proposed wall within 5 feet of the adjacent property and construction of the retention pond adjacent to the homeowners’ properties need to be moved at least past a landscape buffer of 15 feet. That buffer is critical to the adjacent land owners as it is to minimize sound, light, noise and help protect the homeowners’ privacy and property.

See attached relevant IDO pages and drainage site plan:

| Table 5-6(E)(2): Development Next to Low-density Residential Zone Districts |
|-------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| **Development Type**          | **Development Next to** | **Specific Standards** | **General Buffering** |
| Multi-family, mixed-use, or non-residential | 5-6(E)(2) | R-A, R-1, R-MC, or R-T | Landscaped buffer area ≥15 ft. |
| Mixed-use or non-residential | 5-6(E)(3) | R-ML or R-MH | Landscaped buffer area ≥20 ft. |
| Industrial | 5-6(E)(4) | Non-industrial development | Landscaped buffer area ≥25 ft. |

5-6(E)(2) Development Next to Low-density Residential Zone Districts
Where multi-family, mixed-use, or non-residential development other than industrial development occurs on a lot abutting or across an alley from a lot in an R-A, R-1, R-MC, or R-T zone district with 1 or more residential dwellings, the following buffer shall be provided along the lot line, as specified for the relevant area below.

- Buffer ≥15 ft. wide with trees and shrubs
- DT-UC MS-PT
- ≥2 ft. wall/fence with landscaping or ≥6 ft. vegetative screen

5-6(E)(2)(c) General
A landscape buffer area at least 15 feet wide shall be provided. One (1) deciduous or evergreen tree at least 6 feet tall at the time of planting and at least 25 feet tall at maturity, and 3 shrubs, shall
The definition includes the drainage section directly to the south of the project area, therefore extending the 100 foot notification area. Realizing Tierra West already included 130 feet to allow for the roads, and drawing an approximate new line excluding the arroyo, it appears at least 10 other residents should have been notified and have NOT. Most all of the residents are to the south/southwest and are NOT a part of 7 Bar North Community.
The proposed Wintergreen Apartment Complex is contrary to Community Identity as spoken to in Chapter 4. This is especially apparent when applying the Guiding Principles to maintaining:

**Strong Neighborhoods**

* Neighborhoods provide quality of life and remain distinct, vibrant places to live.

Response: 7 Bar is a well-established community (over 20 years old) with a number of residents living here since the neighborhood was first established. One of the residents even moved across the street, when their family home became too big for them. My husband and I moved here when we first came to New Mexico for my job with the federal government. We had planned to move back East once I was retired, but decided we did not want to leave the neighborhood because of the quality of life. There is great fear of this project destroying the neighborhood as this quality of life is greatly reduced, especially for those living adjacent to the vacant land. The loss of privacy, noise, crime, value of homes (lifetime investments), traffic are among the negative impacts this project would bring to the area. We have already seen several homes go up for sale because of this project. Since when is this critical principle NOT considered in the evaluation of this project?

* Development in established neighborhoods matches existing character and promotes revitalization where desired.

Response: The apartment complex as proposed are twice as high as any of the homes that in the surrounding community and have windows and balconies overlooking adjacent homes. The design of the buildings do not match the existing Southwest character and design of all the homes. The opposite of revitalization would occur with this proposed project, as we see happening already with people starting to move because of this proposed project. Once again, why is this NOT being considered with this project.

**Economic Vitality**

* Neighborhood with locally-serving businesses promote sustainable economic growth and re-investment of local dollars.

Response: The residents were not aware of the rezoning to MX-M, and were comfortable with the previous C-2 zoning (in fact the plats on the Youngblood website still show the property as being C-2). The MX-M zoning is one of significant, NEGATIVE changes. When you consider the jobs to population ratio, which is quite low for the Westside, this project would just add to that disparity. You can already see that in the number of vacant apartments in the area. Add in the IDO Process that eliminates the need for the developer to address the issues or even have to consider the input from the residents. This totally goes against the Comprehensive Plan’s Guiding Principles.
Sustainability

* Strong and Vibrant neighborhoods foster social connections and resource sharing

Response: This is very true! This is why we are opposed to this project. This project would destroy this well established neighborhood

Community Health

* Healthy neighborhoods protect residents from hazards, encourages physical activity, and foster positive social interactions.

Response: Once again, this project does the OPPOSITE. Crime, noise, lack of privacy, loss in home value are just a few of the issues. Developers are allowing a healthy, quiet neighborhood to be destroyed.

How can this project be considered when it does not follow the Guiding Principles of the Comprehensive Plan?

Sincerely,

Marsha Kearney
10927 Carreta Drive NW
Albuquerque, NM 87114
On the first page of the Integrated Development Ordinance (IDO) under 1-2 Authority that “In enacting this IDO, the City intends to comply with the provisions of existing law on the same subject, and the provision of this IDO should be interpreted to achieve that goal.”

The Wintergreen Apartments (#2020013) is NOT in compliance with the NM State Statute

Universal Citation: NM Stat § 3-21-5 (2019)

A. The regulations and restrictions of the county or municipal zoning authority are to be in accordance with a comprehensive plan and be designed to:
   (1) lessen congestion in the streets and public ways;
   (2) secure safety from fire, flood waters, panic and other dangers;
   (3) promote health and the general welfare;
   (4) provide adequate light and air;
   (5) prevent the overcrowding of land;
   (6) avoid undue concentration of population;
   (7) facilitate adequate provision for transportation, water, sewerage, schools, parks and other public requirements; and
   (8) control and abate the unsightly use of buildings or land.

B. The zoning authority in adopting regulations and restrictions shall give reasonable consideration, among other things, to the character of the district and its peculiar suitability for particular uses, and to conserving the value of buildings and land and encouraging the most appropriate use of land throughout its jurisdiction.

Responses:

A (1) There will be much greater congestion, especially with the number of units and single entrance/exit onto Golf Course Road. Westside Blvd. just to the north is an access road that is so busy during daylight hours that most residents avoid it. Westside has just been extended past Unser, which will increase traffic even more.

A (2) Safety is greatly impacted as the crime is expected to increase, as it has in nearby areas where apartments have been recently built. In fact just a week or so ago there was a homicide in one such complex adjacent to Coors By-Pass.

A (3) This project would greatly harm general welfare as property values will probably decrease on an average of 20 to 30%, with many homes being lifetime investments. Homes adjacent to the project would have 4 story apartment buildings with balconies and windows looking down into their homes and backyards. Combine that with the traffic and crime increases, as well as adding an estimated 99 students to an already crowded school situation and you have a situation where a project can destroy the neighborhood. The 7 Bar North community is a well-established neighborhood, with many residents being here since the community was first developed over 20 years ago. We are already seeing the negative effects of this proposed project as a number of residents have put up their home for sale.
A (4) Solar access is a major concern with buildings twice the size of surrounding structures, as well as an up to 7 to 9 foot rise in elevation. Also there are a number of trees that are expected to grow up to 35 to 45 feet in height. Solar access will be greatly reduced for the adjacent homes as they lose their access to much of the afternoon sun.

A (5)&(6) This project greatly adds to the overcrowding situation, especially when considering the low number of jobs available in relation to the number of people living here. Right now the apartment buildings in the area have a large number of vacancies. This is a suburban area, not a city center.

A (7) Traffic and schools are major issues. Westside Boulevard is a major traffic mess at most any hour of the day as many commuters use it to access their homes to the north and west (Rio Rancho). This concern is even greater with two major hospitals (Presbyterian Rust Center and Lovelace Westside). An apartment complex project was rejected in 2006 because of the school situation. Since that time the schools have not expanded and the schools continue to be overcrowded.

A (8) This proposed project does the opposite of control and abate unsightly use of buildings and land. The buildings are TWICE the height of any building in the surrounding community and completely out of character of the Southwest design of the 7 Bar Loop North homes.

B. The MX-M Zoning in no way gives consideration to the” character of the district and its peculiar suitability for particular uses, and to conserving the value of buildings and land and encouraging the most appropriate use of land throughout its jurisdiction.” The buildings are over twice the height of others, the building designs are in no way of the Southwest design - they look like cookie cutter apartments. The value of the surrounding community homes will most likely go down in value, a great decrease that many homeowners can not afford. There is proof of these concerns - one only has to look what has happened to those living in 7 Bar North adjacent to Coors By-pass and the apartment complexes south of there. The crime, traffic, privacy issues will destroy the wonderful community life that so many of us moved to Albuquerque for.
Good morning Ms. Gomez,

For the record, please add this message and attached objection letters from homeowners of the properties listed in the Tierra West application and Site Plan, submitted to the Development Review Board in July 2020.

All homeowners, as listed in the records of the County Assessor, of Property located partially or completely within-100 feet (excluding public rights of way) of property listed in the application and reside adjacent to the proposed site of the Wintergreen Apartments. Legal Description: TR E-1 PLAT OF TRS D-1, E-1 AMAFCA BLACK ARROYO CHANNEL ROW PARADISE HEIGHTS, UNIT 1, ZONE ATLAS MAP: A-12-Z & A-13-Z, 8.7795 AC, UPC:101206651442411302.

Homeowner’s who reside on Carreta Drive Dr. NW and one homeowner who resides at Noche Clara Ave. NW, Seven Bar North, Albuquerque, NM 87114 have each signed a Letter of Objection to the proposed Wintergreen Apartment Project #2020013 and the current MX-M (mixed, multiple use) zoning.

The proposed development will have long-term adverse impacts to homeowner’s quality of life, reduction of property values, gross violation and invasion of our privacy, the effects of increased crime, increased overcrowding of our public schools, increased traffic congestion and increased neighborhood noise.

Legal Citation:

2019 New Mexico Statutes
Chapter 3 - Municipalities
Article 21 - Zoning Regulations
Section 3-21-6 - Zoning; mode of determining regulations, restrictions and boundaries of district; public hearing required; notice.

Universal Citation: NM Stat § 3-21-6 (2019)

Please notify me when you have received these documents.

Sincerely,

Larry Sandoval

=======================================================================
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OBJECTION LETTERS
TO DEVELOPMENT AND ZONING OF
PROPOSED WINTERGREEN APARTMENT
PROJECT #2020013
LETTER OF OBJECTION

I, property owner(s) who live on 4509 Noma Rd NW, Albuquerque, NM 87114 hereby sign this letter of objection regarding the development of Project PR-2020-00540, Wintergreen Apartments, Tract E-1. By building four, 45-foot high apartments directly behind our homes, this proposed development will directly affect me since I live within 100-feet adjacent to the proposed development.

The proposed Wintergreen Apartment development will have long-term adverse impacts to me as a homeowner(s) in terms of our quality of life, reduction of our property values, a gross violation and invasion of our privacy, the effect of increased crime, the effect of extreme overcrowding of our schools, the effect of increased traffic congestion, and the effect of increased neighborhood noise. This development will be detrimental, having adverse impacts to our neighborhood and surrounding communities.

Signed: [Signature]

Date: 8/14/20
LETTER OF OBJECTION

I, Cathy Mirabel, property owner(s) who live on 10951 Carreta Drive NW, Albuquerque, NM 87114 hereby sign this letter of objection regarding the development of Project PR-2020-00540, Wintergreen Apartments, Tract E-1. By building four, 45-foot high apartments directly behind our homes, this proposed development will directly affect me since I live within 100-feet adjacent to the proposed development.

The proposed Wintergreen Apartment development will have long-term adverse impacts to me as a homeowner(s) in terms of our quality of life, reduction of our property values, a gross violation and invasion our privacy, the effect of increased crime, the effect of extreme overcrowding of our schools, the effect of increased traffic congestion, and the effect of increased neighborhood noise. This development will be detrimental, having adverse impacts to our neighborhood and surrounding communities.

Signed: Cathy Mirabel
Date: 8-14-20
LETTER OF OBJECTION

August 12, 2020

I, David Lopez, property owner(s) who live on 1100 S Carreta Drive NW, Albuquerque, NM 87114 hereby sign this letter of objection regarding the development of Project PR-2020-00540, Wintergreen Apartments, Tract E-1. By building four, 45-foot high apartments directly behind our homes, this proposed development will directly affect me since I live within 100-feet adjacent to the proposed development.

The proposed Wintergreen Apartment development will have long-term adverse impacts to me as a homeowner(s) in terms of our quality of life, reduction of our property values, a gross violation and invasion our privacy, the effect of increased crime, the effect of extreme overcrowding of our schools, the effect of increased traffic congestion, and the effect of increased neighborhood noise. This development will be detrimental, having adverse impacts to our neighborhood and surrounding communities.

Signed: [Signature]
Date: 8/13/2020
LETTER OF OBJECTION

I, John Fife, property owner(s) who live on 10932 Carreta Drive NW, Albuquerque, NM 87114 hereby sign this letter of objection regarding the development of Project PR-2020-00540, Wintergreen Apartments, Tract E-1. By building four, 45-foot high apartments directly behind our homes, this proposed development will directly affect me since I live within 100-feet adjacent to the proposed development.

The proposed Wintergreen Apartment development will have long-term adverse impacts to me as a homeowner(s) in terms of our quality of life, reduction of our property values, a gross violation and invasion our privacy, the effect of increased crime, the effect of extreme overcrowding of our schools, the effect of increased traffic congestion, and the effect of increased neighborhood noise. This development will be detrimental, having adverse impacts to our neighborhood and surrounding communities.

Signed: 

Date:
LETTER OF OBJECTION

1. James P. Murrell, property owner(s) who live on 10940 Carreta Drive NW, Albuquerque, NM 87114 hereby sign this letter of objection regarding the development of Project PR-2020-00540, Wintergreen Apartments, Tract E-1. By building four, 45-foot high apartments directly behind our homes, this proposed development will directly affect me since I live within 100-feet adjacent to the proposed development.

The proposed Wintergreen Apartment development will have long-term adverse impacts to me as a homeowner(s) in terms of our quality of life, reduction of our property values, a gross violation and invasion our privacy, the effect of increased crime, the effect of extreme overcrowding of our schools, the effect of increased traffic congestion, and the effect of increased neighborhood noise. This development will be detrimental, having adverse impacts to our neighborhood and surrounding communities.

Signed: [Signature]
Date: 8/12/20
LETTER OF OBJECTION

1 Larry Gaciac property owner(s) who live on 10936 Carreta Drive NW, Albuquerque, NM. 87114 hereby sign this letter of objection regarding the development of Project PR-2020-00540, Wintergreen Apartments, Tract E-1. By building four, 45-foot high apartments directly behind our homes, this proposed development will directly affect me since I live within 100-feet adjacent to the proposed development.

The proposed Wintergreen Apartment development will have long-term adverse impacts to me as a homeowner(s) in terms of our quality of life, reduction of our property values, a gross violation and invasion our privacy, the effect of increased crime, the effect of extreme overcrowding of our schools, the effect of increased traffic congestion, and the effect of increased neighborhood noise. This development will be detrimental, having adverse impacts to our neighborhood and surrounding communities.

Signed: [Signature]
Date: 8-14-2020
LETTER OF OBJECTION

I, Larry W. Sandoval, property owner(s) who live on 10943 Carreta Drive NW, Albuquerque, NM. 87114 hereby sign this letter of objection regarding the development of Project PR-2020-00540, Wintergreen Apartments, Tract E-1. By building four, 45-foot high apartments directly behind our homes, this proposed development will directly affect me since I live within 100-feet adjacent to the proposed development.

The proposed Wintergreen Apartment development will have long-term adverse impacts to me as a homeowner(s) in terms of our quality of life, reduction of our property values, a gross violation and invasion of our privacy, the effect of increased crime, the effect of extreme overcrowding of our schools, the effect of increased traffic congestion, and the effect of increased neighborhood noise. This development will be detrimental, having adverse impacts to our neighborhood and surrounding communities.

Signed: Larry W. Sandoval

Date: August 16, 2020
August 14, 2020

LETTER OF OBJECTION

I, Leonard William, property owner(s) who live on 10939 Carreta Drive NW, Albuquerque, NM. 87114 hereby sign this letter of objection regarding the development of Project PR-2020-00540, Wintergreen Apartments, Tract E-1. By building four, 45-foot high apartments directly behind our homes, this proposed development will directly affect me since I live within 100-feet adjacent to the proposed development.

The proposed Wintergreen Apartment development will have long-term adverse impacts to me as a homeowner(s) in terms of our quality of life, reduction of our property values, a gross violation and invasion our privacy, the effect of increased crime, the effect of extreme overcrowding of our schools, the effect of increased traffic congestion, and the effect of increased neighborhood noise. This development will be detrimental, having adverse impacts to our neighborhood and surrounding communities.

Signed: ____________________________

Date: 8/14/20
August 14, 2020

LETTER OF OBJECTION

I, Marsha E. & John R. Kearney, property owner(s) who live on Carreta Drive NW, Albuquerque, NM 87114 hereby sign this letter of objection regarding the development of Project PR-2020-00540, Wintergreen Apartments, Tract E-1. By building four, 45-foot high apartments directly behind our homes, this proposed development will directly affect me since I live within 100-feet adjacent to the proposed development.

The proposed Wintergreen Apartment development will have long-term adverse impacts to me as a homeowner(s) in terms of our quality of life, reduction of our property values, a gross violation and invasion our privacy, the effect of increased crime, the effect of extreme overcrowding of our schools, the effect of increased traffic congestion, and the effect of increased neighborhood noise. This development will be detrimental, having adverse impacts to our neighborhood and surrounding communities.

Signed:       

Date: 8/14/2020
August 12, 2020

LETTER OF OBJECTION

I, Paul Rees and Deborah Rees, property owner(s) who live on 10931 Carreta Drive NW, Albuquerque, NM. 87114 hereby sign this letter of objection regarding the development of Project PR-2020-00540, Wintergreen Apartments, Tract E-1. By building four, 45-foot high apartments directly behind our homes, this proposed development will directly affect me since I live within 100-feet adjacent to the proposed development.

The proposed Wintergreen Apartment development will have long-term adverse impacts to me as a homeowner(s) in terms of our quality of life, reduction of our property values, a gross violation and invasion our privacy, the effect of increased crime, the effect of extreme overcrowding of our schools, the effect of increased traffic congestion, and the effect of increased neighborhood noise. This development will be detrimental, having adverse impacts to our neighborhood and surrounding communities.

Signed: [Signature]

Date: 8/16/2020
LETTER OF OBJECTION

I, Daniel J. and Victoria M. McCormack, property owner(s) who live on 10919 Carreta Drive NW, Albuquerque, NM 87114 hereby sign this letter of objection regarding the development of Project PR-2020-00540, Wintergreen Apartments, Tract E-1. By building four, 45-foot high apartments directly behind our homes, this proposed development will directly affect me since I live within 100-feet adjacent to the proposed development.

The proposed Wintergreen Apartment development will have long-term adverse impacts to me as a homeowner(s) in terms of our quality of life, reduction of our property values, a gross violation and invasion our privacy, the effect of increased crime, the effect of extreme overcrowding of our schools, the effect of increased traffic congestion, and the effect of increased neighborhood noise. This development will be detrimental, having adverse impacts to our neighborhood and surrounding communities.

Signed: [Signature]
Date: 8/19/2020
August 14, 2020

LETTER OF OBJECTION

I, the property owner(s) who live on 10915 Carreta Drive NW, Albuquerque, NM. 87114 hereby sign this letter of objection regarding the development of Project PR-2020-00540, Wintergreen Apartments, Tract E-1. By building four, 45-foot high apartments directly behind our homes, this proposed development will directly affect me since I live within 100-feet adjacent to the proposed development.

The proposed Wintergreen Apartment development will have long-term adverse impacts to me as a homeowner(s) in terms of our quality of life, reduction of our property values, a gross violation and invasion our privacy, the effect of increased crime, the effect of extreme overcrowding of our schools, the effect of increased traffic congestion, and the effect of increased neighborhood noise. This development will be detrimental, having adverse impacts to our neighborhood and surrounding communities.

Signed: 

Date: 8/19/20
August 14, 2020

LETTER OF OBJECTION

I, [Name], property owner(s) who live on [Address], hereby sign this letter of objection regarding the development of Project PR-2020-00540, Wintergreen Apartments, Tract E-1. By building four, 45-foot high apartments directly behind our homes, this proposed development will directly affect me since I live within 100-feet adjacent to the proposed development.

The proposed Wintergreen Apartment development will have long-term adverse impacts to me as a homeowner(s) in terms of our quality of life, reduction of our property values, a gross violation and invasion our privacy, the effect of increased crime, the effect of extreme overcrowding of our schools, the effect of increased traffic congestion, and the effect of increased neighborhood noise. This development will be detrimental, having adverse impacts to our neighborhood and surrounding communities.

Signed: [Signature]
Date: 8/19/2020
LETTER OF OBJECTION

I, Terry Scott Hutchinson, property owner(s) who live on 10974 Carreta Drive NW, Albuquerque, NM. 87114 hereby sign this letter of objection regarding the development of Project PR-2020-00540, Wintergreen Apartments, Tract E-1. By building four, 45-foot high apartments directly behind our homes, this proposed development will directly affect me since I live within 100-feet adjacent to the proposed development.

The proposed Wintergreen Apartment development will have long-term adverse impacts to me as a homeowner(s) in terms of our quality of life, reduction of our property values, a gross violation and invasion our privacy, the effect of increased crime, the effect of extreme overcrowding of our schools, the effect of increased traffic congestion, and the effect of increased neighborhood noise. This development will be detrimental, having adverse impacts to our neighborhood and surrounding communities.

Signed: [Signature]

Date: 21 Aug 2020
LETTER OF OBJECTION

I, [Name], property owner(s) who live on [Address] Carreta Drive NW, Albuquerque, NM 87114 hereby sign this letter of objection regarding the development of Project PR-2020-00540, Wintergreen Apartments, Tract E-1. By building four, 45-foot high apartments directly behind our homes, this proposed development will directly affect me since I live within 100-feet adjacent to the proposed development.

The proposed Wintergreen Apartment development will have long-term adverse impacts to me as a homeowner(s) in terms of our quality of life, reduction of our property values, a gross violation and invasion our privacy, the effect of increased crime, the effect of extreme overcrowding of our schools, the effect of increased traffic congestion, and the effect of increased neighborhood noise. This development will be detrimental, having adverse impacts to our neighborhood and surrounding communities.

Signed: [Signature]
Date: 08-19-20
August 14, 2020

LETTER OF OBJECTION

I, **James George**, property owner(s) who live on 11805 Carreta Drive NW, Albuquerque, NM 87114 hereby sign this letter of objection regarding the development of Project PR-2020-00540, Wintergreen Apartments, Tract E-1. By building four, 45-foot high apartments directly behind our homes, this proposed development will directly affect me since I live within 100-feet adjacent to the proposed development.

The proposed Wintergreen Apartment development will have long-term adverse impacts to me as a homeowner(s) in terms of our quality of life, reduction of our property values, a gross violation and invasion our privacy, the effect of increased crime, the effect of extreme overcrowding of our schools, the effect of increased traffic congestion, and the effect of increased neighborhood noise. This development will be detrimental, having adverse impacts to our neighborhood and surrounding communities.

Signed: [Signature]

Date: 8-19-20
August 14, 2020

LETTER OF OBJECTION

Karen Viola, property owner(s) who live on 11001 Carreta Drive NW, Albuquerque, NM. 87114 hereby sign this letter of objection regarding the development of Project PR-2020-00540, Wintergreen Apartments, Tract E-1. By building four, 45-foot high apartments directly behind our homes, this proposed development will directly affect me since I live within 100-feet adjacent to the proposed development.

The proposed Wintergreen Apartment development will have long-term adverse impacts to me as a homeowner(s) in terms of our quality of life, reduction of our property values, a gross violation and invasion our privacy, the effect of increased crime, the effect of extreme overcrowding of our schools, the effect of increased traffic congestion, and the effect of increased neighborhood noise. This development will be detrimental, having adverse impacts to our neighborhood and surrounding communities.

Signed: [Signature]

Date: 8.19.20
August 14, 2020

LETTER OF OBJECTION

I, [Kristen Morgan], property owner(s) who live on 10923 Carreta Drive NW, Albuquerque, NM. 87114 hereby sign this letter of objection regarding the development of Project PR-2020-00540, Wintergreen Apartments, Tract E-1. By building four, 45-foot high apartments directly behind our homes, this proposed development will directly affect me since I live within 100-feet adjacent to the proposed development.

The proposed Wintergreen Apartment development will have long-term adverse impacts to me as a homeowner(s) in terms of our quality of life, reduction of our property values, a gross violation and invasion our privacy, the effect of increased crime, the effect of extreme overcrowding of our schools, the effect of increased traffic congestion, and the effect of increased neighborhood noise. This development will be detrimental, having adverse impacts to our neighborhood and surrounding communities.

Signed: [Kristen Morgan]
Date: 8/20/2020
August 14, 2020

LETTER OF OBJECTION

I, [Name], property owner(s) who live on Carreta Drive NW, Albuquerque, NM. 87114 hereby sign this letter of objection regarding the development of Project PR-2020-00540, Wintergreen Apartments, Tract E-1. By building four, 45-foot high apartments directly behind our homes, this proposed development will directly affect me since I live within 100-feet adjacent to the proposed development.

The proposed Wintergreen Apartment development will have long-term adverse impacts to me as a homeowner(s) in terms of our quality of life, reduction of our property values, a gross violation and invasion our privacy, the effect of increased crime, the effect of extreme overcrowding of our schools, the effect of increased traffic congestion, and the effect of increased neighborhood noise. This development will be detrimental, having adverse impacts to our neighborhood and surrounding communities.

Signed: [Signature]

Date: 20 Aug 2020
Angela,

This the sixth document that I would like to see added to the written input on Tierra West Apartment Complex proposal on Golf Course (Third case on the September 30th agenda). Please let me know if all six documents have been received. My computer skills are poor, so I need to be assured they were received in a readable format.

Thank you very much.
Marsha Kearney

This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
The Integrated Development Process falls extremely short when it is applied to the MX-M zoning adjacent to single family homes and communities. When you consider the stated purposes in section 1-3 as applied to Tierra West proposed Wintergreen Apartment Complex - the purposes are NOT being met. A key purpose of the State Statutes and Comprehensive Plans is to protect communities and the people that live there.

In the General Provisions Authority (page 1) it states “In enacting this IDO, the City intends to comply with the provisions of existing state law on the same subject, and the provisions of this IDO should be interpreted to achieve that goal.” Below is a response to each of the twelve purpose statements. This project proposal in no way meets the purpose of the IDO and the state statutes and Comprehensive Plan it is tiered to.

1-3 Purpose

1-3(A) Implement the adopted Albuquerque/Bernalillo County Comprehensive Plan (ABC Comp Plan), as amended.

Response: See document submitted earlier to the DRB.

1-3(B) Ensure that all development in the City is consistent with the spirit and intent of any other plans and policies adopted by City Council.

Response: This proposed project does the OPPOSITE of protecting the neighborhood and the rights of the citizens/homeowners the City Council members represent. To allow a long-standing neighborhood to be torn apart at the expense of a developer is a travesty.

1-3(D) Protect the quality and character of residential neighborhoods.

Response: Once again the proposed project does the OPPOSITE of protecting the quality and character. The most grievous aspect is allowing four-story complexes amidst a community limited to two-story buildings. The previous zoning was commercial zoning with limited use apartments - apartment buildings limited to the 2-story height. The buildings proposed do not have a Southwest design, unlike all the surrounding homes. Also the colors proposed are two toned, when the surrounding homes are of single colors. This is not a complex that fits in with the surrounding community, rather it sticks out like a sore thumb.

1-3(E) Promote the economic development and fiscal sustainability of the City.

Response: This project is proposed for an area where the schools are already near or above the maximum student enrollment, a situation that actually resulted in the denial
of a permit to building apartments on the same lots a number of years ago (around 2006). Since that time the situation has become worse, with no plans of adding permanent buildings to alleviate the situation. Traffic concerns, especially on Westside Blvd., continue to get worse as this is used by commuters to access the Westside and Rio Rancho areas. This area has a low jobs to housing ratio, and the additional residents will add to the number of people who will have to commute to work. Is not the intent of economic development to bring in jobs closer to the community and propose housing in areas where the schools are not at capacity? Also, what about the fiscal sustainability of the neighborhood, a critical part of the City. In recent past projects, such as what is proposed, property values in the area have gone down 20 to 30%. This has a significant effect on the neighborhoods, as these homes are often owners’ long-term major investment. This project does not promote, but instead takes away from the economic development and fiscal sustainability of the City.

1-3(G) Protect the health, safety, and general welfare of the public.

Response: This project does not protect the health, safety, and general welfare of the public in numerous ways. In the more than 12 years I have lived here there has never been a problem with the lots behind our home. In fact it has been used by balloonists, hikers and provides habitat for wildlife communities, as well as wonderful sunset viewing to the west. The safety and privacy (especially with the 4 story buildings with balconies) of the neighborhood is greatly compromised with this project. When considering the traffic issues already experienced in this area, the accident rate will most likely increase, especially with only one point of entry for the entry. This is especially critical as there are two hospital complexes within a mile of the project area.

1-3(H) Provide for orderly and coordinated development patterns.

Response: Refer back to 1-3(F). This project is proposed in an area with traffic issues, overcrowded schools (with no plan for expansion), and a low job to population ratio. When we moved here the lots involved were C-2 with conditional use apartments. The C-2 zoning would help increase the job to population ratio, provide services to the public (especially important with the two hospital complexes in the area) and not further impact to the school system. The traffic issues are greatest during commuting hours and a commercial project would have less impact as the traffic would be spread out.

1-3(I) Encourage the conservation and efficient use of water and other natural resources.

Response: Adding to the commuting public increases the use of energy resources, as well as adding to air pollution.
1-3(J) Implement a connected system of parks, trails, and open spaces to promote improved outdoor activity and public health.

Response: Any development of the land will take away from the conservation of one of the few open space areas in the community. With the proposed project the area will no longer be available to the community to use or access the arroyo and adjacent trails.

1-3(K) Provide reasonable protection from possible nuisances and hazards and to otherwise protect and improve public health.

Response: The greatest concern with 4 story apartments with balconies is the invasion of privacy for those who live adjacent to the lots. Six foot trees will be planted to provide screening, but what protects the homeowners for the next 10 to 15 years? Noise, crime and unwanted invasions of adjacent properties will increase. With the traffic situation there will be increased safety hazards, especially during rush hour. Once again this is taking away from the protection in place.

1-3(L) Encourage efficient and connected transportation and circulation systems for motor vehicles, bicycles, and pedestrians.

Response: The proposed project does not do anything to improve the transportation system. In fact with the additional traffic (208 apartments, more than 300 parking spaces, estimated 100 APS students), this just adds to a system that is already dealing with significant issues.

Marsha Kearney
9/27/2020
Once again I would like to be on the record stating my concern of the hinderance of community input and the putting people, like myself, at risk by proceeding with the hearing on Tierra West’s Project #2020013, Wintergreen Apartments. This is a violation of the Open Meetings Act. It’s been extremely difficult to review relevant documents, especially with limited computer skills. There are a number of concerned residents who have not been able to get involved because of the pandemic - because they are working, helping family members out, or isolating at home. There still are a great number of people unaware of this project, as the HOA has a limited e-mail list for the residents of the community and the people to the south of the project do not even have an HOA. To have to call in because of not having Zoom capability is very distracting and does NOT meet the intent of a public hearing. This project is a major concern of individuals like myself and to see it continue on should not be allowed. Why is this an “essential activity? Is it legal to stifle community involvement? This is an especially grievous action considering there is the pandemic, something we have never seen in our lifetime, going on. Add in the fact this is our only chance for the community to be involved with the project not going through the EPC process and you have a situation where we are not even allowed a fair chance to participate. This is NOT what democracy is all about.

Marsha Kearney
This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
Jeanne and Jolene,

I am aware of the deferral in this matter to a later date due to a Water Authority issue.

I have wondered since the last appearance of this matter before the DRB about the changes made by Tierra West to the sewerage lines that point toward the property to the north..........the other half of these almost 16+ acres of land.

In my mind, it is seemingly and amazingly strange that any developer would go to the trouble of ADDING COSTS to a current project that would enable an adjacent piece of land to have an easier time with sewerage hookups...........IF the owner of both plots of land intended to SELL that 'other' portion and had no idea as to how the new owner would use that north plot.

Will there be NO QUESTIONS raised by anyone on the DRB as to this happenstance...........especially if one considers the likelihood that many truisms are based on experience and historical fact, e.g., “there are no random coincidences”. Were I in your shoes, I think that I would be wondering just how far down a prime rose path I was being led.

Thanks for your considerations of all of the above.

Dan Regan

Mr. Regan,

Thank you for bringing up a very good question. The owner does not intend for a second phase of apartments and plans to sell the northern parcel that is in question.
From: Dan Regan [mailto:dreganabq@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, July 22, 2020 11:53 AM
To: Wolfley, Jolene; Wolfenbarger, Jeanne
Cc: dreganabq@gmail.com
Subject: Apts. at Golf Course Rd. & Westside Blvd

Jolene and Jeanne,

I have been watching the DRB hearing on this project and have a traffic question.

If the current proposed apartment project and the intended apartment project on the property just north of this site (between current one and Westside Blvd) were being done simultaneously there could be as many as 800+ apartments involved.

Would this level of parking slots/residents trigger a traffic study?

Is it the Transportation Dept.’s position that adding 800 to 1400 new residents & vehicles to an 8 acre space at the intersection of two already very active &, at times, overloaded major streets is of no real concern because the added traffic doesn’t trigger a traffic study based on national norms? If this is true, then I, as a taxpayer of this City, find your position to be grossly out of touch with the lived reality of your City’s residents!

And, is anyone paying attention to the fact that this developer could well be “playing the system’s game” by proposing this project and getting it approved by itself and, only then, having the development on the north property considered separately?

Thank you for your attention to all of the above.

Dan Regan
District 4 Coalition
Zoning / Development Committee, Chair
But also concerned with precedents be being set in other parts of our city!

=================================================================}

This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
Thank you for following up, Richard!

Philip

PHILIP CRUMP, Mediator & Facilitator
1301 Luisa Street Santa Fe, NM 87505
Skype: phcrump philip@pcmediate.com
www.pcmediate.com Tel/Txt: (505) 989-8558

When I walked out of the gate, I knew that if I continued to hate these people, I would still be in prison. --Nelson Mandela

On 07/21/2020 07:28, Richard Stevenson wrote:

Hello All,

Please find attached the following items relating to the traffic queries for this project:

- Trip Generation Worksheet based on the ITE Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition for Multifamily Housing (Mid-Rise) apartments
- Sub-Area Map as a basis of the trip distribution
- Trip Distribution Worksheet
- Trip Distribution Map
- Westside Blvd. widening project timing and financials which is in the current Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for FFY 2020 and 2021. According to MRCOG TIP Coordinator, this is a high priority project for the City of Albuquerque and City of Rio Rancho. This project will more than likely be completed over the next few years considering the amount of construction that is involved. Here is a link to MRCOG website where you can find the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (which includes project lists), as well as the TIP: https://www.mrcog-nm.gov/233/Metro-Planning.

Grading and Drainage
Kind Regards,

Richard Stevenson, P.E.

Tierra West LLC
5571 Midway Park Pl., NE
Albuquerque, NM  87109
505-858-3100  ext. 232

From: p crump [mailto:phcrumpsf@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2020 9:33 AM
To: Ron Bohannan; Richard Stevenson; rick@rba81.com; gnh5976@gmail.com; 1garciagang@gmail.com; mdmiraba@msn.com; meganfitz@live.com; bcreel@msn.com; frandimarco@msn.com; cfmirabal@gmail.com; ruffkat@yahoo.com; ruffkat@yahoo.com; david.m.lopez@msn.com; garmand_lu@yahoo.com; kmcvrey124@comcast.net; tjmurieta@msn.com; tjmurieta@msn.com; nenaperkin@gmail.com; avalgman12@gmail.com; scott.templeton@comcast.net; chavezdyx4@yahoo.com; mccormackdj@comcast.net; erin.coffman@yahoo.com; huerta.loretta58@gmail.com; gayle.binkley@me.com; marshakearney@gmail.com; nauticalhutch@gmail.com; miladybutler@yahoo.com; rfasel@fed.net
Cc: Jocelyn Torres; Gomez, Angela J.; Maggie Gould; Tyson Hummell ABQ LUF
Subject: [#2020013] Emailing: Facilitated Meeting Wintergreen 6 18 20.docx

Dear All:

Attached please find the Report for the meeting held Thursday evening, June 18th, regarding the proposed Wintergreen Apartments. Please review it carefully.

If there are errors of either Omission (something important said but left out) or Commission (something important misquoted), please let us know and we will issue correcting Amendments. You may send potential corrections to phcrumpsf@gmail.com.

Also, instructions for submitting additional comments to the DRB are included near the end of the report under Hearing Details.

Also, you may let the City know your impression of the meeting and the facilitator(s) by going to one of the following evaluations:


or

Thank you very much for your participation.

Philip Crump and Jocelyn Torres, Facilitators

=======================================================
This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
After reading Tierra West’s response I have several comments/questions I would like included in the record.

1. No mention of lack of notification and the dealing with the signage not being in line with the IDO requirements until two days before the first hearing. How is that matter remedied? Also the 100 feet from the property does NOT include public right-of-ways. Would not that expand the number of residents that needed to be contacted?

2. The residents talked about “river rock,” not “river walk” to discourage people from getting near the adjacent properties. What is planned for the 5 feet between the Planned wall and existing walls? Would not that collect trash and debris? How would that be managed? Also hard to understand how you would build up the six foot wall with 2 foot raised ground where possible. You talk about changes in the buffer, yet there are no displays of what that would look like.

3. The crime has greatly increased in the areas where other apartment complexes have been built on the Westside. What makes this complex different?

4. The statement that 10 story buildings would be allowed in the area under the C-2 zoning is INCORRECT. The previous zoning only allowed for 2 story building with the conditional clause.

5. There is no mention of “solar access.” How does this project impact solar access for the residents?

6. The Developer declined to share the market research to support the building of luxury apartments in this area. This is a critical issue to the residents and when considering the comprehensive plan. There are already a number of apartments on the Westside with “space available.” To say that this information will not be shared is NOT answering questions/concerns.

7. The cross-sections provided are inadequate when speaking to the privacy and noise barriers needed for the residents. Cross-sections show trees. Where exactly are they planted, spacing, heights, etc. We have no clear view of what will be in the buffer and how it will protect the adjacent property owners.

8. When considering the Guiding Principles in Chapter 4 of the Comprehensive Plan, this project is totally out of line with the guidance given by this overarching document. Please answer how this project meets those principles.

Please share your responses with all on this mailing list.
Marsha Kearney
Good Afternoon,

The intent of this email is to provide responses to the questions raised by neighbors at the DRB hearing on July 22nd 2020, in regards to the proposed Wintergreen Apartment project City project number PR-2020-004030.

The updated plans to address DRB comments from the July 22nd hearing are available on the City website: http://data.cabq.gov/government/planning/DRB/PR-2020-004030/DRB%20Submittals/PR-2020-004030_Aug_5_2020_Supp/Application/DRB%20Resubmittal%207.31.2020/2020013%20DRB%20Plans%20Wintergreen%20Luxury%20Apartments%20Resubmittal%207.31.2020.pdf

Below is a list of questions from the DRB meeting on July 22nd that I heard. Any duplicates were consolidated into a single question/theme. If you have specific project questions not previously addressed in the public meetings, please email us so we can work to respond to your questions rstevenson@tierrawestllc.com.

- **Will a Traffic Impact Study (TIS) be prepared by the applicant?**
  Response: This development does not meet the City threshold to require a Traffic Impact Study. Additional traffic review was completed including the Trip Generation Worksheet based on the ITE Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition for Multifamily Housing (Mid-Rise) apartments, Sub-Area Map as a basis of the trip distribution, Trip Distribution Worksheet and Map, which were submitted to the City Traffic Engineer and send to you on July 21 2020. Ms. Mirabel asked at the DRB hearing for the chart which was used to determine the trips, and I have attached to this email. The attachment provides an overview on how the trips are determined based on historical data (pre Covid-19). The development is also subject to payment of City impact fees for transportation, drainage, City facilities, parks, and public safety. Impact fees are a charge of assessment imposed by the City on new development in order to generate revenue for funding or recouping the costs of capital improvements rationally related to new development in accordance with applicable law.

- **Please provide the market research supporting the decision to proceed with luxury apartments?**
  Response: The developer is unwilling to share the market study for this development.

- **We have requested sound barriers, Line of sight barriers, fencing barriers, landscape barriers, lighting barriers.**
Response: A 6-ft CMU block wall is proposed to be installed 5-ft offset the property boundary.

- We requested a sound and visibility wall at least 8 feet along the East end of the property boundary.
  Response: Where feasible we are proposing 2-ft earth bench to elevate the 6-ft wall to include the effective height.

- Will an archeology study, crime impact study, wildlife impact study property value impact study be provided by the applicant?
  Response: Following a sensitivity review of the project site in regards to IDO Section 5-2 Site Design and Sensitive Lands, the following assessment was made by the applicant that Tract E-1 does not meet any of the sensitive land elements, as described further below:
    - 5-2(C)(1)(a) Floodplains and flood hazard areas – the site is not within a floodplain or flood hazard area per FEMA FIRM Map 35001C0108G dated 9/26/2008
    - 5-2(C)(1)(b) Steep slopes – Steep slopes is not defined by the IDO but generally considered steep if the slope is greater than 20%. The average slope of the undeveloped site is 4.5%
    - 5-2(C)(1)(c) Unstable soils – per USGS the soil is bluepoint loamy fine sand 98.1%
    - 5-2(C)(1)(e) Arroyos – per FEMA FIRM map no evidence of recorded arroyos.
    - 5-2(C)(1)(f) Irrigation facilities (acequias) – no
    - 5-2(C)(1)(g) Escarpments – there are no escarpments on the property
    - 5-2(C)(1)(h) Rock outcroppings – there are no rock outcroppings on the property
    - 5-2(C)(1)(i) Large stands of mature trees – not present, the site is in an undeveloped condition with vegetation typical of the west mesa with areas of scrub, small vegetation and some minor disturbance by dumping of soils.

A crime impact, wildlife and property value impact study is not required with the application and will not be completed.

An archeological certification of no effect was provided by the Albuquerque City Archaeologist for this site.
• **We have requested that the recreational walking trail adjacent our properties be removed.**
  Response: The walking trail has been shifted to the west further away from the east property line but remains for the residents to utilize for recreational exercise.

• **Please provide a view plan exhibit?**
  Response: A view plan exhibit was prepared to show the sections along the east half of the property and is attached to this email.

• **We have requested Large River walk as opposed to Grass to discourage foot traffic.**
  Response: Native seed is proposed as ground cover in the 50-ft landscape buffer area, along with shrubs and trees, as detailed on the landscape plans.

• **Concern with the scale and intensity of the development.**
  Response: The subject site is zoned MX-M (Mixed Use Medium intensity) and the proposed multi-family use is allowed permissively. The proposed plan meets applicable development standards (height, setbacks, parking, etc.) and the technical standards (drainage, vehicular access, etc.). The site was previously zoned C-2 (Community Commercial), which allowed multi-family development at a much more intense scale of development (higher density and over 10 stories in height were possible under C-2 zoning).

This development and proposed density also aligns with the infill development of the City with the City of Albuquerque Comprehensive Plan Goal and policy listed in Chapter 5: Land Use, regarding development patterns: Goal 5.3-Efficient Development Patterns: *Promote development patterns that maximize the utility of existing infrastructure and public facilities and the efficient use of land to support the public good,* and Policy 5.3.1-Infill Development: *Support additional growth in areas with existing infrastructure and public facilities.* The project will facilitate development of a portion of a site already served by existing infrastructure that is available for use (Golf Course Rd, Black Arroyo Channel, ABCWUA water and sewer) thereby maximizing the utility of existing infrastructure and using land in an efficient manner. Using infrastructure and land in this way generally supports the public good because it is more efficient than adding infrastructure and/or developing residential developments on the urban fringe.

• **We also would like the landscape plan to include more mature trees, to protect immediate privacy. The current plan has at least 10-year maturity**
Response: 6-ft plus high trees will be installed at install for the Austrian Pine species, Chinese Juniper planted as 5 gal shrubs, the other tree species shall have a 2-inch plus caliper.

- **We would like plants that do not affect allergies. Juniper plants are a major contributor to allergies.**
  Response: The two types of evergreens are selected for the eastern edge of the landscape:
  - Austrian Pines / Pinus nigra. Uncommon tree allergen, minimal needle drop with regular irrigation.
  - Chinese Juniper / Juniperus chinensus – ‘Spartan’ (narrow) variety, planted as 5 gal shrubs. FEMALE TREES ONLY per compliance with City Aeroallergen Ordinance.
  - The city tracks and puts out daily air quality pollen counts. Junipers, a common allergen, are included. Pines, an uncommon allergen, are not included.

- **We want Trash Bins moved away from the East side of the development, away from homeowners’ properties.**
  Response: Limited in placement due to Solid Waste and ABCWUA requirements, located dumpsters outside of the buffer area and as far away as possible from the residents.

- **Lighting must be directed away from private properties.**
  Response: All outdoor lighting for the project is controlled by the New Mexico Night Sky Protection Act and regulated by the IDO section 5-8. No light source for any outdoor light fixture shall be directly visible from any public right-of-way or any adjacent property. Light poles will have a max height of 16-ft.

- **Privacy Concerns**
  Response: The City has no specific standards to protect privacy of backyards such as preventing sight-lines from adjoining properties but does require a 50-ft landscape buffer to provide setback and landscaping between this development and the single family residence. The IDO Neighborhood Edge requirements (height limitations, buffer requirements, etc.) are met with this development.

- **We discourage Grass on the East side buffer, being that the noise generated by maintenance and mowing would impose on the neighborhood.**
Response: All property owners in the City of Albuquerque must follow the Noise Control Ordinance https://www.cabq.gov/environmentalhealth/noise

- **Concern on Crime increasing in the area:**
  Response: Site design and building design standards are reflected in the Integrated Development Ordinance (IDO) which incorporate the basic tenets of CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design), such as adequate lighting, minimizing “hiding places,” providing opportunities for passive surveillance, and restricting access to sites and buildings to only residents (gating, doors with controlled access, etc.). AFR (Fire & Rescue) and APD (Police Department) provided comments on the site plan with those elements considered with the design. As this is a gated apartment community the residents will be as concerned for crime prevention across Albuquerque as any other good neighbor is.

- **Water runoff and drainage has not been addressed adequately to the neighborhood concerns.**
  Response: Tierra West is unaware of any outstanding questions or concerns regarding drainage.

As the applicant we consider the Site Plan complies with all applicable provisions of the IDO, the DPM, other adopted City regulations, all of which is being reviewed thoroughly by the DRB. We have followed the procedures outlined in the IDO document for notice provisions. If you have specific project questions relating to the development, please email us so we can work to respond to your questions rstevenson@tierrawestllc.com.

This application has not bypassed any City agency/s or committee/s and is following the City of Albuquerque process. If you have process questions, i.e. specific to the IDO notification procedures, or any other City process matter please email the DRB Chair Ms. Wolfley at jwolfley@cabq.gov.

The upcoming DRB meeting to review the re-submittal to address DRB member’s comments is this Wednesday, 5 August 2020. The project number is PR-2020-004030, and is number three on the agenda. The agenda is posted online and the call in details are as follows:

Join Zoom Meeting (9:00 am Wednesday 8/5/2020)
https://cabq.zoom.us/j/93846895555

Meeting ID: 938 4689 5555
By phone +1 312 626 6799 or find your local number: https://cabq.zoom.us/u/aLqNrlrNh

Kind Regards,

Richard Stevenson, P.E.

Tierra West LLC
5571 Midway Park Pl., NE
Albuquerque, NM  87109
Here is a downloaded link to the City of Albuquerque 95% plans detailing the Westside Blvd widening from Golf Course Rd to NM 528. Funding has been authorized with construction scheduled to start in spring 2021.

https://1drv.ms/b/s!Ah_cf8IHlL3ogkmvdAAIpPHseyTI

Regards,
Richard Stevenson, PE
Tierra West LLC
(505) 858 3100

Hello All,

Please find attached the following items relating to the traffic queries for this project:

- Trip Generation Worksheet based on the ITE Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition for Multifamily Housing (Mid-Rise) apartments
- Sub-Area Map as a basis of the trip distribution
Trip Distribution Worksheet
Trip Distribution Map
Westside Blvd. widening project timing and financials which is in the current Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for FFY 2020 and 2021. According to MRCOG TIP Coordinator, this is a high priority project for the City of Albuquerque and City of Rio Rancho. This project will more than likely be completed over the next few years considering the amount of construction that is involved. Here is a link to MRCOG website where you can find the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (which includes project lists), as well as the TIP: https://www.mrcog-nm.gov/233/Metro-Planning.

Grading and Drainage

Here is the downloadable link to the drainage plan
https://1drv.ms/b/s!Ah_cf8IH3ogkDpTWEqDymDVXFo

Kind Regards,

Richard Stevenson, P.E.

Tierra West LLC
5571 Midway Park Pl., NE
Albuquerque, NM 87109
505-858-3100 ext. 232

PRIVILEGED AND CONFIDENTIAL
The information contained in this electronic mail message is confidential, may be privileged, and is intended only for the use of the individual(s) named above or their designee. If you are not the intended recipient of this message, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. Any unauthorized interception of this message is illegal under the law. If you have received this message in error, please immediately notify me by return message or by telephone and delete the original message from your email system. Thank you.

From: p crump [mailto:phcrumpsf@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2020 9:33 AM
To: Ron Bohannan; Richard Stevenson; rick@rba81.com; gnhs5976@gmail.com; 1garciagang@gmail.com; mdmiraba@msn.com; meganfitz@live.com; bcreel@msn.com; frandimarco@msn.com; cfmirabal@gmail.com; ruffkat@yahoo.com; ruffkat@yahoo.com; david.m.lopez@msn.com; garnand_lu@yahoo.com; kmcvey124@comcast.net; tjurieta@msn.com; tjurieta@msn.com; nenaperkin@gmail.com; avalgman12@gmail.com; scott.templeton@comcast.net; chavezdyx4@yahoo.com; mccormackdj@comcast.net; erin.coffman@yahoo.com; huerta.loretta58@gmail.com; gayle.binkley@me.com; marshakearney@gmail.com; nauticalhutch@gmail.com; miladybutler@yahoo.com; rfasel@fed.net
Cc: Jocelyn Torres; Gomez, Angela J.; Maggie Gould; Tyson Hummell ABQ LUF
Subject: [#2020013] Emailing: Facilitated Meeting Wintergreen 6 18 20.docx

Dear All:

Attached please find the Report for the meeting held Thursday evening, June 18th, regarding the proposed Wintergreen Apartments. Please review it carefully.

If there are errors of either Omission (something important said but left out) or Commission (something important misquoted), please let us know and we will issue correcting Amendments. You may send potential corrections to phcrumpsf@gmail.com.
Also, instructions for submitting additional comments to the DRB are included near the end of the report under Hearing Details.

Also, you may let the City know your impression of the meeting and the facilitator(s) by going to one of the following evaluations:


or


Thank you very much for your participation.

Philip Crump and Jocelyn Torres, Facilitators

<ITE_Land_Use_221_Mid_Rise.pdf>
<2020013_Building C & D Cross Section_Exhibit_B-C1 C2.pdf>

====================================================================
This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
Thanks Russell,
It will be added to the file.
Angela can you add this to file for 4030? Thanks

---

From: Brito, Russell D.
Sent: Wednesday, July 15, 2020 5:18 PM
To: Wolfley, Jolene <jwolfley@cabq.gov>; Gould, Maggie S. <MGould@cabq.gov>
Subject: FW: CI\Marsha Kearney\RLD (Intranet Quorum IMA00130316)

J and M,

FYI, please see below.

Thanks,

• R

---

From: AMY RINCON <ARINCON@rrnm.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, July 15, 2020 1:34 PM
To: Brito, Russell D. <RBrito@cabq.gov>
Subject: RE: CI\Marsha Kearney\RLD (Intranet Quorum IMA00130316)

Thanks!

---

From: Brito, Russell D. [mailto:RBrito@cabq.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, July 15, 2020 1:33 PM
To: AMY RINCON <ARINCON@rrnm.gov>
Cc: Bazzano, Nicole, RLD <Nicole.Bazzano@state.nm.us>
Subject: RE: CI\Marsha Kearney\RLD (Intranet Quorum IMA00130316)

Amy,

This proposed development is in the City of Albuquerque on Golf Course just south of West Side Boulevard and we are aware of this resident’s concerns. Thank you for sharing.

All the Best,

-One Albuquerque planning -
Hi Russell,
I hope you are doing well in these crazy times. I received the email chain below from the NM RLD by mistake they thought the subject project was in Rio Rancho. Is there a way to forward the original email to the appropriate City of Albuquerque department? I’ve tried looking for the project on the website, but I was unable to spot it on an agenda. And if possible could someone reach out to this resident? Any help on directing this email would be appreciated.

Thanks!

Amy Rincon, AICP
Planning and Zoning Manager
Development Services Department
City of Rio Rancho
3200 Civic Center Circle NE
Rio Rancho, NM  87144
Phone:  (505) 896-8781

Hi Amy, per our conversation please see below email from constituent  Ms. Marsha E Kearney. Let me know if I can help in any way.

Nicole Bazzano
Executive Assistant
Constituent Services Liaison
Office of the Superintendent
Case #: 813319
Date: 7/15/2020
Name: Ms. Marsha E Kearney
Address: 10927 Carreta Drive NW
City: Albuquerque
State: NM
Zip Code: 87114
Email: rmeek1978@gmail.com
Phone Number: 505-899-9705

Description: The development planning process is gone amok in this state and is totally run by developers. To say development planning is essential during the pandemic is beyond my comprehension. To allow developers to push through major projects greatly impacting whole communities without addressing any of the issues goes...
against the idea of democracy - especially in the time of the pandemic. To have the President of Tierra West (Ronald Bohannan) tell us that he's doing us a favor and not responding to any of the issues. The property in question is directly behind us and the area was rezoned and IDO process developed over a three year process, yet no resident was informed. Mr. Bohannan was on the executive committee. Though issues effects both people in Rio Rancho none of the issues have to be addressed. Though our future is greatly impacted by 4-story structures with balconies overlooking homes, increased crime and significant drop in home values, we are only given one chance of getting involved (process has been stove-piped) and less then 4 weeks to respond at the public hearing. The IDO itself is over 500 pages long - as everything is only available online - our ability to provide input is greatly hindered. The public hearing is a quasi-judicial process, which limits who we can talk to/contact. I feel like I have been assaulted and have my hands tied behind my back. I try to state my case and am told it does not matter - no one has to listen. I am in home isolation, yet I am given no relief nor someone to represent me. A meeting we asked for to voice our concerns the HOA paid half for. The HOA's money comes from the residents being impacted, yet we are made to pay to talk to Tierra West. Then we find out not one of our issues or recommendation was responded to. In fact at the meeting we were told the developer would not agree to any changes in design. Mr. Bohannan helped write the rezoning and IDO, so it he knows how to use the process to get what he wants with NO consideration for the victims. The developer, his client, is from out-of-state. As of May 21st (I understand this has since changed) Tierra West website said of the Huning Castle Apartments "numerous appeals filed by the neighborhoods were successfully defended through City Council and on to District Court." Communities are being ignored both in Rio Rancho and Albuquerque (where Bohannan and Huston operate). It's a travesty to see During normal times it's apprehensive. During the pandemic, I think it's criminal. I trusted you to take care of the citizens of our state and was so very proud of what was being done. But with this situation I feel that nobody except the developers are being heard and the communities are being greatly hurt - yet nobody hears our voice. If the intent is to dishearten and beat down solid citizens who have thrived on the sense of community and social justice - you can consider it done.

Please reach out to this constituent within 24 hours of receiving this referral. Please respond within 5 days. If you require an extension, please notify this office with details of the request. Upon response please include pertinent information.

Note: Please respond to this email and cc (Matt Ruybal and matt.ruybal@state.nm.us) for tracking purposes

---

This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.

---

This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
Dear Kathie Long,

The Development Review Board heard this case on July 27, 2020 and deferred it to the meeting of August 5, 2020. I am including the information about why we are having virtual meetings and how you can participate.

We wish to inform you that the City’s ‘Seventh Declaration of Local Emergency Due to Novel Coronavirus COVID-19’ signed July 13, 2020 includes the following statement which authorizes the DRB to conduct a virtual meeting via teleconference or videoconference:

Pursuant to the need for responsive and well-informed government continuity during the current emergency, all public boards, commissions, and committees subject to the Public Boards and Commissions Ordinance, § 2-6-1-1 et seq., are hereby authorized to conduct virtual meetings via teleconference or videoconference for the duration of this Order, and...

The DRB will make every effort to help the public wanting to participate in a DRB meeting to do so successfully. You have both an opportunity to speak or to ask questions of the applicant (cross examination). Please refer to the attachment for instructions in using the Zoom platform which is the videoconference software currently in use by the DRB.

This is the link to the agenda:
https://www.cabq.gov/planning/boards-commissions/development-review-board/development-review-board-agenda-archives

By clicking on the ‘blue’ project number you can view the application that was submitted.

This is the Zoom meeting information that is included on the agenda:

Join Zoom Meeting
https://cabq.zoom.us/j/93846895555

Meeting ID: 938 4689 5555
By phone +1 669 900 6833
Attached are instructions DRB staff created to help the public know how to use Zoom.

Thank you and let me know if you have any further questions.

MAGGIE GOULD
-----Original Message-----
From: Kathie Long <kathielong@mac.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 21, 2020 9:54 PM
To: Wolfley, Jolene <jwolfley@cabq.gov>
Subject: PR-2020 004030

In reference to the meeting scheduled for 7/22/20 regarding apartments on golf course road Tierra West LLC. I would like to attend but I am unable to do a virtual meeting will it be rescheduled when concerned neighbors will be able to attend? Thank you Kathie Long 505-239-4687

Sent from my iPad=
=================================================================================================
This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
I did catch that, too, but figured you meant the 22nd.

Many thanks for the detailed information.

You all take care, and be safe out there.

Ed Padilla
Facility Services
College of University Libraries and Learning Sciences
Zimmerman Library - Rm.129, West Wing
MSC05 3020
1 University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87131
505-277-0458
Cell: 505-249-4162
epadilla@unm.edu

[EXTERNAL]
Hello,
I want to clarify that the case was heard on July 22, 2020.
Thank you

Dear Edward Padilla,
The Development Review Board heard this case on July 27, 2020 and deferred it to the meeting of August 5, 2020. I am including the information about why we are having virtual meetings and how you can participate.

We wish to inform you that the City’s ‘Seventh Declaration of Local Emergency Due to Novel Coronavirus COVID-19’ signed July 13, 2020 includes the following statement which authorizes the DRB to conduct a virtual meeting via teleconference or videoconference:

9. Pursuant to the need for responsive and well-informed government continuity during the current emergency, all public boards, commissions, and committees subject to the Public Boards and Commissions Ordinance, § 2-6-1-16.1, are hereby authorized to conduct virtual meetings via teleconference or videoconference for the duration of this Order, and

The DRB will make every effort to help the public wanting to participate in a DRB meeting to do so successfully. You have both an opportunity to speak or to ask questions of the applicant (cross examination). Please refer to the attachment for instructions in using the Zoom platform which is the videoconference software currently in use by the DRB.

This is the link to the agenda:
https://www.cabq.gov/planning/boards-commissions/development-review-board/development-review-board-agenda-archives

By clicking on the ‘blue’ project number you can view the application that was submitted.

This is the Zoom meeting information that is included on the agenda:

Join Zoom Meeting
https://cabq.zoom.us/j/93846895555

Meeting ID: 938 4689 5555
By phone +1 669 900 6833

Attached are instructions DRB staff created to help the public know how to use Zoom.

Thank you and let me know if you have any further questions.

MAGGIE GOULD
planning manager
land development coordination
o 505-924-3880
c 505-553-0682
e mgould@cabq.gov
cabq.gov/planning
To: Wolfley, Jolene <jwolfley@cabq.gov>
Subject: Proj. #4030

Greeting Ms. Wolfley,

If at all possible please delay the Zoom agenda topic for Project #4030 to a later date when more members of the Seven Bar HOA can attend. I am working at the time of this Zoom meeting, as I am sure others are as well. This topic is extremely important to members of the Seven Bar HOA, and we would like to participate to voice our objection to having these apartments built on the proposed site plan for many of the reasons noted at the first Zoom meeting related to this project.

Respectfully,

Ed Padilla

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

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

Good afternoon. Here are some answers to the questions you raised.

1. The Notice of Decision is available on the DRB website under the date of the DRB meeting. Here is the link from the DRB website.

2. The Notice of Decision identifies the date that an appeal must be filed. The date is October 15, 2020 at 5 pm. This date is 15 calendar days following the DRB meeting.

3. Documents that have already been submitted regarding the case are compiled into the ‘Record’ for the case. That ‘Record’ will be provided to the Land Use Hearing Officer.

4. The case is assigned the Project Number PR-2020-004030. You use this number to identify the DRB decision you would be appealing. The specific Site Plan application is SI 2020-00549. You can include this number.

5. The appeal form should be sent in according to the instructions online. Any information you wish to add to supplement the appeal should be sent in via email. That can be done in more than one email if file sizes are exceeded. Please contact Vanessa Segura vsegura@cabq.gov 505-924-3895 for any assistance in the logistics of filing an appeal. Please note that there is a fee for filing an appeal.

6. I will check into the matters you raised in #6 and get back to you early next week.

Thanks,

JOLENE WOLFLEY
associate director
o 505.924.3891
e jwolfley@cabq.gov
cabq.gov/planning
From: Marsha Kearney <rmeek1978@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, October 9, 2020 2:27 PM
To: Rodenbeck, Jay B. <jrodenbeck@cabq.gov>; Wolfley, Jolene <jwolfley@cabq.gov>; Gomez, Angela J. <agomez@cabq.gov>
Cc: mike mirabal <mdmiraba@msn.com>; Larry Sandoval <larrysandoval75@gmail.com>
Subject: Site Plan for PR-2020-004030 Wintergreen Apartments

Jay,

We need some help understanding the appeal process for the Site Plan for OR-2020-004030, so would appreciate hearing back to this e-mail asap on the following questions:

1. Has the Official Notice of Decision been released, and if so we need a copy to attach to the appeal.

2. When does the 15 day appeal period begin and end?

3. Do we need to resubmit documents that have already been provided for the record?

4. I have seen different numbers attached to this project - Is the OR-2020-004030 number the correct number?

5. I note that the single PDF file must be e-mailed and is limited in size. In responding to this project I have already had to break up previous documents to meet that requirement and do not the capability to make a CD. During the time of the pandemic - how are we expected to provide the appeal information in the short timeframe available? This is a serious matter that we would appreciate attention to.

6. In the plat shared at the last hearing a round-about is shown at the north end of the gated community that appears to include part of the adjacent lot and has a road from the north coming into the round-about. Also, the water system proposed also involves work in that northern parcel. Should not that be included in the site plan? Would not that result in the area being beyond the maximum acreage allowed for the site plan? Also the round about shows the road from the north coming in and using the same access point for the gated community. There has not been a project submitted/approved for the north parcel, so how can the development occur? If the gated community extends beyond the two properties identified, does it not require the project to go through the EPC board?

Greatly appreciate your response to the above questions. With the pandemic continuing on our ability to be able to be involved in this and other projects has been extremely hindered.

Marsha Kearney
7 Bar North Resident

============================================================================================================
This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
I feel it is not wise to hold a Zoom meeting on July 22nd and need to reschedule this when we can have an OPEN Public meeting. Critical decisions are being made that affect the community and THE homeowners Property. We as homeowners NEED to be involved in important decisions that affect us here and around our community. Thank you for your reconsideration in this important matter. Susanna Padilla.

This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
Good morning Mr. Mirabal,
I will add this comment to the file and it will be distributed to the board.
If there is anything that I can do to help you understand the process or the information regarding this case, please let me know.
Thank you.

Get Outlook for Android

This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
Thank you, Mr. Stevenson. In regards to crime, please look at this. This homicide occurred at the Sky Stone apartments a few days ago, yes, the other 4 story apartment complex that butts up against Seven Bar North and my backyard. You failed to give any concrete discussion to the crime that most undoubtedly will occur in our community. We are being surrounded by apartments, which was never the intention of the community. You wouldn’t want this in your backyard, and nor do we.


Thank you

Megan Fitzpatrick
Cobble rock, or equivalent, will be placed in the 5-ft setback between the CMU wall and the property line. The apartment landscape maintenance crew will maintain all areas on the property. Additional trees and vegetation density were added to the buffer area, and the walking trail has been shifted to the west further away from the property line.

We previously discussed crime in prior correspondence and at the public meetings.

All Solar Access requirements per IDO Section 5-10 are met.

The market research and studies completed by the developer are proprietary and will not be shared.

The tree sizes at planting and at maturity are shown in the cross sections to provide a scale and orientation of the apartment building relative to the single family homes and detail the buffer area. As previously mentioned the IDO requires a 50-ft landscape buffer (IDO Section 5-9(F)) to provide a setback between the improvements and the single family homes to increase the privacy and to reduce sight-lines from adjoining properties. Based on the proposed building height there is also a minimum 100-ft offset from the property line (IDO Section 2-4(C)), to provide protection to the adjacent home owners. Please refer to the landscaping plan which details the tree spacing, heights at maturity etc. which is included in the plans (link provided in previous email).

The Comprehensive Plan provides the guiding framework in establishing the zoning designations throughout the City. The zoning allowable uses is then specifically defined in the IDO and by the specific zone classification. The IDO also defines the development standards and the City’s planning system and procedures. This project meets the requirements listed in the IDO, to the best of our knowledge. This is not a zone change, and as such, when the City Council placed the MX-M zoning designation on the property it was guided by the Comprehensive Plan Goals and Policies. The assessment for MX-M zoning was completed by City Planners, property owners, neighborhood associations and members of the public during the adoption of the IDO. You can find more information on the City website https://abc-zone.com/

Regards,
Richard Stevenson, PE
Tierra West LLC
(505) 858 3100

From: Marsha Kearney [mailto:rmeek1978@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, August 3, 2020 9:02 PM
To: Richard Stevenson
Cc: p crump; Ron Bohannan; rick@rba81.com; gnh5976@gmail.com; lgarcigang@gmail.com; mdmiraba@msn.com; meganfitz@live.com; bcree1@msn.com; frandimarco@msn.com; cfmirabal@gmail.com; ruffkat@yahoo.com; david.m.lopez@msn.com; garland lu@yahoo.com; kmcvey124@comcast.net; tjmurieta@msn.com; nenaperkin@gmail.com; avalgman12@gmail.com; scott.templeton@comcast.net; chavezdyx4@yahoo.com; mccormackdj@comcast.net; erin.coffman@yahoo.com; huerta.loretta58@gmail.com; gayle.binkley@me.com; marshakearney@gmail.com; nauticalhutch@gmail.com; miladybutler@yahoo.com; rfasel@fed.net; Gomez, Angela J.; jwolfenbarger@cabq.gov; Maggie Gould
Subject: Re: [#2020013] Wintergreen Apartments DRB questions (PR-2020-004030)

After reading Tierra West’s response I have several comments/ questions I would like included in the record.
1. No mention of lack of notification and the dealing with the signage not being in line with the IDO requirements until two days before the first hearing. How is that matter remedied? Also the 100 feet from the property does NOT include public right-of-ways. Would not that expand the number of residents that needed to be contacted?

2. The residents talked about “river rock,” not “river walk” to discourage people from getting near the adjacent properties. What is planned for the 5 feet between the Planned wall and existing walls? Would not that collect trash and debris? How would that be managed? Also hard to understand how you would build up the six foot wall with 2 foot raised ground where possible. You talk about changes in the buffer, yet there are no displays of what that would look like.

3. The crime has greatly increased in the areas where other apartment complexes have been built on the Westside. What makes this complex different?

4. The statement that 10 story buildings would be allowed in the area under the C-2 zoning is INCORRECT. The previous zoning only allowed for 2 story building with the conditional clause.

5. There is no mention of “solar access.” How does this project impact solar access for the residents?

6. The Developer declined to share the market research to support the building of luxury apartments in this area. This is a critical issue to the residents and when considering the comprehensive plan. There are already a number of apartments on the Westside with “space available.” To say that this information will not be shared is NOT answering questions/concerns.

7. The cross-sections provided are inadequate when speaking to the privacy and noise barriers needed for the residents. Cross-sections show trees. Where exactly are they planted, spacing, heights, etc. We have no clear view of what will be in the buffer and how it will protect the adjacent property owners.

8. When considering the Guiding Principles in Chapter 4 of the Comprehensive Plan, this project is totally out of line with the guidance given by this overarching document. Please answer how this project meets those principles.

Please share your responses with all on this mailing list.

Marsha Kearney

On Aug 3, 2020, at 5:10 PM, Richard Stevenson wrote:

Good Afternoon,

The intent of this email is to provide responses to the questions raised by neighbors at the DRB hearing on July 22nd 2020, in regards to the proposed Wintergreen Apartment project City project number PR-2020-004030.


Below is a list of questions from the DRB meeting on July 22nd that I heard. Any duplicates were consolidated into a single question/theme. If you have specific project questions not previously addressed in the public meetings, please email us so we can work to respond to your questions rstevenson@tierrawestllc.com.
• Will a Traffic Impact Study (TIS) be prepared by the applicant?
  Response: This development does not meet the City threshold to require a Traffic Impact Study. Additional traffic review was completed including the Trip Generation Worksheet based on the ITE Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition for Multifamily Housing (Mid-Rise) apartments, Sub-Area Map as a basis of the trip distribution, Trip Distribution Worksheet and Map, which were submitted to the City Traffic Engineer and send to you on July 21 2020. Ms. Mirabel asked at the DRB hearing for the chart which was used to determine the trips, and I have attached to this email. The attachment provides an overview on how the trips are determined based on historical data (pre Covid-19). The development is also subject to payment of City impact fees for transportation, drainage, City facilities, parks, and public safety. Impact fees are a charge of assessment imposed by the City on new development in order to generate revenue for funding or recouping the costs of capital improvements rationally related to new development in accordance with applicable law.

• Please provide the market research supporting the decision to proceed with luxury apartments?
  Response: The developer is unwilling to share the market study for this development.

• We have requested sound barriers, Line of sight barriers, fencing barriers, landscape barriers, lighting barriers.
  Response: A 6-ft CMU block wall is proposed to be installed 5-ft offset the property boundary.

• We requested a sound and visibility wall at least 8 feet along the East end of the property boundary.
  Response: Where feasible we are proposing 2-ft earth bench to elevate the 6-ft wall to include the effective height.

• Will an archeology study, crime impact study, wildlife impact study property value impact study be provided by the applicant?
  Response: Following a sensitivity review of the project site in regards to IDO Section 5-2 Site Design and Sensitive Lands, the following assessment was made by the applicant
that Tract E-1 does not meet any of the sensitive land elements, as described further below:

- 5-2(C)(1)(a) Floodplains and flood hazard areas – the site is not within a floodplain or flood hazard area per FEMA FIRM Map 35001C0108G dated 9/26/2008
- 5-2(C)(1)(b) Steep slopes – Steep slopes is not defined by the IDO but generally considered steep if the slope is greater than 20%. The average slope of the undeveloped site is 4.5%
- 5-2(C)(1)(c) Unstable soils – per USGS the soil is bluepoint loamy fine sand 98.1%
- 5-2(C)(1)(e) Arroyos – per FEMA FIRM map no evidence of recorded arroyos.
- 5-2(C)(1)(f) Irrigation facilities (acequias) – no
- 5-2(C)(1)(g) Escarpments – there are no escarpments on the property
- 5-2(C)(1)(h) Rock outcroppings – there are no rock outcroppings on the property
- 5-2(C)(1)(i) Large stands of mature trees – not present, the site is in an undeveloped condition with vegetation typical of the west mesa with areas of scrub, small vegetation and some minor disturbance by dumping of soils.

A crime impact, wildlife and property value impact study is not required with the application and will not be completed.

An archeological certification of no effect was provided by the Albuquerque City Archaeologist for this site.

- We have requested that the recreational walking trail adjacent our properties be removed.
  Response: The walking trail has been shifted to the west further away from the east property line but remains for the residents to utilize for recreational exercise.

- Please provide a view plan exhibit?
  Response: A view plan exhibit was prepared to show the sections along the east half of the property and is attached to this email.
• We have requested Large River walk as opposed to Grass to discourage foot traffic. Response: Native seed is proposed as ground cover in the 50-ft landscape buffer area, along with shrubs and trees, as detailed on the landscape plans.

• Concern with the scale and intensity of the development.
Response: The subject site is zoned MX-M (Mixed Use Medium intensity) and the proposed multi-family use is allowed permissively. The proposed plan meets applicable development standards (height, setbacks, parking, etc.) and the technical standards (drainage, vehicular access, etc.). The site was previously zoned C-2 (Community Commercial), which allowed multi-family development at a much more intense scale of development (higher density and over 10 stories in height were possible under C-2 zoning).

This development and proposed density also aligns with the infill development of the City with the City of Albuquerque Comprehensive Plan Goal and policy listed in Chapter 5: Land Use, regarding development patterns: Goal 5.3-Efficient Development Patterns: Promote development patterns that maximize the utility of existing infrastructure and public facilities and the efficient use of land to support the public good, and Policy 5.3.1-Infill Development: Support additional growth in areas with existing infrastructure and public facilities. The project will facilitate development of a portion of a site already served by existing infrastructure that is available for use (Golf Course Rd, Black Arroyo Channel, ABCWUA water and sewer) thereby maximizing the utility of existing infrastructure and using land in an efficient manner. Using infrastructure and land in this way generally supports the public good because it is more efficient than adding infrastructure and/or developing residential developments on the urban fringe.

• We also would like the landscape plan to include more mature trees, to protect immediate privacy. The current plan has at least 10-year maturity
Response: 6-ft plus high trees will be installed at install for the Austrian Pine species, Chinese Juniper planted as 5 gal shrubs, the other tree species shall have a 2-inch plus caliper.

• We would like plants that do not affect allergies. Juniper plants are a major contributor to allergies.
Response: The two types of evergreens are selected for the eastern edge of the landscape:
- Austrian Pines / Pinus nigra. Uncommon tree allergen, minimal needle drop with regular irrigation.
- Chinese Juniper / Juniperus chinensis – ‘Spartan’ (narrow) variety, planted as 5 gal shrubs. FEMALE TREES ONLY per compliance with City Aeroallergen Ordinance.
- The city tracks and puts out daily air quality pollen counts. Junipers, a common allergen, are included. Pines, an uncommon allergen, are not included.

- We want Trash Bins moved away from the East side of the development, away from homeowners’ properties.
  Response: Limited in placement due to Solid Waste and ABCWUA requirements, located dumpsters outside of the buffer area and as far away as possible from the residents.

- Lighting must be directed away from private properties.
  Response: All outdoor lighting for the project is controlled by the New Mexico Night Sky Protection Act and regulated by the IDO section 5-8. No light source for any outdoor light fixture shall be directly visible from any public right-of-way or any adjacent property. Light poles will have a max height of 16-ft.

- Privacy Concerns
  Response: The City has no specific standards to protect privacy of backyards such as preventing sight-lines from adjoining properties but does require a 50-ft landscape buffer to provide setback and landscaping between this development and the single family residence. The IDO Neighborhood Edge requirements (height limitations, buffer requirements, etc.) are met with this development.

- We discourage Grass on the East side buffer, being that the noise generated by maintenance and mowing would impose on the neighborhood.
  Response: All property owners in the City of Albuquerque must follow the Noise Control Ordinance https://www.cabq.gov/environmentalhealth/noise

- Concern on Crime increasing in the area:
  Response: Site design and building design standards are reflected in the Integrated Development Ordinance (IDO) which incorporate the basic tenets of CPTED (Crime Preventative Technology in Environmental Design).
Prevention Through Environmental Design), such as adequate lighting, minimizing “hiding places,” providing opportunities for passive surveillance, and restricting access to sites and buildings to only residents (gating, doors with controlled access, etc.). AFR (Fire & Rescue) and APD (Police Department) provided comments on the site plan with those elements considered with the design. As this is a gated apartment community the residents will be as concerned for crime prevention across Albuquerque as any other good neighbor is.

- Water runoff and drainage has not been addressed adequately to the neighborhood concerns.
  
  Response: Tierra West is unaware of any outstanding questions or concerns regarding drainage.

As the applicant we consider the Site Plan complies with all applicable provisions of the IDO, the DPM, other adopted City regulations, all of which is being reviewed thoroughly by the DRB. We have followed the procedures outlined in the IDO document for notice provisions. If you have specific project questions relating to the development, please email us so we can work to respond to your questions rstevenson@tierrawestllc.com.

This application has not bypassed any City agency/s or committee/s and is following the City of Albuquerque process. If you have process questions, i.e. specific to the IDO notification procedures, or any other City process matter please email the DRB Chair Ms. Wolfley at jwolfley@cabq.gov.

The upcoming DRB meeting to review the re-submittal to address DRB member’s comments is this Wednesday, 5 August 2020. The project number is PR-2020-004030, and is number three on the agenda. The agenda is posted online and the call in details are as follows:

- Join Zoom Meeting (9:00 am Wednesday 8/5/2020)
  https://cabq.zoom.us/j/93846895555
  Meeting ID: 938 4689 5555
- By phone +1 312 626 6799 or find your local number: https://hes32-ctp.trendmicro.com:443/wis/clicktime/v1/query?url=https%3a%2f%2fcabq.zoom.us%2fu%2faLqNrlrNh&umid=32057433-94b8-4fda-b21a-056e4ee2a42&auth=c5e193b2792d33bbda0d14ee5f909adb398f028-6d0e4a7df508df08c0dd6d11236b96ec1d7da9e98

Kind Regards,

Richard Stevenson, P.E.

Tierra West LLC
5571 Midway Park Pl., NE
Albuquerque, NM 87109
505-858-3100 ext. 232
Here is a downloaded link to the City of Albuquerque 95% plans detailing the Westside Blvd widening from Golf Course Rd to NM 528. Funding has been authorized with construction scheduled to start in spring 2021.

https://1drv.ms/b/s!Ah_cf8IHIL3ogkmvdAAIpPHseyTI

Regards,
Richard Stevenson, PE
Tierra West LLC
(505) 858 3100
Hello All,

Please find attached the following items relating to the traffic queries for this project:

- Trip Generation Worksheet based on the ITE Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition for Multifamily Housing (Mid-Rise) apartments
- Sub-Area Map as a basis of the trip distribution
- Trip Distribution Worksheet
- Trip Distribution Map
- Westside Blvd. widening project timing and financials which is in the current Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for FFY 2020 and 2021. According to MRCOG TIP Coordinator, this is a high priority project for the City of Albuquerque and City of Rio Rancho. This project will more than likely be completed over the next few years considering the amount of construction that is involved. Here is a link to MRCOG website where you can find the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (which includes project lists), as well as the TIP: https://www.mrcog-nm.gov/233/Metro-Planning.

Grading and Drainage
- Here is the downloadable link to the drainage plan
  https://1drv.ms/b/s!Ahcf8IHIL3ogkDpTWEqdmDvXfO

Kind Regards,

Richard Stevenson, P.E.

Tierra West LLC
5571 Midway Park Pl., NE
Albuquerque, NM 87109
505-858-3100 ext. 232

PRIVILEGED AND CONFIDENTIAL
The information contained in this electronic mail message is confidential, may be privileged, and is intended only for the use of the individual(s) named above or their designee. If you are not the intended recipient of this message, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. Any unauthorized interception of this message is illegal under the law. If you have received this message in error, please immediately notify me by return message or by telephone and delete the original message from your email system. Thank you.
Dear All:

Attached please find the Report for the meeting held Thursday evening, June 18th, regarding the proposed Wintergreen Apartments. Please review it carefully.

If there are errors of either Omission (something important said but left out) or Commission (something important misquoted), please let us know and we will issue correcting Amendments. You may send potential corrections to phcrumpsf@gmail.com.

Also, instructions for submitting additional comments to the DRB are included near the end of the report under Hearing Details.

Also, you may let the City know your impression of the meeting and the facilitator(s) by going to one of the following evaluations:


or


Thank you very much for your participation.

Philip Crump and Jocelyn Torres, Facilitators
Angela,

I would appreciate the following document being added to the record for Tierra West’s proposed Apartment Complex on Golf Course. Appreciate acknowledgement that has been done.

Thank you!
Marsha Kearney

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

We need some help understanding the appeal process for the Site Plan for OR-2020-004030, so would appreciate hearing back to this e-mail asap on the following questions:

1. **Has the Official Notice of Decision been released, and if so we need a copy to attach to the appeal.**

2. **When does the 15 day appeal period begin and end?**

3. **Do we need to resubmit documents that have already been provided for the record?**

4. I have seen different numbers attached to this project - **Is the OR-2020-004030 number the correct number?**

5. I note that the single PDF file must be e-mailed and is limited in size. In responding to this project I have already had to break up previous documents to meet that requirement and do not the capability to make a CD. During the time of the pandemic - how are we expected to provide the appeal information in the short timeframe available? This is a serious matter that we would appreciate attention to.

6. In the plat shared at the last hearing a round-about is shown at the north end of the gated community that appears to include part of the adjacent lot and has a road from the north coming into the round-about. Also, the water system proposed also involves work in that northern parcel. Should not that be included in the site plan? Would not that result in the area being beyond the maximum acreage allowed for the site plan? Also the round about shows the road from the north coming in and using the same access point for the gated community. There has not been a project submitted/approved for the north parcel, so how can the development occur? If the gated community extends beyond the two properties identified, does it not require the project to go through the EPC board?

Greatly appreciate your response to the above questions. With the pandemic continuing on our ability to be able to be involved in this and other projects has been extremely hindered.

Marsha Kearney
7 Bar North Resident

This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
Ms. Gomez,

I would like this added to the record for Tierra West’s Wintergreen Apartment Complex Proposal on Golf Course Road. Please notify me when that has occurred.

Thank you,
Marsha Kearney

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

3. Notification
4. Comp Plan
5. State Statutes

This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
Dear Ms Gomez and Ms. Gould,

Please add the attached document regarding virtual meetings and the Open Meetings Act to your records. Please confirm when you have received this email and attachment.

Sincerely,

Larry Sandoval

This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
Dear Ms. Chavez and Ms. Gould,

For the record. Here is a copy of a local (KRQE) news story that came out on August 4, 2020 regarding Albuquerque’s water use. Since the Water Utility Authority is mentioned several times in the article, it is important to note that this is an appropriate subject in light of the proposed development (Wintergreen Apartments) with plans to build four, 45-foot high, massive apartment complexes along Golf Course.

My thoughts quickly focused on developers who grab every plot of land less than 10 acres in size throughout the city, then watch as they propose the development of these behemoth apartment complexes at such a fast pace, with little regard for our precious water resources. We will have negative impacts to our neighborhoods and our communities if this growth is not controlled and/or planned. Are we keeping up with our water demands now? There will be a drain on our water resources if we continue to allow the development of high-density, highly populated complexes to dominate the landscape on the Westside and other areas throughout the city. Is this really Planned Development?

Sincerely,

Larry Sandoval


Water use in Albuquerque up by a billion gallons more than same time last year

LOCAL NEWS
by: Jami Seymore

Posted: Aug 4, 2020 / 05:11 AM MDT / Updated: Aug 4, 2020 / 06:55 AM MDT

ALBUQUERQUE, N.M. (KRQE) – With people staying home during the pandemic, Albuquerque’s Water Utility Authority says we’re using much more water. 2019 is a “success story” when it comes to water conservation in Albuquerque, reaching its lowest usage in 20 years. 2020 is another story.

“Last year was a great success story. We hit our per capita usage, the lowest in 20 years of conservation. The community of Albuquerque conserved almost a billion gallons,” said Carlos Bustos, who manages the
conservation program for the Albuquerque Water Utility Authority. “Things have changed, definitely, and this year, we’ve seen a surge in water usage. It’s partly because people are working from home but also because it’s been drier and hotter.”

Bustos says people are likely washing their hands and clothes more during the pandemic, and with a mostly hot and dry summer, they’re using their sprinklers more to keep their home lawns green and plush. Each drop used adds up.

“About 1.2 billion gallons more at this same time last year,” said Bustos. “That’s huge because we’ve still got five or six more months to go in this year.”

If that pattern continues, we’ll use more than double what we saved last year. Bustos says with not much added to the surface water we use like the Rio Grande, we’re tapping into our ground water that took millions of years to build up.

“Whenever we don’t have really good monsoon or snow, this year, specifically, we’re tapping into our ground water source,” said Bustos, who remains hopeful a good forecast will bring more surface water in. “Last week, we had pretty good rain events throughout the city and it’s looking like this weekend is about to be the same.”

The Water Authority hopes people will keep in mind how important it is to save as much water as they can. While they’re not asking you to shower less or not cook as much, it can be as simple as turning off your sprinklers and letting Mother Nature do her job.

“When it rains, let’s not irrigate,” said Bustos. “Let’s turn off our irrigation system.”

Bustos says just 20 days of not using sprinklers would get Albuquerque back on track for saving that precious water. The Water Authority says now is also a good time to start any home improvement projects like giving old toilets and sprinkler systems an ‘efficient’ facelift.

=======================================================
This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
For the August 5th, 2020 DRB hearing

Regarding the Wintergreen Apts.

Dear DRB Board members,

I am the Land Use Director for the Westside Coalition. I receive the notifications of west side projects. I have attended two online facilitated meetings regarding the Wintergreen apartment proposal.

Here are my Comments regarding the proposed Four Story Wintergreen Apartments:

1) Solar Access: The Westside has received a lot of applications for Apartments, recently. These applications are proposing 3 to 4 story apartments; mostly 4 stories. If we don't do this right, we end up with very incompatible apartments adjacent to single family residents, which is creating a lot of conflicts with the neighbors. The size of a building adjacent to single family homes does affect the quality of life for the existing residents in terms of privacy and solar access. In the case of the wintergreen Apts., solar access for the neighbors will especially be affected when the afternoon sun goes down.

2) Neighborhood scale and Character: One of the biggest concerns regarding the proposed Winter Green Apartments is the size of the four story building behind single family neighborhoods. Four stories is completely out of scale and character for the surrounding area. There are no other 4 story buildings along this stretch of Golf Course, heading into Rio Rancho, that are this tall. This site is completely surrounded by single family homes. Four stories will appear out of place, as if a mistake was made in the zoning. Would this be called spot zoning? I'm sure this was not the original intent for this site.

3) Prior C-2 zoning: The prior zone code listed this site as a C-2 zone, Community Commercial. Apartments were a conditional use, under the C-2 Zoning. At the time it had to consider 3 criteria: school capacity, jobs to housing balance, and meeting the usable open space requirement. The residents who purchased their homes, were expecting commercial type businesses similar in scale as the other businesses up the road from them. They did not expect a large apartment complex behind their homes. We do not want this project to set a bad precedent that undermines the scale and character of the surrounding area, upsetting the community.

4) IDO MXM zoning: The IDO is a new zoning ordinance. This site was changed to a MXM zone in the IDO. It now allows apartments permissively, buildings can go up to 45 ft. high. Does this mean that a 45 ft. high building is allowed at all locations? Shouldn't an application meet the goals policies of the ABC-Z Comp Plan which promotes development to blend with the scale and character of the surrounding area? Also note most of the apartments in the area, are near Activity Centers and have transit nearby. Ex: The apartments near the North west Area command are 2 to 3 story buildings, not 4 story. There is a lot of activity around that area, including the cottonwood shopping area, Cibola high school and a bus transit system. Note: The Wintergreen site is in an Area of Consistency, 2) it is not in an Activity Center, 3) It does not have transit service on Golf Course. All these things need to be considered when evaluating this proposal.
The ABC-Z Comp Plan goals and policies are to guide development to fit with the surrounding area:

5) ABC-Z Comp Plan: Pg. 5-23 5.1.2.5 CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE DEVELOPMENT AREAS: Directing growth to Areas of Change is intended to help preserve and protect established neighborhoods in Areas of Consistency. **Areas of Change and Consistency are designed to be complementary to protect the scale and character of distinctive neighborhoods while accommodating new residents and jobs in areas already well served by infrastructure and transit.**

**Areas of Consistency: Pg. 5-23 (City only)** Neighborhoods designated as Areas of Consistency will be protected by policies to limit densities, new uses, and negative impacts from nearby development. While these areas may see some infill development and new uses, **new development or redevelopment will need to be compatible in scale and character with the surrounding area.**

NOTE: The development proposal should fit with the above goals and policies of the ABC-Z Comp Plan. It needs to limit its size and height to avoid privacy issues, solar access issues, and blend with the surrounding area. I recommend further evaluation of this apartment complex to meet these goals and policies, by going down in height to two stories, to protect the neighbors privacy, solar access, and blend with the community.

I am including the State Statute (below): It emphasizes that the Zoning and the Comprehensive Plan, go together in meeting the goals and the vision of the community to obtain complementary and compatible developments adjacent to one another to preserve the quality of life for our citizens.

**2019 New Mexico Statutes**

Chapter 3 - Municipalities

Article 21 - Zoning Regulations

Section 3-21-5 - Zoning; conformance to comprehensive plan.

Universal Citation: NM Stat § 3-21-5 (2019)

A. The regulations and restrictions of the county or municipal zoning authority are to be in accordance with a comprehensive plan and be designed to:

1. lessen congestion in the streets and public ways;

2. secure safety from fire, flood waters, panic and other dangers;

3. promote health and the general welfare;

4. provide adequate light and air;
(5) prevent the overcrowding of land;

(6) avoid undue concentration of population;

(7) facilitate adequate provision for transportation, water, sewerage, schools, parks and other public requirements; and

(8) control and abate the unsightly use of buildings or land.

B. The zoning authority in adopting regulations and restrictions shall give reasonable consideration, among other things, to the character of the district and its peculiar suitability for particular uses, and to conserving the value of buildings and land and encouraging the most appropriate use of land throughout its jurisdiction.


ANNOTATIONS

Comprehensive planning. — A comprehensive plan need not be contained in one document. It may be comprised of several or no documents. It may be found within the ordinance itself where the zoning authority has not enacted a prior comprehensive plan and that absence of a formally adopted comprehensive plan does substantially weaken the presumption of regularity of any zoning ordinance enacted without it. Watson v. Town Council of Town of Bernalillo, 1991-NMCA-009, 111 N.M. 374, 805 P.2d 641.

Comprehensive plan may be found within zoning ordinance itself where the zoning authority has not enacted a prior comprehensive plan. Board of Cnty. Comm'r's v. City of Las Vegas, 1980-NMSC-137, 95 N.M. 387, 622 P.2d 695.

Major reason for requiring comprehensive plan is to ensure that there will not be loose determinations of land utilization of comparatively small sections of the community. Board of Cnty. Comm'r's v. City of Las Vegas, 1980-NMSC-137, 95 N.M. 387, 622 P.2d 695.

Advisory nature of master plan. — The phrase "in accordance with", in Subsection A, requires land use planning regulations to be guided by, and consistent with, a master plan, but it does not mean that the legislature intended city master plans to be strictly adhered to in the same manner as a statute, ordinance, or agency regulation. West Bluff Neighborhood Ass'n v. City of Albuquerque, 2002-NMCA-075, 132 N.M. 433, 50 P.3d 182, overruled by Rio Grande Chapter of Sierra Club v. N.M. Mining Comm'n, 2003-NMSC-005, 133 N.M. 97, 61 P.3d 806.


Ordinance invalid absent evidence of plan. — Where there was no evidence before the trial court demonstrating that a county land fill ordinance included a comprehensive plan, but, to the contrary, both the express statements in the ordinance and the evidence before the trial court show that the disputed ordinance was not enacted in accordance with such a plan, the ordinance was struck down as invalid. Board of County Comm'r's v. City of Las Vegas, 1980-NMSC-137, 95 N.M. 387, 622 P.2d 695.

Comprehensive planning. — A county zoning ordinance was valid where the county had a comprehensive plan in substance if not form at the time the ordinance was enacted. Bogan v. Sandoval Cnty. Planning and Zoning Comm'n, 1994-NMCA-157, 119 N.M. 334, 890 P.2d 395, cert. denied, 119 N.M. 168, 889 P.2d 203.

Presumption of validity. — A zoning ordinance is attached with a presumption of validity. The burden is on a sign owner to overcome this presumption by proving that an ordinance is not reasonably related to its stated purpose. Temple Baptist Church, Inc. v. City of Albuquerque, 1982-NMSC-055, 98 N.M. 138, 646 P.2d 565.

Presumption of correctness regarding initial zoning. — There is a presumption that the initial determination of the type of zoning for a given property is the correct one. Miller v. City of Albuquerque, 1976-NMSC-052, 89 N.M. 503, 554 P.2d 665.

There is a substantial distinction between amendments to a zoning ordinance as contrasted to ordinances enacting comprehensive zoning; the fundamental justification for an amendatory or repealing zoning ordinance is a change of conditions making the amendment or repeal reasonably necessary to protect the public interest, with another function being the covering and perfecting of previous defective ordinances or correcting mistakes or injustices therein. Miller v. City of Albuquerque, 1976-NMSC-052, 89 N.M. 503, 554 P.2d 665.

Ordinance establishing exceptions. — A county ordinance which among other things establishes certain limited special exceptions is an integral part of the plan required under this section, and the main objectives of requiring that a special permit be obtained before a use of land is commenced are to protect adjoining property and to insure the orderly and efficient development of the community. Burroughs v. Board of Cnty. Comm'r's, 1975-NMSC-051, 88 N.M. 303, 540 P.2d 233.
**Aesthetics justify exercise of police power.** — Aesthetic considerations alone justify the exercise of the police power. Ordinances must still, however, be construed for their reasonableness in relation to aesthetic purposes. Moreover, if the ordinance in question impinges on a fundamental right, then the ordinance must "directly advance" the interests of aesthetics. *Temple Baptist Church, Inc. v. City of Albuquerque*, 1982-NMSC-055, 98 N.M. 138, 646 P.2d 565.

**Sign ordinance held reasonably related to proper governmental goals.** — A sign ordinance regulating the size, height and number of signs is reasonably related to the proper governmental goals of aesthetics and traffic safety. *Temple Baptist Church, Inc. v. City of Albuquerque*, 1982-NMSC-055, 98 N.M. 138, 646 P.2d 565 (1982).

**Purpose of a municipal historical zoning ordinance was within the term "general welfare," as used in municipal zoning enabling legislation.** *City of Santa Fe v. Gamble-Skogmo, Inc.*, 1964-NMSC-016, 73 N.M. 410, 389 P.2d 13.

**Judicial review.** — The district court may not substitute its judgment for that of the board of commissioners, but when it was made to appear by the affidavits and other matters in the record that the board may have improperly failed to consider the matters which it was required to consider in making the zoning change, then a question of fact was presented on the issue of the arbitrariness of the board in granting the special use permit, and it was improper for the court to grant summary judgment and thereby resolve this issue as a matter of law. *Cinelli v. Whitfield Transp., Inc.*, 1971-NMSC-103, 83 N.M. 205, 490 P.2d 463.

**Law reviews.** — For note, "County Regulation of Land Use and Development," see 9 Nat. Resources J. 266 (1969).


See photo on next page:

A friend sent me a picture of this Westside neighborhood below. These recently built apartments now block homeowners view at the edge of the City to the West. He said homeowners don’t even want to use their backyards anymore due to the feeling of being watched from the looming apartments.

We don’t want to see this type development to happen again.

Thank you.

Rene' Horvath

WSCONA Land use Director
For the September 30th, 2020 DRB hearing

Regarding the Wintergreen Apts.

Dear DRB Board members,

I would like to add additional comments regarding the Wintergreen Apartments proposal.

In my previous letter dated August 5th, I expressed that the 4 story Wintergreen Apartments are out of place for the surrounding neighborhood and thereby does not meet many of the ABC-Z comp Plan policies; as the apartments are out scale and character.

It should be noted that the primary purpose of zoning: is to segregate uses that are thought to be incompatible. In practice, zoning is used to prevent new development from interfering with existing uses and/or to preserve the character of a community, Zoning laws - Wikipedia.

In summary:

1. The site was zoned C2. The IDO converted it to MXM. Apartments were a condition use in the C zone. Now apartments are permissive in the newly adopted IDO. This feels more like a zone change

2. A MXM zone, allows building height to go up to 45 ft. high. Four stories that will tower over the nearby residents, as shown in the August 5th letter/photo. This size will affect neighbors privacy, loss of views and solar access......

   Would like to request a sunshade analysis for this site, since the building height would shade the adjacent residents, as the sun goes down in the afternoon.

3. The IDO is a new ordinance that replaced the prior zone code. The zone code - C2 Conditional use had 3 criteria for approval which were eliminated in the IDO/MXM zone. The 3 criteria were, jobs to housing balance, school capacity and meeting the usable open space requirement.

4. The adjacent neighbors were not notified of the IDO zone changes, that will now impact them.

5. APS estimates the proposed apartments will generate 53 elementary students which is over the 17 remaining elementary school space for Seven Bar elementary. The west side overall has a high rate of overcrowded schools, "How will APS overcrowding be addressed when it becomes a problem?"

6. Most of the site plans are now going to DRB who said they cannot address the ABC-Z Comp Plan policies, only the EPC has discretionary authority to address policy. Please note Wintergreen site is in an Area of consistency, there is no transit service for this area, traffic is an issue for the west side with limited river crossings, school capacity is an issue. City Council removed the adverse criteria from DRB review. How will adverse impacts now be addressed?

7. When does the ABC-Z Comp Plan policies address protections for the neighborhoods? These are the issues that need to be addressed.

Thank you,
Rene' Horvath
WSCONA Land Use Director
DOCUMENT SUBMITTAL
TO CITY PLANNING DEPARTMENT
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD CHAIR
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Notifications and Meetings

April 7, 2020 - 7 Bar North HOA Exec. Board had the first meeting with Tierra West to talk about the planned apartment complex development project.

Why did Tierra West, Seven Bar North HOA Board members participated at this very critical meeting and not the homeowners that live on Carreta Dr., since they are directly affected by this planned apartment complex development project?

April 14, 2020 – Seven Bar North HOA notifies Carreta Dr. homeowners for the first time regarding an upcoming April 17, through video/audio teleconference.

Why did the HOA wait a week to contact the homeowners on Carreta Drive?

April 17, 2020 – The first video/tele-conference is conducted with a small group of Carreta Dr. homeowners.

Why after 10-days in a video/teleconference, it is the first time Carreta Dr. homeowners have a chance to dialogue with Tierra West and HOA Board members. Yet, another video/teleconference meeting format is scheduled? Only a small number were in attendance and the format did not allow for effective dialogue from all participants.

May 1, 2020 - Carreta Dr. homeowners invite Seven Bar North HOA Board members to a very informal neighborhood Friday night gathering to get an update and start dialogue. Mike Mirabal and Larry Sandoval initiated this informal gathering. HOA President, Scott Templeton only attended. We were told at the gathering that the HOA really could not be involved and homeowners would need to send their concerns to Richard, Stevenson, P.E., Tierra West.

May 6, 2020 – HOA President, Scott Templeton advised Carreta Dr. homeowners by an email to send their concerns directly to Richard Stevenson at Tierra West.

May 21, 2020 - A subsequent video/tele-conference meeting was conducted. It was not well organized and the format was not effective, therefore not adequately addressing the homeowners concerns.

June 18, 2020 – The first face-to-face public meeting is conducted with Tierra West, HOA members and Carreta Dr. homeowners and other concerned homeowners.
The Seven Bar North HOA actually paid for half of the charge of the meeting room. Since when is the public that has to be contacted concerning a project made to pay for half of a meeting room? This is not an appropriate charge. When asked about doing a traffic study the question was asked by Tierra West if we had the $12,000 to pay for the study. Totally inappropriate response from the project planner. I have been in a large number of planning meetings in my career and never have I seen the involved public charged to attend a meeting or the response concerning the traffic impact study. Once again, the process greatly limits the community involvement, but the developer is expecting the public to pay a price to be involved.

**July 22, 2020** - The City of Albuquerque’s Development Review Board (DRB) reviews the planned apartment complex development project.

Once again there is a great concern with the pandemic and ineffectiveness of Zoom and virtual meetings. We feel there needs to be a face to face meeting, in line with the open meetings act and request that the DRB be rescheduled.

Other concerns with Tierra West:

* Tierra West sent out the limited number of notifications on June 26th. At least two letters were sent as first-class mail and the rest not certified. How can they ensure the people to be notified actually received the notification?

* On the Golf Course and Westside Blvd Public Notice Inquiry sent by Dalaina Carmona on 6/24 to Kristi Walker for the Seven Bar North HOA, Jack Corder is listed. Scott Templeton is the President of Seven Bar North HOA. That is totally inappropriate! He does NOT represent the HOA, but is hired to manage the funds and implementation of the covenants. In NO way should he be a contact. He owns a Real Estate company and any role he plays in this process would be a conflict of interest.
Buffer Area Adjacent to Homeowner’s Property and Planned Development

There are several promises made at this meeting that were never followed up, they include the following:

We held a facilitated meeting with the developer representatives on the 18th June.
My understanding from the process is that the purpose of this meeting was to mediate concerns and impacts to our existing neighborhood. We were promised by their representative Richard Stevenson of Tierra West, that after the facilitated meeting we would be provided an additional opportunity (meeting) to respond to our concerns prior to the DRB hearing. This never happened.

As of today, there has been no attempt to provide that information to the neighborhood.
This process has been very inadequate and unfair to the residents of our community.
We are opposed to this development for several reasons, and feel they should be addressed prior to any decisions being made. We would like some accommodations, if approved, in the buffer area, and feel they are reasonable for such an infringement.

1. **The Buffer area**: We have asked that the buffer area be a true buffer area.

   ✓ We have requested sound barriers, Line of sight barriers, fencing barriers, landscape barriers, lighting barriers.

   ✓ We requested a sound and visibility wall at least 8 feet along the East end of the property boundary.

   ✓ We have requested that the recreational walking trail adjacent our properties be removed.

   ✓ We want to discourage foot traffic along our property line.

   ✓ We have requested Large River walk as opposed to Grass to discourage foot traffic.
We also would like the landscape plan to include more mature trees, to protect immediate privacy. The current plan has at least 10-year maturity.

We would like plants that do not affect allergies. Juniper plants are a major contributor to allergies.

We want Trash Bins moved away from the East side of the development, away from homeowners' properties.

Lighting must be directed away from private properties.

We discourage Grass on the East side buffer, being that the noise generated by maintenance and mowing would impose on the neighborhood.

Water runoff and drainage has not been addressed adequately to the neighborhood concerns.

2. We are an established neighborhood of over twenty years and feel our concerns are valid and should be fairly accommodated. This IDO process is very Developer oriented and removes any opportunity for our neighborhood to protect its established quality of life. The change in Zoning does not reflect the prior site plan that was established in the past. This plot was subdivided up into 9 smaller units in the negotiated previous site plan, and was intended for smaller business units. We were never notified of a zoning change, although we live within 100 feet of this property. While the excuse we continue to hear is that it was well published in the past, that the city had the right to arbitrarily change the code. We were under the belief under the previous code that if there were any changes, since we lived within 100 feet, there would be required notification. The city failed to notify the property owners.

We also feel that this process bypasses all the governmental agencies and committees put in place to protect our communities. The Developer bypasses EPC, which looks at all the relevant issues, Schools, Traffic, Environmental studies, Wildlife, Intergovernmental, etc. This MX-M zoning by description was intended for City centers and Apartment corridors. Neither of these fit this location.

We respectfully ask that you reject this proposal; based on the negative affects it has on our neighborhood and the surrounding communities. This will destroy our quality of life and integrity of one of Albuquerque's great neighborhoods. "Because it can be built, does not mean it should be built." There are other things that have value to the community that we negotiated in the past.
DRB Zoom Instructions

Please Note:

1. **You do not need a Zoom account to use Zoom, as long as you're just looking to join meetings.**
2. **You can use your computer to participate in a Zoom meeting with videoconference.**
3. **You can use your phone to participate in a Zoom meeting as an audio conference.**
4. **You can create a Zoom account to make your own meetings, record videos, keep track of your contacts, and more.**

**Join a Meeting**

1. **Option 1:** Join using the provided URL (link).
   a. Open the email, newsletter, calendar invite, or other communication that contains a link to the prescheduled meeting and click the URL to join the Zoom Meeting.
   b. Click on "download here" if a download doesn't start automatically.
      i. If you're prompted, click Launch Application in the pop-up window. This will automatically prompt you to download the Zoom launcher to your computer. This will cause the "zoomuslauncher.zip" file to automatically download onto your computer.
c. Double click the downloaded file to install Zoom. This will open the contents of the "zoomuslauncher.zip" file.
   i. Click Continue, if prompted, to install Zoom

d. Reopen your email and click on the meeting link again. This should automatically connect you to the meeting.

2. **Option 2**: Join using Meeting ID.
   a. Open the Zoom desktop app.
   b. Click on the Home Button.
   c. Click Join and type in the provided Meeting ID and your name.
3. **Option 3**: Join using your phone
   a. On your phone, dial the teleconferencing number provided in your invite. Any of the phone numbers provided should work.
   b. Enter the meeting ID number when prompted using your dial pad.

   - The following commands can be entered using your phone's dial pad while in a Zoom meeting:
     - *6 - Toggle mute/unmute
     - *9 - Raise hand
4. Once you’re in the meeting, you may choose to connect audio in two different ways:
   - Sign into computer audio (recommended).

   - Dialing into a conference bridge from your phone. You can call any of the numbers provided. Follow the prompts on the phone call.

   - The following commands can be entered using your phone's dial pad while in a Zoom meeting:
     * 6 - Toggle mute/unmute
     * 9 - Raise hand
DRB Zoom Instructions

**Signing Up for a Zoom Account**

1. Start by going to [zoom.us](http://zoom.us)

2. Click on the “Sign Up for Free” button

3. Enter your email address and click on “Sign Up”
4. Go to your email and click the confirmation link that was emailed to you. Click on “Activate Your Account”

5. Enter your first and last name and create a password
6. If you’d like to invite other administrators or staff members to sign up for their own Zoom accounts, you can enter their email addresses & select the “I am not a robot” checkbox. Otherwise, select “Skip this step”

7. You are now ready to join a meeting
Commonly Used Controls in Zoom on the Computer

- Video ON/OFF: Once in a meeting, you can turn your video on by clicking the “Start Video” icon on the bottom left of your screen. To turn it off, click the “Stop Video” icon.

- Muting: To ensure minimal background noise during your Zoom meeting, it is recommended that you mute everyone on the call when they’re not talking. To do this, click on the Participants icon at the bottom.

Chat in a meeting

i. Meeting participants can ask questions during a Zoom Meeting via the meeting chat. Start by clicking the “Chat” icon on the bottom right of your screen.

ii. Once the chat panel will open up on the right, you can view and respond to all public chats.

iii. Use the three dots to choose whether you want to send messages to all meeting attendees or the host privately.
• **Sharing Screen**
  i. Click the “Share Screen” icon at the bottom of your screen to share your desktop.
  ii. If you’d like to share specific windows or applications, you can choose to do so from the dialog box.

• **How to raise your hand in Zoom**
  i. During a meeting, click on the icon labeled "Participants" at the bottom center of your computer screen.
  ii. At the bottom of the window on the right side of the screen, click the button labeled "Raise Hand."
  iii. Your digital hand is now raised. Lower it by clicking the same button, now labeled "Lower Hand."

**Commonly Used Controls in Zoom on the Phone**

• The following commands can be entered using your phone's dial pad while in a Zoom meeting:
  *6  - Toggle mute/unmute
  *9  - Raise hand
Hello Ms. Kearney,

We received your e-mail originally sent to Amy Rincon with the City of Rio Rancho. I am sharing a response regarding the issues of remote meeting during this public health emergency. The Development Review Board received your recent email. You expressed concern about the DRB holding meetings to review development applications in a remote setting. We wish to inform you that the City’s ‘Seventh Declaration of Local Emergency Due to Novel Coronavirus COVID-19’ signed July 13, 2020 includes the following statement which authorizes the DRB to conduct a virtual meeting via teleconference or videoconference:

9. Pursuant to the need for responsive and well-informed government continuity during the current emergency, all public boards, commissions, and committees subject to the Public Boards and Commissions Ordinance, § 3-6-1-1 et seq., are hereby authorized to conduct virtual meetings via teleconference or videoconference for the duration of this Order, and

The DRB will make every effort to help the public wanting to participate in a DRB meeting to do so successfully. You have both an opportunity to speak or to ask questions of the applicant (cross examination). Please refer to the attachment for instructions in using the Zoom platform which is the videoconference software currently in use by the DRB.

This is the link to the agenda:
https://www.cabq.gov/planning/boards-commissions/development-review-board/development-review-board-agenda-archives

By clicking on the ‘blue’ project number you can view the application that was submitted.

This is the Zoom meeting information that is included on the agenda:

Join Zoom Meeting https://cabq.zoom.us/j/94350930077
Meeting ID: 943 5093 0077
By phone 1-312-626-6799 or Find your local number: https://cabq.zoom.us/u/aqJL1OTkb

Attached are instructions DRB staff created to help the public know how to use Zoom.

Regarding your concerns about the development process, we will review this case thoroughly and the applicant will be required to meet all of the applicable zoning and technical requirements. If you have questions about the requirements in the IDO or the Development Process Manual, I would be happy to try to answer them.

I can share our staff comments with you on Tuesday afternoon when we send them to the applicant. These are the items that the applicant will need to address prior to the DRB making a decision on the project. It is unlikely that the DRB will make a decision at the July 22 meeting.

If you need clarification about the meeting process through Zoom I can also try to walk you through that. We do want everyone to be able to participate in the process.

573
Please let me know if you have additional questions.

MAGGIE GOULD
planning manager
land development coordination
o 505-924-3880
c 505-553-0682
e mgould@cabq.gov
cabq.gov/planning
Maggie,
I do not know if Ms. Kearney has received an email response regarding the DRB holding a virtual meeting. If she has not received one, please send to her.
Angela, Please make sure this email is included in the record for PR 4030.

From: Marsha Kearney <rmeek1978@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 4:00 PM
To: Morris, Petra <pmorris@cabq.gov>; Wolfley, Jolene <jwolfley@cabq.gov>
Subject: Fwd: Hearing for Tierra West proposed 208 unit apt. Complex on Golf Course

I understand that the Tierra West project is the second item on the agenda and comments below are added to the record for the project. I have not been able to view the agenda for the meeting the ABQ website keeps timing out when I try to go to the agenda. I have been told that the first topic on the agenda is to allow the virtual meeting. I want to make sure that this input is also included in the record for that part of the meeting. I would appreciate notification that it is included.

Sincerely,
Marsha Kearney

Begin forwarded message:

From: Marsha Kearney <rmeek1978@gmail.com>
Date: July 11, 2020 at 12:25:59 PM MDT
To: mross@cabq.gov, Jolene Wolfley <jwolfley@cabq.gov>, Petra Morris <pmorris@cabq.gov>, mike mirabal <mdmiraba@msn.com>, Larry Sandoval <larrysandoval75@gmail.com>
Subject: Hearing for Tierra West proposed 208 unit apt. Complex on Golf Course

I am sending this to several of the staff, as the urgency of the matter gets greater every day that goes by. The public hearing is set for July 22nd, less then four weeks of when we, the residents whose home is within 100 feet of this proposed project were made aware that the site plan had been submitted. It is not possible, to do a proper review of the project and inform the community during the pandemic. Amongst the small group of residents contacted there are people who work long hours as healthcare and wildfire management employees. This project has major issues, not only to those contacted, but to those who live in the community (both Rio Rancho and Albuquerque).

The residents contacted about this project were unaware of the rezoning of the vacant land behind our homes, nor of the IPO process, which greatly limits community involvement and the addressing of environmental/social issues. This has resulted in issues that are critical to the community not being addressed, including buildings twice the height of any building in the community, balconies overlooking private residences, traffic and school issues, erosion control concerns, significant reduction in values of
homes, etc. I have sent numerous e-mails to both the governor and mayor requesting a moratorium on development planning during the pandemic to no avail.

June 24, 2020 Jessica Dyer had an article in the Albuquerque Journal titled, “More scrutiny urged for changes in Albuquerque’s development rules.” In that article Dan Regan from the District 4 Coalition in the Northeast Heights said “The technical changes and Packet A have undergone much more public vetting while Part B came as a surprise. He contends some Packet B changes would “gut residential rights” and said councilors should not vote without significantly more discussion.” He is also quoted the following, “They want it passed in the dark; they don’t want examination of the real impacts.”

The same could be said about the 208 unit apartment complex proposed on Golf Course. In addition, the community has only one chance to get involved with the planning process. That is when the Developer submits the Site Plan for approval.

I have two questions I would like answered:
1. What is the official process/contact to request a moratorium on this project and others as the pandemic worsens?
2. How does one get involved with the Packet B review and the first annual update to the IDO process?

Please include this in with the comments you are collecting for this project. Most importantly, please provide a speedy response to the questions asked. As the pandemic worsens and regulations to protect everyone, especially our “at risk” individuals like myself, the urgency to delay the process becomes more and more urgent.

Sincerely,
Marsha Kearney

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

Your email will be forwarded to all members of the DRB and included in the Record.

Ms. Gould will provided you an email with information regarding DRB meeting during the public health emergency.

Thank you for your comments.

-----Original Message-----
From: Larry Sandoval <larrysandoval75@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, July 18, 2020 6:36 PM
To: Wolfley, Jolene <jwolfley@cabq.gov>
Cc: Larry Sandoval <larrysandoval75@gmail.com>
Subject: Information File -Part II

Ms. Wolfley,

Attached is Part II of the information file. Again, please confirm that you received Part I and Part II.

Respectfully,

Larry Sandoval
This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
Mr. Sandoval,

This message will be forwarded to all DRB members and included in the Record for PR 4030.

-----Original Message-----
From: Larry Sandoval <larrysandoval75@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, July 18, 2020 6:31 PM
To: Wolfley, Jolene <jwolfley@cabq.gov>
Cc: Larry Sandoval <larrysandoval75@gmail.com>
Subject: Information File

Good afternoon Ms. Wolfley,

This information package was e-mailed out yesterday. I want to be sure that you have received this information. I am sending it again in two e-mails due to the size of the file. You will receive Part I, then Part II in a second e-mail. Please let me know when you receive this information.

Thank you,

Larry Sandoval
This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
This email should be in the record for PR 2020-4030.

From: Rodenbeck, Jay B.
Sent: Friday, August 21, 2020 4:26 PM
To: Wolfley, Jolene <jwolfley@cabq.gov>; Gould, Maggie S. <MGould@cabq.gov>
Subject: FW: PR-2020-004030

Hi Richard,

Staff was wondering for the apartments at Golf Course and Black Arroyo (PR-2020-004030) if you have received Water Board approval yet? Also, staff has some ideas regarding the natural shrubbery against the residential wall of the 7Bar neighborhood to the east, and some pictures are attached of the shrubbery.

Planning staff feels that a break in the shrubs is about 5-8 feet from the residential wall and is somewhat continuous. Staff feels that this would be a perfect place to put the wall, allowing it to meander.

Again, please let us know about the Water Board approval status.

Thanks,

Jay Rodenbeck
Planner
o 505.924.3994
e jrodenbeck@cabq.gov
cabq.gov/planning
Richard and Ron,

We received this inquiry from a neighbor regarding the notice for this case (see below).

Can you please address all of the public notice requirements and 100 foot notice buffer and verify that proper notice was mailed to all property owners within the 100 foot buffer?

Thank you,

MAGGIE GOULD
planning manager
land development coordination
o 505-924-3880
c 505-553-0682
e mgould@cabq.gov
cabq.gov/planning

Dear Ms. Wolfley,

Please see documents related to the Notification Process, also note Tierra West’s notification to property owners who live 100-feet from the proposed development buffer and those partially along the development buffer. Documents #4 and #5 indicate homeowners, Larry Sandoval and Kristen Morgan live on Carreta Dr. are located within the 100-feet proposed development buffer were not officially notified by letter per IDO requirements. There are other consistencies as to why some were notified and others were not. The Sign Posting Agreement notification was also in violation and finally corrected two days before the July 22nd DRB hearing. Therefore, the application by Tierra West does not meet full compliance. Ms. Wolfley, please confirm when you receive these documents.

Contents:

1. City of Albuquerque’s Public Notification Process per the IDO
2. Tierra West’s Area Map of Notification to property owners (as submitted to DRB on July 22, 2020)
3. Tierra West's List of property owners (as submitted to the DRB on July 22, 2020)
4. Our Map of property owners Notified and Not Notified
5. Our List of property owners Notified and Not Notified
6. Sign Posting Agreement non-compliance

Sincerely,

Larry Sandoval

=======================================================
This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
Mr. Sandoval,
This is to confirm that you email is included in the record.

It will also be forwarded to the applicant.

From: Larry Sandoval <larrysandoval75@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, July 19, 2020 5:34 PM
To: Wolfley, Jolene <jwolfley@cabq.gov>
Cc: mike mirabal <mdmiraba@msn.com>; Marsha Kearney <rmeek1978@gmail.com>; Larry Sandoval <larrysandoval75@gmail.com>
Subject: Sign Post Agreement - Part II (re-send email)
Mr. Sandoval,
We have received these emails and they will be included in the record.

-----Original Message-----
From: Larry Sandoval <larrysandoval75@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, July 19, 2020 4:57 PM
To: Wolfley, Jolene <jwolfley@cabq.gov>
Cc: mike mirabal <mdmiraba@msn.com>; Marsha Kearney
    <rmeek1978@gmail.com>; Larry Sandoval <larrysandoval75@gmail.com>
Subject: Sign Posting Agreement - Part I

Good afternoon Ms. Wolfley,

The original file was too large to email. So I’ll be sending this to you in parts. Part I, II and III. Please let me know if you receive these documents. Thank you.

Respectfully,

Larry Sandoval
This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
Mr. Sandoval,
This email confirms that your email will be included in the record for PR 4030. It has also been sent to the applicant.
Ms. Kearney,

Good morning. I am following up with you on your October 9th email. Your question #6 is part of the appeal that you have recently filed. Staff will respond to that question in the Planning Memo that is written to the City Council to accompany your appeal.

I include Richard Stevenson of Tierra West on this correspondence so that all parties in the case have access to the same information.

Thank you,

JOLENE WOLFLEY
associate director
o 505.924.3891
e jwolfley@cabq.gov
cabq.gov/planning

From: Wolfley, Jolene
Sent: Friday, October 9, 2020 3:44 PM
To: 'Marsha Kearney' <rmeek1978@gmail.com>; Rodenbeck, Jay B. <jrodenbeck@cabq.gov>; Gomez, Angela J. <agomez@cabq.gov>
Cc: mike mirabal <mdmiraba@msn.com>; Larry Sandoval <larrysandoval75@gmail.com>
Subject: RE: Site Plan for PR-2020-004030 Wintergreen Apartments

Ms. Kearney,

Good afternoon. Here are some answers to the questions you raised.

1. The Notice of Decision is available on the DRB website under the date of the DRB meeting. Here is the link from the DRB website.
2. The Notice of Decision identifies the date that an appeal must be filed. The date is October 15, 2020 at 5 pm. This date is 15 calendar days following the DRB meeting.

3. Documents that have already been submitted regarding the case are compiled into the ‘Record’ for the case. That ‘Record’ will be provided to the Land Use Hearing Officer.

4. The case is assigned the Project Number PR-2020-004030. You use this number to identify the DRB decision you would be appealing. The specific Site Plan application is SI 2020-00549. You can include this number.

5. The appeal form should be sent in according to the instructions online. Any information you wish to add to supplement the appeal should be sent in via email. That can be done in more than one email if file sizes are exceeded. Please contact Vanessa Segura vsegura@cabq.gov 505-924-3895 for any assistance in the logistics of filing an appeal. Please note that there is a fee for filing an appeal.

6. I will check into the matters you raised in #6 and get back to you early next week.

Thanks,

JOLENE WOLFLEY
associate director
o 505.924.3891
e jwolfley@cabq.gov
cabq.gov/planning

From: Marsha Kearney <rmeek1978@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, October 9, 2020 2:27 PM
To: Rodenbeck, Jay B. <jrodenbeck@cabq.gov>; Wolfley, Jolene <jwolfley@cabq.gov>; Gomez, Angela J. <agomez@cabq.gov>
Cc: mike mirabal <mdmiraba@msn.com>; Larry Sandoval <larrysandoval75@gmail.com>
Subject: Site Plan for PR-2020-004030 Wintergreen Apartments

Jay,

We need some help understanding the appeal process for the Site Plan for OR-2020-004030, so would appreciate hearing back to this e-mail asap on the following questions:

1. Has the Official Notice of Decision been released, and if so we need a copy to attach to the appeal.

2. When does the 15 day appeal period begin and end?
3. Do we need to resubmit documents that have already been provided for the record?

4. I have seen different numbers attached to this project - Is the OR-2020-004030 number the correct number?

5. I note that the single PDF file must be e-mailed and is limited in size. In responding to this project I have already had to break up previous documents to meet that requirement and do not the capability to make a CD. During the time of the pandemic - how are we expected to provide the appeal information in the short timeframe available? This is a serious matter that we would appreciate attention to.

6. In the plat shared at the last hearing a round-about is shown at the north end of the gated community that appears to include part of the adjacent lot and has a road from the north coming into the round-about. Also, the water system proposed also involves work in that northern parcel. Should not that be included in the site plan? Would not that result in the area being beyond the maximum acreage allowed for the site plan? Also the round about shows the road from the north coming in and using the same access point for the gated community. There has not been a project submitted/approved for the north parcel, so how can the development occur? If the gated community extends beyond the two properties identified, does it not require the project to go through the EPC board?

Greatly appreciate your response to the above questions. With the pandemic continuing on our ability to be able to be involved in this and other projects has been extremely hindered.

Marsha Kearney
7 Bar North Resident

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

We will not require any additional notice, but you can provide additional notice if you would like.

Maggie Gould
planning manager
land development coordination
o 505-924-3880
c 505-553-0682
e mgould@cabq.gov
cabq.gov/planning

Maggie,

We would like to proceed with DRB tomorrow to discuss comments.

In regards to notice, are we (as the applicant) required to provide any additional notice/s?

Thanks.

Regards,
Hello,

We spoke to our legal staff and they feel that you sent notice using the information that was supplied to you and so notice was correct.

We can hear this case tomorrow or we can defer to allow time to provide notice to Mr. Sandoval to avoid any future issues.

Please let us know how you wish to proceed.

Thank you,

MAGGIE GOULD
planning manager
land development coordination
o 505-924-3880
c 505-553-0682
e mgould@cabq.gov
cabq.gov/planning

Maggie,

Attached is the scanned document we made prior to mailing out the 100-ft buffer notices as proof the notices were sent to the homeowners on the ONC list of addresses.

I also marked up the map provided by the neighbors, see attached.

All IDO notice requirements were met and we followed the ONC list of addresses to mail out letters. I do note that 10943 Carreta Dr home owner was not on the provided list but has been involved with all public meetings and we have
correspondence dating back to May in regards to the proposed development. There is no doubt that the homeowner is aware of the proposed development.

The yellow sign was posted per the sign posting agreement. We were made aware on Monday July 20 from DRB Chair that the yellow sign was leaning over at a 45 degree angle. We correct this immediately that same day, and re-erected the sign (see attached photo of the sign re-erected on July 20). Please note the neighbor who reported the ‘sign leaning’ did not include the applicant with their first and second notice that was sent to the City on Saturday and Sunday the 18th and 19th July respectively. I kindly informed the neighbor if they had provided the applicant the courtesy notice, it would have been re-erected on the 18th for the benefit of the public! Email correspondence attached.

Regards,
Richard Stevenson, PE
Tierra West LLC
(505) 858 3100

From: Gould, Maggie S. [mailto:MGould@cabq.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, August 4, 2020 11:16 AM
To: Richard Stevenson
Cc: Gomez, Angela J.; Wolfley, Jolene
Subject: FW: Public Notification Process PR 2020-4030

Richard and Ron,
We received this inquiry from a neighbor regarding the notice for this case (see below).
Can you please address all of the public notice requirements and 100 foot notice buffer and verify that proper notice was mailed to all property owners within the 100 foot buffer?

Thank you,

MAGGIE GOULD
planning manager
land development coordination
o 505-924-3880
c 505-553-0682
e mgould@cabq.gov
cabq.gov/planning

Dear Ms. Wolfley,

Please see documents related to the Notification Process, also note Tierra West’s notification to property owners who live 100-feet from the proposed development buffer and those partially along the development buffer. Documents #4 and #5 indicate homeowners, Larry Sandoval and Kristen Morgan live on Carreta Dr. are located within the 100-feet proposed development buffer were not officially notified by letter per IDO requirements. There are other consistencies
as to why some were notified and others were not. The Sign Posting Agreement notification was also in violation and finally corrected two days before the July 22nd DRB hearing. Therefore, the application by Tierra West does not meet full compliance. Ms Wolfley, please confirm when you receive these documents.

Contents:

1. City of Albuquerque’s Public Notification Process per the IDO
2. Tierra West’s Area Map of Notification to property owners (as submitted to DRB on July 22, 2020)
3. Tierra West’s List of property owners (as submitted to the DRB on July 22, 2020)
4. Our Map of property owners Notified and Not Notified
5. Our List of property owners Notified and Not Notified
6. Sign Posting Agreement non-compliance

Sincerely,

Larry Sandoval

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

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

==================================================================
This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
Dear Erin Coffman,

The Development Review Board received your recent email. You expressed concern about the DRB holding meetings to review development applications in a remote setting. We wish to inform you that the City’s ‘Seventh Declaration of Local Emergency Due to Novel Coronavirus COVID-19’ signed July 13, 2020 includes the following statement which authorizes the DRB to conduct a virtual meeting via teleconference or videoconference:

9. Pursuant to the need for responsive and well-informed government continuity during the current emergency, all public boards, commissions, and committees subject to the Public Boards and Commissions Ordinance, § 2-6-1-1 et seq., are hereby authorized to conduct virtual meetings via teleconference or videoconference for the duration of this Order; and

The DRB will make every effort to help the public wanting to participate in a DRB meeting to do so successfully. You have both an opportunity to speak or to ask questions of the applicant (cross examination). Please refer to the attachment for instructions in using the Zoom platform which is the videoconference software currently in use by the DRB.

This is the link to the agenda:
https://www.cabq.gov/planning/boards-commissions/development-review-board/development-review-board-agenda-archives

By clicking on the ‘blue’ project number you can view the application that was submitted.

This is the Zoom meeting information that is included on the agenda:

Join Zoom Meeting https://cabq.zoom.us/j/94350930077
Meeting ID: 943 5093 0077
By phone 1-312-626-6799 or Find your local number: https://cabq.zoom.us/u/aqJL1OTkb

Attached are instructions DRB staff created to help the public know how to use Zoom.

Thank you and let me know if you have any further questions.

MAGGIE GOULD
planning manager
land development coordination
o 505-924-3880
c 505-553-0682
e mgould@cabq.gov
cabq.gov/planning
Dear Larry Garcia,

The Development Review Board received your recent email. You expressed concern about the DRB holding meetings to review development applications in a remote setting. We wish to inform you that the City’s ‘Seventh Declaration of Local Emergency Due to Novel Coronavirus COVID-19’ signed July 13, 2020 includes the following statement which authorizes the DRB to conduct a virtual meeting via teleconference or videoconference:

9. Pursuant to the need for responsive and well-informed government continuity during the current emergency, all public boards, commissions, and committees subject to the Public Boards and Commissions Ordinance, § 2-6-1 et seq., are hereby authorized to conduct virtual meetings via teleconference or videoconference for the duration of this Order, and

The DRB will make every effort to help the public wanting to participate in a DRB meeting to do so successfully. You have both an opportunity to speak or to ask questions of the applicant (cross examination). Please refer to the attachment for instructions in using the Zoom platform which is the videoconference software currently in use by the DRB.

This is the link to the agenda:
https://www.cabq.gov/planning/boards-commissions/development-review-board/development-review-board-agenda-archives

By clicking on the ‘blue’ project number you can view the application that was submitted.

This is the Zoom meeting information that is included on the agenda:

Join Zoom Meeting https://cabq.zoom.us/j/94350930077
Meeting ID: 943 5093 0077
By phone 1-312-626-6799 or Find your local number: https://cabq.zoom.us/u/aqJL1OTkb

Attached are instructions DRB staff created to help the public know how to use Zoom.

Thank you and let me know if you have any further questions.

MAGGIE GOULD
planning manager
land development coordination
o 505-924-3880
c 505-553-0682
e mgould@cabq.gov
cabq.gov/planning
Dear Rachel Romero,
The Development Review Board received your recent email. You expressed concern about the DRB holding meetings to review development applications in a remote setting. We wish to inform you that the City’s ‘Seventh Declaration of Local Emergency Due to Novel Coronavirus COVID-19’ signed July 13, 2020 includes the following statement which authorizes the DRB to conduct a virtual meeting via teleconference or videoconference:

9. Pursuant to the need for responsive and well-informed government continuity during the current emergency, all public boards, commissions, and committees subject to the Public Boards and Commissions Ordinance, § 2-6-1 et seq., are hereby authorized to conduct virtual meetings via teleconference or videoconference for the duration of this Order, and

The DRB will make every effort to help the public wanting to participate in a DRB meeting to do so successfully. You have both an opportunity to speak or to ask questions of the applicant (cross examination). Please refer to the attachment for instructions in using the Zoom platform which is the videoconference software currently in use by the DRB.

This is the link to the agenda: https://www.cabq.gov/planning/boards-commissions/development-review-board/development-review-board-agenda-archives
By clicking on the ‘blue’ project number you can view the application that was submitted.

This is the Zoom meeting information that is included on the agenda:

Join Zoom Meeting https://cabq.zoom.us/j/94350930077
Meeting ID: 943 5093 0077
By phone 1-312-626-6799 or Find your local number: https://cabq.zoom.us/u/aqJL1OTkb

Attached are instructions DRB staff created to help the public know how to use Zoom.

Thank you and let me know if you have any further questions.

MAGGIE GOULD
planning manager
land development coordination
o 505-924-3880
c 505-553-0682
e mgould@cabq.gov
cabq.gov/planning
Dear Amy Garcia,

The Development Review Board received your recent email. You expressed concern about the DRB holding meetings to review development applications in a remote setting. We wish to inform you that the City’s ‘Seventh Declaration of Local Emergency Due to Novel Coronavirus COVID-19’ signed July 13, 2020 includes the following statement which authorizes the DRB to conduct a virtual meeting via teleconference or videoconference:

The DRB will make every effort to help the public wanting to participate in a DRB meeting to do so successfully. You have both an opportunity to speak or to ask questions of the applicant (cross examination). Please refer to the attachment for instructions in using the Zoom platform which is the videoconference software currently in use by the DRB.

This is the link to the agenda: https://www.cabq.gov/planning/boards-commissions/development-review-board/development-review-board-agenda-archives

By clicking on the ‘blue’ project number you can view the application that was submitted.

This is the Zoom meeting information that is included on the agenda:

Join Zoom Meeting https://cabq.zoom.us/j/94350930077
Meeting ID: 943 5093 0077
By phone 1-312-626-6799 or Find your local number: https://cabq.zoom.us/u/aqJL1OTkb

Attached are instructions DRB staff created to help the public know how to use Zoom.

Thank you and let me know if you have any further questions.

MAGGIE GOULD
planning manager
land development coordination
o 505-924-3880
c 505-553-0682
e mgould@cabq.gov
cabq.gov/planning
Dear Randy Kearney,

The Development Review Board received your recent email. You expressed concern about the DRB holding meetings to review development applications in a remote setting.

We wish to inform you that the City’s ‘Seventh Declaration of Local Emergency Due to Novel Coronavirus COVID-19’ signed July 13, 2020 includes the following statement which authorizes the DRB to conduct a virtual meeting via teleconference or videoconference:

9. Pursuant to the need for responsive and well-informed government continuity during the current emergency, all public boards, commissions, and committees subject to the Public Boards and Commissions Ordinance, § 2-6-1-1 et seq., are hereby authorized to conduct virtual meetings via teleconference or videoconference for the duration of this Order, and

The DRB will make every effort to help the public wanting to participate in a DRB meeting to do so successfully. You have both an opportunity to speak or to ask questions of the applicant (cross examination). Please refer to the attachment for instructions in using the Zoom platform which is the videoconference software currently in use by the DRB.

This is the link to the agenda: https://www.cabq.gov/planning/boards-commissions/development-review-board/development-review-board-agenda-archives

By clicking on the ‘blue’ project number you can view the application that was submitted.

This is the Zoom meeting information that is included on the agenda:

Join Zoom Meeting https://cabq.zoom.us/j/94350930077
Meeting ID: 943 5093 0077
By phone 1-312-626-6799 or Find your local number: https://cabq.zoom.us/u/aqL1OTkb

Attached are instructions DRB staff created to help the public know how to use Zoom.

Thank you and let me know if you have any further questions.

MAGGIE GOULD
planning manager
land development coordination
o 505-924-3880
c 505-553-0682
e mgould@cabq.gov
cabq.gov/planning
Dear Dan McCormack,

The Development Review Board received your recent email. You expressed concern about the DRB holding meetings to review development applications in a remote setting. We wish to inform you that the City’s ‘Seventh Declaration of Local Emergency Due to Novel Coronavirus COVID-19’ signed July 13, 2020 includes the following statement which authorizes the DRB to conduct a virtual meeting via teleconference or videoconference:

The DRB will make every effort to help the public wanting to participate in a DRB meeting to do so successfully. You have both an opportunity to speak or to ask questions of the applicant (cross examination). Please refer to the attachment for instructions in using the Zoom platform which is the videoconference software currently in use by the DRB.

This is the link to the agenda:
https://www.cabq.gov/planning/boards-commissions/development-review-board/development-review-board-agenda-archives

By clicking on the ‘blue’ project number you can view the application that was submitted.

This is the Zoom meeting information that is included on the agenda:

Join Zoom Meeting https://cabq.zoom.us/j/94350930077
Meeting ID: 943 5093 0077
By phone 1-312-626-6799 or Find your local number: https://cabq.zoom.us/u/aqJL1OTkb

Attached are instructions DRB staff created to help the public know how to use Zoom.

Thank you and let me know if you have any further questions.
land development coordination
○ 505-924-3880
● 505-553-0682
 ● mgoold@cabq.gov
 ● cabq.gov/planning
Hello,
We spoke to our legal staff and they feel that you sent notice using the information that was supplied to you and so notice was correct.
We can hear this case tomorrow or we can defer to allow time to provide notice to Mr. Sandoval to avoid any future issues.
Please let us know how you wish to proceed.
Thank you,

MAGGIE GOULD
planning manager
land development coordination
505-924-3880
505-553-0682
mgould@cabq.gov
cabq.gov/planning

Attached is the scanned document we made prior to mailing out the 100-ft buffer notices as proof the notices were sent to the homeowners on the ONC list of addresses.

I also marked up the map provided by the neighbors, see attached.

All IDO notice requirements were met and we followed the ONC list of addresses to mail out letters. I do note that 10943 Carreta Dr home owner was not on the provided list but has been involved with all public meetings and we have
correspondence dating back to May in regards to the proposed development. There is no doubt that the homeowner is aware of the proposed development.

The yellow sign was posted per the sign posting agreement. We were made aware on Monday July 20 from DRB Chair that the yellow sign was leaning over at a 45 degree angle. We correct this immediately that same day, and re-erected the sign (see attached photo of the sign re-erected on July 20). Please note the neighbor who reported the ‘sign leaning’ did not include the applicant with their first and second notice that was sent to the City on Saturday and Sunday the 18th and 19th July respectively. I kindly informed the neighbor if they had provided the applicant the courtesy notice, it would have been re-erected on the 18th for the benefit of the public! Email correspondence attached.

Regards,
Richard Stevenson, PE
Tierra West LLC
(505) 858 3100

---

From: Gould, Maggie S. [mailto:MGould@cabq.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, August 4, 2020 11:16 AM
To: Richard Stevenson
Cc: Gomez, Angela J.; Wolfley, Jolene
Subject: FW: Public Notification Process PR 2020-4030

Richard and Ron,
We received this inquiry from a neighbor regarding the notice for this case (see below).
Can you please address all of the public notice requirements and 100 foot notice buffer and verify that proper notice was mailed to all property owners within the 100 foot buffer?

Thank you,

MAGGIE GOULD
planning manager
land development coordination
o 505-924-3880
c 505-553-0682
e mgould@cabq.gov
cabq.gov/planning

Dear Ms. Wolfley,

Please see documents related to the Notification Process, also note Tierra West’s notification to property owners who live 100-feet from the proposed development buffer and those partially along the development buffer. Documents #4 and #5 indicate homeowners, Larry Sandoval and Kristen Morgan live on Carreta Dr. are located within the 100-feet proposed development buffer were not officially notified by letter per IDO requirements. There are other consistencies as to why some were notified and others were not. The Sign Posting Agreement notification was also in violation and
finally corrected two days before the July 22nd DRB hearing. Therefore, the application by Tierra West does not meet full compliance. Ms Wolfley, please confirm when you receive these documents.

Contents:

1. City of Albuquerque’s Public Notification Process per the IDO
2. Tierra West’s Area Map of Notification to property owners (as submitted to DRB on July 22, 2020)
3. Tierra West’s List of property owners (as submitted to the DRB on July 22, 2020)
4. Our Map of property owners Notified and Not Notified
5. Our List of property owners Notified and Not Notified
6. Sign Posting Agreement non-compliance

Sincerely,

Larry Sandoval

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

================================================================================================
This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
Hello Mr. Rees,

The DRB is reviewing this project in the same way that we would review any other site plan. The DRB will hear this case on July 22. The DRB will discuss the case and determine how to proceed. It is unlikely that the DRB will make a decision on July 22nd. Most site plan cases take multiple meetings to allow the applicant to address board comments. I can share those comments with you.

Here is guidance about remote meetings.
The Development Review Board received your recent email. You expressed concern about the DRB holding meetings to review development applications in a remote setting.
We wish to inform you that the City’s ‘Seventh Declaration of Local Emergency Due to Novel Coronavirus COVID-19’ signed July 13, 2020 includes the following statement which authorizes the DRB to conduct a virtual meeting via teleconference or videoconference:

9. Pursuant to the need for responsive and well informed government continuity during the current emergency, all public boards, commissions, and committees subject to the Public Boards and Commissions ordinance, § 2-6-1-1 et seq., are hereby authorized to conduct virtual meetings via teleconference or videoconference for the duration of this Order, and

The DRB will make every effort to help the public wanting to participate in a DRB meeting to do so successfully. You have both an opportunity to speak or to ask questions of the applicant (cross examination). Please refer to the attachment for instructions in using the Zoom platform which is the videoconference software currently in use by the DRB.

This is the link to the agenda: https://www.cabq.gov/planning/boards-commissions/development-review-board/development-review-board-agenda-archives
By clicking on the ‘blue’ project number you can view the application that was submitted.

This is the Zoom meeting information that is included on the agenda:

Join Zoom Meeting https://cabq.zoom.us/j/94350930077
Meeting ID: 943 5093 0077
By phone 1-312-626-6799 or Find your local number: https://cabq.zoom.us/u/aqJL1OTkb

Attached are instructions DRB staff created to help the public know how to use Zoom.

Thank you and let me know if you have any further questions.
From: reesp1719 <reesp1719@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 4:05 PM
To: Wolfley, Jolene <jwolfley@cabq.gov>
Cc: Marsha Kearney <rmeek1978@gmail.com>
Subject: Drb zoom meeting July 22, 2020 objection

I am a resident in the north seven bar loop neighborhood that borders the mesa at Golf Course and Westside. There is an apartment complex proposed to be built there, and I have an objection to the zoom Drb meeting on July 22, 2020, in reference to this complex. During the covid-19 pandemic, I have attended 2 virtual online meetings in reference to this complex, and have voiced my concerns to the developer and meeting moderators. It should be noted that the majority of my neighborhood was unaware of any proposed development, or any related meetings that they could voice their opinions at. Furthermore, the developer allegedly mailed postcards informing nearby residents about the proposed development 2 years ago, yet I've still not met any neighbors who had received these postcards, including myself. I fear that this development is being rushed in order to bypass possible opposition by neighbors. I am concerned that not many people surrounding this proposed development are aware of it at all. Please consider postponing this meeting so that neighbors have an opportunity to educate themselves on the development, as well as voice concerns. Thank you for your consideration. Paul Rees (505) 553-2260

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

=======================================================
This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
Hello Mr. Sandoval,

The Development Review Board received your recent email. You expressed concern about the DRB holding meetings to review development applications in a remote setting.

We wish to inform you that the City’s ‘Seventh Declaration of Local Emergency Due to Novel Coronavirus COVID-19’ signed July 13, 2020 includes the following statement which authorizes the DRB to conduct a virtual meeting via teleconference or videoconference:

> The DRB will make every effort to help the public wanting to participate in a DRB meeting to do so successfully. You have both an opportunity to speak or to ask questions of the applicant (cross examination). Please refer to the attachment for instructions in using the Zoom platform which is the videoconference software currently in use by the DRB.

This is the link to the agenda:
https://www.cabq.gov/planning/boards-commissions/development-review-board/development-review-board-agenda-archives

By clicking on the ‘blue’ project number you can view the application that was submitted.

This is the Zoom meeting information that is included on the agenda:

Join Zoom Meeting https://cabq.zoom.us/j/94350930077
Meeting ID: 943 5093 0077
By phone 1-312-626-6799 or Find your local number: https://cabq.zoom.us/u/aqJL1OTkb

Attached are instructions DRB staff created to help the public know how to use Zoom.

Thank you and let me know if you have any further questions.
Mr. Sandoval,

Your email will be forwarded to all members of the DRB and included in the Record. Ms. Gould will provided you an email with information regarding DRB meeting during the public health emergency.

Thank you for your comments.

-----Original Message-----
From: Larry Sandoval <larrysandoval75@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, July 18, 2020 6:36 PM
To: Wolfley, Jolene <jwolfley@cabq.gov>
Cc: Larry Sandoval <larrysandoval75@gmail.com>
Subject: Information File -Part II

Ms. Wolfley,

Attached is Part II of the information file. Again, please confirm that you received Part I and Part II.

Respectfully,

Larry Sandoval

========================================================================
This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
Hello Mr. Mirabal,

Here is the Mayor’s full emergency order. If you scroll down to the bottom of the page you can find the document.


Please let me know if you have additional questions.

Thank you,

[Signature Image]

MAGGIE GOULD
planning manager
land development coordination
o 505-924-3880
c 505-553-0682
e mgould@cabq.gov
cabq.gov/planning

Ms Gould,

Thank you for your follow up response. Could you possibly give me a link to the document that item #9 is extracted from. I would like to get a better context of the statement.

Again thank you for your help.

Get Outlook for Android
Dear Mike Mirabal,

The Development Review Board received your recent email. You expressed concern about the DRB holding meetings to review development applications in a remote setting. We wish to inform you that the City’s ‘Seventh Declaration of Local Emergency Due to Novel Coronavirus COVID-19’ signed July 13, 2020 includes the following statement which authorizes the DRB to conduct a virtual meeting via teleconference or videoconference:

The DRB will make every effort to help the public wanting to participate in a DRB meeting to do so successfully. You have both an opportunity to speak or to ask questions of the applicant (cross examination). Please refer to the attachment for instructions in using the Zoom platform which is the videoconference software currently in use by the DRB.

This is the link to the agenda:
https://www.cabq.gov/planning/boards-commissions/development-review-board/development-review-board-agenda-archives
By clicking on the ‘blue’ project number you can view the application that was submitted.

This is the Zoom meeting information that is included on the agenda:

Join Zoom Meeting https://cabq.zoom.us/j/94350930077
Meeting ID: 943 5093 0077
By phone 1-312-626-6799 or Find your local number: https://cabq.zoom.us/u/aqJL1OTkb

Attached are instructions DRB staff created to help the public know how to use Zoom.

Thank you and let me know if you have any further questions.

MAGGIE GOULD
planning manager
land development coordination
o 505-924-3880
c 505-553-0682
e mgould@cabq.gov
cabq.gov/planning

This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
Hello,
I want to clarify that the case was heard on July 22, 2020.
Thank you
Thank you and let me know if you have any further questions.

-----Original Message-----
From: Kathie Long <kathielong@mac.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 21, 2020 9:54 PM
To: Wolfley, Jolene <jwolfley@cabq.gov>
Subject: PR-2020 004030

In reference to the meeting scheduled for 7/22/20 regarding apartments on golf course road Tierra West LLC. I would like to attend but I am unable to do a virtual meeting will it be rescheduled when concerned neighbors will be able to attend? Thank you Kathie Long 505-239-4687

Sent from my iPad=

This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
Hello,
I want to clarify that the case was heard on July 22, 2020.
Thank you

From: Gould, Maggie S.
Sent: Wednesday, July 22, 2020 4:10 PM
To: 'kathielong@mac.com' <kathielong@mac.com>
Cc: Gomez, Angela J. <agomez@cabq.gov>
Subject: RE: PR-2020 004030 , Wintergreen apartments deferral to August 5

Dear Kathie Long,
The Development Review Board heard this case on July 27, 2020 and deferred it to the meeting of August 5, 2020. I am including the information about why we are having virtual meetings and how you can participate.

We wish to inform you that the City’s ‘Seventh Declaration of Local Emergency Due to Novel Coronavirus COVID-19’ signed July 13, 2020 includes the following statement which authorizes the DRB to conduct a virtual meeting via teleconference or videoconference:

9. Pursuant to the need for responsive and well-informed government continuity during the current emergency, all public boards, commissions, and committees subject to the Public Boards and Commissions Ordinance, § 2-6-1-1 et seq., are hereby authorized to conduct virtual meetings via teleconference or videoconference for the duration of this Order, and

The DRB will make every effort to help the public wanting to participate in a DRB meeting to do so successfully. You have both an opportunity to speak or to ask questions of the applicant (cross examination). Please refer to the attachment for instructions in using the Zoom platform which is the videoconference software currently in use by the DRB.

This is the link to the agenda:
https://www.cabq.gov/planning/boards-commissions/development-review-board/development-review-board-agenda-archives

By clicking on the ‘blue’ project number you can view the application that was submitted.

This is the Zoom meeting information that is included on the agenda:

Join Zoom Meeting
https://cabq.zoom.us/j/93846895555

Meeting ID: 938 4689 5555
By phone +1 669 900 6833
Attached are instructions DRB staff created to help the public know how to use Zoom.
Thank you and let me know if you have any further questions.

MAGGIE GOULD
planning manager
land development coordination
o 505-924-3880
c 505-553-0682
e mgould@cabq.gov
cabq.gov/planning

-----Original Message-----
From: Kathie Long <kathielong@mac.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 21, 2020 9:54 PM
To: Wolfley, Jolene <jwolfley@cabq.gov>
Subject: PR-2020 004030

In reference to the meeting scheduled for 7/22/20 regarding apartments on golf course road Tierra West LLC. I would like to attend but I am unable to do a virtual meeting will it be rescheduled when concerned neighbors will be able to attend? Thank you Kathie Long 505-239-4687

Sent from my iPad=
=================================
This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
From: Edward Padilla <epadilla@unm.edu>  
Sent: Thursday, July 23, 2020 9:16 AM  
To: Gould, Maggie S.  
Cc: Gomez, Angela J.  
Subject: Re: Proj. #4030

I did catch that, too, but figured you meant the 22nd.

Many thanks for the detailed information.

You all take care, and be safe out there.

Ed Padilla  
Facility Services  
College of University Libraries and Learning Sciences  
Zimmerman Library - Rm.129, West Wing  
MSC05  3020  
1 University of New Mexico  
Albuquerque, New Mexico  87131  
505-277-0458  
Cell: 505-249-4162  
epadilla@unm.edu

From: Gould, Maggie S. <MGould@cabq.gov>  
Sent: Thursday, July 23, 2020 9:14 AM  
To: Edward Padilla <epadilla@unm.edu>  
Cc: Gomez, Angela J. <agomez@cabq.gov>  
Subject: RE: Proj. #4030

[EXTERNAL]

Hello,
I want to clarify that the case was heard on July 22, 2020.
Thank you

From: Gould, Maggie S.  
Sent: Thursday, July 23, 2020 9:09 AM  
To: 'epadilla@unm.edu' <epadilla@unm.edu>  
Cc: Gomez, Angela J. <agomez@cabq.gov>  
Subject: RE: Proj. #4030

Dear Edward Padilla,
The Development Review Board heard this case on July 27, 2020 and deferred it to the meeting of August 5, 2020. I am including the information about why we are having virtual meetings and how you can participate.

We wish to inform you that the City’s ‘Seventh Declaration of Local Emergency Due to Novel Coronavirus COVID-19’ signed July 13, 2020 includes the following statement which authorizes the DRB to conduct a virtual meeting via teleconference or videoconference:

9. Pursuant to the need for responsive and well-informed government continuity during the current emergency, all public boards, commissions, and committees subject to the Public Boards and Commissions Ordinance, § 2-6-1-1.c of seq., are hereby authorized to conduct virtual meetings via teleconference or videoconference for the duration of this Order, and

The DRB will make every effort to help the public wanting to participate in a DRB meeting to do so successfully. You have both an opportunity to speak or to ask questions of the applicant (cross examination). Please refer to the attachment for instructions in using the Zoom platform which is the videoconference software currently in use by the DRB.

This is the link to the agenda:
https://www.cabq.gov/planning/boards-commissions/development-review-board/development-review-board-agenda-archives

By clicking on the ‘blue’ project number you can view the application that was submitted.

This is the Zoom meeting information that is included on the agenda:

Join Zoom Meeting
https://cabq.zoom.us/j/93846895555

Meeting ID: 938 4689 5555
By phone +1 669 900 6833
Attached are instructions DRB staff created to help the public know how to use Zoom.

Thank you and let me know if you have any further questions.

MAGGIE GOULD
planning manager
land development coordination
o 505-924-3880
c 505-553-0682
e mgould@cabq.gov
cabq.gov/planning

From: Edward Padilla <epadilla@unm.edu>
Sent: Monday, July 20, 2020 8:57 AM
Greeting Ms. Wolfley,

If at all possible please delay the Zoom agenda topic for Project #4030 to a later date when more members of the Seven Bar HOA can attend. I am working at the time of this Zoom meeting, as I am sure others are as well. This topic is extremely important to members of the Seven Bar HOA, and we would like to participate to voice our objection to having these apartments built on the proposed site plan for many of the reasons noted at the first Zoom meeting related to this project.

Respectfully,

Ed Padilla
Ms. Kearney,

Thank you for all your work to try to understand the DRB application in your neighborhood. Here are a few answers to your questions:

(1) DRB applications have been moving to a digital format over the past year or so. The pandemic has made that conversion complete. Applicants submit their applications digitally (no hard copies) and staff and the public can review that same online application. Hopefully you found the link from the DRB agenda that we directed you to. If we can do anything to help you with the format of the file, we will be happy to do that.

(2) The Integrated Development Ordinance (IDO) is available from the City's website. http://documents.cabq.gov/planning/IDO/IDO-Effective-2018-05-17.pdf It sounds like you have found it. Notice that there is a search field (top left, fifth icon from the left, magnifying glass icon) where you can put in the word you are looking for and the search engine will take you to that passage in the IDO.

(3) The DRB staff has the responsibility to review the IDO and the Development Process Manual (DPM) and evaluate the relevant provisions for an application. Those comments--for PR #2020-4030 located on Golf Course--from each of the DRB respective areas (Hydrology, Transportation, etc.) will be available this afternoon for you to review. The DRB comments will be sent to you and might help you in your review.
of the application. Please feel free to share those comments with other neighbors.

(4) We will be looking at ways to make the IDO more accessible to the public when we complete the first Annual Update of the IDO.

(5) For your information, a neighborhood group is not obligated to pay for a room when there is a neighborhood facilitated meeting. A developer may ask, but the neighborhood is not obligated to pay for the room.

Thank you,

JOLENE WOLFLEY
associate director
e jwolfley@cabq.gov
cabq.gov/planning

-----Original Message-----
From: Marsha Kearney <rmeek1978@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 21, 2020 10:04 AM
To: Wolfley, Jolene <jwolfley@cabq.gov>; Renz-Whitmore, Mikaela J. <mrenz-whitmore@cabq.gov>; Larry Sandoval <larrysandoval75@gmail.com>; mike mirabal <mdmiraba@msn.com>; Brito, Russell D. <RBrito@cabq.gov>; Schultz, Shanna M. <smschultz@cabq.gov>
Subject: Request for a hard copy of the IDO and permit application

Jolene,

It’s been an extremely difficult task trying to understand the IPO and reviewing the application on the computer. I know I missed items, such
as the hydrological and erosion concerns, etc. If we were not in a pandemic I would be able to come to the city offices and review the items, getting copies of pertinent pages. I am asking for a hard copy of both the IPO and DRB application. I will be glad to have that readily accessible for others who are in the process of reviewing the material. I would like that to be sent to
Marsha Kearney
10927 Carreta Drive NW
Albuquerque, NM 87114

If there is a charge I would like an explanation of why, especially during the pandemic.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.
Marsha Kearney

=================================================================
This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
Good morning Larry,

You can send any documents/photographic files over 9 megabytes in size to us via WeTransfer (at https://wetransfer.com/), and I believe you can send up to three different recipients these documents/files through WeTransfer at once. You should send these documents/files to PLNDRS@cabq.gov, as well as to agomez@cabq.gov and jrodenbeck@cabq.gov. Once the documents/files have been successfully sent via WeTransfer, you will receive email confirmation from WeTransfer that they were sent successfully. The instructions for using WeTransfer are below:

**WeTransfer Instructions:**

You will initially be directed to a page which gives you the option of going to the free version of the site (send up to 2 GB at a time), or the subscription-based version of the site (send up to 20 GB at a time). Click on the link to the free version of the site, and you will be directed to the free version of the site (a screenshot of the WeTransfer webpage is attached). You just add the email address(es) to send files to, add your files and a message of what you’re sending, then click the “Transfer” icon.

When you receive files from a sender on WeTransfer, you will receive an email from the sender. Within the email message is an icon labeled “Get your files” that you click on to download the files from the sender (a screenshot of an email from a sender is attached). Once you click on that icon, a webpage appears with a “Download” icon. Just click on the “Download” icon, and the files sent to you will then download onto your computer. Once you download the files, you can place them where you want. If the sender sends more than one file to you, you will be send a Zip file which you will have extract the individual files from.
Dear Ms. Wolfley,

Due to electronic file size limitations for large documents/photographic files, we are uncertain that all the documents we sent to you and Ms. Gould were ever received from Mike Mirabal, Marsha Kearney and myself Larry Sandoval. Documents were sent back to you several times because they were too large and they were rejected.

We had to send documents with photos and had to break them into smaller files and parts. We are requesting confirmation of all the documents you both received, including parts of documents. Some of the documents are in a PDF format, MS word format or RTF format. We need a list of the documents (files) you and Ms. Gould have received. Please contact me if you have questions per our request.

Thank you,

Larry Sandoval

This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
Ms. Kearney,

Good afternoon. Here are some answers to the questions you raised.

1. The Notice of Decision is available on the DRB website under the date of the DRB meeting. Here is the link from the DRB website.  

2. The Notice of Decision identifies the date that an appeal must be filed. The date is October 15, 2020 at 5 pm. This date is 15 calendar days following the DRB meeting.

3. Documents that have already been submitted regarding the case are compiled into the ‘Record’ for the case. That ‘Record’ will be provided to the Land Use Hearing Officer.

4. The case is assigned the Project Number PR-2020-004030. You use this number to identify the DRB decision you would be appealing. The specific Site Plan application is SI 2020-00549. You can include this number.

5. The appeal form should be sent in according to the instructions online. Any information you wish to add to supplement the appeal should be sent in via email. That can be done in more than one email if file sizes are exceeded. Please contact Vanessa Segura vsegura@cabq.gov 505-924-3895 for any assistance in the logistics of filing an appeal. Please note that there is a fee for filing an appeal.

6. I will check into the matters you raised in #6 and get back to you early next week.

Thanks,

[Contact Information]

Gomez, Angela J.
From: Marsha Kearney <rmeek1978@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, October 9, 2020 2:27 PM
To: Rodenbeck, Jay B. <jrodenbeck@cabq.gov>; Wolfley, Jolene <jwolfley@cabq.gov>; Gomez, Angela J. <agomez@cabq.gov>
Cc: mike mirabal <mdmiraba@msn.com>; Larry Sandoval <larrysandoval75@gmail.com>
Subject: Site Plan for PR-2020-004030 Wintergreen Apartments

Jay,

We need some help understanding the appeal process for the Site Plan for OR-2020-004030, so would appreciate hearing back to this e-mail asap on the following questions:

1. Has the Official Notice of Decision been released, and if so we need a copy to attach to the appeal.

2. When does the 15 day appeal period begin and end?

3. Do we need to resubmit documents that have already been provided for the record?

4. I have seen different numbers attached to this project - Is the OR-2020-004030 number the correct number?

5. I note that the single PDF file must be e-mailed and is limited in size. In responding to this project I have already had to break up previous documents to meet that requirement and do not the capability to make a CD. During the time of the pandemic - how are we expected to provide the appeal information in the short timeframe available? This is a serious matter that we would appreciate attention to.

6. In the plat shared at the last hearing a round-about is shown at the north end of the gated community that appears to include part of the adjacent lot and has a road from the north coming into the round-about. Also, the water system proposed also involves work in that northern parcel. Should not that be included in the site plan? Would not that result in the area being beyond the maximum acreage allowed for the site plan? Also the round about shows the road from the north coming in and using the same access point for the gated community. There has not been a project submitted/approved for the north parcel, so how can the development occur? If the gated community extends beyond the two properties identified, does it not require the project to go through the EPC board?

Greatly appreciate your response to the above questions. With the pandemic continuing on our ability to be able to be involved in this and other projects has been extremely hindered.

Marsha Kearney
7 Bar North Resident

This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
Ms. Kearney and others,

Thank you for your interest in PR 2020-4030. You may submit comments through Tuesday. DRB does not have a hard deadline. But practically, Board members will not see emails that are submitted close to meeting time (including late on Tuesday). This property still needs approval from the Water Authority to proceed. It is likely Wednesday will be a continuation of the discussion regarding the project.

The best way for you to submit your emails and comments is to Angela Gomez and Maggie Gould. They can make sure that all DRB members receive your emails. They can also provide you with a response that your email has been included in the record for the case.

I will be forwarding all the emails I have received over the weekend to Angela and Maggie for proper processing. All your previous emails have been sent to Angela Gomez and you should have received an email letting you know the particular email was received and is being including it in the Record. If you did not receive a response email, you can resubmit your email to Angela. It will be confusing to all of us if you send differing emails to different staff members. The best path is to send all emails to Angela and Maggie.

If you would like to send a list of the larger size emails and documents that you are concerned are not in the record, we can check your list
against our records. Please send the list of your previous emails to Angela Gomez.

agomez@cabq.gov
MGould@cabq.gov

If the applicant has not been included on your email correspondence, we will be including the applicant in our response to your comments. This will allow everyone to be aware of concerns and look for ways to address those concerns.

Thank you,

JOLENE WOLFLEY
associate director
o 505.924.3891
e jwolfley@cabq.gov
cabq.gov/planning

-----Original Message-----
From: Marsha Kearney <rmeek1978@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, August 1, 2020 9:18 AM
To: Wolfley, Jolene <jwolfley@cabq.gov>
Cc: Megan Fitzpatrick <meganfitz@live.com>; Larry Sandoval <larrysandoval75@gmail.com>; mike mirabal <mdmiraba@msn.com>
Subject: Re: Wednesday, August 5th Hearing

Thank you for getting back to me so quickly. Do we still have until Monday am to submit comments?
> On Aug 1, 2020, at 9:06 AM, Wolfley, Jolene <jwolffey@cabq.gov> wrote:
> 
> > The agenda was posted Friday end of wor day. You can see it now.
> > 
> > Sent from my iPhone
> > 
> >> On Aug 1, 2020, at 8:59 AM, Marsha Kearney <rmeek1978@gmail.com> wrote:
> >>
> >> I have looked on the website and not seen any announcement for the August 5th Hearing. Appreciate any information you might have.
> >>
> >> Sincerely,
> >> Marsha Kearney
> >>
> >>
> >> This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
> >>
> >>>===================================================================================================
> >> This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
Dear Susanna Padilla,

The Development Review Board received your recent email. You expressed concern about the DRB holding meetings to review development applications in a remote setting.

We wish to inform you that the City’s ‘Seventh Declaration of Local Emergency Due to Novel Coronavirus COVID-19’ signed July 13, 2020 includes the following statement which authorizes the DRB to conduct a virtual meeting via teleconference or videoconference:

Pursuant to the need for responsive and well-informed government continuity during the current emergency, all public boards, commissions, and committees subject to the Public Boards and Commissions Ordinance, § 2-6-1-1 et seq., are hereby authorized to conduct virtual meetings via teleconference or videoconference for the duration of this Order, and

The DRB will make every effort to help the public wanting to participate in a DRB meeting to do so successfully. You have both an opportunity to speak or to ask questions of the applicant (cross examination). Please refer to the attachment for instructions in using the Zoom platform which is the videoconference software currently in use by the DRB.

This is the link to the agenda:
https://www.cabq.gov/planning/boards-commissions/development-review-board/development-review-board-agenda-archives

By clicking on the ‘blue’ project number you can view the application that was submitted.

This is the Zoom meeting information that is included on the agenda:

Join Zoom Meeting https://cabq.zoom.us/j/94350930077
Meeting ID: 943 5093 0077
By phone 1-312-626-6799 or Find your local number: https://cabq.zoom.us/u/agJL1OTkb

Attached are instructions DRB staff created to help the public know how to use Zoom.

Thank you and let me know if you have any further questions.
I feel it is not wise to hold a Zoom meeting on July 22nd and need too reschedule this when we can have an OPEN Public meeting. Critical decisions are being made that affect the community and THE homeowners Property. We as homeowners NEED to be involved in important decisions that affect us here and around our community. Thank you for your reconsideration in this important matter. Susanna Padilla.

This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
DRB Zoom Instructions
DRB Zoom Instructions

Please Note:

1. **You do not need a Zoom account to use Zoom, as long as you’re just looking to join meetings.**
2. **You can use your computer to participate in a Zoom meeting with videoconference.**
3. **You can use your phone to participate in a Zoom meeting as an audio conference.**
4. **You can create a Zoom account to make your own meetings, record videos, keep track of your contacts, and more.**

*Join a Meeting*

1. **Option 1:** Join using the provided URL (link).
   
   a. Open the email, newsletter, calendar invite, or other communication that contains a link to the prescheduled meeting and click the URL to join the Zoom Meeting.
   b. Click on "download here" if a download doesn't start automatically.
      i. If you're prompted, click Launch Application in the pop-up window. This will automatically prompt you to download the Zoom launcher to your computer. This will cause the "zoomuslauncher.zip" file to automatically download onto your computer.
c. Double click the downloaded file to install Zoom. This will open the contents of the "zoomuslauncher.zip" file.
   i. Click Continue, if prompted, to install Zoom

d. Reopen your email and click on the meeting link again. This should automatically connect you to the meeting.

2. **Option 2**: Join using Meeting ID.
   a. Open the Zoom desktop app.
   b. Click on the Home Button.
   c. Click Join and type in the provided Meeting ID and your name.
3. **Option 3**: Join using your phone
   a. On your phone, dial the teleconferencing number provided in your invite. Any of the phone numbers provided should work.
   b. Enter the meeting ID number when prompted using your dial pad.

- The following commands can be entered using your phone's dial pad while in a Zoom meeting:
  - *6 - Toggle mute/unmute
  - *9 - Raise hand
4. Once you’re in the meeting, you may choose to connect audio in two different ways:
   • Sign into computer audio (recommended).
   • Dialing into a conference bridge from your phone. You can call any of the numbers provided. Follow the prompts on the phone call.

   The following commands can be entered using your phone's dial pad while in a Zoom meeting:
   *6 - Toggle mute/unmute
   *9 - Raise hand
DRB Zoom Instructions

**Signing Up for a Zoom Account**

1. Start by going to [zoom.us](https://zoom.us)

2. Click on the “Sign Up for Free” button

3. Enter your email address and click on “Sign Up”
4. Go to your email and click the confirmation link that was emailed to you. Click on “Activate Your Account”

![Activate Account Image]

5. Enter your first and last name and create a password

![Create Account Image]
DRB Zoom Instructions

6. If you’d like to invite other administrators or staff members to sign up for their own Zoom accounts, you can enter their email addresses & select the “I am not a robot” checkbox. Otherwise, select “Skip this step”

7. You are now ready to join a meeting
Commonly Used Controls in Zoom on the Computer

- Video ON/OFF- Once in a meeting, you can turn your video on by clicking the “Start Video” icon on the bottom left of your screen. To turn it off, click the “Stop Video” icon.

- Muting- To ensure minimal background noise during your Zoom meeting, it is recommended that you mute everyone on the call when they’re not talking. To do this, click on the Participants icon at the bottom.

Chat in a meeting

i. Meeting participants can ask questions during a Zoom Meeting via the meeting chat. Start by clicking the “Chat” icon on the bottom right of your screen.

ii. Once the chat panel will open up on the right, you can view and respond to all public chats.

iii. Use the three dots to choose whether you want to send messages to all meeting attendees or the host privately.
• Sharing Screen
  i. Click the “Share Screen” icon at the bottom of your screen to share your desktop.
  ii. If you’d like to share specific windows or applications, you can choose to do so from the dialog box.

• How to raise your hand in Zoom
  i. During a meeting, click on the icon labeled "Participants" at the bottom center of your computer screen.
  ii. At the bottom of the window on the right side of the screen, click the button labeled "Raise Hand."
  iii. Your digital hand is now raised. Lower it by clicking the same button, now labeled "Lower Hand."

_Commonly Used Controls in Zoom on the Phone_

• The following commands can be entered using your phone's dial pad while in a Zoom meeting:
  *6 - Toggle mute/unmute
  *9 - Raise hand
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHECK</th>
<th>NOTIFICATION</th>
<th>STREET NO.</th>
<th>STREET NAME</th>
<th>HOMEOWNER</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>NOT NOTIFIED</td>
<td>12025</td>
<td>SULLIVAN CT NW</td>
<td>SANCHEZ RICHARD ANTHONY &amp; JANET LYNN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>NOT NOTIFIED</td>
<td>12019</td>
<td>SULLIVAN CT NW</td>
<td>RUFF CHERYL L &amp; KATHLEEN M VIGIL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>NOT NOTIFIED</td>
<td>12015</td>
<td>SULLIVAN CT NW</td>
<td>WHITE RICHARD L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW</td>
<td>Notified by TW</td>
<td>12009</td>
<td>SULLIVAN CT NW</td>
<td>SANDOVAL NICK A &amp; DEBBIE L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW</td>
<td>Notified by TW</td>
<td>12005</td>
<td>SULLIVAN CT NW</td>
<td>THIERJUNG NELSON P &amp; EVA S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW</td>
<td>Notified by TW</td>
<td>11009</td>
<td>CARRETA DR NW</td>
<td>GREENWOOD REBEKAH SULTEMEIER</td>
<td>Sale pending sign.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW</td>
<td>Notified by TW</td>
<td>11005</td>
<td>CARRETA DR NW</td>
<td>FISHER TINA R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW</td>
<td>Notified by TW</td>
<td>11001</td>
<td>CARRETA DR NW</td>
<td>VIOLA STEPHEN W &amp; KAREN C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW</td>
<td>Notified by TW</td>
<td>10951</td>
<td>CARRETA DR NW</td>
<td>MIRabal MICHAEL D &amp; MIRabal CATHY F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW</td>
<td>Notified by TW</td>
<td>10947</td>
<td>CARRETA DR NW</td>
<td>HUTCHINSON TERRY SCOTT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>NOT NOTIFIED</td>
<td>10943</td>
<td>CARRETA DR NW</td>
<td>SANDOVAL LARRY W SR &amp; SHERRI A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW</td>
<td>Notified by TW</td>
<td>10940</td>
<td>CARRETA DR NW</td>
<td>MURRIETA JAMES P JP TYRA J TRUSTEES MURRIETA RVT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW</td>
<td>Notified by TW</td>
<td>10939</td>
<td>CARRETA DR NW</td>
<td>MCMILLAN BEVERLY A &amp; LENNARD C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW</td>
<td>Notified by TW</td>
<td>10936</td>
<td>CARRETA DR NW</td>
<td>GARCIA LARRY M &amp; AMY C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW</td>
<td>Notified by TW</td>
<td>10935</td>
<td>CARRETA DR NW</td>
<td>LOPEZ STEVEN C &amp; GOLBERG MELANIE A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW</td>
<td>Notified by TW</td>
<td>10932</td>
<td>CARRETA DR NW</td>
<td>FIFE JOHN WAYNE &amp; MARSHA YVETT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW</td>
<td>Notified by TW</td>
<td>10931</td>
<td>CARRETA DR NW</td>
<td>REES PAUL J &amp; DEBORAH A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW</td>
<td>Notified by TW</td>
<td>10928</td>
<td>CARRETA DR NW</td>
<td>TRUJILLO CARLOS &amp; GALLEGOS CAROLINE A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW</td>
<td>Notified by TW</td>
<td>10927</td>
<td>CARRETA DR NW</td>
<td>MARSHA E KEARNEY &amp; JOHN R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>NOT NOTIFIED</td>
<td>10923</td>
<td>CARRETA DR NW</td>
<td>MORGAN KRISTEN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW</td>
<td>Notified by TW</td>
<td>10920</td>
<td>CARRETA DR NW</td>
<td>MAGGIO MICHAEL &amp; JOANN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW</td>
<td>Notified by TW</td>
<td>10919</td>
<td>CARRETA DR NW</td>
<td>MCCORMACK DANIEL J &amp; VICTORIA M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW</td>
<td>Notified by TW</td>
<td>10915</td>
<td>CARRETA DR NW</td>
<td>CALDERON MARY LOU C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>NOT NOTIFIED</td>
<td>10909</td>
<td>CARRETA DR NW</td>
<td>CANNOLES JOHN C &amp; DAWN R TRUSTEES CANNOLES RVT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW</td>
<td>Notified by TW</td>
<td>4509</td>
<td>NOCHE CLARA AVE NW</td>
<td>RAINWATER KATHRYN M &amp; CHARLES T CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW</td>
<td>Notified by TW</td>
<td>4505</td>
<td>NOCHE CLARA AVE NW</td>
<td>BACA DEBORAH</td>
<td>Sold home due to proposed apts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW</td>
<td>Notified by TW</td>
<td>4501</td>
<td>NOCHE CLARA AVE NW</td>
<td>WARD LARRY A &amp; GERALDINE S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW</td>
<td>Notified by TW</td>
<td>4424</td>
<td>CAMPO DE MAIZ RD NW</td>
<td>ISSUES JAMES A &amp; MARY JO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW</td>
<td>Notified by TW</td>
<td>10812</td>
<td>10812 OLYMPIC ST NW</td>
<td>SERNA MIKE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW</td>
<td>Notified by TW</td>
<td>11008</td>
<td>CARRETA DR NW</td>
<td>LOPEZ DAVID M &amp; CASSANDRA F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW</td>
<td>Notified by TW</td>
<td>4524</td>
<td>BENTON AVE NW</td>
<td>WHEELER STEPHEN C &amp; MARCIA L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW</td>
<td>Notified by TW</td>
<td>4520</td>
<td>BENTON AVE NW</td>
<td>SERDA ADRIANNA M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW</td>
<td>Notified by TW</td>
<td>11000</td>
<td>CARRETA DR NW</td>
<td>COFFMAN ERIN M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW</td>
<td>Notified by TW</td>
<td>4516</td>
<td>BENTON AVE NW</td>
<td>JAEGGER JACK J II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>NOT NOTIFIED</td>
<td>4512</td>
<td>BENTON AVE NW</td>
<td>TRUJILLO KAREN CHRISTINE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>NOT NOTIFIED</td>
<td>4508</td>
<td>BENTON AVE NW</td>
<td>FILMER EDWARD J II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Public Notification Process

In accordance with the procedures of the City of Albuquerque’s Integrated Development Plan (IDO) Subsection 14-16-6-4 (K) (2) Mailed Public Notice, Tierra West, LLC submitted their application for the Site Development Plan to the Development Review Board (DRB) per Table 6-1-1 to be reviewed.

E. Public Notice

According to the City’s Notification Process per Administrative Decisions 6-4(K) (2) (b) it states:

1.-1 The applicant shall mail notice to all of the following:

1. The owner of the property listed in the application.

2. All owners, as listed in the records of the County Assessor, of Property located partially or completely within 100 feet (excluding public rights of way) of property listed in the application.

My property is located at 10943 Carreta Dr. which is 100-feet from the adjacent proposed development buffer. My family will be directly and adversely impacted by this development. My family was excluded from the Notification Process. I did not receive an official notification letter by mail. My name and my spouse’s name is not listed in Tierra West’s application submitted to the DRB.

Note that the property owner at 10923 Carreta Drive NW also lives 100-feet from the adjacent proposed development buffer. My family will be directly and adversely impacted by this development. My family was excluded from the Notification Process. I did not receive an official notification letter by mail. My name and my spouse’s name is not listed in Tierra West’s application submitted to the DRB.

Note that the property owner at 10923 Carreta Drive NW also lives 100-feet from the adjacent proposed development buffer. My family will be directly and adversely impacted by this development. My family was excluded from the Notification Process. I did not receive an official notification letter by mail. My name and my spouse’s name is not listed in Tierra West’s application submitted to the DRB.

Note that the property owner at 10923 Carreta Drive NW also lives 100-feet from the adjacent proposed development buffer. My family will be directly and adversely impacted by this development. My family was excluded from the Notification Process. I did not receive an official notification letter by mail. My name and my spouse’s name is not listed in Tierra West’s application submitted to the DRB.

Note that the property owner at 10923 Carreta Drive NW also lives 100-feet from the adjacent proposed development buffer. My family will be directly and adversely impacted by this development. My family was excluded from the Notification Process. I did not receive an official notification letter by mail. My name and my spouse’s name is not listed in Tierra West’s application submitted to the DRB.

Note that the property owner at 10923 Carreta Drive NW also lives 100-feet from the adjacent proposed development buffer. My family will be directly and adversely impacted by this development. My family was excluded from the Notification Process. I did not receive an official notification letter by mail. My name and my spouse’s name is not listed in Tierra West’s application submitted to the DRB.

Another glaring example of inconsistent notifications in Tierra West’s submittal of the property owner’s list shows 4508 and 4512 Benton Ave. They were not notified, yet property owners on 4516, 4520, 4524 Benton Ave. and 10812 Olympic St. NW were notified. There is no sensible rationale for some property owners that some received official notification letters, while others did not, even though they live on the same block (see attached maps, Tierra West address list and our list of property owners not notified).

Due to the fact that two families were never given an official letter of notification, the applicant has failed to notify those with the 100-foot buffer of the development’s property and those neighbors who will be affected. How could the applicant, Tierra West claim that the application is complete? Tierra West’s notification to property owners, does not comply with the IDO as stated in Subsection 14-16-6-4 (K) (2) Mailed Public Notice.
\( \times \) = Not notified by Tierra West

\( \checkmark \) = Notified by Tierra West
DOCUMENT SUBMITTAL
TO CITY PLANNING DEPARTMENT
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD CHAIR
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Notifications and Meetings

April 7, 2020 - 7 Bar North HOA Exec. Board had the first meeting with Tierra West to talk about the planned apartment complex development project.

Why did Tierra West, Seven Bar North HOA Board members participated at this very critical meeting and not the homeowners that live on Carreta Dr., since they are directly affected by this planned apartment complex development project?

April 14, 2020 – Seven Bar North HOA notifies Carreta Dr. homeowners for the first time regarding an upcoming April 17, through video/audio teleconference.

Why did the HOA wait a week to contact the homeowners on Carreta Drive?

April 17, 2020 – The first video/teleconference is conducted with a small group of Carreta Dr. homeowners.

Why after 10-days in a video/teleconference, it is the first time Carreta Dr. homeowners have a chance to dialogue with Tierra West and HOA Board members. Yet, another video/teleconference meeting format is scheduled? Only a small number were in attendance and the format did not allow for effective dialogue from all participants.

May 1, 2020 - Carreta Dr. homeowners invite Seven Bar North HOA Board members to a very informal neighborhood Friday night gathering to get an update and start dialogue. Mike Mirabal and Larry Sandoval initiated this informal gathering. HOA President, Scott Templeton only attended. We were told at the gathering that the HOA really could not be involved and homeowners would need to send their concerns to Richard, Stevenson, P.E., Tierra West.

May 6, 2020 – HOA President, Scott Templeton advised Carreta Dr. homeowners by an email to send their concerns directly to Richard Stevenson at Tierra West.

May 21, 2020 - A subsequent video/teleconference meeting was conducted. It was not well organized and the format was not effective, therefore not adequately addressing the homeowners concerns.

June 18, 2020 – The first face-to-face public meeting is conducted with Tierra West, HOA members and Carreta Dr. homeowners and other concerned homeowners.
The Seven Bar North HOA actually paid for half of the charge of the meeting room. Since when is the public that has to be contacted concerning a project made to pay for half of a meeting room? This is not an appropriate charge. When asked about doing a traffic study the question was asked by Tierra West if we had the $12,000 to pay for the study. Totally inappropriate response from the project planner. I have been in a large number of planning meetings in my career and never have I seen the involved public charged to attend a meeting or the response concerning the traffic impact study. Once again, the process greatly limits the community involvement, but the developer is expecting the public to pay a price to be involved.

**July 22, 2020** - The City of Albuquerque’s Development Review Board (DRB) reviews the planned apartment complex development project.

Once again there is a great concern with the pandemic and ineffectiveness of Zoom and virtual meetings. We feel there needs to be a face to face meeting, in line with the open meetings act and request that the DRB be rescheduled.

Other concerns with Tierra West:

* Tierra West sent out the limited number of notifications on June 26th. At least two letters were sent as first-class mail and the rest not certified. How can they ensure the people to be notified actually received the notification?

* On the Golf Course and Westside Blvd Public Notice Inquiry sent by Dalaina Carmona on 6/24 to Kristi Walker for the Seven Bar North HOA, Jack Corder is listed. Scott Templeton is the President of Seven Bar North HOA. That is totally inappropriate! He does NOT represent the HOA, but is hired to manage the funds and implementation of the covenants. In NO way should he be a contact. He owns a Real Estate company and any role he plays in this process would be a conflict of interest.
Buffer Area Adjacent to Homeowner’s Property and Planned Development

There are several promises made at this meeting that were never followed up, they include the following:

We held a facilitated meeting with the developer representatives on the 18th June.
My understanding from the process is that the purpose of this meeting was to mediate concerns and impacts to our existing neighborhood. We were promised by their representative Richard Stevenson of Tierra West, that after the facilitated meeting we would be provided an additional opportunity (meeting) to respond to our concerns prior to the DRB hearing. This never happened.

As of today, there has been no attempt to provide that information to the neighborhood.
This process has been very inadequate and unfair to the residents of our community.
We are opposed to this development for several reasons, and feel they should be addressed prior to any decisions being made. We would like some accommodations, if approved, in the buffer area, and feel they are reasonable for such an infringement.

1. **The Buffer area**: We have asked that the buffer area be a true buffer area.

   ✓ We have requested sound barriers, Line of sight barriers, fencing barriers, landscape barriers, lighting barriers.

   ✓ We requested a sound and visibility wall at least 8 feet along the East end of the property boundary.

   ✓ We have requested that the recreational walking trail adjacent our properties be removed.

   ✓ We want to discourage foot traffic along our property line.

   ✓ We have requested Large River walk as opposed to Grass to discourage foot traffic.
✓ We also would like the landscape plan to include more mature trees, to protect immediate privacy. The current plan has at least 10-year maturity.

✓ We would like plants that do not affect allergies. Juniper plants are a major contributor to allergies.

✓ We want Trash Bins moved away from the East side of the development, away from homeowners' properties.

✓ Lighting must be directed away from private properties.

✓ We discourage Grass on the East side buffer, being that the noise generated by maintenance and mowing would impose on the neighborhood.

✓ Water runoff and drainage has not been addressed adequately to the neighborhood concerns.

2. We are an established neighborhood of over twenty years and feel our concerns are valid and should be fairly accommodated. This IDO process is very Developer oriented and removes any opportunity for our neighborhood to protect its established quality of life. The change in Zoning does not reflect the prior site plan that was established in the past. This plot was subdivided up into 9 smaller units in the negotiated previous site plan, and was intended for smaller business units. We were never notified of a zoning change, although we live within 100 feet of this property. While the excuse we continue to hear is that it was well published in the past, that the city had the right to arbitrarily change the code. We were under the belief under the previous code that if there were any changes, since we lived within 100 feet, there would be required notification. The city failed to notify the property owners.

We also feel that this process bypasses all the governmental agencies and committees put in place to protect our communities. The Developer bypasses EPC, which looks at all the relevant issues, Schools, Traffic, Environmental studies, Wildlife, Intergovernmental, etc. This MX-M zoning by description was intended for City centers and Apartment corridors. Neither of these fit this location.

We respectfully ask that you reject this proposal; based on the negative affects it has on our neighborhood and the surrounding communities. This will destroy our quality of life and integrity of one of Albuquerque's great neighborhoods. "Because it can be built, does not mean it should be built." There are other things that have value to the community that we negotiated in the past.
SIGN POSTING AGREEMENT

Regarding signage as a requirement by the City’s Planning Department, note that there were two people who drove by the planned development site to see if the signage was in place. They could not find the signage or it was not obvious.

On 7/17-19/20 someone reported that the signage was found on a small square piece of plywood. The sign was not conspicuous to the public or moving traffic, it was not two feet above the ground, and it was not planted firmly in the ground and properly supported. It was found lying down at a 45-degree angle being held up by bushes and some rocks. The sign should be more legible. This does not meet compliance as written in the City’s Sign Posting Agreement. The Sign Post was not maintained for three consecutive days we can confirm (see pictures below). This concern was never not addressed with the applicant at the July 22, 2020 DRB Hearing.

Pictures were taken at Golf Course (picture to left is facing north) and (picture to right is facing south).
Jeanne the property is being sold by the owner to our client so once the sale is commenced there will be separate ownership of the parcels. Our client is buying Parcel E-1. We have heard rumors of other developments on the corner but nothing set in stone. We are not working on those parcels at this time. The driveway is a common lot line and it is shared between our parcel and the remaining parcel. The site plan reflects how that shared access is being proposed. We also don’t know if the property to the north Tract D-1 will be subdivided but probably will in the future. We do not know of any time frames when the property will develop especially in this current economic environment.

For the entrance we can assume a commercial use on the balance and then compute what the resulting peak hour turning movements would be to adjust the queue length to accommodate the parcel to the north if that is acceptable? The gate on the south side is emergency entrance only and all of our traffic will use the northern driveway. We will show how the fire access and turning movement can be handed.

Let me know if I answered your questions and if we can assume a normal commercial development for the establishment of the queue length for the entrance?

Thanks

Ronald R. Bohannan, P.E.
Tierra West LLC.
5571 Midway Park Place, NE
Albuquerque, NM 87109
505-858-3100
entrance?) It looks like there is additional right-of-way for a right turn lane if needed. Also provide diagram showing that a car can turn around easily without having to back up into Golf Course at this southern entrance.

Thanks!

JEANNE WOLFENBARGER
manager for transportation
o 505.924-3991
e jwolfenbarger@cabq.gov
cabq.gov/planning

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

I will make sure the signage is labelled for the emergency access.

Attached is the plat for the property; there is a blanket cross access easement between both parcels. Do we need to create a specific shared access agreement?

Regards,
Richard Stevenson, PE
Tierra West LLC
(505) 858 3100

From: Wolfenbarger, Jeanne [mailto:jwolfenbarger@cabq.gov]
Sent: Thursday, July 23, 2020 10:58 AM
To: Ron Bohannan; Richard Stevenson
Cc: Biazar, Shahab
Subject: RE: [#2020013] 004030 DRB Case

Thanks for the quick response and the information, Ron! Is there a shared access agreement?

Yes, it makes sense to assume a commercial use for the bay lengths just as you have proposed below.

Gated Entrance: I remember the keyed note showed a gated entrance, not necessarily noted as an emergency access only. If it is an emergency access only, include two signs per MUTCD involving emergency access only and a knox box. Get Fire Marshall approval.

Thanks!

Jeanne Wolfenbarger
manager for transportation
o 505.924-3991
e jwolfenbarger@cabq.gov
cabq.gov/planning
Jeanne the property is being sold by the owner to our client so once the sale is commenced there will be separate ownership of the parcels. Our client is buying Parcel E-1. We have heard rumors of other developments on the corner but nothing set in stone. We are not working on those parcels at this time. The driveway is a common lot line and it is shared between our parcel and the remaining parcel. The site plan reflects how that shared access is being proposed. We also don’t know if the property to the north Tract D-1 will be subdivided but probably will in the future. We do not know of any time frames when the property will develop especially in this current economic environment.

For the entrance we can assume a commercial use on the balance and then compute what the resulting peak hour turning movements would be to adjust the queue length to accommodate the parcel to the north if that is acceptable? The gate on the south side is emergency entrance only and all of our traffic will use the northern driveway. We will show how the fire access and turning movement can be handed.

Let me know if I answered your questions and if we can assume a normal commercial development for the establishment of the queue length for the entrance?

Thanks

Ronald R. Bohannan, P.E.
Tierra West LLC.
5571 Midway Park Place, NE
Albuquerque, NM 87109
505-858-3100

Richard, I had some comments/questions after yesterday’s meeting:

- I was looking closer at the site plans and noticed that the property line needed to be shown on the north side of the property. It looks like shared access needs to be established with the property to the north based on driveway location after looking at AGIS even though property owner is the same.
- Additionally, I had a question about what the plans were for the property to the north given that it has the same owner. Was there a plan to replat? Is there a plan to build more apartments to the north and what is the timing of this? (This will affect how we look at the traffic and the queuing into the site.)
- The queuing analysis requested for the left and right turn bays needs to also address the gate on the southern entrance. It needs to be established. (Is there a reason for a gate at the southern entrance but not for the northern entrance?) It looks like there is additional right-of-way for a right turn lane if needed. Also provide diagram showing that a car can turn around easily without having to back up into Golf Course at this southern entrance.

Thanks!

JEANNE WOLFENBARGER
manager for transportation
o 505.924-3991
e jwolfenbarger@cabq.gov
cabq.gov/planning
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TREASURER'S CERTIFICATION

THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT TAXES ARE CURRENT AND PAID ON LOT 24, BLOCK H, PARCEL 16.

CHUCK B. LUCAS
Chief Treasurer
City of Albuquerque
February 26, 2009

NOTICE OF SUBDIVISION PLAT CONDITIONS

A variance or waiver from certain subdivision requirements has been granted by the City and the Albuquerque Metropolitan Planning Commission in connection with this plat.

The City and the City Property, Utilities, and Waste Management Director, and the Planning and Zoning Board, have approved and endorsed this plat. The plat is subject to all applicable codes and ordinances of the City of Albuquerque.

The plat is subject to the following conditions:

1. All streets and alleys shall be constructed to the specifications of the City of Albuquerque.
2. All utilities shall be installed in accordance with the specifications of the City of Albuquerque.
3. All open spaces shall be maintained in accordance with the specifications of the City of Albuquerque.

DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

The purpose of this plat is to reserve the easements for the benefit of the public and to provide for the betterment of the surrounding area.

SURVEYOR'S CERTIFICATION

I, JOHN J. BORDENAVE, a registered professional engineer and land surveyor, under the laws of New Mexico, do hereby certify that this plat was prepared by me in accordance with the laws and regulations of the State of New Mexico and the City of Albuquerque, and that it is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.

JOHN J. BORDENAVE
P.O. Box 1982, Albuquerque, NM 87103

APPROVALS

PROJECT NO.: 5100234 APPLICATION NO.: 06DRB-70099

MARCH 2009

A.M.A.R.C.C.A.

PLAT OF TRACTS D-I, E-I
AMAFC A BLACK ARROYO CHANNEL ROW
PARADISE HEIGHTS, UNIT I
ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO

FREE CONSENT AND DEDICATION

The subdivision of the land described on this plat is with the free consent of and in accordance with the desires of the undersigned owners of the land. The owners hereby warrant that they hold them complete and indefeasible title to the land so subdivided and that the specific surface and sub-surface water, gas, sewer, and communication easements as described on the plat are conveyed to the City of Albuquerque.

TRACTS D & E OLA ALVARADO GROUP, A NEW MEXICO GENERAL PARTNERSHIP

DONALD E. CARROLL, GENERAL PARTNER

COUNTY OF BERNALILLO

1901 N. AMERICA ROAD

BORDENAVE DESIGNS
P.O. BOX 1982, ALBUQUERQUE, NM 87103
(505)823-1344 FAX (505)382-9102

SHEET 1 OF 3
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LEGAL DESCRIPTION

A tract of land situated in projected section 5, T14N, R34W, TOWNSHIP 34 NORTH, RANGE 14 WEST, OF THE LAYTON MERIDIAN, SANTA FE COUNTY, NEW MEXICO, said tract being the same as tract A and B and Block 19, Plats of Tracts D-I, E-I, PARADISE HEIGHTS, UNIT I - ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO as shown on the Plat of Tracts D-I, E-I - PARADISE HEIGHTS, UNIT I - ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO, as recorded in the Office of the County Clerk of Bernalillo County, New Mexico on Dec. 11, 1995 in BR. 112, PAGE 1A and on July 28, 1994 in BR. 108, PAGE 56, AND ON OCTOBER 9, 1995 IN BR. 108, PAGE 55, AND ON OCTOBER 9, 1995 IN BR. 108, PAGE 56, as referenced on said plat.

BEGINNING at the northeast corner of the tract herein described from whence the aforesaid monument ACS B-411 begins N18°19'37"E a distance of 890.78 feet, said point being on the southerly right-of-way of westside blvd, thence departing the southerly right-of-way of westside blvd, S86°43'25"W, 150.60 feet to a point on the northerly right-of-way of a point, thence

NORTHWESTERLY 81.45 feet along the arc of a curve right, having a radius of 158.45 feet and a long chord bearing N86°43'25"W a distance of 81.45 feet to a point, thence

NORTH 189.05 feet to a point, thence

NORTHWESTERLY 114.25 feet along the arc of a curve left, having a radius of 222.45 feet and a long chord bearing N86°43'25"W a distance of 114.25 feet to a point, thence

NORTHEAST 39.27 feet along the arc of a curve right, having a radius of 25.00 feet and a long chord bearing N86°43'25"W a distance of 39.27 feet to a point and thence

RUN PARALLEL with the southerly right-of-way of westside blvd, thence

S18°21'55"E 497.42 feet along the vacated southerly right-of-way of westside blvd to a point on the new right-of-way of westside blvd, thence

NORTH 18°49'58"E a distance of 18°49'58" to a point, thence

NORTHWEST 22.84 feet along the arc of a curve right, having a radius of 23.50 feet and a long chord bearing N18°49'58"E a distance of 22.84 feet to a point, thence

NORTH 16°03'57"E 55.82 feet to a point, thence

NORTH 38°02'26"W, 4.12 feet to a point, thence

NORTHWEST 38.06 feet along the arc of a curve right, having a radius of 25.00 feet and a long chord bearing N18°49'58"E a distance of 38.06 feet to a point, thence

NORTH 289°27'25"E 290.99 feet along the arc of a curve right, having a radius of 39.27 feet and a long chord bearing N18°49'58"E a distance of 289°27'25" to a point, thence

NORTh 37°24'34"E 140.00 feet and a long chord bearing N18°49'58"E a distance of 37°24'34" to a point, thence

NORTH 81°30'24"E 310.00 feet and a long chord bearing N18°49'58"E a distance of 81°30'24" to a point, thence

NORTH 17°00'24"E 90.00 feet to a point, thence

NORTH 30°07'04"E 29.03 feet to a point, thence

NORTH 52°09'34"E 29.03 feet to a point, thence

NORTH 52°09'34"E 29.03 feet to a point, thence

NORTH 52°09'34"E 29.03 feet to a point, thence

NORTH 52°09'34"E 29.03 feet to a point, thence

NEW MEXICO GAS COMPANY EASEMENT RELEASE APPROVAL

New Mexico Gas Company, Inc., a Delaware corporation, does hereby release, waive, quitclaim and discharge its right, right and interest in the easement(s) (granted by prior plat, replat or document) shown to be vacated on this plat.

NEW MEXICO GAS COMPANY

By: ____________________________

OFFICIAL SEAL

STATE OF NEW MEXICO
COUNTRY OF BERNALILLO

This instrument was acknowledged before me on the 27th day of May, 2009.

My Commission Expires: March 24, 2014

BORDENAVE DESIGNS
P.O. BOX 51344, ALBUQUERQUE, NM 87198
050383-1344 FAX 050383-9105

1. MILES OF FULL WIDTH PRIVATE STREETS CREATED BY THIS
2. TOTAL NUMBER OF TRACTS CREATED - 3
3. BASIS OF POSITION AND BEARINGS
ACR B-411 (NO. 1983 & NO. 1996)
NORTHING = 1534434.857
EASTING = 1507007.171

4. ALL DISTANCES SHOWN ARE HORIZONTAL DISTANCES
5. ALL BOUNDARY CORNERS, LOT CORNERS AND ANGLES ARE
MONUMENTED WITH A 0.875 INCH YELLOW PLASTIC CAP
STAMPED "BERNALILLO, LS 516" UNLESS SHOWN OTHERWISE.
6. CURRENT VERSIONS OF TRACTS D & E IS C-2 AND OF LOTS 1 THRU 7 IS B-1.

INSET 1 SCALE 1" = 20'

INSET 2 SCALE 1" = 10'

INSET 3 SCALE 1" = 10'

NOTE: SEE SHEET 3 FOR CURVE DATA NOT SHOWN ON THIS SHEET
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Richard, he did leave a message. I then left him a message regarding the size of the complex, but he never contacted me again.

It seems that he is not really that interested in this particular project. My experience with Rio Rancho is very different from that of NMDOT.

It seems clear from the e-mail below that he is not concerned. What have your discussions with him been?

JEANNE WOLFENBARGER
manager for transportation
o 505.924-3991
e jwolfenbarger@cabq.gov
cabq.gov/planning

Jeanne,

Did David Serrano from Rio Rancho ever contact you in regards to traffic coordination? What was the outcome? Thanks.

Regards,
Richard Stevenson, PE
Tierra West LLC
(505) 858 3100
Cc: Ron Bohannan  
Subject: RE: [#2020013] 2020013 - Apartment Complex Golf Course and Western Trails Albuquerque

David,

I have included Ms. Jeanne Wolfenbarger who is the Manager for Transportation in this email. Her telephone number is 924-3991.

Thanks for the quick response.

Regards,
Richard Stevenson, PE
Tierra West LLC
(505) 858 3100

From: DAVID SERRANO [mailto:DSERRANO@RRNM.GOV]
Sent: Thursday, July 23, 2020 10:59 AM
To: Ron Bohannan
Cc: Richard Stevenson
Subject: RE: [#2020013] 2020013 - Apartment Complex Golf Course and Western Trails Albuquerque

Ron,

Doing well, hope you are as well. I am not sure why the City of Rio Rancho would be involved as Westside/Golf Course intersection is COA maintained. Can you direct me to the COA contact I can call to discuss the concern?

Thanks,
David D. Serrano, P.E.
Engineering Division Manager
Development Services Dept.
City of Rio Rancho
3200 Civic Center Circle NE
Rio Rancho, NM  87144
Mobile: (505) 235-5512
Phone: (505) 891-5059
dserrano@rrnm.gov

From: Ron Bohannan <rrb@tierrawestllc.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 23, 2020 9:18 AM
To: DAVID SERRANO <DSERRANO@RRNM.GOV>
Cc: Richard Stevenson <rstevenson@tierrawestllc.com>; Ron Bohannan <rrb@tierrawestllc.com>
Subject: FW: [#2020013] 2020013 - Apartment Complex Golf Course and Western Trails Albuquerque

David

Hope you are doing well. We are proposing to develop 208 apartments on a vacant site within the City of Albuquerque, on the northeast corner of Golf Course Rd and AMAFCA Black Arroyo channel (see attached vicinity map and site plan). Attached is the trip generation and distribution that we have provided to City who wanted us to coordinate with
you and the City of Rio Rancho. We have been in discussions with the Department of Municipal Development (DMD) who has indicated they are still tracking the widening of Western Trails early next year.

We are getting a lot of neighborhood opposition and so the City wanted us to coordinate with your department. We want to confirm we are to follow the City of Albuquerque DPM process for traffic review/improvement consideration?

If you have any other questions please feel free to reach out to either Richard Stevenson or myself.

Thanks

Ronald R. Bohannan, P.E.
Tierra West LLC.
5571 Midway Park Place, NE
Albuquerque, NM 87109
505-858-3100

=======================================================
This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
Thanks, Richard. I will review. Regarding your last question about the streetlights from an earlier e-mail, the DPM discusses light requirements at intersections and at mid-block. Review and let me know. It appeared that you could add a light at your entrance, but I will leave that to you as the designer.

JEANNE WOLFENBARGER
manager for transportation
o 505.924-3991
e jwolfenbarger@cabq.gov
cabq.gov/planning

Cc: Ron Bohannan
Subject: RE: [#2020013] DRB Case# 4030

Jeanne,

Attached is the following items as requested with comment #5 for tomorrows DRB hearing. We will provide a summary at the meeting in regards to impact on cut through and the congestion on Western Trails, but we wanted to get the numbers in front of you today.
. Trip Generation Worksheet based on the ITE Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition for Multifamily Housing (Mid-Rise) apartments
. Sub-Area Map as a basis of the trip distribution
. Trip Distribution Worksheet
. Trip Distribution Map

Regards,
Richard Stevenson, PE
Tierra West LLC
(505) 858 3100

-----Original Message-----
From: Wolfenbarger, Jeanne [mailto:jwolfenbarger@cabq.gov]
Sent: Monday, July 20, 2020 1:39 PM
To: Ron Bohannan; Richard Stevenson
Subject: DRB Case# 4030

Ron and Richard,

Please see neighborhood comments and attached comments from Transportation for the upcoming DRB. Thanks!

JEANNE WOLFENBARGER
manager for transportation
o 505.924-3991
e jwolfenbarger@cabq.gov
cabq.gov/planning
-----Original Message-----
From: Larry Sandoval [mailto:larrysandoval75@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, July 18, 2020 4:38 PM
To: Wolfley, Jolene
Cc: Wolfenbarger, Jeanne; mike mirabal; Marsha Kearney; Larry Sandoval
Subject: Request for Traffic Impact Study

Good afternoon Ms. Wofley,

Please include this pdf document as part of our record to the Board. Thank you.

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

=======================================================
This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
The old DPM specifies streetlighting at intersections and a light mid-block probably where your entrance is. I think the mid-block distance is 500 feet, but you would have to look that up.

The new DPM relies on an illumination design, but the LEDs are brighter than the old types of lights.

From: Richard Stevenson [mailto:rstevenson@tierrawestllc.com]  
Sent: Tuesday, July 28, 2020 10:37 AM  
To: Wolfenbarger, Jeanne  
Cc: Ron Bohannan  
Subject: RE: [#2020013] DRB Case# 4030

Jeanne,

In regards to comment # 6:
6. Follow DPM requirements for streetlighting design along Golf Course for the new site. Place streetlighting on infrastructure list, including all necessary appurtenances.

I checked Section 7-4(M)(6) of the new DPM and this only talks to new subdivisions. We will provide lighting at the driveway entrance but unless required will not offer to install street lights for Golf Course along the property frontage. Can you tell me which section in the DPM requires new street lighting along the Golf Course frontage please?

Regards,  
Richard Stevenson, PE  
Tierra West LLC  
(505) 858 3100

-----Original Message-----  
From: Richard Stevenson  
Sent: Tuesday, July 21, 2020 8:02 AM  
To: 'Wolfenbarger, Jeanne'  
Cc: Ron Bohannan  
Subject: RE: [#2020013] DRB Case# 4030

Thanks Jeanne.

Yes I checked Section 7-4(M)(6) of the new DPM and this only talks to new subdivisions. We will provide lighting at the driveway entrance but unless required will not offer to install street lights for Golf Course along the property frontage.

Not sure how many neighbors will be on the call tomorrow to discuss traffic but we will do our best to answer their questions.
Thanks, Richard. I will review. Regarding your last question about the streetlights from an earlier e-mail, the DPM discusses light requirements at intersections and at mid-block. Review and let me know. It appeared that you could add a light at your entrance, but I will leave that to you as the designer.

JEANNE WOLFENBARGER
manager for transportation
o 505.924-3991
e jwolfenbarger@cabq.gov
cabq.gov/planning

Cc: Ron Bohannan
Subject: RE: [#2020013] DRB Case# 4030

Jeanne,

Attached is the following items as requested with comment #5 for tomorrows DRB hearing. We will provide a summary at the meeting in regards to impact on cut through and the congestion on Western Trails, but we wanted to get the numbers in front of you today.
.
  . Trip Generation Worksheet based on the ITE Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition for Multifamily Housing (Mid-Rise) apartments
  . Sub-Area Map as a basis of the trip distribution
  . Trip Distribution Worksheet
  . Trip Distribution Map

Regards,
Richard Stevenson, PE
Tierra West LLC
(505) 858 3100
Ron and Richard,

Please see neighborhood comments and attached comments from Transportation for the upcoming DRB. Thanks!

JEANNE WOLFENBARGER
manager for transportation
o 505.924-3991
e jwolfenbarger@cabq.gov
cabq.gov/planning

-----Original Message-----
From: Larry Sandoval [mailto:larrysandoval75@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, July 18, 2020 4:38 PM
To: Wolfley, Jolene
Cc: Wolfenbarger, Jeanne; mike mirabal; Marsha Kearney; Larry Sandoval
Subject: Request for Traffic Impact Study

Good afternoon Ms. Wofley,

Please include this pdf document as part of our record to the Board. Thank you.
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This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
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Thanks, Richard. I am hoping that showing an actual graph might help answer MR. Sandoval’s questions.

Ok, we can include the graph, but at some point the applicant has to draw the line… The neighbors are not listening to our responses to their questions and concerns. Everything they raised at DRB we had already discussed prior in the public meetings.

Regards,
Richard

Richard, I thought it would be helpful to include the ITE graph for trip generations since there were questions about the numbers and data for this next meeting. For Mr. Sandoval, I thought that would be helpful.
**Project #:** 2020013; Pre-application  
**Property Description/Address:** Wintergreen Apartments at Tract E-1, east of Golf Course Rd. and north of the Black Arroyo Channel.  
**Date Submitted:** June 22, 2020  
**Submitted By:** Philip Crump and Jocelyn M. Torres  
**Meeting Date/Time:** June 18, 2020, 6:30-8:00 PM  
**Meeting Location:** First Baptist Church, 3906 19th Ave. SE, Rio Rancho, NM  
**Facilitator:** Philip Crump  
**Co-facilitator:** Jocelyn M. Torres  
**Applicant:** Calabac Illas Group c/o Donald Harville (owners)  
**Agent** – Tierra West LLC (TW), Ronald Bohannan, President and Richard Stevenson, Engineer  
**Neighborhood Associations/Interested Parties** - Seven Bar North Homeowners Association (HOA), West Side Coalition of Neighborhood Associations, Neighbors  

**Background/Meeting Summary:** The proposed gated community site location is the undeveloped Tract E-1, east of Golf Course Rd. and north of the Black Arroyo Channel. This is a pre-application meeting. The property is approximately eight acres and is zoned MX-M. The developer proposes four apartment buildings with 52 units in each building, totaling 208 units. This equates to a density of 24 units per acre. Each building will have a mix of studio, one and two-bedroom apartments. Vehicular access is off Golf Course Rd. at the existing driveway entrance, near the northwest corner of the property, which is intended to be a shared driveway when the currently vacant northern Tract D-1 is developed. There is also an emergency exit onto Golf Course Rd. proposed at the midblock as required by the Fire Marshall.

The development will also have a 5,000 sq. ft. clubhouse with porte-cochere. The clubhouse includes amenities such as a pool, spa, conference and meeting rooms, barbeque, and lounge areas. The residents’ gated entryways will be on each side of the entrance. There is extensive landscaping, with open space between the apartment buildings. Total square footage of each apartment building is 59,716 ft. with a maximum building height of 45 feet in elevation. One parking space for each apartment will include a covered parking stall. There are 379 parking spaces including the covered stalls and handicap spaces.

Setbacks for the apartments are: Front 5-feet, Side 0-feet (Table 2-4-5 on page 27 IDO), and Rear 50-ft landscape buffer (IDO Section 14-16-5-9(F) on page 287). The buildings themselves will be significantly farther from the property lines, as they are surrounded by parking. The eastern buildings will be approximately 134 feet offset the eastern property line. This site does not meet the traffic impact threshold to require a traffic study.

A prior meeting was conducted April 7, 2020 to discuss the DRB and ZHE request, of which the developer canceled the variance request. A second online meeting was held May 21, 2020 to discuss the DRB application. The Developer delayed the submittal to DRB to provide an in-person meeting on June 18, 2020 to discuss the DRB application, following easing of restrictions from the COVID-19.

**Outcomes:**
- Areas of Agreement:
  - All participants agreed to meet in person.
  - Participants were encouraged to attend the DRB Hearing of July 22, 2020.
  - TW will address action plan items.

- Unresolved Issues & Concerns:
  - Several issues were discussed in this meeting.
  - Neighbors remain opposed to the proposed development.

- Key Points:
  - Neighbors continue to have strong concerns regarding the apartment location, height, privacy, views, traffic and schools.
  - Neighbors also voiced concerns regarding the apartment landscaping, wall height, construction, vibration, noise, maintenance, walking paths, arroyo access, drainage, wildlife plan and potential development of northside eight acres.

Meeting Specifics:

1) Introduction.

Facilitator: Philip Crump: phcrumpsf@gmail.com. Those who signed in legibly, with their name and affiliation, will receive a meeting report. Philip Crump and Jocelyn M. Torres are neutral facilitators for the City of Albuquerque. TW Engineer Richard Stevenson, President Ron Bohannan and Architect Richard Bennett are in attendance. Richard Stevenson provided the project overview presented in prior meetings.

2) Building Height, Privacy, Views, Landscaping and Trash Bin Locations.

a) Neighbors stated the proposed design is not consistent with the property location and intent. The four-story height is inconsistent with this community.
   i) They asked that the building height be reduced to two stories.
      (1) TW – This height and design meets the IDO requirements. It took three years to amend the zoning code, with a goal of preventing urban sprawl. This property has a 50-foot buffer with a 134-foot setback distance of the buildings from the residential homes. It is near market development. The guidelines of the IDO motivated the Developer, who wants four stories.
   ii) View, wall height, buffer and landscaping concerns were expressed by neighbors. Neighbors are concerned that their views will be blocked, that the apartment residents will congregate near their property, that the wall should be eight-feet instead of six-feet high, that there should not be an eastside walking path, that landscaping should include river rock instead of native grass and that 6.5 foot specified barrier trees will not provide privacy until they mature. Trash containers should be moved to the center of the property and should not be located on the corners near the neighborhood. Juniper trees cause pollen and pine trees will shed.
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(1) TW - Concerns regarding the buffer area will be taken to the Developer, who has changed the tree specification to Evergreens. We will ask the Developer to change the trash bin locations so they are not adjacent to the neighborhood. (See Action Items.)

3) Traffic.

   a) Neighbors expressed several concerns about traffic congestion on Golf Course and Westside. This Development does not require a traffic study. There is a need for a traffic light on Westside at 7 Bar Loop Road. There are cut-through problems. There are problems with Rio Rancho traffic on Westside. This apartment complex will likely result in an additional 376 cars traveling south on Golf Course or East on Westside. School traffic will negatively impact existing roadways. The Lovelace Hospital is already overloading Westside.

   i) TW – The biggest problem is Westside Drive. Sandoval County has not built up their side of the roadway. TW will look at these traffic concerns closely and will reach out to the New Mexico Department of Transportation (NMDOT) regarding traffic problems expressed by neighbors. TW will review and report on traffic studies done within the past three years regarding the clear-sight triangle on Golf Course and Westside Drive intersection (See Action Item).

   ii) TW – Neighbors can protest cut-through problems via the City’s cut-through ordinance. The City can quantify traffic thresholds and implement a means of slowing the traffic, such as roundabouts and speed bumps.

   iii) TW - Rio Rancho has always had traffic problems. MRGCD gets funding for major corridors. The Intersection of 528 and Unser is under consideration for funding. This Development is under CABQ jurisdiction so we are not consulting with Rio Rancho. Development impact fees vary depending on the proposal. We only have 208 apartments and 250 are required for a traffic impact study.

   iv) TW - Will prepare a trip generation (hours) and trip distribution (network) study regarding Golf Course and Westside traffic in this location. (See Action Item).

4) Schools.

   a) Neighbors stated that schools will be stressed because of this development. They are concerned that an estimated 300 kids will further overload the schools.

   b) School traffic concerns were addressed in above Section 3.

5) Development of Northside Eight Acres.

   a) Neighbors are concerned about the development of the property north of the project consisting of eight acres. Will this developer be involved in a phase two development of that site? There is already a traffic problem on 7 Bar Loop and development of that site will increase traffic problems. It is unknown what type of development will be placed on that site.

   i) TW – This Developer is separate to the northern tract. MX-M Zoning allows for many permissive uses of the northern tract. Depending upon the use, the development of that site may require a traffic study. The neighborhood will be notified when that site is developed as required by the IDO notification procedures. TW will take the traffic impact study question to the apartment developer (See Action Item).

CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE
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a) Neighbors asked several questions. Why wasn’t a Southwest style used for these apartments? Why wasn’t a Southwest style used for these apartments? What is the anticipated construction duration? Will there be vibration and noise problems associated with the construction? Will there be utility problems due to construction? Will there be noise problems with the apartment complex?

i) TW – The anticipated construction duration is 12-16 months. The dirt work contractor will monitor vibrations. The construction site is 135 feet from the neighborhood. We are in contact with the Water Department and will contact PNM and NMGC regarding utilities. We don’t anticipate blasting. The contractor will determine the foundations. We will use standard techniques for determining vibration and settling. We will write the specification and these standard techniques will be included in the specification (See Action Item.)

ii) TW – The Developer, Contractor and Apartment Complex will abide by the CABQ Noise Ordinance requirements.

7) Apartment Maintenance, Management and Pest Control.

a) Neighbors requested that apartment maintenance and repairs not be conducted on weekends and that they be conducted at a reasonable hour. They asked that gas blowers not be used. They asked about pest control.

i) TW – Will take these concerns to the Owner (See Action Item). Noise ordinance day and time requirements will be met. TW recommends this project and believes they will do their best to comply with these requests.

8) Drainage.

a) Neighbors asked about the drainage plan.¹

i) TW – We do have a drainage plan and it will be shared with all. The grading plan will show where the runoff area is located and will be provided. Site drainage will enter into the AMAFCA Black Arroyo Channel to the south of the property. The drainage plan will be distributed at time of application to DRB to attendees of the meeting (See Action Item).

9) Arroyo Access.

a) Neighbors asked about apartment arroyo walking access.

i) TW – There will be pedestrian gates so residents can access the arroyo paths.

10) Apartment Need.

¹ In the May 21, 2020 Meeting, TW explained the property drainage plan as follows: “The property design allows for water remediation prior to entering the arroyo or the Rio Grande (RG) per the City of Albuquerque Drainage Ordinance and based upon the EPA Clean Water Act. This allows for the collection of trash, oil, and sediment before the water runoff enters the RG. The first flush pond holds the first portion and the excess runoff goes into the arroyo (See May 26, 2020 Report).”
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a) Neighbors asked whether there is a need for these apartments. There are 1,400 homes available to buy rather than the usual amount of 4,000-6,000 homes. Because of Covid-19 people want to buy instead of renting.

i) TW – There is currently a 30 day wait to get into rental housing. There is a need for additional rental housing.

11) Wildlife plan.

a) Neighbors asked about the wildlife plan.

i) TW – Will look at wildlife issues for this development (See Action Item).

Next Steps and Action Plan:

- TW will complete action items.
- Application will be submitted June 26, 2020.
- DRB hearing will be held July 22, 2020.

Action Items:

- TW will take concerns regarding the buffer area to the Developer and will ask that the trash bin locations be changed, so they are not adjacent to the neighborhood.
- TW will review and report on traffic studies done within the past three years regarding the clear-sight triangle on Golf Course and Westside Drive intersection.
- TW will prepare a trip generation (hours) and trip distribution (network) study regarding Golf Course and Westside intersection traffic in this location.
- TW will ask if a traffic impact study would be performed by Developer.
- TW will use standard techniques for determining vibration and settling and will include them in the specification for grading and drainage of the site.
- TW will consult with Owner and report on apartment maintenance, management and pest control plans.
- TW will provide the drainage plan at time of submittal to DRB.
- TW will consult with Owner regarding necessity of following CABQ Noise Ordinance regarding maintenance schedule, vehicles and other pertinent matters.
- TW will review Wildlife issues pertaining to this development.

Application Hearing Details:

- The Development Review Board hearing will be conducted on July 22, 2020. The agenda will be posted by Friday afternoon July 17th.
- Development Review Board meetings, a portion of which are public hearings, are held each Wednesday beginning at 9 a.m. in the Plaza del Sol Hearing Room at 600 2nd NW. Free 2-hour parking for Plaza del Sol customers is available on the north side of the building.
- The DRB, as with all City boards and commissions, is holding online meetings via Zoom. “The DRB ‘remote’ public meetings are using the Zoom software. All participants – DRB members, applicants, and the public – participate from the safety of their homes. You can choose to participate by video or audio only. Participants can listen to the meeting and may also speak during the public comment period.
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The agenda for the DRB meeting is posted on the City website by Friday afternoon ahead of the Wednesday meeting. The agenda includes information on accessing the DRB meeting. Participants can call the number listed on the agenda from their phone to be connected to the meeting. Participants may also can click on the link on the agenda to participate via computer (a microphone is required; a camera is optional.) Participants are not required to create a Zoom account, but may choose to do so.”

- The six members of the DRB are City staff representing the Planning Department, Parks and Recreation Department, Code Enforcement, City Engineer, Traffic Engineer, and Water/Sewer Utilities Engineer.
- The chairperson is the City Planner representative. Each member is authorized to sign plats.
- Jolene Wolfley, DRB Chair, Planning Department; Email: jwolfley@cabq.gov
- Additional comments may be sent to Planner Maggie Gould <MGould@cabq.gov>
- For questions, contact the Development Review Board Administrative Assistant Angela Gomez at (505) 924-3946.

Meeting Adjourned.

Names & Affiliations of Attendees:
Ron Bohannon    Tierra West
Richard Stevenson  Tierra West
Rick Bennett    Richard Bennett Architects
Gary Hirsch     7 Bar North HOA
Amy Garcia      7 Bar North HOA
Mike Mirabal     7 Bar North HOA
Megan Fitzpatrick  7 Bar North HOA
Bruce Creel     7 Bar North HOA
Fran DiMarco     7 Bar North HOA
Cathy Mirabal    7 Bar North HOA
Cheryl Ruff       7 Bar North HOA
Kathy Vigil     7 Bar North HOA
David Lopez     7 Bar North HOA
Lucille Lopez    7 Bar North HOA
Ken McVey       7 Bar North HOA
JP Murrieta      7 Bar North HOA
Tyra Murrieta   7 Bar North HOA
Nena Perkin     7 Bar North HOA
Lillian Werntz   7 Bar North HOA
Scott & Jae Templeton 7 Bar North HOA
Debbie Chavez    7 Bar North HOA
Dan McCormack   7 Bar North HOA
Erin & Tim Zinsmeyer 7 Bar North HOA
Loretta Huerta 7 Bar North HOA
Gayle M Binkley 7 Bar North HOA
Marsha & John Kearney 7 Bar North HOA
T Scott Hutchinson 7 Bar North HOA, Pres
Sandra Kruzich   7 Bar North HOA
Hilary Butler
Roy Fassell
Lennard Mc???
Land Use: 221
Multifamily Housing (Mid-Rise)

Description
Mid-rise multifamily housing includes apartments, townhouses, and condominiums located within the same building with at least three other dwelling units and that have between three and 10 levels (floors). Multifamily housing (low-rise) (Land Use 220), multifamily housing (high-rise) (Land Use 222), off-campus student apartment (Land Use 225), and mid-rise residential with 1st-floor commercial (Land Use 231) are related land uses.

Additional Data
In prior editions of Trip Generation Manual, the mid-rise multifamily housing sites were further divided into rental and condominium categories. An investigation of vehicle trip data found no clear differences in trip making patterns between the rental and condominium sites within the ITE database. As more data are compiled for future editions, this land use classification can be reinvestigated.

For the six sites for which both the number of residents and the number of occupied dwelling units were available, there were an average of 2.46 residents per occupied dwelling unit.

For the five sites for which the numbers of both total dwelling units and occupied dwelling units were available, an average of 95.7 percent of the total dwelling units were occupied.

Time-of-day distribution data for this land use are presented in Appendix A. For the eight general urban/suburban sites with data, the overall highest vehicle volumes during the AM and PM on a weekday were counted between 7:00 and 8:00 a.m. and 4:45 and 5:45 p.m., respectively.

For the four dense multi-use urban sites with 24-hour count data, the overall highest vehicle volumes during the AM and PM on a weekday were counted between 7:15 and 8:15 a.m. and 4:15 and 5:15 p.m., respectively. For the three center city core sites with 24-hour count data, the overall highest vehicle volumes during the AM and PM on a weekday were counted between 6:45 and 7:45 a.m. and 5:00 and 6:00 p.m., respectively.

For the six sites for which data were provided for both occupied dwelling units and residents, there was an average of 2.46 residents per occupied dwelling unit.

For the five sites for which data were provided for both occupied dwelling units and total dwelling units, an average of 95.7 percent of the units were occupied.

The average numbers of person trips per vehicle trip at the five center city core sites at which both person trip and vehicle trip data were collected were as follows:

- 1.84 during Weekday, Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic, one hour between 7 and 9 a.m.
- 1.94 during Weekday, AM Peak Hour of Generator
- 2.07 during Weekday, Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic, one hour between 4 and 6 p.m.
- 2.59 during Weekday, PM Peak Hour of Generator
The average numbers of person trips per vehicle trip at the 32 dense multi-use urban sites at which both person trip and vehicle trip data were collected were as follows:

- 1.90 during Weekday, Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic, one hour between 7 and 9 a.m.
- 1.90 during Weekday, AM Peak Hour of Generator
- 2.00 during Weekday, Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic, one hour between 4 and 6 p.m.
- 2.08 during Weekday, PM Peak Hour of Generator

The average numbers of person trips per vehicle trip at the 13 general urban/suburban sites at which both person trip and vehicle trip data were collected were as follows:

- 1.56 during Weekday, Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic, one hour between 7 and 9 a.m.
- 1.88 during Weekday, AM Peak Hour of Generator
- 1.70 during Weekday, Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic, one hour between 4 and 6 p.m.
- 2.07 during Weekday, PM Peak Hour of Generator

The sites were surveyed in the 1980s, the 1990s, the 2000s, and the 2010s in Alberta (CAN), British Columbia (CAN), California, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Ontario, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, Virginia, and Wisconsin.

Source Numbers

Multifamily Housing (Mid-Rise)
(221)

Vehicle Trip Ends vs: Dwelling Units
On a: Weekday

Setting/Location: General Urban/Suburban
Number of Studies: 27
Avg. Num. of Dwelling Units: 205
Directional Distribution: 50% entering, 50% exiting

Vehicle Trip Generation per Dwelling Unit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Rate</th>
<th>Range of Rates</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>1.27 - 12.50</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Plot and Equation

Fitted Curve Equation: \( T = 5.45(X) - 1.75 \)
\( R^2 = 0.77 \)
Multifamily Housing (Mid-Rise)
(221)

Vehicle Trip Ends vs: Dwelling Units
On a: Weekday,
Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic,
One Hour Between 7 and 9 a.m.

Setting/Location: General Urban/Suburban
Number of Studies: 53
Avg. Num. of Dwelling Units: 207
Directional Distribution: 26% entering, 74% exiting

Vehicle Trip Generation per Dwelling Unit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Rate</th>
<th>Range of Rates</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.06 - 1.61</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Plot and Equation

Fitted Curve Equation: \( \ln(T) = 0.98 \ln(X) - 0.98 \)

\( R^2 = 0.67 \)
Multifamily Housing (Mid-Rise)

Vehicle Trip Ends vs:  Dwelling Units
On a:  Weekday,
Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic,
One Hour Between 4 and 6 p.m.
Setting/Location:  General Urban/Suburban
Number of Studies:  60
Avg. Num. of Dwelling Units:  208
Directional Distribution:  61% entering, 39% exiting

Vehicle Trip Generation per Dwelling Unit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Rate</th>
<th>Range of Rates</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.15 - 1.11</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Plot and Equation

Fitted Curve Equation: \( \ln(T) = 0.96 \ln(X) - 0.63 \)
\( R^2 = 0.72 \)
PLAT OF TRACTS D-I, E-I
AMAFCAL BLACK ARROYO CHANNEL ROW
PARADISE HEIGHTS, UNIT I
ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO
MARCH, 2009

APPROVALS

PROJECT NO: 1002556 APPLICATION NO: 09DRB-70099
CITY SURVEYOR
CHRISTINE GASCON
4/10/09

FIRE AND REGULATIONS DEPARTMENT
ANTONIO CLAY
4/8/09

AMFCA

UTILITIES DEPARTMENT
ROGER C. LANE
4/8/09

TRANSPORTATION DIVISION
DAS CHAIRPERSON, PLANNING DEPARTMENT
4/8/09

TALOS LOG NO. 2009101434

FREE CONSENT AND DEDICATION

THE SUBMISSION OF THIS PLAT IS WITH THE FREE CONSENT OF AND IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE DESIRE OF THE UNDERSIGNED OWNERS OF THE LAND. THE OWNERS HEREBY WARRANT THAT THEY HOLD AMONG THEM COMPLETE AND INDEFEASIBLE TITLE TO THE LAND SUBMITTED. GRATUITIOUS SPECIFIC SUBURBANITY AND SURFACE PLOW, GAZING, SEWER, AND COMMUNICATIONS EASEMENTS AS COUNCILED ON THIS PLAT;

ADDITIONAL EXISTING EASEMENTS AS SHOWN ON THIS PLAT;

STATE THAT THIS SUBMISSION LIES WITHIN THE SUBMISSION REGULATION LIMITATION OF THE CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO.

IN ADDITION THE OWNER OF TRACTS D AND E DOES HEREBY DEDICATE PUBLIC RIGHTS-OF-WAY, SHOWN HEREIN, IN FEE SIMPLE WITH EASEMENT CONDITIONS TO THE CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE.

TRACTS D & E (GALAMBOS GROUP, A NEW MEXICO GENERAL PARTNERSHIP)

DONALD B. HARRIS

NOTARY PUBLIC

STATE OF NEW MEXICO
COUNTY OF BERNALILLO

This instrument was acknowledged before me on 3/15/09

JOHN B. HARRIS
EXECUTIVE EMBASSY

STATE OF NEW MEXICO
COUNTY OF BERNALILLO

This instrument was acknowledged before me on 3/15/09

JOHN B. KELLY
EXECUTIVE EMBASSY

NOTARY PUBLIC

BORDENAVE DESIGNS
P.O. BOX 91926, ALBUQUERQUE, NM 87199
(505)382-1344
(505)382-9105
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691
LEGAL DESCRIPTION
A tract of land situated in Projected Section 1, T11S, R18E, NGVD, TOWN OF ALAMEDA GRANDE, CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE, SANTA FE COUNTY, NEW MEXICO. Said tract being the said as tract A and E and block 18, Paradise Heights, Unit I, and described as follows:

Northeast corner of the tract herein described from whence the aforesaid monument 0-0-111 begins, northerly a distance of 206.79 feet, said point being on the southerly right-of-way of Westside Blvd, thence departing the southerly right-of-way of Westside Blvd,

500'7"E, 194.50 feet to a point on the northerly right-of-way of Benton Ave, thence,

N92°32'58"W, 170.30 feet along the northerly right-of-way of Benton Ave to a point, thence,

Northeast, 81.45 feet along the arc of a curve, having a radius of 158.45 feet and a long chord bearing N92°32'58"W a distance of 83.50 feet to a point, thence,

N91°45'36"W, 194.30 feet to a point, thence,

Northeast, 114.20 feet along the arc of a curve, leaving a radius of 222.45 feet and a long chord bearing N91°45'36"W a distance of 111.00 feet to a point, thence,

Northeast, 38.27 feet along the arc of a curve, leaving a radius of 25.00 feet and a long chord bearing N91°45'36"W a distance of 34.99 feet to the arc and from the northerly right-of-way of Benton Ave to the easterly right-of-way of golf course Rd, thence,

N91°40'10"E, 170.40 feet along the easterly right-of-way of golf course Rd to a point, thence,

N91°43'42"E, 477.42 feet along the vacated easterly right-of-way of golf course Rd to a point on the new right-of-way of golf course Rd, thence,

Northeast, 27.75 feet along the arc of a curve, leaving a radius of 207.76 feet and a long chord bearing N91°43'42"E a distance of 27.17 feet to a point, thence,

N92°14'25"W, 56.63 feet to a point, thence,

N78°32'58"W, 51.32 feet to a point, thence,

Northeast, 38.85 feet along the arc of a curve, leaving a radius of 25.00 feet and a long chord bearing N87°00'21"E a distance of 34.26 feet to a point, thence,

Northeast, 250.27 feet along the arc of a curve, leaving a radius of 280.50 feet and a long chord bearing N87°00'21"E a distance of 248.32 feet to a point, thence,

Northeast, 37.24 feet along the arc of a curve, leaving a radius of 140.40 feet and a long chord bearing N87°00'21"E a distance of 36.15 feet to a point, thence,

Northeast, 63.85 feet along the arc of a curve, leaving a radius of 30.00 feet and a long chord bearing N87°00'21"E a distance of 62.84 feet to a point, thence,

N91°17'20"E, 90.00 feet to a point, thence,

N83°30'00"E, 28.03 feet to a point, thence,

Northeast, 16.00 feet along the arc of a curve, leaving a radius of 30.00 feet and a long chord bearing N83°30'00"E a distance of 17.73 feet to a point on the vacated easterly right-of-way of golf course Rd, thence,

Northeast, 28.56 feet along the arc of a curve, leaving a radius of 25.00 feet and a long chord bearing N83°30'00"E a distance of 27.14 feet to a point on the vacated easterly right-of-way of golf course Rd to the southerly right-of-way of Westside Blvd, thence,

N83°30'00"W, 74.24 feet to a point, thence,

N84°54'36"E, 25.05 feet along the vacated right-of-way of Westside Blvd to a point on the new right-of-way of Westside Blvd, thence,

Northeast, 31.50 feet along the arc of a curve, leaving a radius of 20.00 feet and a long chord bearing N84°54'36"E a distance of 30.50 feet to a point, thence,

N91°40'10"E, 170.40 feet to a point, thence,

N91°43'42"E, 13.20 feet to a point, said point being the point of beginning.

Said tract contains 18,673 acres more or less.

NEW MEXICO GAS COMPANY EASEMENT RELEASE APPROVAL

New Mexico Gas Company, Inc., a Delaware corporation, does hereby release, waive, relinquish, and discharge its rights, title and interest in the easement(s) (granted by prior plat, replat or document) shown to be vacated on this plat.

NEW MEXICO GAS COMPANY

By:

STATE OF NEW MEXICO
COUNTY OF Bernalillo
This instrument was acknowledged before me on 7-1-19
My Commission Expires: March 24, 2019

Geographic Locale

INSET I SCALE 1" = 20'

INSET 2 SCALE 1" = 10'

INSET 3 SCALE 1" = 10'

PLAT OF TRACTS D-I, E-I
AMAFCA BLACK ARROYO CHANNEL ROW
PARADISE HEIGHTS, UNIT I
ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO
MARCH, 2009

NOTE: SEE SHEET 3 FOR CURVE DATA NOT SHOWN ON THIS SHEET
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Jeanne,

Thanks for passing on the residents’ concerns. We held a pre-application NA meeting on Thursday 18th (which was facilitated), it was the third public meeting we held with the NA regarding the proposed development. The neighbors had a lot of general traffic concerns and questions which we tried to address and have some action items to follow up with the NMDOT to find out more on the Westside Blvd. expansion plans. I’ve attached the meeting minutes for reference.

We intend to submit to DRB by this Friday. The application is to DRB for a site plan – major, and we do not go to EPC.

We followed the IDO notification procedures for the pre-application meeting, and the resident will be notified at time of making DRB application based on the proximity to the site.

Regards,
Regards,
Richard Stevenson, PE
Tierra West LLC
(505) 858 3100

Good morning, Richard. There have been a lot of neighborhood contacts regarding this project that just got approved at EPC. They have mainly been contacting me regarding traffic and streetlighting complaints. Anyway, I just wanted to give you a heads up.

When will you be turning in your DRB application? One of the complaints was that the neighbors did not feel adequately notified, and she thought neighbors in her area were not notified. (This is her address below.) I just wanted to make sure you were aware before sending out DRB notifications.

Marsha Kearney rmeek1978@gmail.com
Marsha Kearney
>> 10927 Carreta Drive NW
>> Albuquerque, NM 87114
JEANNE WOLFENBARGER
manager for transportation
o 505.924-3991
e jwolfenbarger@cabq.gov
cabq.gov/planning

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

Please find attached the following items relating to the traffic queries for this project:

- Trip Generation Worksheet based on the ITE Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition for Multifamily Housing (Mid-Rise) apartments
- Sub-Area Map as a basis of the trip distribution
- Trip Distribution Worksheet
- Trip Distribution Map
- Westside Blvd. widening project timing and financials which is in the current Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for FFY 2020 and 2021. According to MRCOG TIP Coordinator, this is a high priority project for the City of Albuquerque and City of Rio Rancho. This project will more than likely be completed over the next few years considering the amount of construction that is involved. Here is a link to MRCOG website where you can find the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (which includes project lists), as well as the TIP: https://www.mrcog-nm.gov/233/Metro-Planning.

Grading and Drainage
- Here is the downloadable link to the drainage plan https://1drv.ms/b/s!Ah_cf8IHIIL3ogkDpTWEqdmDVXFo

Kind Regards,

Richard Stevenson, P.E.
Dear All:

Attached please find the Report for the meeting held Thursday evening, June 18th, regarding the proposed Wintergreen Apartments. Please review it carefully.

If there are errors of either Omission (something important said but left out) or Commission (something important misquoted), please let us know and we will issue correcting Amendments. You may send potential corrections to phcrumpsf@gmail.com.

Also, instructions for submitting additional comments to the DRB are included near the end of the report under Hearing Details.

Also, you may let the City know your impression of the meeting and the facilitator(s) by going to one of the following evaluations:


or


Thank you very much for your participation.

Philip Crump and Jocelyn Torres, Facilitators

=================================================================
This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
Ok, we can include the graph, but at some point the applicant has to draw the line... The neighbors are not listening to our responses to their questions and concerns. Everything they raised at DRB we had already discussed prior in the public meetings.

Regards,
Richard

Richard, I thought it would be helpful to include the ITE graph for trip generations since there were questions about the numbers and data for this next meeting.
For Mr. Sandoval, I thought that would be helpful.
### Trip Distribution Table

**Project Name:**

For determination of Trip Distribution for Proposed Residential Development Trips

**2015 and 2025 Data Taken from Mid-Region Council of Governments’ 2035 Socioeconomic Forecasts by Data Analysis Subzones for the Mid-Region of New Mexico**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub Area</th>
<th>% Sub Area in Study</th>
<th>2012 Employment</th>
<th>2040 Employment</th>
<th>Interpolated Employment for the Year</th>
<th>Employment in Study</th>
<th>Dist. (M.)</th>
<th>Employment / Distance</th>
<th>% Employment</th>
<th>% Utilizing</th>
<th>% Employment / Dist Utilizing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(GCR)</td>
<td>Golf Course Rd. North</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(GSS)</td>
<td>Golf Course Rd. South</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(WWP)</td>
<td>Westside Blvd. West</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(WE)</td>
<td>Westside Blvd. East</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Sub Area Employment Data:

Trip_Dist_Residential.xlsx - DAZ_Pop
**Project Desc.:** Rehab & widen from 2 to 4 lanes, bike lanes, pedestrian enhancements and other improvements per the Westside-McMahon Corridor Study. Transitions fr. Improv. To exist. Roadway sections include 350' w. of Westside/Golf Course intersection. SEE REMARKS SEC.

**Remarks:** AM-Apr-20, AM-feb-20, R-19-11, AM-Dec-18, Project will utilize AC project delivery method. R-18-01 on Westside; 250’ east of intersection of Westside and NM 528, on Westside, 250’ n of the intersection of Westside and Golf Course;, on Golf Course; 600’ south of the intersection of Westide and Golf Course, on Golf Course and ADA ramp improvement on the SE corner.

### PROGRAMMED FUNDS - Four Year Federal TIP by Funding Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUND SOURCE</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>4 Yr. TOTALS</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Match</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Match</td>
<td>$1,173,321</td>
<td>$469,933</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,643,254</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP-U</td>
<td>$5,385,204</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>$2,757,627</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>$8,142,831</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP-U</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$8,058,525</td>
<td>$3,227,560</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$11,286,085</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 6

Subareas of the MRCOG Region

Subarea boundaries extend to county boundary where full extent of subarea not shown except for Subarea 29 which only includes southern Santa Fe County.

Mid-Region Council of Governments
317 Commercial NE, Suite 104
Albuquerque, NM 87102
505-247-1750

Wintergreen Luxury Apartments
(Golf Course Rd. South of Westside Blvd.)
Trip Distribution Subarea Map
Wintergreen Luxury Apartments (Golf Course Rd. South of Westside Blvd.)


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USE (ITE CODE)</th>
<th>24 HOUR TWO-WAY VOLUME</th>
<th>A.M. PEAK HOUR</th>
<th>P. M. PEAK HOUR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GROSS</td>
<td>ENTER</td>
<td>EXIT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily Housing (Mid-Rise)</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>1,130</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dwelling Units

ITE Trip Generation Equations:

Average Vehicle Trip Ends on a Weekday (24 HOUR TWO-WAY VOLUME)

\[
T = 5.44 \times (X) + 1.75
\]

50% Enter, 50% Exit

Average Vehicle Trip Ends on a Weekday, Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic, One Hour Between 7am and 9am (A.M. PEAK HOUR)

\[
T = 0.36 \times (X) + 0
\]

26% Enter, 74% Exit

Average Vehicle Trip Ends on a Weekday, Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic, One Hour Between 4pm and 6pm (P.M. PEAK HOUR)

\[
T = 0.44 \times (X) + 0
\]

61% Enter, 39% Exit

Comments:

Four Stories

Based on ITE Trip Generation Manual - 10th Edition
Jeanne the property is being sold by the owner to our client so once the sale is commenced there will be separate ownership of the parcels. Our client is buying Parcel E-1. We have heard rumors of other developments on the corner but nothing set in stone. We are not working on those parcels at this time. The driveway is a common lot line and it is shared between our parcel and the remaining parcel. The site plan reflects how that shared access is being proposed. We also don’t know if the property to the north Tract D-1 will be subdivided but probably will in the future. We do not know of any time frames when the property will develop especially in this current economic environment.

For the entrance we can assume a commercial use on the balance and then compute what the resulting peak hour turning movements would be to adjust the queue length to accommodate the parcel to the north if that is acceptable? The gate on the south side is emergency entrance only and all of our traffic will use the northern driveway. We will show how the fire access and turning movement can be handed.

Let me know if I answered your questions and if we can assume a normal commercial development for the establishment of the queue length for the entrance?

Thanks

Ronald R. Bohannan, P.E.
Tierra West LLC.
5571 Midway Park Place, NE
Albuquerque, NM 87109
505-858-3100

Richard, I had some comments/questions after yesterday’s meeting:

- I was looking closer at the site plans and noticed that the property line needed to be shown on the north side of the property. It looks like shared access needs to be established with the property to the north based on driveway location after looking at AGIS even though property owner is the same.
- Additionally, I had a question about what the plans were for the property to the north given that it has the same owner. Was there a plan to replat? Is there a plan to build more apartments to the north and what is the timing of this? (This will affect how we look at the traffic and the queuing into the site.)
- The queuing analysis requested for the left and right turn bays needs to also address the gate on the southern entrance. It needs to be established. (Is there a reason for a gate at the southern entrance but not for the northern
It looks like there is additional right-of-way for a right turn lane if needed. Also provide diagram showing that a car can turn around easily without having to back up into Golf Course at this southern entrance.

Thanks!

JEANNE WOLFENBARGER
manager for transportation
o 505.924-3991
e jwolfenbarger@cabq.gov
cabq.gov/planning
Jeanne,

I will make sure the signage is labelled for the emergency access.

Attached is the plat for the property; there is a blanket cross access easement between both parcels. Do we need to create a specific shared access agreement?

Regards,
Richard Stevenson, PE
Tierra West LLC
(505) 858 3100

From: Wolfenbarger, Jeanne [mailto:jwolfenbarger@cabq.gov]
Sent: Thursday, July 23, 2020 10:58 AM
To: Ron Bohannan; Richard Stevenson
Cc: Biazar, Shahab
Subject: RE: [#2020013] 004030 DRB Case

Thanks for the quick response and the information, Ron! Is there a shared access agreement?

Yes, it makes sense to assume a commercial use for the bay lengths just as you have proposed below.

Gated Entrance: I remember the keyed note showed a gated entrance, not necessarily noted as an emergency access only. If it is an emergency access only, include two signs per MUTCD involving emergency access only and a knox box. Get Fire Marshall approval.

Thanks!
Jeanne the property is being sold by the owner to our client so once the sale is commenced there will be separate ownership of the parcels. Our client is buying Parcel E-1. We have heard rumors of other developments on the corner but nothing set in stone. We are not working on those parcels at this time. The driveway is a common lot line and it is shared between our parcel and the remaining parcel. The site plan reflects how that shared access is being proposed. We also don’t know if the property to the north Tract D-1 will be subdivided but probably will in the future. We do not know of any time frames when the property will develop especially in this current economic environment.

For the entrance we can assume a commercial use on the balance and then compute what the resulting peak hour turning movements would be to adjust the queue length to accommodate the parcel to the north if that is acceptable? The gate on the south side is emergency entrance only and all of our traffic will use the northern driveway. We will show how the fire access and turning movement can be handed.

Let me know if I answered your questions and if we can assume a normal commercial development for the establishment of the queue length for the entrance?

Thanks

Ronald R. Bohannan, P.E.
Tierra West LLC.
5571 Midway Park Place, NE
Albuquerque, NM 87109
505-858-3100
- The queuing analysis requested for the left and right turn bays needs to also address the gate on the southern entrance. It needs to be established. (Is there a reason for a gate at the southern entrance but not for the northern entrance?) It looks like there is additional right-of-way for a right turn lane if needed. Also provide diagram showing that a car can turn around easily without having to back up into Golf Course at this southern entrance.

Thanks!

JEANNE WOLFENBARGER
manager for transportation
o 505.924-3991
e jwolfenbarger@cabq.gov
cabq.gov/planning

This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
Richard, he did leave a message. I then left him a message regarding the size of the complex, but he never contacted me again.

It seems that he is not really that interested in this particular project. My experience with Rio Rancho is very different from that of NMDOT.

It seems clear from the e-mail below that he is not concerned. What have your discussions with him been?

---

JEANNE WOLFENBARGER
manager for transportation
o 505.924-3991
e jwolfenbarger@cabq.gov
cabq.gov/planning

---

Jeanne, 

Did David Serrano from Rio Rancho ever contact you in regards to traffic coordination? What was the outcome? Thanks.

Regards,
Richard Stevenson, PE
Tierra West LLC
(505) 858 3100

---
David,

I have included Ms. Jeanne Wolfenbarger who is the Manager for Transportation in this email. Her telephone number is 924-3991.

Thanks for the quick response.

Regards,
Richard Stevenson, PE
Tierra West LLC
(505) 858 3100

From: DAVID SERRANO [mailto:DSERRANO@RRNM.GOV]
Sent: Thursday, July 23, 2020 10:59 AM
To: Ron Bohannan
Cc: Richard Stevenson
Subject: RE: [#2020013] 2020013 - Apartment Complex Golf Course and Western Trails Albuquerque

Ron,

Doing well, hope you are as well. I am not sure why the City of Rio Rancho would be involved as Westside/Golf Course intersection is COA maintained. Can you direct me to the COA contact I can call to discuss the concern?

Thanks,
David D. Serrano, P.E.
Engineering Division Manager
Development Services Dept.
City of Rio Rancho
3200 Civic Center Circle NE
Rio Rancho, NM  87144
Mobile: (505) 235-5512
Phone:  (505) 891-5059
dserrano@rrnm.gov

From: Ron Bohannan <rrb@tierrawestllc.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 23, 2020 9:18 AM
To: DAVID SERRANO <DSERRANO@RRNM.GOV>
Cc: Richard Stevenson <rstevenson@tierrawestllc.com>; Ron Bohannan <rrb@tierrawestllc.com>
Subject: FW: [#2020013] 2020013 - Apartment Complex Golf Course and Western Trails Albuquerque

Hope you are doing well. We are proposing to develop 208 apartments on a vacant site within the City of Albuquerque, on the northeast corner of Golf Course Rd and AMAFCA Black Arroyo channel (see attached vicinity map and site plan). Attached is the trip generation and distribution that we have provided to City who wanted us to coordinate with
you and the City of Rio Rancho. We have been in discussions with the Department of Municipal Development (DMD) who has indicated they are still tracking the widening of Western Trails early next year.

We are getting a lot of neighborhood opposition and so the City wanted us to coordinate with your department. We want to confirm we are to follow the City of Albuquerque DPM process for traffic review/improvement consideration?

If you have any other questions please feel free to reach out to either Richard Stevenson or myself.

Thanks

Ronald R. Bohannan, P.E.
Tierra West LLC.
5571 Midway Park Place, NE
Albuquerque, NM 87109
505-858-3100

=======================================================
This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
Thanks, Richard. I will review. Regarding your last question about the streetlights from an earlier e-mail, the DPM discusses light requirements at intersections and at mid-block. Review and let me know. It appeared that you could add a light at your entrance, but I will leave that to you as the designer.

JEANNE WOLFENBARGER
manager for transportation
o 505.924-3991
e jwolfenbarger@cabq.gov
cabq.gov/planning

Cc: Ron Bohannan
Subject: RE: [#2020013] DRB Case# 4030

Jeanne,

Attached is the following items as requested with comment #5 for tomorrows DRB hearing. We will provide a summary at the meeting in regards to impact on cut through and the congestion on Western Trails, but we wanted to get the numbers in front of you today.
. 
. Trip Generation Worksheet based on the ITE Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition for Multifamily Housing (Mid-Rise) apartments
     . Sub-Area Map as a basis of the trip distribution
     . Trip Distribution Worksheet
     . Trip Distribution Map

Regards,
Richard Stevenson, PE
Tierra West LLC
(505) 858 3100

-----Original Message-----
From: Wolfenbarger, Jeanne [mailto:jwolfenbarger@cabq.gov]
Sent: Monday, July 20, 2020 1:39 PM
To: Ron Bohannan; Richard Stevenson
Subject: DRB Case# 4030

Ron and Richard,

Please see neighborhood comments and attached comments from Transportation for the upcoming DRB. Thanks!

JEANNE WOLFENBARGER
manager for transportation
o 505.924-3991
e jwolfenbarger@cabq.gov
cabq.gov/planning
-----Original Message-----
From: Larry Sandoval [mailto:larrysandoval75@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, July 18, 2020 4:38 PM
To: Wolfley, Jolene
Cc: Wolfenbarger, Jeanne; mike mirabal; Marsha Kearney; Larry Sandoval
Subject: Request for Traffic Impact Study

Good afternoon Ms. Wofley,

Please include this pdf document as part of our record to the Board. Thank you.

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

=================================================================================================
This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
The old DPM specifies streetlighting at intersections and a light mid-block probably where your entrance is. I think the mid-block distance is 500 feet, but you would have to look that up.

The new DPM relies on an illumination design, but the LEDs are brighter than the old types of lights.

Jeanne,

In regards to comment #6:
6. Follow DPM requirements for streetlighting design along Golf Course for the new site. Place streetlighting on infrastructure list, including all necessary appurtenances.

I checked Section 7-4(M)(6) of the new DPM and this only talks to new subdivisions. We will provide lighting at the driveway entrance but unless required will not offer to install street lights for Golf Course along the property frontage. Can you tell me which section in the DPM requires new street lighting along the Golf Course frontage please?

Regards,
Richard Stevenson, PE
Tierra West LLC
(505) 858 3100

-----Original Message-----
From: Richard Stevenson
Sent: Tuesday, July 21, 2020 8:02 AM
To: 'Wolfenbarger, Jeanne'
Cc: Ron Bohannan
Subject: RE: [#20200113] DRB Case# 4030

Thanks Jeanne.

Yes I checked Section 7-4(M)(6) of the new DPM and this only talks to new subdivisions. We will provide lighting at the driveway entrance but unless required will not offer to install street lights for Golf Course along the property frontage.

Not sure how many neighbors will be on the call tomorrow to discuss traffic but we will do our best to answer their questions.
Thanks, Richard. I will review. Regarding your last question about the streetlights from an earlier e-mail, the DPM discusses light requirements at intersections and at mid-block. Review and let me know. It appeared that you could add a light at your entrance, but I will leave that to you as the designer.

JEANNE WOLFENBARGER  
manager for transportation  
o 505.924-3991  
e jwolfenbarger@cabq.gov  
cabq.gov/planning

Attached is the following items as requested with comment #5 for tomorrows DRB hearing. We will provide a summary at the meeting in regards to impact on cut through and the congestion on Western Trails, but we wanted to get the numbers in front of you today.

. Trip Generation Worksheet based on the ITE Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition for Multifamily Housing (Mid-Rise) apartments
. Sub-Area Map as a basis of the trip distribution
. Trip Distribution Worksheet
. Trip Distribution Map

Regards,  
Richard Stevenson, PE  
Tierra West LLC  
(505) 858 3100
Ron and Richard,

Please see neighborhood comments and attached comments from Transportation for the upcoming DRB. Thanks!

JEANNE WOLFENBARGER
manager for transportation
o 505.924-3991
e jwolfenbarger@cabq.gov
cabq.gov/planning

-----Original Message-----
From: Larry Sandoval [mailto:larrysandoval75@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, July 18, 2020 4:38 PM
To: Wolfley, Jolene
Cc: Wolfenbarger, Jeanne; mike mirabal; Marsha Kearney; Larry Sandoval
Subject: Request for Traffic Impact Study

Good afternoon Ms. Wofley,

Please include this pdf document as part of our record to the Board. Thank you.
Gomez, Angela J.

From: Wolfenbarger, Jeanne
Sent: Friday, July 24, 2020 8:19 AM
To: 'Richard Stevenson'
Cc: Ron Bohannan
Subject: RE: [#2020013] ITE Graph

Thanks, Richard. I am hoping that showing an actual graph might help answer MR. Sandoval’s questions.

From: Richard Stevenson [mailto:rstevenson@tierrawestllc.com]
Sent: Friday, July 24, 2020 8:16 AM
To: Wolfenbarger, Jeanne
Cc: Ron Bohannan
Subject: RE: [#2020013] ITE Graph

Ok, we can include the graph, but at some point the applicant has to draw the line... The neighbors are not listening to our responses to their questions and concerns. Everything they raised at DRB we had already discussed prior in the public meetings.

Regards,
Richard

From: Wolfenbarger, Jeanne [mailto:jwolfenbarger@cabq.gov]
Sent: Friday, July 24, 2020 8:11 AM
To: Richard Stevenson
Subject: ITE Graph

Richard, I thought it would be helpful to include the ITE graph for trip generations since there were questions about the numbers and data for this next meeting.
For Mr. Sandoval, I thought that would be helpful.

JEANNE WOLFENBARGER
manager for transportation
o 505.924-3991
e jwolfenbarger@cabq.gov
cabq.gov/planning

=================================================================================================
This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
Project #: 2020013; Pre-application
Property Description/Address: Wintergreen Apartments at Tract E-1, east of Golf Course Rd. and north of the Black Arroyo Channel.
Date Submitted: June 22, 2020
Submitted By: Philip Crump and Jocelyn M. Torres
Meeting Date/Time: June 18, 2020, 6:30-8:00 PM
Meeting Location: First Baptist Church, 3906 19th Ave. SE, Rio Rancho, NM
Facilitator: Philip Crump
Co-facilitator: Jocelyn M. Torres
Applicant: Calabac Illas Group c/o Donald Harville (owners)
Agent – Tierra West LLC (TW), Ronald Bohannan, President and Richard Stevenson, Engineer
Neighborhood Associations/Interested Parties - Seven Bar North Homeowners Association (HOA), West Side Coalition of Neighborhood Associations, Neighbors

Background/Meeting Summary: The proposed gated community site location is the undeveloped Tract E-1, east of Golf Course Rd. and north of the Black Arroyo Channel. This is a pre-application meeting. The property is approximately eight acres and is zoned MX-M. The developer proposes four apartment buildings with 52 units in each building, totaling 208 units. This equates to a density of 24 units per acre. Each building will have a mix of studio, one and two-bedroom apartments. Vehicular access is off Golf Course Rd. at the existing driveway entrance, near the northwest corner of the property, which is intended to be a shared driveway when the currently vacant northern Tract D-1 is developed. There is also an emergency exit onto Golf Course Rd. proposed at the midblock as required by the Fire Marshall.

The development will also have a 5,000 sq. ft. clubhouse with porte-cochere. The clubhouse includes amenities such as a pool, spa, conference and meeting rooms, barbeque, and lounge areas. The residents’ gated entryways will be on each side of the entrance. There is extensive landscaping, with open space between the apartment buildings. Total square footage of each apartment building is 59,716 ft. with a maximum building height of 45 feet in elevation. One parking space for each apartment will include a covered parking stall. There are 379 parking spaces including the covered stalls and handicap spaces.

Setbacks for the apartments are: Front 5-feet, Side 0-feet (Table 2-4-5 on page 27 IDO), and Rear 50-ft landscape buffer (IDO Section 14-16-5-9(F) on page 287). The buildings themselves will be significantly farther from the property lines, as they are surrounded by parking. The eastern buildings will be approximately 134 feet offset the eastern property line. This site does not meet the traffic impact threshold to require a traffic study.

A prior meeting was conducted April 7, 2020 to discuss the DRB and ZHE request, of which the developer canceled the variance request. A second online meeting was held May 21, 2020 to discuss the DRB application. The Developer delayed the submittal to DRB to provide an in-person meeting on June 18, 2020 to discuss the DRB application, following easing of restrictions from the COVID-19.

Outcomes:
- **Areas of Agreement:**
  - All participants agreed to meet in person.
  - Participants were encouraged to attend the DRB Hearing of July 22, 2020.
  - TW will address action plan items.

- **Unresolved Issues & Concerns:**
  - Several issues were discussed in this meeting.
  - Neighbors remain opposed to the proposed development.

- **Key Points:**
  - Neighbors continue to have strong concerns regarding the apartment location, height, privacy, views, traffic and schools.
  - Neighbors also voiced concerns regarding the apartment landscaping, wall height, construction, vibration, noise, maintenance, walking paths, arroyo access, drainage, wildlife plan and potential development of northside eight acres.

**Meeting Specifics:**

1) **Introduction.**

   Facilitator: Philip Crump: phcrumpsf@gmail.com. Those who signed in legibly, with their name and affiliation, will receive a meeting report. Philip Crump and Jocelyn M. Torres are neutral facilitators for the City of Albuquerque. TW Engineer Richard Stevenson, President Ron Bohannan and Architect Richard Bennett are in attendance. Richard Stevenson provided the project overview presented in prior meetings.

2) **Building Height, Privacy, Views, Landscaping and Trash Bin Locations.**

   a) Neighbors stated the proposed design is not consistent with the property location and intent. The four-story height is inconsistent with this community.
   
   i) They asked that the building height be reduced to two stories.
   
   (1) TW – This height and design meets the IDO requirements. It took three years to amend the zoning code, with a goal of preventing urban sprawl. This property has a 50-foot buffer with a 134-foot setback distance of the buildings from the residential homes. It is near market development. The guidelines of the IDO motivated the Developer, who wants four stories.

   ii) View, wall height, buffer and landscaping concerns were expressed by neighbors. Neighbors are concerned that their views will be blocked, that the apartment residents will congregate near their property, that the wall should be eight-feet instead of six-feet high, that there should not be an eastside walking path, that landscaping should include river rock instead of native grass and that 6.5 foot specified barrier trees will not provide privacy until they mature. Trash containers should be moved to the center of the property and should not be located on the corners near the neighborhood.Juniper trees cause pollen and pine trees will shed.
CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE
LAND USE FACILITATION PROGRAM PROJECT MEETING REPORT

(1) TW - Concerns regarding the buffer area will be taken to the Developer, who has changed the tree specification to Evergreens. We will ask the Developer to change the trash bin locations so they are not adjacent to the neighborhood. (See Action Items.)

3) Traffic.

a) Neighbors expressed several concerns about traffic congestion on Golf Course and Westside. This Development does not require a traffic study. There is a need for a traffic light on Westside at 7 Bar Loop Road. There are cut-through problems. There are problems with Rio Rancho traffic on Westside. This apartment complex will likely result in an additional 376 cars traveling south on Golf Course or East on Westside. School traffic will negatively impact existing roadways. The Lovelace Hospital is already overloading Westside.

i) TW – The biggest problem is Westside Drive. Sandoval County has not built up their side of the roadway. TW will look at these traffic concerns closely and will reach out to the New Mexico Department of Transportation (NMDOT) regarding traffic problems expressed by neighbors. TW will review and report on traffic studies done within the past three years regarding the clear-sight triangle on Golf Course and Westside Drive intersection (See Action Item).

ii) TW – Neighbors can protest cut-through problems via the City’s cut-through ordinance. The City can quantify traffic thresholds and implement a means of slowing the traffic, such as roundabouts and speed bumps.

iii) TW - Rio Rancho has always had traffic problems. MRGCD gets funding for major corridors. The Intersection of 528 and Unser is under consideration for funding. This Development is under CABQ jurisdiction so we are not consulting with Rio Rancho. Development impact fees vary depending on the proposal. We only have 208 apartments and 250 are required for a traffic impact study.

iv) TW - Will prepare a trip generation (hours) and trip distribution (network) study regarding Golf Course and Westside traffic in this location. (See Action Item).

4) Schools.

a) Neighbors stated that schools will be stressed because of this development. They are concerned that an estimated 300 kids will further overload the schools.

b) School traffic concerns were addressed in above Section 3.

5) Development of Northside Eight Acres.

a) Neighbors are concerned about the development of the property north of the project consisting of eight acres. Will this developer be involved in a phase two development of that site? There is already a traffic problem on 7 Bar Loop and development of that site will increase traffic problems. It is unknown what type of development will be placed on that site.

i) TW – This Developer is separate to the northern tract. MX-M Zoning allows for many permissive uses of the northern tract. Depending upon the use, the development of that site may require a traffic study. The neighborhood will be notified when that site is developed as required by the IDO notification procedures. TW will take the traffic impact study question to the apartment developer (See Action Item).

a) Neighbors asked several questions. Why wasn’t a Southwest style used for these apartments? What is the anticipated construction duration? Will there be vibration and noise problems associated with the construction? Will there be utility problems due to construction? Will there be noise problems with the apartment complex?

i) TW – The anticipated construction duration is 12-16 months. The dirt work contractor will monitor vibrations. The construction site is 135 feet from the neighborhood. We are in contact with the Water Department and will contact PNM and NMGC regarding utilities. We don’t anticipate blasting. The contractor will determine the foundations. We will use standard techniques for determining vibration and settling. We will write the specification and these standard techniques will be included in the specification (See Action Item.)

ii) TW – The Developer, Contractor and Apartment Complex will abide by the CABQ Noise Ordinance requirements.

7) Apartment Maintenance, Management and Pest Control.

a) Neighbors requested that apartment maintenance and repairs not be conducted on weekends and that they be conducted at a reasonable hour. They asked that gas blowers not be used. They asked about pest control.

i) TW – Will take these concerns to the Owner (See Action Item). Noise ordinance day and time requirements will be met. TW recommends this project and believes they will do their best to comply with these requests.

8) Drainage.

a) Neighbors asked about the drainage plan.¹

i) TW – We do have a drainage plan and it will be shared with all. The grading plan will show where the runoff area is located and will be provided. Site drainage will enter into the AMAFCA Black Arroyo Channel to the south of the property. The drainage plan will be distributed at time of application to DRB to attendees of the meeting (See Action Item).

9) Arroyo Access.

a) Neighbors asked about apartment arroyo walking access.

i) TW – There will be pedestrian gates so residents can access the arroyo paths.

10) Apartment Need.

---

¹ In the May 21, 2020 Meeting, TW explained the property drainage plan as follows: "The property design allows for water remediation prior to entering the arroyo or the Rio Grande (RG) per the City of Albuquerque Drainage Ordinance and based upon the EPA Clean Water Act. This allows for the collection of trash, oil, and sediment before the water runoff enters the RG. The first flush pond holds the first portion and the excess runoff goes into the arroyo (See May 26, 2020 Report)."
a) Neighbors asked whether there is a need for these apartments. There are 1,400 homes available to buy rather than the usual amount of 4,000-6,000 homes. Because of Covid-19 people want to buy instead of renting.
   i) TW – There is currently a 30 day wait to get into rental housing. There is a need for additional rental housing.

11) **Wildlife plan.**

   a) Neighbors asked about the wildlife plan.
   i) TW – Will look at wildlife issues for this development *(See Action Item).*

Next Steps and Action Plan:

- TW will complete action items.
- Application will be submitted June 26, 2020.
- DRB hearing will be held July 22, 2020.

Action Items:

- TW will take concerns regarding the buffer area to the Developer and will ask that the trash bin locations be changed, so they are not adjacent to the neighborhood.
- TW will review and report on traffic studies done within the past three years regarding the clear-sight triangle on Golf Course and Westside Drive intersection.
- TW will prepare a trip generation (hours) and trip distribution (network) study regarding Golf Course and Westside intersection traffic in this location.
- TW will ask if a traffic impact study would be performed by Developer.
- TW will use standard techniques for determining vibration and settling and will include them in the specification for grading and drainage of the site.
- TW will consult with Owner and report on apartment maintenance, management and pest control plans.
- TW will provide the drainage plan at time of submittal to DRB.
- TW will consult with Owner regarding necessity of following CABQ Noise Ordinance regarding maintenance schedule, vehicles and other pertinent matters.
- TW will review Wildlife issues pertaining to this development.

Application Hearing Details:

- The Development Review Board hearing will be conducted on July 22, 2020. The agenda will be posted by Friday afternoon July 17th.
- Development Review Board meetings, a portion of which are public hearings, are held each Wednesday beginning at 9 a.m. in the Plaza del Sol Hearing Room at 600 2nd NW. Free 2-hour parking for Plaza del Sol customers is available on the north side of the building. The DRB, as with all City boards and commissions, is holding online meetings via Zoom. “The DRB ‘remote’ public meetings are using the Zoom software. All participants – DRB members, applicants, and the public – participate from the safety of their homes. You can choose to participate by video or audio only. Participants can listen to the meeting and may also speak during the public comment period.
The agenda for the DRB meeting is posted on the City website by Friday afternoon ahead of the Wednesday meeting. The agenda includes information on accessing the DRB meeting. Participants can call the number listed on the agenda from their phone to be connected to the meeting. Participants may also can click on the link on the agenda to participate via computer (a microphone is required; a camera is optional.) Participants are not required to create a Zoom account, but may choose to do so.”

- The six members of the DRB are City staff representing the Planning Department, Parks and Recreation Department, Code Enforcement, City Engineer, Traffic Engineer, and Water/Sewer Utilities Engineer.
- The chairperson is the City Planner representative. Each member is authorized to sign plats.
- Jolene Wolfley, DRB Chair, Planning Department; Email: jwolffley@cabq.gov
- Additional comments may be sent to Planner Maggie Gould <MGould@cabq.gov>
- For questions, contact the Development Review Board Administrative Assistant Angela Gomez at (505) 924-3946.

Meeting Adjourned.

Names & Affiliations of Attendees:
Ron Bohannon  Tierra West
Richard Stevenson  Tierra West
Rick Bennett  Richard Bennett Architects
Gary Hirsch  7 Bar North HOA
Amy Garcia  7 Bar North HOA
Mike Mirabal  7 Bar North HOA
Megan Fitzpatrick  7 Bar North HOA
Bruce Creel  7 Bar North HOA
Fran DiMarco  7 Bar North HOA
Cathy Mirabal  7 Bar North HOA
Cheryl Ruff  7 Bar North HOA
Kathy Vigil  7 Bar North HOA
David Lopez  7 Bar North HOA
Lucille Lopez  7 Bar North HOA
Ken McVey  7 Bar North HOA
JP Murrieta  7 Bar North HOA
Tyra Murrieta  7 Bar North HOA
Nena Perkin  7 Bar North HOA
Lillian Werntz  7 Bar North HOA
Scott & Jae Templeton  7 Bar North HOA
Debbie Chavez  7 Bar North HOA
Dan McCormack  7 Bar North HOA
Erin & Tim Zinsmeyer  7 Bar North HOA
Loretta Huerta  7 Bar North HOA
Gayle M Binkley  7 Bar North HOA
Marsha & John Kearney  7 Bar North HOA
T Scott Hutchinson  7 Bar North HOA, Pres
Sandra Kruzich  7 Bar North HOA
Hilary Butler
Roy Fassel
Lennard Mc???
Land Use: 221
Multifamily Housing (Mid-Rise)

Description
Mid-rise multifamily housing includes apartments, townhouses, and condominiums located within the same building with at least three other dwelling units and that have between three and 10 levels (floors). Multifamily housing (low-rise) (Land Use 220), multifamily housing (high-rise) (Land Use 222), off-campus student apartment (Land Use 225), and mid-rise residential with 1st-floor commercial (Land Use 231) are related land uses.

Additional Data
In prior editions of Trip Generation Manual, the mid-rise multifamily housing sites were further divided into rental and condominium categories. An investigation of vehicle trip data found no clear differences in trip making patterns between the rental and condominium sites within the ITE database. As more data are compiled for future editions, this land use classification can be reinvestigated.

For the six sites for which both the number of residents and the number of occupied dwelling units were available, there were an average of 2.46 residents per occupied dwelling unit.

For the five sites for which the numbers of both total dwelling units and occupied dwelling units were available, an average of 95.7 percent of the total dwelling units were occupied.

Time-of-day distribution data for this land use are presented in Appendix A. For the eight general urban/suburban sites with data, the overall highest vehicle volumes during the AM and PM on a weekday were counted between 7:00 and 8:00 a.m. and 4:45 and 5:45 p.m., respectively.

For the four dense multi-use urban sites with 24-hour count data, the overall highest vehicle volumes during the AM and PM on a weekday were counted between 7:15 and 8:15 a.m. and 4:15 and 5:15 p.m., respectively. For the three center city core sites with 24-hour count data, the overall highest vehicle volumes during the AM and PM on a weekday were counted between 6:45 and 7:45 a.m. and 5:00 and 6:00 p.m., respectively.

For the six sites for which data were provided for both occupied dwelling units and residents, there was an average of 2.46 residents per occupied dwelling unit.

For the five sites for which data were provided for both occupied dwelling units and total dwelling units, an average of 95.7 percent of the units were occupied.

The average numbers of person trips per vehicle trip at the five center city core sites at which both person trip and vehicle trip data were collected were as follows:

- 1.84 during Weekday, Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic, one hour between 7 and 9 a.m.
- 1.94 during Weekday, AM Peak Hour of Generator
- 2.07 during Weekday, Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic, one hour between 4 and 6 p.m.
- 2.59 during Weekday, PM Peak Hour of Generator
The average numbers of person trips per vehicle trip at the 32 dense multi-use urban sites at which both person trip and vehicle trip data were collected were as follows:

- 1.90 during Weekday, Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic, one hour between 7 and 9 a.m.
- 1.90 during Weekday, AM Peak Hour of Generator
- 2.00 during Weekday, Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic, one hour between 4 and 6 p.m.
- 2.08 during Weekday, PM Peak Hour of Generator

The average numbers of person trips per vehicle trip at the 13 general urban/suburban sites at which both person trip and vehicle trip data were collected were as follows:

- 1.56 during Weekday, Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic, one hour between 7 and 9 a.m.
- 1.88 during Weekday, AM Peak Hour of Generator
- 1.70 during Weekday, Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic, one hour between 4 and 6 p.m.
- 2.07 during Weekday, PM Peak Hour of Generator

The sites were surveyed in the 1980s, the 1990s, the 2000s, and the 2010s in Alberta (CAN), British Columbia (CAN), California, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Ontario, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, Virginia, and Wisconsin.

Source Numbers

Multifamily Housing (Mid-Rise)
(221)

Vehicle Trip Ends vs: Dwelling Units
On a: Weekday

Setting/Location: General Urban/Suburban
Number of Studies: 27
Avg. Num. of Dwelling Units: 205
Directional Distribution: 50% entering, 50% exiting

Vehicle Trip Generation per Dwelling Unit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Rate</th>
<th>Range of Rates</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>1.27 - 12.50</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Plot and Equation

Fitted Curve Equation: \( T = 5.45(X) - 1.75 \)
\( R^2 = 0.77 \)
Multifamily Housing (Mid-Rise)
(221)

Vehicle Trip Ends vs: Dwelling Units
On a: Weekday,
Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic,
One Hour Between 7 and 9 a.m.
Setting/Location: General Urban/Suburban
Number of Studies: 53
Avg. Num. of Dwelling Units: 207
Directional Distribution: 26% entering, 74% exiting

Vehicle Trip Generation per Dwelling Unit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Rate</th>
<th>Range of Rates</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.06 - 1.61</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Plot and Equation

Fitted Curve Equation: $ \ln(T) = 0.98 \ln(X) - 0.98$

$R^2 = 0.67$
Multifamily Housing (Mid-Rise)  
(221)  

Vehicle Trip Ends vs: Dwelling Units  
On a: Weekday,  
Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic,  
One Hour Between 4 and 6 p.m.  
Setting/Location: General Urban/Suburban  
Number of Studies: 60  
Avg. Num. of Dwelling Units: 208  
Directional Distribution: 61% entering, 39% exiting

Vehicle Trip Generation per Dwelling Unit  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Rate</th>
<th>Range of Rates</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.15 - 1.11</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Plot and Equation

Fitted Curve Equation: Ln(T) = 0.96 Ln(X) - 0.63  
R² = 0.72
Jeanne,

Thanks for passing on the residents’ concerns. We held a pre-application NA meeting on Thursday 18th (which was facilitated), it was the third public meeting we held with the NA regarding the proposed development. The neighbors had a lot of general traffic concerns and questions which we tried to address and have some action items to follow up with the NMDOT to find out more on the Westside Blvd. expansion plans. I’ve attached the meeting minutes for reference.

We intend to submit to DRB by this Friday. The application is to DRB for a site plan – major, and we do not go to EPC.

We followed the IDO notification procedures for the pre-application meeting, and the resident will be notified at time of making DRB application based on the proximity to the site.

Regards,
Richard Stevenson, PE
Tierra West LLC
(505) 858 3100

Good morning, Richard. There have been a lot of neighborhood contacts regarding this project that just got approved at EPC. They have mainly been contacting me regarding traffic and streetlighting complaints. Anyway, I just wanted to give you a heads up.

When will you be turning in your DRB application? One of the complaints was that the neighbors did not feel adequately notified, and she thought neighbors in her area were not notified. (This is her address below.) I just wanted to make sure you were aware before sending out DRB notifications.

Marsha Kearney mseek1978@gmail.com
Marsha Kearney
>> 10927 Carreta Drive NW
>> Albuquerque, NM 87114
JEANNE WOLFENBARGER
manager for transportation
o 505.924-3991
e jwolfenbarger@cabq.gov
cabq.gov/planning

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

Please find attached the following items relating to the traffic queries for this project:

- Trip Generation Worksheet based on the ITE Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition for Multifamily Housing (Mid-Rise) apartments
- Sub-Area Map as a basis of the trip distribution
- Trip Distribution Worksheet
- Trip Distribution Map
- Westside Blvd. widening project timing and financials which is in the current Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for FFY 2020 and 2021. According to MRCOG TIP Coordinator, this is a high priority project for the City of Albuquerque and City of Rio Rancho. This project will more than likely be completed over the next few years considering the amount of construction that is involved. Here is a link to MRCOG website where you can find the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (which includes project lists), as well as the TIP: https://www.mrcog-nm.gov/233/Metro-Planning.

Grading and Drainage
- Here is the downloadable link to the drainage plan https://1drv.ms/b/s!Ah Cf8IHU3ogkDpTWEqdjmDVXFo

Kind Regards,

Richard Stevenson, P.E.
Dear All:

Attached please find the Report for the meeting held Thursday evening, June 18th, regarding the proposed Wintergreen Apartments. Please review it carefully.

If there are errors of either Omission (something important said but left out) or Commission (something important misquoted), please let us know and we will issue correcting Amendments. You may send potential corrections to phcrumpsf@gmail.com.

Also, instructions for submitting additional comments to the DRB are included near the end of the report under Hearing Details.

Also, you may let the City know your impression of the meeting and the facilitator(s) by going to one of the following evaluations:


or


Thank you very much for your participation.

Philip Crump and Jocelyn Torres, Facilitators

=================================================================================================
This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
Ok, we can include the graph, but at some point the applicant has to draw the line... The neighbors are not listening to our responses to their questions and concerns. Everything they raised at DRB we had already discussed prior in the public meetings.

Regards,
Richard

From: Wolfenbarger, Jeanne [mailto:jwolfenbarger@cabq.gov]
Sent: Friday, July 24, 2020 8:11 AM
To: Richard Stevenson
Subject: ITE Graph

Richard, I thought it would be helpful to include the ITE graph for trip generations since there were questions about the numbers and data for this next meeting.
For Mr. Sandoval, I thought that would be helpful.

JEANNE WOLFENBARGER
manager for transportation
o 505.924-3991
e jwolfenbarger@cabq.gov
cabq.gov/planning

This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
**Trip Distribution Table**

**Project Name:** Trip Distribution for Proposed Residential Development Trips

For determination of Trip Distribution for Proposed Socioeconomic Forecasts by Data Analysis Subzones for the Mid-Region of New Mexico

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Golf Course Rd. North</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf Course Rd. South</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westside Blvd. East</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westside Blvd. West</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Trip_Dist_Residential.xlsx - DAZ_Pop
**Mid-Region MPO Rec Num:** 508.1  
**Fed ID:** A301050  
**Category:** Capacity Proj  
**NMDOT Dist.:** 3  
**County:** Bernalillo  
**Municipality:** City of Albuquerque  
**Length:** 0.823 Miles  

**RT1 FL5257 Proj:** Westside Blvd Widening  
**Fr:** Golf Course Rd  
**To:** NM 528  

**Est. Proj. Cost:** $11,988,332  
**Est. Letting:** 3/1/2020  
**TIP Amendment Pending?** □  

**Project Desc.:** Rehab & widen from 2 to 4 lanes, bike lanes, pedestrian enhancements and other improvements per the Westside-McMahon Corridor Study. Transitions fr. Improv. To exist. Roadway sections include 350’ w. of Westside/Golf Course intersection  SEE REMARKS SEC.  

**Remarks:** AM-Apr-20, AM-feb-20, R-19-11, AM-Dec-18, Project will utilize AC project delivery method. R-18-01 on Westside; 250’ east of intersection of Westside and NM 528, on Westside, 250’ n of the intersection of Westside and Golf Course;, on Golf Course; 600’ south of the intersection of Westide and Golf Course, on Golf Course and ADA ramp improvement on the SE corner  

### PROGRAMMED FUNDS - Four Year Federal TIP by Funding Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUND SOURCE</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>4 Yr. TOTALS</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Match</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Match</td>
<td>$1,173,321</td>
<td>$469,933</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,643,254</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP-U</td>
<td>$5,385,204</td>
<td>$2,757,627</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,142,831</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP-U</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$8,058,525</td>
<td>$3,227,560</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$11,286,085</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reg. Sig.**  

**Work Zone**  

---

*Thursday, June 25, 2020*
Figure 6

Subareas of the MRCOG Region

Subarea Identification Number

Subarea boundaries extend to county boundary where full extent of subarea not shown except for Subarea 29 which only includes southern Santa Fe County.

Wintergreen Luxury Apartments
(Golf Course Rd. South of Westside Blvd.)
Trip Distribution/Subarea Map
Wintergreen Luxury Apartments (Golf Course Rd. South of Westside Blvd.)


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USE (ITE CODE)</th>
<th>24 HOUR TWO-WAY VOLUME</th>
<th>A.M. PEAK HOUR</th>
<th>P.M. PEAK HOUR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GROSS</td>
<td>ENTER</td>
<td>EXIT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily Housing (Mid-Rise)</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>1,130</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dwelling Units

ITE Trip Generation Equations:

Average Vehicle Trip Ends on a Weekday (24 HOUR TWO-WAY VOLUME)

\[ T = 5.44 \times (X) + (-1.75) \]

50% Enter, 50% Exit

Average Vehicle Trip Ends on a Weekday, Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic, One Hour Between 7am and 9am (A.M. PEAK HOUR)

\[ T = 0.36 \times (X) + 0 \]

26% Enter, 74% Exit

Average Vehicle Trip Ends on a Weekday, Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic, One Hour Between 4pm and 6pm (P.M. PEAK HOUR)

\[ T = 0.44 \times (X) + 0 \]

61% Enter, 39% Exit

Comments:

Four Stories

Based on ITE Trip Generation Manual - 10th Edition

Wintergreen_TRIPS_X.xlsx - LandUse (1)
APPLICATION FOR SPECIAL EXCEPTION
CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE, PLANNING DEPARTMENT
Office of the Zoning Hearing Examiner
600 2nd Street NW, Suite 300, 87102
505.924.3918

A. APPLICANT INFORMATION—PLEASE PRINT

Kitt's Development LLC (Thomas G. Joseph - Managing Member)

1356 Rio Rancho Blvd. #252
Rio Rancho, NM 87124

OAK Enterprises (Doug Granwell - Principal)

1250 NE Box 16696
Albuquerque, NM 87114

TELEPHONE (INCLUDE AREA CODE)

505.867.6599 (W)
505.804.0295 (M)
505.321.6415 (C)

LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED SPECIAL EXCEPTION—PLEASE PRINT

7101 1206 649 6485 11 303

B. CRITERIA FOR DECISION—

I have been given the Criteria for Decision requirements.

C. EXPLANATION OF REQUEST—

On additional sheet(s) of paper, please state why you want this Special Exception, based on the Criteria for Decision Requirements.

D. DRAWINGS OF REQUEST—

ATTACH THREE (3) COPIES. Please follow instructions on the back of this form and attach the appropriate drawings.

E. TRAFFIC ENGINEERING REVIEW—

REQUIRED FOR ALL WALLS AND FENCES IN THE FRONT AND FRONT SIDE YARD SETBACKS.

Call the Traffic Analysis Supervisor at 505.857.6680 for Site Plan Review. Delay of your case will result if you do not obtain comments from the Traffic Analysis Supervisor.

F. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT—

I hereby acknowledge that, to the best of my knowledge, this application is correct and complete and that I have received one or more signs that I have agreed to post and maintain as provided and where instructed. I understand that failure to property post sign(s) is grounds for deferral of my case.

ZONING ENFORCEMENT OFFICE INTERNAL USE ONLY

PROJECT #: 10041553

APPLICATION #: 05ZHE018864

APPLICATION FOR: (CHECK AS APPROPRIATE)

? Conditional Use

? Expansion of a NonConforming Use

? NonConforming Use / Status Established Building

? Variance: (CHECK AS APPROPRIATE)

? Distance

? Setback

? Height

? Parking

? Size

? Other

LEGAL AD:

CONDITIONAL USE TO ALLOW DWELLING ON C-2

SECTOR DEVELOPMENT AREA:

ZONE:

ZONED: C-2 (SC)

ZONE ATLAS PAGE: A-12

NO. OF SIGNS ISSUED: 2

POST SIGNS / STREET ADDRESS OF PROPOSED SPECIAL EXCEPTION

APPLICATION RECEIVED BY Z.E.O. (PRINT FULL NAME)

DATE

DATE OF PUBLIC HEARING

FEE: $1415.00

(APN) 441018 / 4971000 $ 35.00

(SEA) 441006 / 4917000 $ 100.00

(CMP) 441032 / 3424000 $ 10.00

757
CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE
OFFICE OF THE ZONING HEARING EXAMINER
NOTIFICATION OF DECISION

KITTS DEVELOPMENT LLC request(s) a special exception to Section 14.16.2.17. (B), (6): a CONDITIONAL USE to allow for dwellings in a C-2 zone on all or a portion of Lot(s) D, Tract(s) D & E, Paradise Heights Addition, zoned C-2 and located at 10850 GOLF COURSE RD NW (A-12) (OLD BUSINESS)

Special Exception No:..............05ZHE - 01864
Project No:..........................1004503
Hearing Date:.......................03-21-06
Closing of Public Record:.......03-21-06
Date of Decision:..................04-05-06

STATEMENT OF FACTS: The Applicant is requesting a conditional use to allow for dwellings in a C-2 zone. The Applicant is proposing to develop 252 dwelling units in approximately 62 buildings. The Applicant submitted a petition of support. He indicates that the impact on the schools would be minimum at best. If approved this project will be completed in 2007 and coincides with the proposed expansion of a school in the area to be completed in 2007. The Agent indicates that the development is consistent with the comprehensive plan in regards to density. He also indicates that this will be a high-end project and therefore property values will likely increase once the development is completed.

This request is aggressively opposed by numerous neighbors which is pursuant to a petitioned which was submitted and is part of the file. Present was Mrs. Sisneros who raised her individual opposition, and Mike Mirabal who indicated that the impact to the existing overcrowded schools will be great. He also argues that this type of development will increase crime, will increase traffic, and that property owners will have their privacy interfered with from second story structures. He also indicates that there will be considerable noise which will have a negative impact on the enjoyment of other land, and he further argues that the property values based on his conversation with real estate agents suggest that they will be decreased five to seven percent. Also in opposition was Mr. Westfall who indicated that the existing infra-structure cannot keep up with the proposed increase in residential living. Mr. Hall was also in opposition and argued that commercial land should be used in a manner which is consistent with commercial zoning.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS: I find that the Applicants make a very strong case for developing an upscale apartment complex. The parking will be within the interior. The closest residential community is seventy-eight feet away, and the Applicant is prepared to take necessary measures to assure that privacy is enjoyed and that there is no negative impact with regard to their project on the residential community. However, the most crucial issue in this matter is whether or not an increase of 252 dwellings would have a negative impact on an already over capacitated school system. The Agent has
indicated that his client will assist the school problem by placing a portable building as part of APS expansion. There is however no question that the impact of such a large development will affect the existing school problem. This office is supportive of development of high end dwelling units with private parking, security and amenities that would tend to create an advantage to what otherwise has been vacant undeveloped commercial land. It would seem to be an advantage to the area. However, the anticipation by property owners is that the zoned community would be developed commercially and provide opportunities for employment. This proposed use is inconsistent with the zoning and expectations of the residential community. This would have a considerable impact on existing problems and is therefore considered injurious to the neighborhood, adjacent property and the community.

**DECISION:** Denied.

If you wish to appeal this decision, you may do so by 5:00 PM in the manner described below:

**APPEAL IS TO THE BOARD OF APPEALS WITHIN 15 DAYS OF THE DECISION.** A filing fee of $55.00 shall accompany each appeal application, as well as a written explanation outlining the reason for appeal and a copy of the ZHE decision. Appeals are taken at 600 2nd Street, Plaza Del Sol Building, Ground Level, Planning Application Counter located on the west side of the lobby. Please present this letter of notification when filing an appeal. When an application is withdrawn, the fee shall not be refunded.

An appeal shall be heard by the Board of Appeals within 45 days of the appeal period and concluded within 75 days of the appeal period. The Planning Division shall give written notice of an appeal, together with a notice of the date, time and place of the hearing to the applicant, a representative of the opponents, if any are known, and the appellant.

Please note that pursuant to Section 14.16.4.4. (B.). of the City of Albuquerque Comprehensive Zoning Code, you must demonstrate that you have legal standing to file an appeal as defined.

You will receive notice if any other person files an appeal. If there is no appeal, you can receive building permits any time after the appeal deadline quoted above, provided all conditions imposed at the time of approval have been met. However, the Zoning Hearing Examiner may allow issuance of building permits if the public hearing produces no objection of any kind to the approval of an application. To receive this approval, the applicant agrees in writing to return the building permit or occupation tax number.

Successful applicants are reminded that other regulations of the City must be complied with, even after approval of a special exception is secured. This decision does not constitute approval of plans for a building permit. If your
Successful applicants are reminded that other regulations of the City must be complied with, even after approval of a special exception is secured. This decision does not constitute approval of plans for a building permit. If your application is approved, bring this decision with you when you apply for any related building permit or occupation tax number. Approval of a conditional use or a variance application is void after one year from date of approval if the rights and privileges are granted, thereby have not been executed or utilized.

Roberto Albertorio, Esq.
Zoning Hearing Examiner

cc: Zoning Enforcement (2)
    ZHE File
    Doug Crandall/DAC Enterprises, P.O. Box 16658, 87191
    Kitts Development, 1380 Rio Rancho Blvd. #282, 87124
    Timothy Flynn-O’Brien, 817 Gold Ave SW, 87102
    Mike D. Mirabal, 10951 Carreta NW, 87114
    Beverly Westfall, 12005 Sullivan Ct. NW, 87114
    Linda Gordon, Clayton Heights/Lomas Del Cielo NA, 2509 Spruce SE, 87106
    Isabel F. Cabrera, Clayton Heights/Lomas Del Cielo NA, 1720 Buena Vista SE, 87106
    Marcia Boyer, Kirtland Community NA, 1624 Alamo Ave SE, 87106
    Jocelyn N. Lewis, Kirtland Community NA, P.O. Box 9902, 87119
    Steve Schroeder, Victory Hills NA, 909 Princeton SE, 87106
    Scott Sandoval, Victory Hills NA, 1816 Cornell SE, 87106
KITTS DEVELOPMENT LLC requests a special exception to Section 14. 16. 2. 17. (B). (6): a CONDITIONAL USE to allow for dwellings in a C-2 zone on all or a portion of Lot(s) D, Tract(s) D & E, Paradise Heights Addition, zoned C-2 and located at 10850 GOLF COURSE RD NW (A-12)

Special Exception No:.............05ZHE - 018864
Project No:.........................1004503
Hearing Date:.......................02-14-06
Closing of Public Record:......None
Date of Decision:.................None

STATEMENT OF FACTS: The Applicant, Kitts Development LLC, requests a conditional use to allow for apartments in a C-2 zone.

This matter has been deferred to Tuesday, March 21, 2006 with the consent of the applicants.

cc: Zoning Enforcement (2)
    ZHE File
    Doug Crandall/DAC Enterprises, P.O. Box 16658, 87191
    Kitts Development, 1380 Rio Rancho Blvd. #282, 87124
    Timothy Flynn-O’Brien, 817 Gold Ave SW, 87102
    Mike D. Mirabal, 10951 Carreta NW, 87114
    Beverly Westfall, 12005 Sullivan Ct. NW, 87114
    Linda Gordon, Clayton Heights/Lomas Del Cielo NA, 2509 Spruce SE, 87106
    Isabel F. Cabrera, Clayton Heights/Lomas Del Cielo NA, 1720 Buena Vista SE, 87106
    Marcia Boyer, Kirtland Community NA, 1624 Alamo Ave SE, 87106
    Jocelyn N. Lewis, Kirtland Community NA, P.O. Box 9902, 87119
    Steve Schroeder, Victory Hills NA, 909 Princeton SE, 87106
    Scott Sandoval, Victory Hills NA, 1816 Cornell SE, 87106
KITTS DEVELOPMENT LLC requests a special exception to Section 14. 16. 2. 17. (6). a CONDITIONAL USE to allow for dwellings in a C-2 zone on all or a portion of Lot(s) D, Tract(s) D & E, Paradise Heights Addition, zoned C-2 and located at 10850 GOLF COURSE RD NW (A-12)

**STATEMENT OF FACTS:** The Applicant, Kitts Development LLC, requests a conditional use to allow for apartments in a C-2 zone.

This matter has been continued to Tuesday, February 14, 2006 with the consent of the applicants.

Roberto Albertorio, Esq.
Zoning Hearing Examiner

cc: Zoning Enforcement (2)
ZHE File
Doug Crandall/DAC Enterprises, P.O. Box 16658, 87191
Kitts Development, 1380 Rio Rancho Blvd. #282, 87124
Timothy Flynn-O’Brien, 817 Gold Ave SW, 87102
Mike D. Mirabal, 10951 Carreta NW, 87114
Beverly Westfall, 12005 Sullivan Ct. NW, 87114
Linda Gordon, Clayton Heights/Lomas Del Cielo NA, 2509 Spruce SE, 87106
Isabel F. Cabrera, Clayton Heights/Lomas Del Cielo NA, 1720 Buena Vista SE, 87106
Marcia Boyer, Kirtland Community NA, 1624 Alamo Ave SE, 87106
Jocelyn N. Lewis, Kirtland Community NA, P.O. Box 9902, 87119
Steve Schroeder, Victory Hills NA, 909 Princeton SE, 87106
Scott Sandoval, Victory Hills NA, 1816 Cornell SE, 87106
KITTS DEVELOPMENT LLC request(s) a special exception to Section 14. 16. 2. 17. (B), 6.: a CONDITIONAL USE to allow for apartments in a C-2 zone on all or a portion of Lot(s) A, Block(s) 12, Clayton Heights Addition, zoned C-2 and located at 1921 YALE BLVD SE (L-15)

January 19, 2006

Re: Special Hearing
    Kitts Development, LLC / 05ZHE - 01863 & 01864

Interested Parties:

The above matter is scheduled for a Special Hearing to be held on Thursday, January 26, 2006 at 1:00 p.m., in the Plaza Del Sol hearing room.

Roberto Albertorio, Esq.
Zoning Hearing Examiner

cc: Zoning Enforcement (2)
    ZHE File
    Doug Crandall/DAC Enterprises, PO Box 16658, 87191
    Kitts Development LLC, 1380 Rio Rancho Blvd. #282, 87124
    Timothy Flynn-O’Brien, 817 Gold Ave SW, 87102
    Mike D. Mirabal, 10951 Carreta NW, 87114
    Beverly Westfall, 12005 Sullivan Ct. NW, 87114
Linda Gordon, Clayton Heights/Lomas Del Cielo NA, 2509 Spruce SE, 87106
Isabel F. Cabrera, Clayton Heights/Lomas Del Cielo NA, 1720 Buena Vista SE, 87106
Marcia Boyer, Kirtland Community NA, 1624 Alamo Ave SE, 87106
Jocelyn N. Lewis, Kirtland Community NA, P.O. Box 9902, 87119
Steve Schroeder, Victory Hills NA, 909 Princeton SE, 87106
Scott Sandoval, Victory Hills NA, 1816 Cornell SE, 87106
KITTS DEVELOPMENT LLC request(s) a special exception to Section 14. 16. 2. 17. (B). 6.: a CONDITIONAL USE to allow for apartments in a C-2 zone on all or a portion of Lot(s) A, Block(s) 12, Clayton Heights Addition, zoned C-2 and located at 1921 YALE BLVD SE (L-15)

January 13, 2006

Re: 05ZHE-01863 & 01864
Kitts Development, LLC

Interested Parties:

The above matter has been deferred. Parties will be notified of the next scheduled hearing by mail.

Roberto Albertorio, Esq.
Zoning Hearing Examiner

cc: Zoning Enforcement (2)
ZHE File
Doug Crandall/DAC Enterprises, PO Box 16658, 87191
Kitts Development LLC, 1380 Rio Rancho Blvd. #282, 87124
CITY OF PLANNING
PLANNING DEPARTMENT
PROPERTY OWNERSHIP LIST

Meeting Date: JANUARY 17, 2006
Zone Atlas Page: A-12-Z
Notification Radius: 100 Ft.

Project# 1004503
App#05ZHE-01864

Cross Reference and Location: PARADISE HEIGHTS UNIT 1 / 10850 GOLF COURSE RD NW

Applicant: KITTS DEVELOPMENT LLC (THOMAS G. JOSEPH-MANAGING MEMBER)
Address: 1380 RIO RANCHO BLVD # 282
RIO RANCHO, NM 87124

Agent: DAC ENTERPRISES (DOUG CRANDALL-PRINCIPAL)
PO BOX 16658
ALBUQUERQUE, NM 87191

Special Instructions:

Notice must be mailed from the City’s 15 day’s prior to the meeting.

Date Mailed: DECEMBER 29, 2005
Signature: YVONNE SAAVEDRA
101206649648511303 LEGAL: TR 3 of UNIT #1 PARADISE HEIGHTS CONT 8.821 AC LAND USE: 
PROPERTY ADDR: 00000 GOLF COURSE 
OWNER NAME: CALABACILLES GROUP 
OWNER ADDR: 08200 CONSTITUTION 
PL NW ALBUQUERQUE NM 87110

101306600551021834 LEGAL: LT 7 A-P1 PLAT OF ESTRELLA DEL NORTE AT SEVEN BAR N LAND USE: 
PROPERTY ADDR: 00000 SULLIVAN 
OWNER NAME: PHAN DAI 
OWNER ADDR: 12025 SULLIVAN 
PL NW ALBUQUERQUE NM 87114

1012066432648110504 LEGAL: TRAC T-8-1 PLAT OF DRAINAGE ROW TRACT A AND TRS B A LAND USE: 
PROPERTY ADDR: 00000 GOLF COURSE 
OWNER NAME: CALABACILLES GROUP 
OWNER ADDR: 08200 CONSTITUTION 
PL NW ALBUQUERQUE NM 87110

101306600250021835 LEGAL: LT 7 2-P1 PLAT OF ESTRELLA DEL NORTE AT SEVEN BAR N LAND USE: 
PROPERTY ADDR: 00000 SULLIVAN 
OWNER NAME: RUFF, CHERYL L & KATHLEEN M VIG 
OWNER ADDR: 07744 CLUB CREST 
DR NW ARVADA CO 80005

101306600449231836 LEGAL: LT 7 2-P1 PLAT OF ESTRELLA DEL NORTE AT SEVEN BAR N LAND USE: 
PROPERTY ADDR: 00000 SULLIVAN 
OWNER NAME: WHITE, RICHARD L 
OWNER ADDR: 12015 SULLIVAN 
CT NW ALBUQUERQUE NM 87114

101306600448621837 LEGAL: LT 7 1-P1 PLAT OF ESTRELLA DEL NORTE AT SEVEN BAR N LAND USE: 
PROPERTY ADDR: 00000 SULLIVAN 
OWNER NAME: SANDOVAL, NICK A & DEBBIE L 
OWNER ADDR: 12009 SULLIVAN 
CT NW ALBUQUERQUE NM 87114

101306600547821838 LEGAL: LT 7 D-P1 PLAT OF ESTRELLA DEL NORTE AT SEVEN BAR N LAND USE: 
PROPERTY ADDR: 00000 SULLIVAN 
OWNER NAME: WESTFALL, ANTHONY D & 
OWNER ADDR: 12005 SULLIVAN 
CT NW ALBUQUERQUE NM 87114

101306600546921840 LEGAL: LT 6 8-P1 PLAT OF ESTRELLA DEL NORTE AT SEVEN BAR N LAND USE: 
PROPERTY ADDR: 00000 NOCHE CLARA 
OWNER NAME: ADAMS, BRIDGET M & MEGAN M 
OWNER ADDR: 04509 NOCHE CLARA 
AV NW ALBUQUERQUE NM 87114

101306600146421841 LEGAL: LT 6 7-P1 PLAT OF ESTRELLA DEL NORTE AT SEVEN BAR N LAND USE: 
PROPERTY ADDR: 00000 NOCHE CLARA 
OWNER NAME: RAYNOR, CLAYBY N 
OWNER ADDR: 04509 NOCHE CLARA 
AV NW ALBUQUERQUE NM 87114

101306600145521842 LEGAL: LT 6 6-P1 PLAT OF ESTRELLA DEL NORTE AT SEVEN BAR N LAND USE: 
PROPERTY ADDR: 00000 CARRETA 
OWNER NAME: MOORE, TOMMY R & SUSAN S 
OWNER ADDR: 11009 CARRETA 
DR NW ALBUQUERQUE NM 87114

101206645043510503 LEGAL: TRAC T 3-1 PLAT OF DRAINAGE ROW TRACT A AND TRS B A LAND USE: 
PROPERTY ADDR: 00000 GOLF COURSE 
OWNER NAME: CALABACILLES GROUP 
OWNER ADDR: 08200 CONSTITUTION 
PL NW ALBUQUERQUE NM 87110
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January 14, 2007

Mr. Roberto Albertorio, Esq.
Zoning Hearing Examiner
Planning Department
City of Albuquerque
Albuquerque, New Mexico

VIA FACSIMILE: 924-3339

Re: 05ZHE-01863 & 01864

Dear Mr. Albertorio:

Please accept this letter as an official request for withdrawal of the above referenced case. The applicant, Kitts Development, LLC, no longer has an option on the property.

Thank you.

Regards,

Doug Crandall
DAC Enterprises, Inc.
Agent for Kitts Development, LLC
A community has to have balance in order to flourish. A well planned community would offer schools, places of worship, community services to include medical facilities, community center, library, post office etc as well as businesses and retail.

Our West Side schools are severely overcrowded. An Albuquerque Journal article dated January 19, 2006 indicates that James Monroe Middle School has a capacity of 780 students but has an enrollment of 1,400 this year; almost double capacity!! The redistricting solution is to send our child from a school two miles away to one across the river on the already overburdened Alameda, traveling during the morning and evening rush hour traffic. Granted, the Governor has allocated money for West Side Schools but they will not be built tomorrow or next year for that matter. By adding 254 additional families, the school overcrowding is compounded and the area they will be located assures they will be bussed across the river to Taylor Middle School as well.

Until we improve our schools, we will not be able to attract new industry and the city of Albuquerque as well as the whole state of New Mexico will suffer.

Currently the business hub for Paradise Hills Community centers in the Cottonwood Mall area even though the west end of the community is rapidly approaching Pasco Del Volcan Rd. Due to the lack of services in my community, I as well as neighbors and friends often go to Rio Rancho for our business needs. Our doctor, chiropractor, dentist, orthodontist, insurance agent, dry cleaner etc., are all located in Rio Rancho due solely to the availability. Our dollar is not being spent in our community or city.

Rio Rancho has sustained their commercial use property strictly for commercial use thereby serving the Rio Rancho resident. They are planning their downtown civic center and other facilities in unison with housing.

Rio Rancho’s population in 2004 (yes 2004) was 62,000 residents located on 92,000 acres and Paradise Hills 2005 population was 33,390 with no where near 92,000 acres yet the difference in “transient housing” indicates Rio Rancho’s willingness to support their city. In Paradise Hills there are currently fifteen apartment complexes with 4,061 units versus Rio Rancho’s eight complexes (note three of the eight complexes were built by Larkspur Development/Kitts Enterprises) consisting of 1,095 units. Paradise Hills’ population is half of Rio Rancho’s yet we have four times the amount of apartments already in our community. This complex will add an additional 254 apartments to Paradise Hills.

I don’t even want to go into the traffic issues on the West Side as this is reported in the media every day but the location of these apartments on Golf Course road (which is main thorough fare between Albuquerque and Rio Rancho) with no traffic light can only spell disaster for that many residents attempting to exit the complex during rush hour traffic.

Mr. Romero has referred to these apartments as “luxury apartments with beautiful landscaping”. The larger comparable complexes in Paradise Hills have far more amenities (24 hr fitness center, garages & covered parking, lending library & video rentals, heated pool & spa, movie theaters, conference center, basketball, tennis & sport
courts, nail salon and last but not least a clubhouse). Kitts/Larkspur representatives have indicated in prior meetings that each four-plex will cost about $450,000 therefore each owner will have to rent each unit for about $1,000 which is substantially higher than any of the other Paradise Hills complexes. Where do you think someone will live, the higher priced complex with minimal amenities or the lower priced complex with an array of amenities? And as for the “beautiful landscaping”, the pictures of their other units indicate otherwise. With each four-plex owned by different owners (many from out of state as indicated by the ownership of their other apartments) probable high rents and no on-site management, my concerns are great.

As far as Mr. Romero’s indication that a Wal-Mart could be constructed on this lot, this is highly improbable since there is one Wal-Mart Supercenter less then a mile west of the proposed apartment location, another being constructed about another mile and a half northwest and a Wal-Mart grocery store less then two miles south on the same street.

Please, let’s keep our commercially zoned land for businesses to support our community. The Heights is running out of land and the majority of Albuquerque’s growth is on the West Side therefore planning is essential! We only have one chance to get it right! Proper use of zoning is vital to supporting our community and the economic growth of Albuquerque as well as the State of New Mexico.
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City Information

History

Rio Rancho, one of the fastest growing communities in the nation, has the "quality of life" features to entice both industry and individuals looking to re-locate. The magnificent view of the Sandia Mountains, the warm summer days and cool evenings, and the mild winter temperatures are just a few of the enticements. Add low land costs, affordable housing, quality education, and a community with positive attitudes and you will understand why Rio Rancho is continuing to boom well into the future.

In the early 1960s, the AMREP Corporation purchased 55,000 acres of land on the outskirts of Albuquerque, originally called Rio Rancho Estates. This was the beginning of Rio Rancho. AMREP marketed the area to residents in the Midwest and eastern states. When home building began in 1962, many of the first residents were middle-income retirees. In 1966, the 100th family moved to Rio Rancho and by 1977 the population had grown to 5,000. In 1971, AMREP purchased and platted an additional 35,000 acres. Rio Rancho Estates was now 92,000 acres and larger, geographically, than the city of Albuquerque. By the early 80's, Rio Rancho was incorporated and its population had reached 10,000. A new financing program, offering low interest home loans, changed Rio Rancho from a retirement community to a community attracting young families. Today, Rio Rancho offers a cultural diversity within its population of 62,000.

Government

City of Rio Rancho
Administrative Office - 891-5002
3900 Southern Blvd / PO Box 15550
Rio Rancho, NM 87174-5550

Rio Rancho has a Mayor/Council form of government with six elected councilors. There are 12 city departments under the supervision of the City Administrator.

Climate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season</th>
<th>Average Temp High</th>
<th>Average Temp Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>91.10</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Elevation: 5,679 feet
Average Annual Precipitation: 8.5 inches

There are four distinct seasons, all characterized by sunny days an average of 360 days a year and low relative humidity. It snows several times every winter, but usually melts quickly (often the same day).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Pop</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>62,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>53,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>48,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>38,505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Median age 34
**Albuquerque, NM - 87114 neighborhood details**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>Zip 87114</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>National</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood type</td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>33,388</td>
<td>618,289</td>
<td>281,522,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pop. density</td>
<td>1,773.2</td>
<td>2,037.1</td>
<td>79.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent male</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
<td>49.9%</td>
<td>49.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent female</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
<td>50.1%</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median age</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>37.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People per household</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent married</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent single</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median household income</td>
<td>$51,321</td>
<td>$38,546</td>
<td>$41,994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. income per capita</td>
<td>$24,213</td>
<td>$18,886</td>
<td>$21,587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>zip 87114</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent crime risk index</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property crime risk index</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>zip 87114</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median home value</td>
<td>$173,500</td>
<td>$142,700</td>
<td>$185,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median age of homes</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home appreciation</td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent owning home</td>
<td>65.2%</td>
<td>55.3%</td>
<td>63.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent renting home</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent homes vacant</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent commuting by bus</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent commuting by carpool</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent commuting by auto</td>
<td>83.1%</td>
<td>75.1%</td>
<td>71.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent working at home</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

» Continue to page 2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th># of units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arroyo Villas</td>
<td>4701 Irving, Alb NM 87114</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Aspens</td>
<td>9677 Eagle Ranch Rd NW, Alb NM 87114</td>
<td>388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camino Real Apartments</td>
<td>3305 Calle Cuervo St NW, Alb NM 87114</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City View Apartments</td>
<td>5350 Justin Dr NW, Alb NM 87114</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottonwood Ranch Apartments</td>
<td>10001 Coors Bypass NW, Alb NM 87114</td>
<td>472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagle Ranch Apartments</td>
<td>9250-70 Eagle Ranch Rd NW, Alb NM 87114</td>
<td>432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larkspur Development (Kitts Enterprises)</td>
<td>5101 McMahon Rd NW, Alb NM 87114</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paradise Plaza Apartments</td>
<td>5300-5324 Justin Dr NW, Alb NM 87114</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paseo del Sol Apartments</td>
<td>291 El Pueblo NW, Alb NM 87114</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerta del Sol Apartments</td>
<td>4816 McMahon NW, Alb NM 87114</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Walk-La Paz Apartments</td>
<td>3405 Calle Cuervo St NW, Alb NM 87114</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventana Canyon Apartments</td>
<td>10300 Golf Course Rd NW, Alb NM 87114</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventana Ranch Apartments</td>
<td>10400 Universe Blvd NW, Alb NM 87114</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Vistas @ Seven Bar Apartments
10600 Cibola Loop NW, Alb NM  87114

West Park Apartments
9251 Eagle Ranch Rd NW, Alb NM  87114
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216

4,061
### RIO RANCHO APARTMENT COMPLEXES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th># of units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrowhead Ridge (LOW INCOME)</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4515 Arrowhead Ridge Dr SE, Rio Rancho, NM 87124</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enchanted Vista</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4501 Sprint Blvd, Rio Rancho, NM 87144</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrada Pointe</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900 Country Club, Rio Rancho, NM 87124</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larkspur Development (Kitts Enterprises)</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1101-1127 Meadowlark Ct, Rio Rancho, NM 87124</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larkspur Development (Kitts Enterprises)</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabana Grande, Rio Rancho, NM 87124</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larkspur Development (Kitts Enterprises)</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behind Target, Rio Rancho, NM 87124</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meadowlark Apartments</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4201 Meadowlark Ln, Rio Rancho, NM 87124</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinnacle @ High Resort</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Resort, Rio Rancho, NM 87124</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,095</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NMPRC Corporation Information Inquiry

Public Regulation Commission

1/23/2006

- Follow this link to start a new search.

KITTS DEVELOPMENT LLC

SCC Number: 2434363
Tax & Revenue Number:
Organization Date: MARCH 09, 2004, in NEW MEXICO
Organization Type: IS A DOMESTIC LIMITED LIABILITY
Organization Status: IS EXEMPT
Good Standing: N/R
Purpose: N/R

ORGANIZATION DATES

Taxable Year End Date:
Filing Date:
Expiration Date: 03/09/2034

SUPPLEMENTAL POST MARK DATES

Supplemental:
Name Change:
Purpose Change:
Agent Resigned:

MAILING ADDRESS

1380 RIO RANCHO BLVD. #282 RIO RANCHO, NEW MEXICO 87124

PRINCIPAL ADDRESS

1380 RIO RANCHO BLVD. #282 RIO RANCHO NEW MEXICO 87124
PRINCIPAL ADDRESS (Outside New Mexico)

REGISTERED AGENT

THOMAS G. JOSEPH

1380 RIO RANCHO BLVD. #282 RIO RANCHO NEW MEXICO 87124

Agent Designated:

COOP LICENSE INFORMATION

Number:
Type:
Expiration Year:

ORGANIZERS

JOSEPH, THOMAS G.

DIRECTORS

Date Election of Directors:
NMPRC Corporation Information Inquiry

Public Regulation Commission

1/23/2006

- Follow this link to start a new search.

LARKSPUR, L.L.C.

SCC Number: 2263861
Tax & Revenue Number: 
Organization Date: JULY 09, 2002, in NEW MEXICO
Organization Type: IS A DOMESTIC LIMITED LIABILITY
Organization Status: IS EXEMPT
Good Standing: NOT REQUIRED

ORGANIZATION DATES

Taxable Year End Date: 
Filing Date: 
Expiration Date: 07/09/2032

SUPPLEMENTAL POST MARK DATES

Supplemental: 
Name Change: 
Purpose Change: 
Agent Resigned: 

MAILING ADDRESS

1380 RIO RANCHO BLDG, BOX 282 RIO RANCHO, NEW MEXICO 87124

PRINCIPAL ADDRESS

3109 15TH AVE. RIO RANCHO NEW MEXICO 87124
PRINCIPAL ADDRESS (Outside New Mexico)

REGISTERED AGENT

THOMAS G. JOSEPH
1380 RIO RANCHO BLDG, BOX 282 RIO RANCHO NEW MEXICO 87124
Agent Designated:

COOP LICENSE INFORMATION

Number:
Type:
Expiration Year:

ORGANIZERS

JOSEPH, THOMAS G.

DIRECTORS

Date Election of Directors:
Evergreen At Ventana Canyon
10300 Golf Course Road, NW
Albuquerque, NM 87114
1-877-335-9139

Overview ▶ Details ▶ Floorplans ▶ Photos ▶ Maps ▶ Management

Description

Move beyond your highest expectations. Move to Evergreen at Ventana Canyon! This stunning community combines unmatched luxury amenities and an extraordinary location together with superior Alliance Residential management services. Services rivaled by only the finest resorts. Visit Evergreen at Ventana Canyon today and see for yourself. It's the lifestyle you deserve.

Custom Features
- Full-size washers and dryers in each apartment
- Oversized closets
- Oversized hot water heaters
- Gas fireplaces*
- Glass block accent windows
- Heated pool and spa
- 24-hour fitness center
- Resident business center and lending library
- Covered parking
- Pets welcome
- Free video rentals
- Frost-free refrigerators with ice makers
- Built-in microwaves
- *In select apartments

General Info
- Number of Units: 264
- Lease Terms:
  - Variable
  - 6-Month
- Managed by:
  - Bernard/Allison Management Services, Inc.
- Fax: 505-898-7477

For your move to Albuquerque-Santa Fe

Helpful Local Resources

Bank of America
Allstate

Save Big On Your Move. Free Online Quote.

Want to Move to FREE checking? Sign up for direct deposit.

WFR: Submitted to protect at the hearing. 3/21/06. RR 1/28/2006 7:52 PM
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Evergreen At Ventana Canyon
10300 Golf Course Road NW, Albuquerque, NM 87114
1-877-335-9139

Overview > Details > Floorplans > Photos > Maps > Management

Pricing
Style Beds Ba 1/2 Ba SqFt Price Term Deposit
Apartment 1 1 0 0 From $649 Per Month $150
Apartment 2 2 0 0 From $775 Per Month $200
Apartment 3 2 0 0 From $929 Per Month $300

Prices and availability subject to change without notice. For more information, contact property.

Apartment Features
- Disability Access
- Cable Ready
- Microwave
- Air Conditioning
- Ceiling Fan(s)
- Oversized Closets
- Balcony
- Dishwasher
- Washer & Dryer In Unit

Community Features
- Furnished Available
- Fitness Center
- Public Transportation
- Pets Allowed
- Garage and/or Covered Parking
- Swimming Pool
- Clubhouse
- High Speed Internet Access
- Whirlpool/Spa
- Emergency Maintenance
- Laundry Facility

Pet Policy: Weight Restriction.

Office Hours
Mon-Fri 9:00 to 6:00
Saturday 10:00 to 6:00
Sunday 12:00 to 5:00

Directions
From I-25 take Paseo del Norte west to Coors. Turn north on Coors to Irving. Turn left at Irving to Golf Course Road, turn right on Golf Course and we are the brand new community on your right.

For your move to Albuquerque-Santa Fe

Helpful Local Resources
- Thousands of Roommate Listings!
- Search or Advertise Free - EasyRoommate

Want to Move to FREE checking?
Sign up for direct deposit.
The Aspens Resort Community
9677 Eagle Ranch Road, NW, Albuquerque, NM 87114
1-888-689-4565

Description

Wouldn't you like to live today in a place that felt so much like your own that you never worried again about moving? Sound impossible? Well it's not. Enjoy homes nestled in a lush alpine setting with membership to the westside's most dynamic health club, on-site day spa and internet cafe. Your new home at The Aspens is only minutes from Cottonwood Mall, Intel and fine dining.

Custom Features
- On-site day spa
- Hair salon
- Sports court
- Granite-style countertops
- Upgraded black appliances
- Brushed-chrome hardware
- 9-20' ceilings
- Luxurious Berber carpeting
- Free washer/dryer
- Beach volleyball court
- High-speed internet access
- Award-winning school district
- Enchanting resort-style pools
- Internet cafe in the lodge
- Free membership to on-site health club w/ trainer
- Panoramic city and mountain views
- Huge kiddie playland

For your move to Albuquerque-Santa Fe

Helpful Local Resources

Save Big On Your Move.
Free Online Quote.

General Info
- Number of Units: 388
- Lease Terms:
  - Variable
  - Monthly
  - 9-Month
  - 6-Month
  - 12-Month
- Managed by:
  - American Realcorp Management Services
The Aspens Resort Community
9677 Eagle Ranch Road, NW, Albuquerque, NM 87114
-888-689-4565

Overview  Details  Floorplans  Photos  Maps  Management

Contact Leasing Office  View an Online Tour
Email a Friend  Add To Cart
Printable Guide  Check Your Credit

Pricing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Style</th>
<th>Beds</th>
<th>Ba</th>
<th>1/2 Ba</th>
<th>SqFt</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Deposit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flat 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>From $699</td>
<td>Per Month</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loft 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>From $699</td>
<td>Per Month</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flat 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>From $799</td>
<td>Per Month</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flat 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>From $999</td>
<td>Per Month</td>
<td>$400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prices and availability subject to change without notice. For more information, contact property.

Apartment Features
- Disability Access
- Air Conditioning
- Alarm
- Balcony
- Cable Ready
- Dishwasher
- Fireplace
- Microwave

Community Features
- Furnished Available
- Pets Allowed
- Short Term Available
- Clubhouse
- Extra Storage
- Fitness Center
- Garage and/or Covered Parking
- Fireplace
- High Speed Internet Access
- Playground
- Swimming Pool
- Whirlpool/Spa
- Washer & Dryer In Unit

Pet Policy: Call for Policy.

Office Hours
Mon-Fri 9:00 to 6:00
Saturday 10:00 to 5:00
Sunday 1:00 to 5:00

Directions
From I-25, take Paseo Del Norte west to Coors Blvd. Go north on Coors to Coors Bypass. Follow Coors Bypass to Eagle Ranch Road and turn left. The Aspens will be ahead on your right.

For your move to Albuquerque-Santa Fe

Helpful Local Resources

Thousands of Roommate Listings!  Want to Move to FREE checking?
Cottonwood Ranch
10001 Coors Bypass N W
Albuquerque, NM 87114
(666) 739-7077 TOLL FREE

from $549/mo

Studio-3 Bed, 1-2 Bath
583-1423 Sq. Ft.

Map & Directions
Save this community
Send to a friend

Contact Call About Our Current Specials!!

472 Units - Built 1999

At CottonWood Ranch Apartment Homes, You will enjoy these unparalleled community amenities: Albuquerque's Most Spectacular Pool & Spa! Free High Speed Internet, a night-lit full-court Basketball, sand volleyball court, golf putting greens! One of Albuquerque's Best School Districts features the new LBJ Middle School! Walk to the CottonWood Mall, Wal-Mart Supercenter, movies, restaurants... Huge movie screening & conference facility! Fully equipped business center, largest kiddie playland in New Mexico, poolside fantastically equipped gym and one of Albuquerque's Best Customer Service & Maintenance Team! Learn More.

To access this webpage directly, use http://www.rentnet.com/call/6667397077

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Floor Plan</th>
<th>Bed</th>
<th>Bath</th>
<th>Sq. Ft</th>
<th>Deposit</th>
<th>Availability</th>
<th>From</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Birch</td>
<td>Studio</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>Call</td>
<td>$549/mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Maple</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>Call</td>
<td>$599/mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Aspen</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>Call</td>
<td>$749/mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Cypress</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>Call</td>
<td>$749/mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Cottonwood</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1423</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>Call</td>
<td>$899/mo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Apartment Features:
- Refrigerator/ icemaker
- High Speed Internet Available
- Furnished A
- Patio/Balcony/ Deck/Porch
- Storage
- High Ceilings
- View
- Separate Dining Room
- Ceiling Fan
- Fireplace
- Disposal
- Intrusion Alarm
- Disability Access

Community Amenities:
- Basketball Court
- Tennis Court
- Movie Theatre
- Small Dogs Allowed
- Cats Allowed
- Pet Friendly®
- BBQ/Picnic Area
- Business Center
- Playground
- Spa/Hot Tub/ Sauna
- Pool
- Fitness Center
- Satellite TV Available
RENTNET: Find Apartments for Rent

- Microwave
- Dishwasher
- Air Conditioning
- W/D in Apartment

Get Details

- Cable TV Available
- Bus/Public Trans
- Garages
- Covered Parking
  - Pet Policy - Up to 30 lbs. must be 1 yr. in age

Office Hours: Mon-Fri: 8:30AM-5:30PM Sat: 10:00AM-5:00PM Sun: 1:00PM-5:00PM

Lease Options: 9-14 month leases

Type of Housing: Apt Furnished, Apt Unfurnished

Payment Accepted: Personal Check, Money Order

Contact Community

Management Company

Managed and/or owned by:
Cottonwood Ranch

See this company's other listings

---

Found Your Dream Apartment?

Get Qualified

- Understand your Credit
- Find out what is in your Credit Report for FREE
- See Your FREE Credit Score before your landlord does
- Test your knowledge with the Credit Quiz

Get Moving

- Find a Mover
- Find a Roommate
- Get connected with High-Speed Internet
- Rent Furnished from CORT

Get Settled

- Checking Accounts
- Check the School Quality
- Get a City Report

For Professionals

Property Owners, did you know that you could have special features like Virtual Tours on your listings? Click here to find out more!

* International callers should dial (505) 890-8800 with the correct country code to be connected to the community.

This information has been secured from sources we believe to be reliable, but we make no representations or warranties, expressed or implied, as to the accuracy of the information. You must verify the information and bear all risk for inaccuracies.

Search in Popular Metros:
Atlanta Austin Boston Charlotte Chicago Dallas Denver Detroit Fort Worth Houston Las Vegas Los Angeles Memphis Minneapolis Nashville New York City Oakland Orlando Philadelphia Phoenix San Antonio San Diego San Francisco Seattle Tampa

Site Map | Corporate News & Info | Contact Us | Advertise With Us | Join Our Staff | Additional Cities

Terms of Use and NEW! Privacy Policy
© Copyright Homestore, Inc., 1997-2004. All rights reserved. Equal Housing Opportunity.
Vistas at Seven Bar Ranch
10650 Cibola Loop N.W.
Albuquerque, NM 87114
(866) 575-2485 TOLL FREE

from $500/mo
Studio-3 Bed, 1-2 Bath
443-1194 Sq. Ft.

ARCHSTONE

Home is a whole lot more than an apartment number on your door. It's where you unwind and relax at the end of the day. Where you want to be free from problems and worries. Home is Vistas at Seven Bar Ranch. Learn More.

To access this webpage directly, use http://www.rentnet.com/call/9665752485

Apartment Features
- Garages/Carports Storage Avail
- Pre-Wired For Alarms
- Frost-Free Refrigerators
- Walk-In Linen Closets
- Private Patios Or Balconies
- High Speed Internet Available
- Short Term Avail
- Patio/Balcony/Deck/Porch
- Full Kitchen
- Storage
- Separate Dining Room
- Ceiling Fan
- Dishwasher
- Air Conditioning

Community Amenities
- 24-Hour Emergency Maintenance
- Theater Featuring Big Screen A
- Why Wait To Get Approved?
- Basketball & Sand Volleyball
- Community Resource Center
- Sparkling Pools
- Other Pets Allowed
- Small Dogs Allowed
- Cats Allowed
- Pet Friendly**
- BBQ/Picnic Area
- Playground
- Pool
- Fitness Center
- Cable TV Available
- Laundry Facility
Found Your Dream Apartment?

Get Qualified
Understand your Credit
Find out what is in your Credit Report for FREE
See Your FREE Credit Score before your landlord does
Test your knowledge with the Credit Quiz

Get Moving
Find a Mover
Find a Roommate
Get connected with High-Speed Internet
Rent Furniture from CORT

Get Settled
Checking Accounts
Check the School Quality
Get a City Report

For Professionals

Property Owners, did you know that you could have special features like Virtual Tours on your listings? Click here to find out more!

* International callers should dial (562) 792-7227 with the correct country code to be connected to the community.

This information has been secured from sources we believe to be reliable, but we make no representations or warranties, expressed or implied, as to the accuracy of the information. You must verify the information and bear all risk for inaccuracies.

Search in Popular Metros:
Atlanta Austin Boston Charlotte Chicago Dallas Denver Detroit Fort Worth Houston Las Vegas Los Angeles Memphis Minneapolis Nashville New York City Oakland Orlando Philadelphia Phoenix San Antonio San Diego San Francisco Seattle Tampa

Site Map | Corporate News & Info | Contact Us | Advertise With Us | Join Our Staff | Additional Cities

Terms of Use and NEW! Privacy Policy
© Copyright Homestore, Inc., 1997-2004. All rights reserved. Equal Housing Opportunity
River Walk - La Paz Apartment Homes
3405 Calle Cuervo N.W.
Albuquerque, NM 87114
(866) 371-5751 TOLL FREE *

500 Units · Built: 1986 · Remodeled: 2000
Welcome to River Walk at Puerta de Corrales, where a quiet, country lifestyle and city conveniences come together to provide an exclusive combination. River Walk is where you will enjoy the lifestyle of a lifetime. Lease today, and we will waive your security deposit! Learn More

To access this webpage directly, use http://www.rentnet.com/call/8663715751

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Floor Plan</th>
<th>Bed</th>
<th>Bath</th>
<th>Sq. Ft.</th>
<th>Deposit</th>
<th>Availability</th>
<th>From</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greenway</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>Call</td>
<td>$509/mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spacious Bedroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanglewood</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>Call</td>
<td>$549/mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Living/Dining Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>Call</td>
<td>$594/mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass Through Kitchen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hargrove</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>Call</td>
<td>$649/mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Den</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logwood</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>Call</td>
<td>$679/mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patio With Storage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurelwood</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>Call</td>
<td>$694/mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Spacious Bedrooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crescent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>995</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>Call</td>
<td>$719/mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Split Floor Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweetwater</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>Call</td>
<td>$749/mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Split Floor Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Apartment Features**
- Frost-Free Refrigerators
- Gas Heat
- Spacious Closets
- Two Tone Paint
- Vaulted Ceilings
- Vertical And Mini-Blinds
- W/D Hookup
- Separate Dining Room
- Patio/Balcony/Deck/Porch
- View
- Ceiling Fan

**Community Amenities**
- 24-Hour Maintenance Guarantee
- Home Theatre
- Sand Volleyball
- Two Pools And Two Spas
- Pet Friendly**
- Covered Parking
- Bus/Public Trans
- Fitness Center
- Pool
- Cable TV Available
- Laundry Facility
- WD in Apartment
- Air Conditioning
- Fireplace
- Disposal
- Dishwasher

- Cats Allowed
- Small Dogs Allowed
- BBQ/Picnic Area
- Spa/Hot Tub/Sauna
- **Pet Policy** - Pet Deposit, Rent & Fee, Up to 20lbs

Office Hours: Mon-Fri: 10:00AM-6:00PM Sat: 10:00AM-5:00PM Sun: 12:00PM-5:00PM

Lease Options: CALL FOR AVAILABILITY

Type of Housing: Apt Unfurnished

Utilities Included: Trash

Payment Accepted: Visa, Mastercard, American Express, Personal Check, Money Order

Contact Community

Management Company

Managed and/or owned by:
Nevins Lewbel Property Mgmt.

- View this company's website
- See this company's other listings

---

**Found Your Dream Apartment?**

**Get Qualified**
- Understand your Credit
- Find out what is in your Credit Report for FREE
- See Your FREE Credit Score before your landlord does
- Test your knowledge with the Credit Quiz

**Get Moving**
- Find a Mover
- Find a Roommate
- Get connected with High Speed Internet
- Rent Furniture from CORT

**Get Settled**
- Checking Accounts
- Check the School Quality
- Get a City Report

---

**For Professionals**

Property Owners, did you know that you could have special features like Virtual Tours on your listings? Click here to find out more!

* International callers should dial (800) 895-7935 with the correct country code to be connected to the community.

This information has been secured from sources we believe to be reliable, but we make no representations or warranties, expressed or implied, as to the accuracy of the information. You must verify the information and bear all risk for inaccuracies.

---

**Search in Popular Metros:**
- Atlanta
- Austin
- Boston
- Charlotte
- Chicago
- Dallas
- Denver
- Detroit
- Fort Worth
- Houston
- Las Vegas
- Los Angeles
- Memphis
- Minneapolis
- Nashville
- New York City
- Oakland
- Orlando
- Philadelphia
- Phoenix
- San Antonio
- San Diego
- San Francisco
- Seattle
- Tampa

---

Terms of Use and NEW! Privacy Policy

© Copyright Homestore, Inc., 1997-2004. All rights reserved. Equal Housing Opportunity

1/28/2006 7:31 PM

794
Apartment Ventana Canyon in Albuquerque, NM

Rent.com

Welcome!

Account | Search Preferences | Sign Out

Return to apartment search

Rent.com Reward
If you’re moving in here, let us know. Your $100 is waiting for you!

Ventana Canyon
(866) 347-7147 ext. 7904
10300 Golf Course Road
Albuquerque, NM 87114
Managed by: Bernard/Allison Management Services

Save as Favorite
Send to a Friend
Print this page

Bedrooms | Bathrooms | Rent Range | Square Footage | Check Availability
--- | --- | --- | --- | ---
1 Bedroom | 1 | $649 | 796 |
2 Bedroom | 2 | $775 - $785 | 1096 - 1116 |
3 Bedroom | 2 | $915 | 1196 |

Property Overview

"Breathtaking City and Mountain Views...Sparkling Heated Pool and Jacuzzi...Full Size Washer and Dryer in Every Unit..."

Moving Checklist
Before You Move
Free Credit Report
Moving Quotes
Moving Boxes
Truck Rental
Storage

After You Move
Car Insurance
Renters Insurance
Health Insurance
Internet Access
Phone Service
Satellite TV
Checking Account
Online Education

Get free checking with direct deposit.

Bank of America

Rent.com

Contact now

rental detail page

"Breathtaking City and Mountain Views...Sparkling Heated Pool and Jacuzzi...Full Size Washer and Dryer in Every Unit..."

Move-In Special:
• Get a $100 reward from Rent.com if you move here. Learn more.

Pet Policy:
• Cats and dogs accepted.

Apartment Features:
• Fireplace
• Ceiling Fan
• Dishwasher
• Cable Ready
• Air Conditioning
• Walk-in closets
• Microwave
• Garbage Disposal
• Balcony, Deck, Patio
• Washer and Dryer in Unit
• Refrigerator
• Carpeting
• High Speed Internet Available

Community Features:
• Pool
• Business Center
• Spa/Hot Tub
• Club House
• Fitness Center
• Covered Parking

Property Description:
Move beyond your highest expectations. This stunning community combines unmatched amenities with an extraordinary location. Offering quality, convenience and unsurpassed service. Call our friendly staff to set up your personal tour.

Lease Terms:
Lease Terms: 3, 6, 9, and 12 months. Security Deposit: $150.00 one bdrm. $200 on two bdrms and $300 on a three bdrms. Pet Policy: 25 pound weight limit, 2 pets maximum, $25/month pet rent, $300 pet deposit.

Office Hours:
Monday-Friday: 9:00am-6:00pm
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bedrooms</th>
<th>Bathrooms</th>
<th>Rent Range</th>
<th>Square Footage</th>
<th>Check Availability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Bedroom</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$509 - $634</td>
<td>550 - 750</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bedroom</td>
<td>1 - 2</td>
<td>$649 - $789</td>
<td>800 - 1070</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Park Like Grounds... Mature Landscaping... City Convenience With Country Charm."

Move-in Specials:
- Lease today and pay no deposit!
- Get a $100 reward from Rent.com if you move here. Learn more.

Pet Policy:
- Cats and dogs accepted.

Apartment Features:
- Fireplace
- Ceiling Fan
- Garbage Disposal
- Balcony, Deck, Patio
- Washer and Dryer Hookups in Unit
- Walk-in closets
- Refrigerator
- Carpeting
- High Speed Internet Available
- Vaulted Ceiling
- Dishwasher
- Cable Ready
- Air Conditioning

Community Features:
- Pool
- Club House
- Handicap Access
- Spa/Hot Tub
- Covered Parking
- Fitness Center
- Laundry Room

Property Description:
Welcome to River Walk at Puerta De Corrales where a quiet country lifestyle and city conveniences come together to provide you with an exclusive combination. You'll be able to walk to the bosque, jog through Corrales, bicycle down country roads or picnic on 23 acres. Conveniently located only minutes from Paseo del Norte, Cottonwood Mall, and entertainment, River Walk is where you will enjoy the lifestyle of a lifetime.

Lease Terms:
Eagle Ranch
(866) 651-1105 ext. 5758
9270 EAGLE RANCH ROAD
ALBUQUERQUE, NM 87114
Managed by: N.A.L.S.

Property Overview

**Minutes from Downtown... Easy Access to Cottonwood Mall... Shopping, Banking, Restaurants Closeby**

### Move-In Specials:
- $300 off on select 2 bedroom for a limited time.
- Get a $100 reward from Rent.com if you move here. [Learn more.](#)

### Pet Policy:
- Cats and dogs accepted.

### Moving Checklist
- Before You Move
  - Free Credit Report
  - Moving Quotes
  - Moving Boxes
  - Truck Rental
  - Storage
- After You Move
  - Car Insurance
  - Renter's Insurance
  - Health Insurance
  - Internet Access
  - Phone Service
  - Satellite TV
  - Checking Account
  - Online Education

### Bedroom Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bedrooms</th>
<th>Bathrooms</th>
<th>Rent Range</th>
<th>Square Footage</th>
<th>Check Availability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Bedroom</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$640 - $710</td>
<td>740</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bedroom</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$755 - $915</td>
<td>960 - 1121</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Bedroom</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$965 - $1005</td>
<td>1320</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Apartment Features:
- Fireplace
- Vaulted Ceiling
- Microwave
- Garbage Disposal
- Furnished Units Available
- Air Conditioning
- Walk-in closets
- Intrusion Alarm Available
- Refrigerator
- Carpeting
- Balcony, Deck, Patio
- Washer and Dryer in Unit
- Ceiling Fan
- Dishwasher
- Cable Ready
- High Speed Internet Available

### Community Features:
- Detached Garage
- Fitness Center
- Playground
- Handicap Access
- Pool
- Business Center
- Extra Storage Units
- Spa/Hot Tub
- Club House
- Covered Parking

### Property Description:
For the finest in luxury apartment living, there’s no better location than the prestigious Eagle Ranch area with its great views of the city and the Sandia Mountains. You’re close to a wide selection of great restaurants, major employers, shopping and movies at the Cottonwood Mall. Convenient freeway access puts all the pleasures of the city only minutes away from Eagle Ranch. For your convenience, our
My name is Kenneth Hall of 4416 Serenata PL NW, 87114. I am here to speak in opposition to 01864 a special exception to Section 14, Request for A Conditional Use Permit to allow for dwellings on all of a portion of Lot(s) A, Block(s) 12, Clayton Heights Addition zoned C-2 at 10850 Golf Course Road NW.

The request for a Conditional Use burdens the applicant to present evidence to the Zoning Hearing Examiner that the USE will not be injurious to the adjacent property, the neighborhood or the community. The following will address each item presented by DAC ENTERPRISE on behalf of KITTS DEVELOPMENT LLC (APPLICANT) in the application for Conditional Use to demonstrate that each item in the application does not meet this burden of proof. Therefore, the proposed development does in fact present conditions injurious to the adjacent property, neighborhood and community by not meeting this burden of proof.

**Injurious to the Adjacent Property**

Numerous comments can be made about design, parking, traffic, adequate tenant common use areas, trash and crime. Most of these comments have been already addressed by neighbors present or can be addressed at a later date during the Planning Approval Process, if this application is approved.

The applicant makes issue that a Commercial Use would be more injurious. The WESTSIDE STRATEGIC PLAN 2002 discuss in depth the Proposed Seven Bar Regional Center centered around the Cottonwood Mall and Cottonwood Corners Commercial Area (Exhibit F attached, pg 32, map WSP). The basis of the Plan is to encourage commercial uses and increase employment in this area. While the text encourages high-density residential uses, the current number of apartment complexes in the vicinity is reducing the land available to commercial development. Thus, a reduction in available jobs to the community and an increase in traffic flow to the East Side for employment opportunities. The applicants proposed development is NOT in this area but references this area in his application as a supporting item to development approval.

An additional Map in the West Side Strategic Plan labeled GOLF COURSE/COUNTY LINE NEIGHBOR CENTER does contain the proposed development. There was no specific text in the West Side Strategic Plan about this area. It appears this area is included as part of the ELLISON/GOLF COURSE NEIGHBORHOOD CENTER. The listed Acceptable Uses for the ELLISON/GOLF COURSE NEIGHBORHOOD CENTER does again mention higher density housing but states the primary uses SHOULD be office, medical and related services (Exhibit E). There are already 2 apartment communities in this Center with a third under construction just West on McMahon, just out of the boundaries.

Not Maintaining Commercial Zoning for Use as Commercial/Employment development as stated in the WESTSIDE STRATEGIC PLAN can be, in itself, injurious to the adjacent neighbors (Exhibit I).

The APPLICANT states that the proposed development is “an upscale multi-family dwelling units that will rent for up to $1100 a month”.

The following is an excerpt from the Albuquerque/Bernalillo Comprehensive Plan 2002 pg I-71(Exhibit C):

“Slightly over one-half of the renter households in Albuquerque have incomes at or below the level generally required to afford an efficiency apartment and 70 percent have incomes at or below the level needed to afford a two-bedroom dwelling. These figures suggest Albuquerque has a growing affordable housing problem.”

The Comprehensive Plan actually recommends “AFFORDABLE multi-family housing” is needed in Albuquerque. The applicant is providing two and three bedroom units at a high rent.

Additionally, Agent for the Applicant, DAC ENTERPRISES, stated several times in his presentation before the ZHE on 26 JAN that the proposed project is for 252 APARTMENTS in 63 units. While the Application for Conditional Use actually states DWELLING UNITS.
The applicant states in 01863 for Conditional Use (basically the same application), uses the term APARTMENTS and in 01864 the term DWELLING UNITS. This leads to the assumption the Applicant intends to CONDO off the 63 units for investment purposes. Traditionally, in Albuquerque, this leads to remote landlords that are not ON SITE. The downside to this is the landlords compete between themselves for renters. Leading to low rent properties and higher crime rates. The Albuquerque Police Department has set up a special task force called "The Multi-Family Crime Task Force" specifically to deal with the crime issues around this type of development. This scenario would be VARY injurious to the adjacent properties.

**Injurious to the Neighborhood**

The application references that Policy 5 h of the Albuquerque/Bernalillo Comprehensive Plan (2002?), stating: "The Comprehensive Plan STRONGLY encourages high density multi-family development at this location". This reference was hard to find as the reference is incomplete.

The proper reference is ALBUQUERQUE/BERNALILLO COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2002 Part II Section B Part 5 Policy(h):

- Higher density housing is most appropriate in the following situations:
  - In designated Activity Centers.
  - In areas with excellent access to the major street network.
  - In areas where a mixed density pattern is already established by zoning or use, where it is compatible with existing area land uses and where adequate infrastructure is or will be available.
  - In areas now predominantly zoned single-family only where it comprises a complete block face and faces onto similar or higher density development; up to 10 dwelling units per net acre.
  - In areas where a transition is needed between single-family homes and much more intensive development; densities will vary up to 30 dwelling units per net acre according to the intensity of development in adjacent areas.

The following address's this portion of the COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, in the first situation:

**In Response:**

*In designated Activity Centers.*

The proposed development on Golf Course is not in a designated Activity Center per the West Side Development Plan 2002 for the Cottonwood Mall area but is in the GOLF COURSE/ELLISON ACTIVITY CENTER. The typical uses do not "strongly" encourage high density housing but does suggest primary uses of medical and office. Currently, these areas are becoming overbalanced to High Density Housing departing from the Goals of the Comprehensive plan.

*In areas where a mixed density pattern is already established by zoning or use, where it is compatible with existing area land uses and where adequate infrastructure is or will be available.*

Adequate infrastructure includes utilities, roads and SCHOOLS. The current mixed density pattern is already unbalanced by the existing Apartment Communities in the area.

The applicant states that the schools in the immediate area are SEVEN BAR ES, JAMES MONROE MS and CIBOLA HS. Seven Bar ES has 861 students enrolled with a determined capacity of 860, so the school is currently 1 student overcrowded. The applicant failed to note that Seven Bar started the school year with 50 students over projections. During the first 75 days of school most classes exceeded 30 students while APS moved in additional portables and hired additional staff to ease the overcrowding, as was the case with many West Side Schools. Regrettably, the Applicant is correct that as of January 2006 that currently Seven Bar is not "overcrowded", until, at least, the start of the next school year.
The following chart indicates enrollment at Seven Bar ES since 2001-2002 school year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Year</th>
<th>Projected APS Enrollment</th>
<th>Actual Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001-2002</td>
<td>624 (k-5)</td>
<td>688 (no 5th grade)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-2003</td>
<td>900-950 (?)</td>
<td>1020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-2004</td>
<td>809</td>
<td>1022 (125 bussed to Corrales ES)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>861</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Capacity, as determined by APS, is the total number of students a school can handle in classrooms plus the additional capacity with all available space utilized by portables. This does not account for a playground area for the students. Currently, as the applicant stated, Seven Bar is not experiencing overcrowding. Yet, overcrowding has always been an issue at Seven Bar.

The applicant states that James Monroe should be relieved this year by a proposed boundary change that sends 400 students to Taft or Taylor. This proposal has been suspended based on a public outcry.

The applicant further states that the second phase of James Monroe should begin in February INCREASING the capacity of James Monroe to 1200 students. During the Applicants presentation Mr. Albertorio asked "INCREASING?" the Applicant stated "Yes, Increasing". According to APS Demographer Betty King states the second phase of construction will REPLACE some of the existing portables. There is not an INCREASE in total capacity. The current enrollment is 1394, almost 200 students over projections. With the continued residential construction in Ventana Ranch, surrounding communities and the proposed Multi Family growth the number of students will only increase.

The applicant states he has a proven track record of working with local schools to provide facilities, computers, playground equipment, or other needs. Nancy Lacher, Principal at Seven Bar Elementary, has never heard of KITTS DEVELOPMENT LLC. Nancy Romero, Principal at Taylor Middle School, has never heard of KITTS DEVELOPMENT LLC. Patty Salaz, Secretary for Mr. Martinez at Monroe Middle School has never heard of KITTS DEVELOPMENT LLC. Chuck Atwood in the Real Estate Department of APS has never heard of KITTS DEVELOPMENT LLC.

The applicant attached a chart to demonstrate the number of school age children residing in multi-family housing based on the National Average. One question, how is this standard documented?

The chart in Exhibit A shows the local apartment complexes, address, number of units, rent, etc. The number of APS students, for each apartment community, was provided by Betty King with the APS Demographics. The National Standard for School Age Students was obtained from The National Multi Family Housing website. There is a national average of 31 students per 100 units. That standard is modified based on the Average Median Income (AMI) as shown as a range in the chart. The higher the family income over the AMI the fewer school aged children. The lower the income the more students.

The APPLICANTS Complexes are highlighted in Yellow. Two very important issues are evident. The first is that 3 of the complexes listed by the are not even in the same Zip Code and have no bearing on the impact to the community by the proposed project. The second is that for the shown complexes the reported school aged children is incorrect. This chart demonstrates the lack of effort or concern by the APPLICANT to really understand how the proposed complex will impact the overcrowding of the school system. Additionally, these charts are only a snap shot in time. Historical data will show the trends of growth of APS school age children in local apartment communities.

PLEASE NOTE THAT THE NUMBER OF APS STUDENTS ONLY REFERS TO APS STUDENTS AND DOES NOT INCLUDE POTENTIAL STUDENTS (PRE K) OR STUDENTS IN OTHER SITUATIONS.
Injurious to the Community

There is no new information presented here. Is it not the burden of the Applicant to demonstrate impact on the Community. The impact of an additional 522 cars on Seven Bar ES and Cibola HS school zones has an impact at 7:30 in the morning. Not to mention the traffic loads on Ellison, Coors, Paseo Del Norte, and Alameda as the tenants will need to travel to the Eastside for employment. Exhibit I, (page 1.47 from the WESTSIDE STRATEGIC PLAN) states that the City Council is concerned about the importance of achieving Westside job creation and the need for additional policy. That policy might be the need to maintain the Commercial Zones for Commercial Use to achieve the objectives of the WESTSIDE STRATEGIC PLAN. The applicant does not address this impact on the community.

Conclusion

Being that each point of the Application has been disputed and documented. That the information provided by the applicant is unsubstantiated and/or erroneous. The Zoning Hearing Examiner, Mr. Albertorio, should have no reason to approve KITTS DEVELOPMENT LLC application for Conditional Use as the Applicant has not meet his burden of proof.

Thank you for your time.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map Location</th>
<th>Zip Code</th>
<th>Rent</th>
<th># of Units</th>
<th>Applicant Proposed Students</th>
<th>National Average 0.31</th>
<th>Avg. based on Income 13/unit (70% AMI)</th>
<th>37/unit (&lt;50% AMI)</th>
<th># APS Students*</th>
<th>Actual % APS Students*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Cottonwood Ranch 10001 Coors Bypass NW</td>
<td>87114</td>
<td>$610.00</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>61.36</td>
<td>174.64</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Arroyo Villas 4701 Irving Blvd NW</td>
<td>87114</td>
<td>$535.00</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A The Aspens 9677 Eagle Ranch Road</td>
<td>87114</td>
<td>$649.00</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>50.44</td>
<td>143.56</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Ventana Ranch (240 Dev) 10400 Universe NW</td>
<td>87114</td>
<td>$468.00</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>89.3</td>
<td>37.44</td>
<td>106.56</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Eagle Ranch Lux Apart Hms 9270 Eagle Ranch Rd NW</td>
<td>87114</td>
<td>$640.00</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>56.16</td>
<td>159.84</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F City View Twinhouse Apt 5350 Justin Dr NW</td>
<td>87114</td>
<td>$535.00</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>8.58</td>
<td>24.42</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G El Paseo Adult 55+ 361 El Pueblo NW</td>
<td>87114</td>
<td>$591.00</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>36.24</td>
<td>81.56</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H Camino Real 3305 Calle Cuervo NW</td>
<td>87114</td>
<td>$650.00</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>32.24</td>
<td>91.76</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Paseo Del Sol Apts 291 El Pueblo Road NW</td>
<td>87114</td>
<td>$540.00</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J West Park Apartments 9251 Eagle Ranch Rd NW</td>
<td>87114</td>
<td>$535.00</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>28.21</td>
<td>80.29</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K EvergreenVentana Canyon 10300 Golf Course Rd NW</td>
<td>87114</td>
<td>$649.00</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>34.32</td>
<td>97.68</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L New Units McMahon</td>
<td>87114</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Riverwalk Puerta De Corrales 3405 Calle Cuervo</td>
<td>87114</td>
<td>$509.00</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Puerta Del Sol 4816 McMahon NW</td>
<td>87114</td>
<td>$439.00</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>17.68</td>
<td>50.32</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Manzano Ridge 701 Stephen Moody SE</td>
<td>87123</td>
<td>$562.00</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>86.8</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>103.6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Valencia Court 209 Valencia Dr SE</td>
<td>87108</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Villa De San Felipe 701 Coal Av SE</td>
<td>87102</td>
<td>$360.00</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>20.93</td>
<td>59.57</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Vistas at Seven Bar Ranch 10600 Cibola Loop NW</td>
<td>87114</td>
<td>$460.00</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>74.36</td>
<td>211.64</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Taylor Ranch</td>
<td>87120</td>
<td>$419.00</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q Arroyo Del Sol 4801 Irving Blvd</td>
<td>87114</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on students on the 40th day of 2005/06
**Number of students who live at 9270 Eagle Ranch Rd and 9280 Eagle Ranch Rd
***Number of students who live at 3505 Calle Cuervo and 3405 Calle Cuervo
****Number of students who live at 10600 Cibola Lp and 10500 Cibola Lp

Apartments referenced by Kitts Dev
5. HOUSING

Inventory

Between 1970 and 1980 Albuquerque’s housing inventory grew from 78,825 dwelling units to 132,788 dwelling units, a 69 percent increase. The area’s relatively new housing stock exceeded population growth by 4 percent. The 1980 Census indicated 41 percent of the City’s housing structures had been built in the previous ten years. The housing inventory continued to increase between 1980 and 1985, with a 15 percent increase in the number of dwelling units, representing an average annual growth rate of 3.1 percent.

The demand for housing has been greater than population growth. The housing unit increase between 1970 and 1980 was almost double the City and County population growth. Smaller household size accounted for most change, declining from 3.17 persons per household in 1970 to 2.65 persons per household in 1980.

Market

Albuquerque has a growing but segmented housing market. Low interest rates, moderate inflation, and an increase in general consumer wealth created in a market which homes are more affordable now (1988) than in 1980. The average selling price of a single family house in 1986 was $91,200. Townhomes and condominiums lower selling prices that averaged $83,050. Although below the national average, the average selling price of homes in Albuquerque offers an interesting insight into the local market. Over 80 percent of the homes sold for less than $100,000, but the mean price was higher as a consequence of the upper income housing demand which increased the overall average selling price for area homes.

Housing demand primarily reflects the strength of the low cost and the high cost single family dwellings market segments. Demand to purchase moderately priced units is shrinking.

The market dichotomy is evident in the rental market as well. The proportion of renter households in the County which spend at least a quarter of their gross monthly income on rent has grown from 30 to 53 percent between 1970 and 1980. Slightly over one-half of the renter households in Albuquerque have incomes at or below the level generally required to afford an efficiency apartment and 70 percent have incomes at or below the level needed to afford a two bedroom dwelling. These figures suggest Albuquerque has a growing affordable housing problem.

The City coordinates Federal assistance for housing: rehabilitation, public housing, and rent subsidies. The City also owns and manages over 1,000 public housing units and it supports another 2,000 units through the Federal rent subsidy program. The number of families eligible for rental assistance far exceeds current resources. Regardless of demand, Federal housing assistance continues to decline, challenging local government to devise innovative solutions. Rental or sale incentives to developers willing to provide low cost housing is an example of a potential solution to the affordable housing question. Adequate housing for the entire population is an outcome of maintaining a balanced housing market to accommodate the population’s varied wants and needs.
Policy h

Higher density housing is most appropriate in the following situations:

- In designated Activity Centers.
- In areas with excellent access to the major street network.
- In areas where a mixed density pattern is already established by zoning or use, where it is compatible with existing area land uses and where adequate infrastructure is or will be available.
- In areas now predominantly zoned single-family only where it comprises a complete block face and faces onto similar or higher density development; up to 10 dwelling units per net acre.
- In areas where a transition is needed between single-family homes and much more intensive development: densities will vary up to 30 dwelling units per net acre according to the intensity of development in adjacent areas.

(See also Policy 7.b relative to Activity page 39.)

Possible Techniques

2) Guide through sector plans.

1) Control through the Zoning and Subdivision Ordinances.

3) Explore direct (e.g. public investment) and indirect (e.g. zoning regulations) approaches to promoting higher density development in appropriate areas.

Policy i

Employment and service uses shall be located to complement residential areas and shall be sited to minimize adverse effects of noise, lighting, pollution, and traffic on residential environments.

Possible Techniques

1) Achieve by area and sector development plans, Zoning and Subdivision Ordinances.

2) Consider use of performance zoning.

3) Prepare Activity Center Implementation Plan.

4) Include industrial site location as a component of Comprehensive Plan economic development strategy.

5) Provide opportunity for neighborhood review and comment on site plans by notifying recognized neighborhood associations of site plan proposals in accordance with the City Neighborhood Recognition Ordinance 92.
WEST SIDE STRATEGIC PLAN

Employment is projected to increase from 3,085 to 15,250 from 1995 to 2020, with retail and service businesses being dominant.

Regional/Community Center

The regional scale commercial developments surrounding and including Cottonwood Mall comprise a regional retail center. Community scale retail, professional offices, Cibola High School and multifamily housing surround the regional retail center, with community scale commercial uses extending south of the Calabacillas Arroyo along Coors Boulevard through the Paradise Community to Paseo del Norte.

Community area: NA
2020 population served: NA
2020 employment: 12,869
Potential uses: Regional retail, services, higher density housing, public/institutional (Cibola High School, public uses to be located in the Seven Bar town center)

1. The goal of the West Side Strategic Plan is to create an intense mixed-use center, similar in scale to the Uptown Area. Public policy regarding this center is to encourage growth in service employment in mid-rise office parks in the area bounded by Coors Boulevard, the Coors By-Pass and NM 528. Because of the existing dominance of retail uses and planning retail growth, office development will be mixed in with retail buildings rather than concentrated in an office park setting.

Community Centers

Some community-scale retail development at Paseo del Norte and Golf Course Road will serve residents of the western part of the Seven Bar community. The characteristics of this area were listed in the descriptions of the Taylor Ranch and Paradise communities. The development is most appropriate as a neighborhood center. Community scale service needs should be met by the Paseo del Norte/Coors community cluster and the regional center around Cottonwood Mall.

Neighborhood Centers

Ellison/Golf Course

The area along Golf Course Road from Ellison to Irving contains a mix of institutional uses, medical offices, higher density housing and a limited amount of retail use, primarily restaurants. This area will continue to develop as a center, although primary uses will be office, medical and related services.
**WEST SIDE STRATEGIC PLAN**

**Strategies and Policies**

*Seven Bar Ranch contains the West Side's only Regional Center.*

**Regional Center**

There is one Regional Center on the West Side, and it is located at Seven Bar Ranch. It is roughly bounded by the Calabacillas Arroyo on the south, the Seven Bar Ranch Sector Plan boundary on the north, the Corrales Acequia on the east, and Blacks Arroyo to a parcel boundary between Cibola Loop and Seven Bar Loop on the northwest (see map below).

The Regional Center will develop with a greater density and larger amount of commercial services than anywhere else on the West Side. The Regional Center serves the entire region, not just the West Side, and is characterized by a major concentration of a full mixture of the most intensive activities needed to service metropolitan populations. Typical uses include: regional shopping centers, regional commercial activities, corporate offices, large public and quasi-public uses, cultural and entertainment facilities, high-density residential uses, and transit access facilities or stations. These uses are discouraged outside of designated Regional Centers and Community Centers.

Urban Centers on the West Side were previously designated near St. Pius High School and Westgate Heights. These areas have not, and will not, develop as Urban Centers and the designations will be removed from those areas in the appropriate plans and the Seven Bar location will be designated as a Regional Center.
The strategies of the Community Plan/Urban Form section of the Plan shall be implemented through systematic follow-through on all policies requiring further action, and by enforcement of all policies stating intent. Uniform enforcement and consistency with stated intent is required in order to achieve the urban form envisioned herein and endorsed by the public.

City of Albuquerque staff and Bernalillo County staff shall be the lead entities for implementation, with participation and support from MRGC, NPS, AMAFCA, NMSHTD, City of Rio Rancho, neighborhood associations, affected landowners, and the public.

The City of Albuquerque and Bernalillo County shall each designate a minimum of one staff person whose job is to coordinate the follow-through of all implementation strategies of the West Side Plan. These staff persons will work together to set up the necessary task forces, communication methods, research methodologies, and strategies to complete the tasks outlined herein.

Elected officials will be reminded of key implementation enforcement needs by the designated City and County staff persons so that continuity of enforcement will extend beyond the terms of office for key officials.

- Support for staff positions necessary by City and County
- Public funding for needed public improvements identified, allocated in a timely fashion
- Private development sources
- Joint funding whenever possible in multi-jurisdictional areas

- Immediate, begin 1996

Encouraging Employment Growth on the West Side

During the course of reviews of West Side Strategic Plan drafts, the City Council Department became concerned about both the importance of achieving the West Side Job creation objectives and the need for additional policy direction with regard to achieving these objectives. The Strategic Plan called for a significant increase West Side jobs: 36,250 new jobs between 1995 and 2020. Perhaps more importantly, it called for the ratio of population to jobs to decrease from the current figure of 4.5 (people) to 1 (job) to 2 to 1 over this period. Recent data indicate that while job growth on the West Side had increased during the last five years, the ratio of population to jobs only changed from 5 to 1, to 4.5 to 1. In addition, the West side was not very successful in attracting “base or export jobs” which are necessary to achieve this population to jobs ratio.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1997-98</th>
<th>2005-06</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
<th>Average Annual Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cibola Cluster</td>
<td>6,508</td>
<td>10,961</td>
<td>4,443</td>
<td>68.3%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westside</td>
<td>25,288</td>
<td>32,177</td>
<td>6,889</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APS District</td>
<td>87,033</td>
<td>89,469</td>
<td>2,436</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Westside includes all elementary, middle, and high schools located west of the
Based on 40th day enrollment figures.
Historical Enrollment for the Cibola Cluster: 1997-2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cibola Cluster</td>
<td>6,508</td>
<td>6,795</td>
<td>7,222</td>
<td>7,538</td>
<td>8,579</td>
<td>9,123</td>
<td>9,811</td>
<td>10,297</td>
<td>10,951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on 40th day count for each school year.
## Enrollment Trends

### Middle School Enrollment Trends: 1997-2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>457</td>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>1096</td>
<td>1139</td>
<td>1115</td>
<td>1146</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>485</td>
<td>LB Johnson</td>
<td>1096</td>
<td>1192</td>
<td>1193</td>
<td>1195</td>
<td>1169</td>
<td>1061</td>
<td>1077</td>
<td>1034</td>
<td>1132</td>
<td>1175</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>490</td>
<td>Monroe</td>
<td>1096</td>
<td>1192</td>
<td>1193</td>
<td>1195</td>
<td>1169</td>
<td>1061</td>
<td>1077</td>
<td>1034</td>
<td>1132</td>
<td>1175</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>455</td>
<td>Taft</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**: 2,840, 2,991, 2,978, 2,970, 3,153, 3,291, 3,485, 3,562, 3,754, 3,754, -988

**Population Change**: 5%, 0%, 0%, 6%, 4%, 6%, 2%, 5%

### Preliminary Middle School Enrollment Projections: 2006-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Loc</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>2006-07</th>
<th>2007-08</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>Projected Space Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>457</td>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>485</td>
<td>LB Johnson</td>
<td>1132</td>
<td>1121</td>
<td>1124</td>
<td>1141</td>
<td>1138</td>
<td>1176, 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>490</td>
<td>Monroe</td>
<td>1406</td>
<td>1599</td>
<td>1730</td>
<td>1781</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>780, -1051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>455</td>
<td>Taft</td>
<td>821</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**: 3,133, 3,282, 3,383, 3,460, 3,528, 2,745, -783

**% Population Change**: 4.6%, 3.1%, 2.3%, 2.0%

---

Student counts are based on 40th day enrollment.

*2005/06 enrollment based on 20th day count.
Enrollment Trends


Students Enrolled

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>1,096</td>
<td>1,139</td>
<td>1,115</td>
<td>1,146</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB Johnson</td>
<td>1,096</td>
<td>1,192</td>
<td>1,193</td>
<td>1,196</td>
<td>1,169</td>
<td>1,061</td>
<td>1,077</td>
<td>1,034</td>
<td>1,132</td>
<td>1,121</td>
<td>1,124</td>
<td>1,141</td>
<td>1,138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>799</td>
<td>969</td>
<td>1,115</td>
<td>1,247</td>
<td>1,406</td>
<td>1,599</td>
<td>1,730</td>
<td>1,781</td>
<td>1,841</td>
<td>1,814</td>
<td>1,814</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taft</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>634</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Adams</td>
<td>1,045</td>
<td>1,022</td>
<td>1,049</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>807</td>
<td>872</td>
<td>895</td>
<td>955</td>
<td>974</td>
<td>994</td>
<td>1,013</td>
<td>1,034</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Student counts are based on 40th day enrollment

**2005-06 enrollment based on 30th day count.
Parents Slam Proposed APS Boundary Changes

Some 23 buses wait to take James Monroe Middle School students home after school on Tuesday. The school district is attempting to adjust attendance boundaries to ease overcrowding at the school.

West Siders Oppose Busing to North Valley

BY ANDREA SCHÖLLKOPF
Journal Staff Writer

West Side parents said Tuesday they would rather have their children stay in overcrowded middle schools next year than have them bused to North Valley schools.

Some threatened other alternatives under a redistricting proposal being considered by Albuquerque Public Schools. A few residents even tried to revive talk of a West Side school district.

"If this plan goes through, we will home school, family school, charter school," local television personality and West Side resident Steve Stucker said during a public forum on the proposed changes. "We will not send our children across the river to Albuquerque Public Schools."

The forum — the first of two on new West Side middle school boundaries — drew an estimated 550 people to the James Monroe Middle School gymnasium Tuesday night.

The school board is scheduled to vote on the boundaries Dec. 7.

A second forum is scheduled for 7 p.m. Monday at Lyndon B. Johnson Middle School’s cafeteria.

Monroe, which has 36 portable classrooms, is built for 1,100 students and is 300 students over its capacity. APS officials have said the school expects to have 1,800 students for the 2000-01 school year.

Misty Ashcraft, a Petroglyph Elementary School parent, listens during a meeting Tuesday night at James Monroe Middle School. The meeting was held to discuss a plan to relieve overcrowding at the middle school.

See PARENTS on PAGE A2
Parents Air Boundary Concerns

from PAGE A1
to 1,900 students by 2009 and it does not have much more room to accommodate portables or students.

The proposed changes would send students living in the Petroglyph Elementary neighborhoods — which encompass the eastern end of Paradise Hills as well as the homes between Coors and the Rio Grande south of Paseo del Norte — more than six miles away to Taft Middle School near Fourth and Osuna in Los Ranchos.

Students in the Seven Bar Elementary neighborhoods would be sent to Taylor Middle School, which is near Los Ranchitos and Guadalupe.

Taylor currently serves West Side students living north of the Calabacillas Arroyo west to Golf Course.

The proposed changes would decrease Monroe's enrollment to 913 next year. Taylor, now at 595, would increase to 810. And Taft would increase to 819.

APS officials — who did not respond to comments — had earlier told parents the plans could change based on input they receive.

"We are trying to do the best that we can with a situation we did not create," said Nellinda Venegas, APS assistant superintendent. "The public schools did not create the growth, but we have to make sure that we accommodate for students."

APS officials seemed to realize the problem early on in the forum when APS Facilities Master Plan Director Kizito Wijenje — with a straight face — said the bus ride to the North Valley schools would average six or seven minutes longer. The claim received a prompt round of laughter from those familiar with the city's bridge system and its congestion at rush hour.

James Monroe Middle School is 2.56 miles away from Petroglyph Elementary. In comparison, Taft is 6.2 miles from Petroglyph.

Seven Bar Elementary is about equal distance, 4.2 miles, from James Monroe and Taft middle schools.

Parents cited concerns over the rush-hour traffic commute keeping children on the bus, breaking up communities and decreasing property values and lower socioeconomic factors in North Valley schools.

Some proposed solutions were keeping sixth graders at the elementary schools — many of which are also at or above capacity — or adjusting the Lyndon B. Johnson Middle School boundaries to keep West Side students at West Side schools.

"I put my children into this (West Side) district, so they could have the best education they could possibly get," said Seven Bar resident and teacher Andrea Lucero. "It all has to do with socioeconomic . . . I want my kids to be safe here."

Parents recalled their children being bused to Taylor before Monroe opened, and said it took 45 minutes roundtrip. They said the trip to Taft would be longer.

"I feel that the people moving here are pushing us out of our school," said Kim Rarrick. "... APS keeps asking us to support their bond issues and we do. And yet, we're going to be sent to a lesser-quality school."

Monroe eighth grader Merry Hanson said students have started a petition to limit the boundary change to students living east of Coors.

"No one from Monroe wants to leave here," she said. "We all have our friends here."

Parents compared costs of private school tuition and talked about school choice options as they waited for the meeting to start.

Former school board write-in candidate Eric Johnson, who had opposed an APS split during his election campaign, was outside James Monroe Tuesday night crusading for a new West Side district.

"We can build a West Side district sooner than they can build a new middle school," he said.

Rep. Thomas Anderson, R-Albuquerque, who was part of a 2004 legislative movement for the West Side to secede, said area lawmakers are still considering breaking off from the district.

"Do we want to do it?" he said. "No, it's too much work. But we need to do something."

On Monday, City Councilor Michael Cadigan — whose children attend Petroglyph — sponsored a memorial calling on APS to find alternatives to busing children from the West Side across the Rio Grande.

"My frustration is their first reaction (to overcrowding) is to redistrict," Cadigan said earlier Tuesday.
Building Plan Questioned

By Terry Wiggins

There was a time, a few months ago, when the
developers were confident that they would
be able to build a 250-unit apartment complex
next to the city's Dearborn Park. The
developers had plans for a large, modern
complex with all the amenities, including
a swimming pool, fitness center, and
playground for the children. But now, their
plans are in question.

The city council, concerned with the
impact of the proposed development on
the surrounding area, has requested a
revised plan that includes measures to
mitigate the effects of the new project.

Some residents are concerned about
the increased traffic and noise that will
result from the new complex, while
others worry about the impact on
property values.

The developers are working with
the city to come up with a revised
plan that addresses these concerns.

The revised plan includes

- A reduction in the number of
  units to 200
- A redesign of the parking lot
  to reduce noise and
  traffic
- A creation of a green belt
  between the complex and
  the existing park

The city council will
review the revised plan
in the coming weeks.

The developers are
hoping for approval,
but the road to
completion is far from
smooth.
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FROM NIMBY TO GOOD NEIGHBORS:
RECENT STUDIES REINFORCE THAT APARTMENTS
ARE GOOD FOR A COMMUNITY

- Community leaders and public planning officials agree that the key to growing smarter is to develop more higher density housing, such as apartments. Developers eager to meet these housing needs are often thwarted, however, by misguided local not-in-my-backyard (NIMBY) activists.

- One of the most persistent claims is that new apartments will reduce nearby property values. Fortunately, there is an increasing body of research that indicates that apartments (even affordable apartments) are not a threat to local property values. In fact, new research shows that apartments can be a net plus to communities and can actually help raise nearby property values in certain neighborhoods.

- This NMHC/NAA White Paper summarizes those reports and offers links to the original research. It also identifies other literature and resources that community leaders and housing providers can use to overcome NIMBY opposition.

- Suggested distribution includes:
  o General Counsels
  o Directors of Development
  o Research Directors

© This document is intended for NMHC members only. It may not be reproduced or retransmitted electronically, in whole or in part, without permission from the National Multi Housing Council.
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INTRODUCTION

Last year in Cuyahoga Falls, Ohio, the city refused to issue a building permit for an affordable housing apartment community even though the plan was consistent with all of the city’s zoning regulations. After searching its existing zoning regulations in vain for any reason to deny the developer a permit, the city actually changed the rules in the middle of the game by launching a referendum on the proposal. By appealing to people’s irrational “not in my backyard” (NIMBY) fears about affordable housing, the referendum denied the developer the right to build the apartments.

Despite our nation’s pressing need for greater housing density and more apartment homes, those seeking to build apartments still encounter NIMBY behavior too often. When a project is proposed, misguided local activists respond with NIMBY complaints so frequently that some have suggested a better acronym would be BANANA (Build Absolutely Nothing Anywhere Near Anyone).

The National Multi Housing Council/National Apartment Association (NMHC/NAA) Joint Legislative Program watches these NIMBY debates closely, sometimes filing legal briefs on behalf of members who have run up against NIMBYism. But since it is best to avoid the costly and slow legal system if possible, disarming potential opposition and winning local stakeholders over early is a good idea.

There is an ever-increasing body of research that indicates that apartments (even affordable apartments) are not a threat to local property values and can be a net plus to communities. This paper summarizes those recent reports and identifies other literature and presentations that NMHC/NAA members can use to overcome NIMBY opposition.

IMPACT OF APARTMENTS ON PROPERTY VALUES

The Vitality of America’s Working Communities (2003)
By Alexander von Hoffman, Eric Belsky, James DeNormandie, and Rachel Bratt

According to this new research by Harvard’s Joint Center for Housing Studies (JCHS), apartments pose no threat to the value of single-family houses nearby. Using U.S. Census data from 1970 through 2000, the researchers found that—contrary to the perception that apartments lower property values—the average value of owner-occupied houses was highest in working communities (defined as neighborhoods in which residents earn between 60 percent and 100 percent of area-wide median income) that have the most apartments.

The study found that working communities with apartments comprising more than 30 percent of their housing units have sustained a 30-year increase in home values in each of the largest 42 metropolitan areas. There is a more detailed report of the same name forthcoming from the same authors.


NMHC White Paper: From NIMBY to Good Neighbors

824
George Galster, Wayne State (MI) University

This report from a Wayne State University professor finds that federally assisted housing has an insignificant—or even a positive—effect on property values. Professor Galster finds that prior studies have over-estimated the negative impact subsidized housing has on property values, and uses a new methodology that measures property values both before and after affordable housing is constructed (not just after construction, like most studies) to determine whether such housing affected property values, or whether property values in the neighborhood may have been already declining before the housing was built. Galster finds that assisted housing had insignificant or positive effects on property values in higher-value, less vulnerable neighborhoods. It was more likely to improve property values in lower-value, more vulnerable neighborhoods. Any negative impacts were directly related to the size and scale of the subsidized housing.


Low-Income Housing Tax Credit Housing Developments and Property Values (2002)
The University of Wisconsin Center for Urban Land Economics Research

This study, which reviewed eight prior studies on Low-Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) properties and property values, found no evidence that LIHTC properties cause property values to deteriorate. Instead, contrary to conventional wisdom, this study's authors discovered that Low-Income Housing Tax Credit developments often cause surrounding property values to increase. They note with interest that past research has generally found that such developments have a more positive impact in higher income areas.

The researchers then tested those conclusions by measuring the appreciation rates of houses in one Wisconsin city and two counties near LIHTC properties between 1991-2000. Their analysis also found no evidence that LIHTC properties caused property values to depreciate, and they found evidence that in Madison, Wisconsin, properties near LIHTC developments actually appreciated more rapidly.

Low-Income Housing Tax Credit Housing Developments and Property Values is available at: www.whecda.com/cat_lca/wc study.pdf.

A Study of the Relationship Between Affordable Family Rental Housing and Home Values in the Twin Cities (2000)
Family Housing Fund and Maxfield Research, Inc.

Minnesota's Family Housing Fund, a non-profit agency that supports affordable housing throughout Minneapolis and its twin city of St. Paul, commissioned this survey of 12 Twin City neighborhoods in which a tax-credit rental housing development was located within an area of owner-occupied homes. Looking at three standards of single-family house performance—sales price per square foot, percentage of sales price to asking price and time on the market—the study found nearly no negative impacts, and many positives to integrating tax credit rental housing into these neighborhoods.
For example, the single-family homes around the tax credit property displayed similar or stronger market performance after the rental properties were built, and similar or stronger market performance than houses not located near a tax credit property. Though this study is nearly three years old, tax-credit property developers especially should still be aware of it. A Study of the Relationship between Affordable Family Rental Housing and Home Values in the Twin Cities is available at www.fhfund.org/Research/Maxfield-Exec%20Summary.pdf.

Arthur C. Nelson and Mitch Moody
This upcoming study looks to Gwinnett County, Georgia in suburban Atlanta for a case study of the relationship between apartments and house values nearby. Prepared with support from NMHC and the National Association of Realtors, On Common Ground concludes that in the area they studied, apartments did affect nearby property values, sometimes adversely but sometimes adding value.

Examining all homes sold in the county in the 1990s as well as 158 apartment complexes, the authors find that Gwinnett house prices per square foot were lower within one-quarter mile of an apartment complex, but that those farther than one-half mile away sell for less than those that are one-quarter mile away from an apartment building. They theorize that this means that apartments generally create value in an area, suggesting that apartments may provide the critical mass needed to support the local shopping and services that nearby homeowners value. They also believe that most apartment residents are in a transitional period; they may be new to the area and want to learn about the area before purchasing, or may be waiting until they have sufficient income to buy. Finally, the authors theorize that apartments may lead demand rather than follow it. That is, they say, the presence of apartments may signal more demand for residential development in the area.

This study concludes with several observations, including that locating apartment buildings near major transportation access points minimizes traffic congestion, which is a favorite NIMBY rallying cry. Positioning an apartment building as a visual or noise buffer to separate retail or commercial sites from a residential neighborhood also minimizes the effect apartments have on neighboring detached houses. The authors conclude that over the long run, a well-located apartment building with attractive landscaping and entranceways probably raises the overall value of detached homes compared to having no apartment buildings.

On Common Ground will be released shortly. Copies will be available from NMHC's LaToya Scott at 202/974-2349 or via e-mail at lscott@nmhc.org.

PUBLIC PERCEPTIONS OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING

The worsening affordable housing shortage has created a new awareness among many city officials about the importance of building more rental housing. But when it comes time to approve proposed projects, many are afraid to support them because they fear they will lose the support of their local citizens. But a public opinion survey conducted in 2003 should give public officials the confidence to publicly support more affordable housing in their communities.
Public Perceptions of Affordable Housing in the Chicago Region found surprising public support for affordable housing in Chicago. In a "YIMBY" twist, a poll of 1,000 residents in a six-county area found that two-thirds would support more low- and moderate-income housing in the neighborhoods where they live. Only 17 percent would strongly oppose it. The poll was sponsored by Housing Illinois, a coalition of business, civic and religious groups formed to raise public awareness about the affordable housing shortage. Housing Illinois was pleasantly surprised by the results, and says that there is a "silent majority" of support for high quality projects.

That said, the report also pointed to significant challenges that must be overcome before we can start planning NIMBY's funeral. Two-thirds of the residents worry that low- and moderate-income housing is poorly maintained, and half believe crime usually accompanies it or that property values will fall in areas with such housing. Nearly half also said that the design of housing for low-income people is usually unattractive. Advocates say these are the key concerns they must address to make the silent majority for affordable housing proposals more vocal than the NIMBYs.

Public Perceptions of Affordable Housing in the Chicago Region is available at: www.chicagorehab.org/pubs/pdfs/housingilreport.pdf.

The Campaign for Affordable Housing
In an effort to swing all-important public opinion in favor of affordable housing (particularly high-density rental housing), the new non-profit organization The Coalition for Affordable Housing (TCAH) positions itself as "a partnership for public education," and seeks to dispel the myths about and publicize the benefits of affordable housing. The Campaign also conducts research on affordable housing's impact and provides materials and advice for housing organizations and those seeking affordable project approvals. TCAH is financially supported by NMHC/NAA, Freddie Mac, Apartment Finance Magazine and many others in the housing industry.

More information on The Campaign for Affordable Housing is available at: www.TCAH.org.

NMHC, American Institute of Architects, and the Urban Land Institute
NMHC, AIA and ULI convened a Housing Density Forum in February 2002 in Washington, DC. The event brought together more than 40 diverse stakeholders to move the discussion about housing density forward. Participants included architects, apartment developers, urban planners, elected officials and environmentalists. One conclusion reached is that good design is one of the most effective ways to overcome community opposition to apartment properties. Another is that a simple change in terminology from the word 'density' to the phrase 'compact development' or 'efficient, walkable community' may help to allay neighbors' NIMBY concerns. Finally, it was agreed that visual aids are much more effective than just written descriptions when persuading citizens that apartment communities can be a well-designed benefit to their community. A White Paper detailing the proceedings is available at: www.nmhc.org/Content/ServeContent.cfm?ContentItemID=2555.
Prometheus Prize
Housing Trust of Santa Clara County

Though developers sometimes resist design improvements to affordable housing in an effort to keep costs down, housing advocates agree that good design is essential to winning over NIMBY opposition to new apartments. To show developers that better design can actually reduce costs and speed up the approval process, the Housing Trust of Santa Clara County has created the Prometheus Prize. Using a grant from a nonprofit charitable foundation established by the principals of the Prometheus Real Estate Group, the prize is awarded based on three criteria: timelessness of design, quality of design and surrounding neighborhood/community impact. The award is the idea of a San Francisco developer who, after objections from local officials to a proposed property, discovered that some impromptu changes made the "bland" property more attractive and actually reduced costs. The prize is presented to the architect, developer, builder, landscape architect and local government, and $10,000 cash is awarded to directly benefit the winning project's residents.

More information about the Prometheus prize is available at:
www.housingtrustsc.org/prometheusprize/overview.html.


Echoing the consensus of the Housing Density Forum attendees mentioned above, an article in the Washington Post stressed the importance of good design "if Americans are to be convinced that apartment living is a desirable—not merely acceptable—dwelling choice." ("Good Design Can Make Apartment Living More Than a Low-Rent Alternative to a House," July 13, 2002.) The author, architecture professor Roger K. Lewis, notes that as we strive to grow smarter, "like it or not, more and more Americans will be living in apartments in the decades ahead" and that good design is the best way to make "high-density livable and likable." The Washington Post article is available at: www.nmhc.org/Content/ServeContent.cfm?ContentItemID=2564.

There are several publications available to help you illustrate your point to your local decision makers.

Creating Successful Communities: A New Housing Paradigm

NMHC/NAA offer a 16-page color booklet titled Creating Successful Communities: A New Housing Paradigm. This resource can help overcome local NIMBY opposition by explaining how higher density housing is needed to solve many of our most pressing problems, including the affordable housing shortage, suburban sprawl and urban decay. Creating Successful Communities also debunks the most common apartment myths, including the idea that apartments overly burden local schools or that they cause property values to fall and crime rates to rise.

The Case for Multifamily Housing

This 20-page booklet was published by the non-partisan Urban Land Institute (ULI) in cooperation with NMHC and NAA. The Case for Multifamily Housing documents the need for multifamily housing, and it refutes some of the most common NIMBY objections that are raised about apartments. Separate sections discuss such issues as the growing popularity of multifamily housing, how multifamily housing can help reduce traffic, why apartments are important to a
region's overall economic development, how multifamily development is more environmentally friendly than sprawling, low-density development and the fact that well-designed multifamily housing can be an attractive addition to communities. Copies of The Case for Multifamily Housing can be purchased from ULI by calling 800/321-5011 and asking for document number C64 or by visiting www.bookstore.uli.org.

NMHC/NAA use both of these brochures as tools in our ongoing "balanced housing policy" initiative. We have shared them with more than 15,000 mayors city managers and local planning officials as well as leading community development and smart growth stakeholders. The response to both has been overwhelmingly favorable. Creating Successful Communities is available at www.nmhc.org/Content/BrowseContent.cfm?IssueID=215.


Triumphing over NIMBYism was discussed at NMHC's Annual Meeting in January 2003. Debra Stein from the consulting firm GCA Strategies explained the five elements critical to overcoming NIMBY opposition. They include:

- Engaging in two outreach campaigns; one for opponents and one for supporters;
- Using the right message for the right constituency;
- Focusing your public information campaign on the relevant misperceptions;
- Providing the right amount of information; and
- Avoiding unnecessary concessions.

John Millham from Prometheus Real Estate Group offered a case study of how Prometheus overcame NIMBYism to construct its 218-unit Metropolitan Apartment Community in San Mateo, California. His presentation identifies the influential neighborhood groups and discusses the five steps Prometheus took to obtain entitlements despite NIMBY opposition. These steps include:

- Meet early and often with as many of the NIMBYs as possible;
- Attempt to educate/change perceptions about apartments and the development under discussion;
- Make no concessions before you absolutely have to;
- Constantly gauge political leverage and the environment; and
- Manufacture support.

Both of these presentations can be found at: www.nmhc.org/Content/ServeContent.cfm?ContentItemID=2786.

**Presentation: Apartments – The New American Dream?**


This presentation, originally prepared for the National Association of Real Estate Editors' Annual Meeting, explains why apartment living is becoming more popular among households who can afford to buy and provides statistical evidence and reasons why the trend is likely to continue in the future. It explores the demographic changes, lifestyle changes and public policy influences driving the emergence of discretionary renters. It is available at: www.nmhc.org/Content/ServeContent.cfm?IssueID=215&ContentItemID=1828.

*NMHC White Paper: From NIMBY to Good Neighbors*
**NMHC Apartment Myths Web Site**

NMHC's web site includes a special section with additional documents that refute the myths about apartments and the people who live in them. You can find it at:

www.nmhc.org/Content/BrowseContent.cfm?id=215.

---

**CONCLUSION: YOU ARE NOT ALONE**

Our country's population continues to swell. Immigrants arrive daily and seek apartments, and a wave of Echo Boomers is approaching their prime renting years. Clearly, the need for quality housing for all Americans is becoming critical. Vital workers in our communities are being pushed farther and farther from the cities where they work by NIMBY opposition, resulting in greater sprawl, worse traffic congestion, and horrendous commutes in cities across the country.

Though apartments are necessary to fill this need, the smallest, most vocal minority of local activists too often can keep a proposed project from ever reaching fruition. The good news is this: you are not alone in your frustration with the NIMBY phenomenon. In fact, speaking to the U.S. Conference of Mayors in May, Housing and Urban Development Secretary Mel Martinez said, "Whether by intent—through the so-called NIMBY syndrome of exclusionary zoning, expensive building fees, and burdensome regulatory barriers—or unintentionally, local governments are driving up housing costs and driving out affordable housing." Let us hope that the recent research collected here and the acknowledgement from the highest levels of government that the "not in my backyard" phenomenon presents a problem are big steps toward victory over NIMBYism in America.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GoF Course</th>
<th>Impact on Local Schools</th>
<th>Total Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Apartment Complex</th>
<th>Total Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Typical 252 Unit Apartment Complex</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam Ranch</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colondra Ranch</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villa de San Felipe</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Aspens</td>
<td>388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vasquez Court</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lightning Ridge</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GoF Course</th>
<th>Total Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15%</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GoF Course</th>
<th>Total Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GoF Course Apartments Impact on Local Schools
# Apartment Income Statistics

**Albuquerque MSA Median Household Income (MHl)**  
$38,272.00

## Students per Apartment  
Household, by Area Median Income (AMI)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th>% of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 50% of AMI</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-79% of AMI</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-119% of AMI</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120-170% of AMI</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170% of AMI and above</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Technical Notes:** Data collected from National Multifamily Housing Council Apartment Study. Data represents national averages.

## Luxury Albuquerque Apartment Complexes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Multifamily Household Median Income Level</th>
<th>Income Range (as % of MHl)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Broadstone Heights</td>
<td>$70,068.00</td>
<td>183%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allegro At Tanoan</td>
<td>$65,091.00</td>
<td>170%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinnacle at High Desert</td>
<td>$66,148.00</td>
<td>173%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinnacle Estates</td>
<td>$62,399.00</td>
<td>163%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Enclave</td>
<td>$64,123.00</td>
<td>168%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Median**  
170%

## Typical Albuquerque Apartment Complexes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Multifamily Household Median Income Level</th>
<th>Income Range (as % of MHl)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manzano Ridge</td>
<td>$47,119.00</td>
<td>123%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valencia Court</td>
<td>$39,560.00</td>
<td>103%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Aspens</td>
<td>$57,819.00</td>
<td>151%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villa de San Felipe</td>
<td>$34,722.00</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottonwood Ranch</td>
<td>$51,930.00</td>
<td>136%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventana Ranch</td>
<td>$45,729.00</td>
<td>119%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Median**  
121%

### Difference in School age children (Luxury Apartments vs. Typical Apartments)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Type</th>
<th>Median Income Range</th>
<th>% of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Luxury Complexes</td>
<td>170%</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical Complexes</td>
<td>121%</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Luxury Complex Income Multiplier**  
-38%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Name</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEVEN BAR ES</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORRALLES ES</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS RANCHOS ES</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAMEDA ES</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>880</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Students
Project Progress

Golf Course Apartments Schedule of Completion & Occupation
We the undersigned, are opposed to the building of multi-family dwellings on the plot directly north of the Estrella Del North Subdivision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joni Morris-Kuykendall</td>
<td>4409 Eton De Oro</td>
<td>Joni Morris-Kuykendall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Snyder</td>
<td>4415 Eton de Oro</td>
<td>Jennifer Snyder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kame Kaneshiro</td>
<td>10825 Chicobush Dr NW</td>
<td>Heidi Kaneshiro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy &amp; Kyle Dilts</td>
<td>4408 Dry Creek Pl NW</td>
<td>Andy Dilts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Len &amp; Helen Diasio</td>
<td>4404 Dry NW</td>
<td>Leonard Diasio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl &amp; Betty Gottlieb</td>
<td>4400 Aley NW</td>
<td>Betty Gottlieb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Templeton</td>
<td>4352 Dry Creek Pl NW</td>
<td>Scott Templeton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Warden</td>
<td>4316 Dry Creek Pl</td>
<td>David Warden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Drezge</td>
<td>4312 Dry Creek PkPw NW</td>
<td>Christine Drezge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scot Kar</td>
<td>4303 Eton De Oro</td>
<td>Scot Kar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lori Bohn</td>
<td>4309 Eton de Oro</td>
<td>Lori Bohn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan J. Gale</td>
<td>4316 Woodrose NW</td>
<td>Alan J. Gale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We the undersigned, are opposed to the building of multi-family dwellings on the plot directly west of the Estrella Del North Subdivision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hilda Lehman</td>
<td>10927 Farola Dr NW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amber Bennett</td>
<td>10923 Farola Dr NW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Pike</td>
<td>10919 Farola Dr NW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felix Madrid</td>
<td>10905 Farola Dr NW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Shaw</td>
<td>4405 Campo de Marzal NW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Lisenbe</td>
<td>4405 CAMPO DE MARZAL NW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joana Spaul</td>
<td>10923 Pasquale NW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Jigl</td>
<td>10919 Pasquale NW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph Buchan</td>
<td>10905 PASQUALE NW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen Cox</td>
<td>10932 Favola</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Su Welch</td>
<td>10910 Pagosa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lora Hanson</td>
<td>10923 Carsera 120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margie Barnett</td>
<td>4011 Arapahoe Ave NW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We the undersigned, are opposed to the building of multi-family dwellings on the plot directly north of the Estrella Del North Subdivision,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steve Wheatstone</td>
<td>4324 Boton De Oro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristan Montano-Auger</td>
<td>4400 Boton De Oro Rd</td>
<td>Kristan Montano-Auger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Hawkins</td>
<td>4408 Boton De Oro Rd</td>
<td>Richard Hawkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lori Page</td>
<td>4409 Dry Creek Pl</td>
<td>Lori Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramon Rojas</td>
<td>4401 Dry Creek Pl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanna Astremsisi</td>
<td>4331 Dry Creek P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Keefner</td>
<td>4327 Dry Creek Pl</td>
<td>Patricia Keefner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pam Meyer</td>
<td>4301 Dry Creek Pl</td>
<td>Pam Meyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Valdez</td>
<td>4300 Dry Creek Pl</td>
<td>Christine Valdez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molly Zadra</td>
<td>4305 Boton De Oro</td>
<td>Molly Zadra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat Caffrey</td>
<td>4316 Boton De Oro</td>
<td>Pat Caffrey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Herry</td>
<td>4324 Woodlouse</td>
<td>Bill Herry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We the undersigned, are opposed to the building of multi-family dwellings on the plot directly west of the Estrella Del North Subdivision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tommy Houck</td>
<td>11009 Casceta</td>
<td>Houck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Rainwater</td>
<td>4509 Noche Clara NW</td>
<td>Keen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brendan Adams</td>
<td>4505 Noche Clara</td>
<td>Keen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4501 Noche Clara</td>
<td>Keen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David M. Lopez</td>
<td>11008 Carreta Dr</td>
<td>David</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Viola</td>
<td>11001 Carreta</td>
<td>Karen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Fife</td>
<td>10945 Carreta NW</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayram Murieta</td>
<td>10940 Carreta</td>
<td>Murieta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Mabuek</td>
<td>10936 Carreta Dr</td>
<td>Mabuek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George</td>
<td>10928</td>
<td>George</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teresa Grieso</td>
<td>Carreta</td>
<td>8714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop DeKneut</td>
<td>10920 Carreta Dr</td>
<td>DeKneut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph L Montesano</td>
<td>10916 Carreta Dr</td>
<td>Montesano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10908 Carreta</td>
<td>Montesano</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We the undersigned, are opposed to the building of multi-family dwellings on the plot directly north of the Estrella Del North Subdivision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Brunswick</td>
<td>11005 Casada Azul, 11001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10923</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue Sanders</td>
<td>10919 Casada Azul NW</td>
<td>Sue Sanders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Adams</td>
<td>10915 Casada Azul NW</td>
<td>Margaret Adams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane Durbach</td>
<td>10909 Cascada Azul</td>
<td>Diane Durbach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Robert</td>
<td>10905 Cascada Azul</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10901</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14304</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinah Sandusky</td>
<td>10900 Cascada Azul</td>
<td>Sandusky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Fink</td>
<td>10908 Cascada Azul</td>
<td>Carol Fink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deloris Barto</td>
<td>10904</td>
<td>Deloris Barto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Marsh</td>
<td>10912 Cascada Azul P1 NW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We the undersigned, are opposed to the building of multi-family dwellings on the plot directly south of the Estrella Del North Subdivision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roy Masi</td>
<td>10928 Farola Dr NW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gene Johnson</td>
<td>10920 Farola Dr NW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emma Kelly</td>
<td>10916 Farola Dr NW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amir Par</td>
<td>10908 Frazee Dr NW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conrad Douglas</td>
<td>10904 Farola Dr NW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim Frechott</td>
<td>10900 Farola Dr NW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Ketzman</td>
<td>10904 Pasquale Dr NW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Land</td>
<td>10708 Pasquale Dr NW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy Daniel</td>
<td>10928 Pasquale Dr NW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10931 Pasquale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4401 Campo De Maiz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry Beggis</td>
<td>10920 Pasquale Dr NW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlos Gurule</td>
<td>10924 Farola Dr NW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We the undersigned, are opposed to the building of multi-family dwellings on the plot directly north of the Estrella Del North Subdivision,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12000 Steller Ct NW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12001 Steller Ct NW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Hertz</td>
<td>12005 Steller Ct NW</td>
<td>JoJ 9/2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyce Harris</td>
<td>12004 Steller Ct NW</td>
<td>Joyce Harris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jody S. Wright</td>
<td>12008 Steller Ct NW</td>
<td>Jody A. Wright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Robert Pedullo</td>
<td>12009 Steller Ct NW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobins Fubler</td>
<td>12014 Steller Ct NW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alyssa Dietsch</td>
<td>12015 Steller Ct NW</td>
<td>Alyssa Dietsch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Richard Gorman</td>
<td>12018 Steller Ct NW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12019 Steller Ct NW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12022 Steller Ct NW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M/ln Fred Quintana</td>
<td>12023 Steller Ct NW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We the undersigned, are opposed to the building of multi-family dwellings on the plot directly north of the Estrella Del North Subdivision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary Ann Salazar</td>
<td>11012 Cascada Azul</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan Sierra</td>
<td>12000 Cascada Azul</td>
<td>R S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy Montoya</td>
<td>12001 Cascada Azul</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12004 Cascada Azul</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>12005 Cascada Azul</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Uher</td>
<td>12008 Cascada Azul</td>
<td>Mike Uher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ampa Brum</td>
<td>12009 Cascada Azul</td>
<td>Ampa Brum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Jackson</td>
<td>12014 Cascada Azul</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Stanoveck</td>
<td>12015 Cascada Azul</td>
<td>Sandra Stanoveck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Rozmajer</td>
<td>12018 Cascada Azul</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Costales</td>
<td>12019 Cascada Azul</td>
<td>Julie Costales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We the undersigned, are opposed to the building of multi-family dwellings on the plot directly north of the Estrella Del North Subdivision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Karl Lozato-Garcia</td>
<td>10900 Carreta Dr, NW</td>
<td>Karl Lozato-Garcia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayra Bryant</td>
<td>10905 Carrera Dr</td>
<td>Mayra E. Bryant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gayle Gonsalves</td>
<td>18921 Carrera Dr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maynard</td>
<td>10927 Carreta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megan England</td>
<td>10931 Carreta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike D. Michael</td>
<td>10935 Carreta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10947 Carreta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10951 Carreta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We the undersigned, are opposed to the building of multi-family dwellings on the plot directly north of the Estrella Del North Subdivision.

NAME                          ADDRESS                          SIGNATURE

Michele Rainwater             4509 Noche Clara                    
Megan Adams                   4505 Noche Clara                    
Larry Ward                    4501 Noche Clara                    
Michael Tippin                4405 Noche Clara                    
Aaron Ivener                  4408 Noche Clara                    
Chris Chaves                  4400 Noche Clara                    
C. Paul Peat                  4312 Noche Clara                    
Mark Garcia                   4308 Noche Clara                    

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
We the undersigned, are opposed to the building of multi-family dwellings on the plot directly west of the Estrella Del North Subdivision,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lance Linhares</td>
<td>4405 Boton Secoro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Hill</td>
<td>10805 Chico Bush Dr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denise Smith</td>
<td>4400 Woodrose Pat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Se vero Moreno</td>
<td>4101 Arapahoe Ave NW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason Brav</td>
<td>10701 Catanfont</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence Pedersen</td>
<td>4130 Campode Mayo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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We the undersigned, are opposed to the building of multi-family dwellings on the plot directly north of the Estrella Del North Subdivision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Alkonio</td>
<td>10916</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Lohmann</td>
<td>11000</td>
<td>General H. Gordon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Stewert</td>
<td>11004 Cascade Azul</td>
<td>Amy Lohmann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11008 Cascade Azul</td>
<td>Anna Stewert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11009 Cascade Azul</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan Sparlock</td>
<td>10923 Pasquale Dr NW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                     |                          |           |
We the undersigned, are opposed to the building of multi-family dwellings on the plot directly north of the Estrella Del North Subdivision,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Serpa</td>
<td>4404 Woodrose Rd NW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick Davis</td>
<td>4368 Woodrose N.W.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Martinez</td>
<td>10935 Othello NW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patty Vasquez</td>
<td>10909 Farola Dr NW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We the undersigned, are opposed to the building of multi-family dwellings on the plot directly west of the Estrella Del North Subdivision,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Terrance McCabe</td>
<td>10536 Calle Sombra NW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheryl McCabe</td>
<td>10536 Calle Sombra NW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynda Michalk</td>
<td>10532 Calle Sombra NW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Michalk</td>
<td>10532 Calle Sombra NW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanae Garza</td>
<td>10640 Calle Sombra NW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Glass</td>
<td>10544 Calle Sombra NW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTHIRA HEENAN</td>
<td>10548 CALLE SOMBRA NW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremiah Nguyen</td>
<td>4416 Driftwood Dr NW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVID BALZ</td>
<td>4409 Espira Dr NW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roxanne Balz</td>
<td>4409 Espira Dr NW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonard Staff</td>
<td>10524 ESPIRA CT NW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bratih Muddhi</td>
<td>10517 ESPIRA CT NW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Coleman</td>
<td>10509 ESPIRA CT NW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We the undersigned, are opposed to the building of multi-family dwellings on the plot directly west of the Estrella Del North Subdivision,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geni Laws</td>
<td>10505 Espira Ct NW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenton Laws</td>
<td>10505 Espira Ct NW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Palmer</td>
<td>10500 Espira Ct NW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred Abbott</td>
<td>10564 Espira Ct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna Aitken</td>
<td>10508 Espira Ct NW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pete Pavias</td>
<td>10545 Calle Sombra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Romero</td>
<td>10601 Olympic St NW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Sadowski</td>
<td>10541 Calle Sombra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We the undersigned, are opposed to the building of multi-family dwellings on the plot directly north of the Estrella Del North Subdivision,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Poirier</td>
<td>12000 Sullivan Ct NW</td>
<td>Poirier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmer Medina</td>
<td>12004 Sullivan Ct NW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverly Westfall</td>
<td>12006 Sullivan Ct NW</td>
<td>Westfall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria L Gonzalez</td>
<td>12008 Sullivan Ct NW</td>
<td>Gonzalez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick A Sandoun</td>
<td>12009 Sullivan Ct NW</td>
<td>Sandoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christina Vasquez</td>
<td>12014 Sullivan Ct NW</td>
<td>Vasquez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Littell</td>
<td>12015 Sullivan Ct NW</td>
<td>Littell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Landavazo</td>
<td>12018 Sullivan Ct NW</td>
<td>Landavazo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12019 Sullivan Ct NW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Garcia</td>
<td>12022 Sullivan Ct NW</td>
<td>Garcia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daiphem</td>
<td>12025 Sullivan Ct NW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Vieal</td>
<td>12026 Sullivan Ct NW</td>
<td>Vieal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
January 17, 2006

Roberto Albertorio, Esq.
Zoning Hearing Examiner
City of Albuquerque
Albuquerque, New Mexico

Re: 05ZHE 1863/05ZHE1864

Dear Mr. Albertorio:

DAC Enterprises, Inc. has been retained to represent Kitts Development, LLC regarding the conditional use applications referenced above. Both of these cases involve a request for a conditional use approval to allow dwellings in the C-2 zone. You have deferred these cases, and several similar requests pending a proposed text amendment to the Zoning Code that may eliminate dwellings as a conditional use in the C-1 and C-2 zones. We are on record as opposing a 60-day deferral for our case. At least one other applicant, Tramway Associates, Inc. is similarly on record as opposing the deferral. In the hearing, you stated that you would review your deferral decision and affirm or amend your determination this afternoon.

We are hopeful that your decision will be to proceed with the conditional use hearing for Kitts Development, LLC; Tramway Associates, Inc. and all of the similarly deferred applicants. However, several representatives of those in support, or opposition to these requests have already been notified of the deferral and will not be attending today’s meeting. It is likely that, at least in some cases, the issue of due notice will result in an appeal of your decision, regardless of an approval or denial.

We therefore respectfully request that a special meeting, with adequate legal notice, be convened as soon as possible to hear our conditional use requests, as well as each of the other similar requests deferred, rather than attempt to hear the cases today.

Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

Doug Crandall
Agent for Kitts Development, LLC.
With regard to the above mentioned request:

We the undersigned oppose a permit for the proposed project. We live in the Estrella Del Norte Neighborhood due east of this proposed development, and some signatures are from families on the south side of the proposed development.

There are several reasons for our concerns. Per the guidelines of the conditional use ordinance 14.16.4.2 (c)(1), it is incumbent on the developer to show that the project will not be injurious to the adjacent property, the neighborhood or the community. We were promised by the developer that if our neighborhood was opposed to the development, they would not proceed. We feel under current circumstance this project would be injurious to all of the above. Some examples of why we feel this way:

1. Schools
2. Crime
3. Traffic congestion
4. Noise
5. Quality of life
6. Notification
7. Environmental impacts
8. Privacy
9. Ownership and Management
10. City Council zoning ordinance change for C-2 Zones
11. Property Values

1. Schools

We understand that the city does not have control of school capital projects, but we feel the city needs to take them into consideration when approving permits for multi family developments in overcrowded school clusters. Currently the Cibola Cluster is the most overcrowded high school cluster in the city of Albuquerque. We as parents are being faced with the possibility of busing our kids across the river due to the fact there are not enough schools to accommodate the growth in this neighborhood and the surrounding community. For the last 15 years the Westside schools have faced overcrowded schools. There are efforts now to help alleviate the problems, but they won't help if the city continues to allow multifamily developments to propagate across the west side unchecked. We have been waiting for a new high school on the Westside for at least 15 years or more. It will be 2010 before we are expected to have another high school completed. In addition to the need for a high school there are needs for Middle schools and Elementary schools. All schools in this cluster are overcrowded and can not accommodate even one more student without negative impacts. We would prefer that this property be used for commercial uses, such as offices or small businesses that are accepted under the C-2 guidelines. These types of businesses would help the community by providing local jobs, and limit the impact of more students, which can not be said for more apartments.

2. Crime

Our Neighborhood is a very quiet and secluded neighborhood. We have been fortunate enough to not have too many issues related to major crime. We recently had a presentation made by an APD Multi Family Crime Taskforce representative with respect to our concerns about this complex. He described to us that although they are making efforts to minimize the crime associated with Multi family projects such as these, we
would have to accept the fact that crime in these types of developments and surrounding areas would increase from what we currently are accustomed. This would constitute a negative impact to our community.

3. Traffic Congestion
   We recently had a bond issue rejected by the city taxpayers who would have helped complete and improve the roads and surrounding infrastructure. Because of the delays in road construction the roads in this community will be negatively impacted by an additional 256 multifamily unit. Our neighborhood and the surrounding neighborhood to the south have concerns about traffic cutting through the neighborhoods to get around the constant backups at Golfcourse and Ellison/McMahon intersection. The most adjacent street would be Westside road which is currently closed. If this street were to be opened, it would cause additional congestion at north Sevenbar and Westside. There currently is no stoplight at the intersection of Golfcourse and Westside, which would cause more backups and congestion due to the increased traffic. With this Complex and the other complexes currently in the planning and building stages we will negatively be impacted due to the increased traffic. Access to and exits from this complex would have to be limited to Golfcourse.

4. Noise
   As previously stated we live in one of the few remaining quiet neighborhoods in the city. The building of an apartment complex of this size and nature will negatively impact our community with by the potential 24 hour noise that is produced from a complex such as this. Having apartments essentially in our back yards would cause numerous noise problems for our neighborhoods. We would not be able to restrict the inherent nature of noise problems associated with apartment living.

5. Quality of Life
   The quality of life in our neighborhood, as it currently exists is what makes this neighborhood one of the best neighborhoods in the city. The Neighborhood is quiet, secluded in a semi enclosed development, only two entrances in and out of, relatively free from outside disturbance and crime. The neighborhood can be described in three words as peaceful, friendly and neighborly. Every one tends to know their neighbor. The views of the Sandia Mountains and the sunsets to the west are exceptional. Noise is kept to a minimum. The majority of families are mature responsible families, some with small kids, but most with either older or already adult children. The impacts of an apartment complex of this nature would be a considerable negative impact to the Quality of life that we bought into when we purchased our homes.

6. Notification
   As a homeowner with property adjacent to the proposed development, I would have expected to have been notified by either the developer or the city as to the hearing before the Zoning Hearing Examiner. I have checked with my neighbors and they also have not been notified. I had understood that signs were supposed to be posted on the property prior to the request with an established deadline. To my knowledge none of these requirements have been met. We are not incorporated as a city recognized neighborhood association, but we do belong to membership in a homeowners association. Since the HOA was unable to raise a quorum at the annual meeting they have decided not to take an official stand either for or against this proposal. Therefore we as homeowners in the immediate and surrounding vicinity are asking for your consideration of our request per our petition.

7. Environmental Impacts
   There are numerous varieties of wildlife that reside in the field that is proposed for development. These varieties include California quail, coyotes, roadrunners, blue tailed lizards, hawks, squirrels, bats, snakes, mice and various other bird species. There is a mixture of native plants which populate the field and supply habitat for all of the wildlife. The added traffic and resulting pollutants will have a negative impact on the surrounding environment. The possibility of an environmental impact study should be considered prior to approval of a project of this nature.
8. Privacy

Due to the narrow depth of the property, and the fact the proposed apartments are two story
apartments, the privacy of the adjacent single family homeowners will be negatively impacted. The back yards
that face towards the complex will not be afforded a single shred of privacy. There will constantly be people
looking into your back yard. Any activities that are currently enjoyed by single family homeowners in the
privacy of their back yards will constantly be observed by the residence in the apartment complex.

9. Ownership and Management

As described to the neighborhood, it is our understanding that each 4 plex can be independently owned by
separate investors. While that in and of itself may not pose a problem, it raises several questions as to whether
the property is pseudo subdivided property. We also understand that it can also pose problems with
enforcement of evictions and property management when the ownership of each independent 4 plex may reside
in another state or locale. If it is necessary to contact an individual owner to resolve issues relevant to this
complex, it may prove very difficult if not impossible to locate the owners of each independent unit.

10. City Council Planning Committee

The City Council currently has amendment to the C-1, C-2, Zoning requirements. Our understanding is
that the planning committee is currently studying the feasibility of removing apartments from this zoning class
in an effort to use this class of zoning for its intended purpose of utilizing these properties for commercial
business properties. We would like to have any consideration of this proposal delayed at least until this change
can be reviewed by planning. We understand that this zoning changed is scheduled to be reviewed on January
the 19th, 2006.

11. Property Values

In discussions with local realtors, the belief is that as a result of these apartments we will see an
approximate loss of value of anywhere from 5% to 7%. The city has seen property values appreciate in recent
years, to where the average price of a home in our neighborhood is approximately $300,000. At that estimate
an average homeowner in this neighborhood would lose about $15,000 to $21,000, all for the benefit of having
an apartment complex in their back yards. The developer will be the beneficiary of profits, but we have
nothing to gain, but property value loss. This again is a negative impact (injury) to our community and
neighborhood. Some homes in the neighborhood are valued even higher, with more to lose.

12. Summary

In summary, we ask that you disallow a permit for this project for the reasons stated.
We feel while efforts are being made to accommodate the growth, we are considerably behind on infrastructure
to allow for any additional multifamily units in this sector. The city needs to look at the drastic effects that
will occur with if growth is allocated, without the required needs of the community in place prior to the
growth. We on the Westside have been promised schools and jobs for years and have had nothing done to
alleviate the rapid growth. For at least 15 years the schools on the Westside have suffered under overcrowded
conditions that have affected the quality of education for the last generation of kids, and now we are looking at
impacting the next generation of kids on the Westside. The city needs to work closely with the other governing
bodies to plan the infrastructure first, prior to allowing these communities to be deprived of necessary schools
businesses, roads, parks, etc. etc. We ask as a community that you consider our request. We have attached
some supporting documents to support our reasoning, and also have attached a petition with other neighbors
that are opposed to this development. We would also ask that this property be used for the purpose that we
believe C1 and C-2 Zoning was intended for, which was small commercial business, that would not promote
overcrowding in our schools.

If this permit is allowed we have a few requests for modifications that can be made to the property that would
help to blunt the impacts to our homes in the immediate vicinity.
1. Lower the overall elevation, to limit the effects of the 26 feet tall apartments.
2. Require that the apartments can be no closer than 50 feet from our property lines.
3. Require that no apartments be built with balconies facing into our back yards.
4. Require the developer to have the complex totally enclosed by block fencing, to limit access to our neighborhoods. (On all sides)
5. Require the developer to raise our walls to whatever maximum height the zoning code allows, if the homeowner requests them to be raised.
6. Require that the development be lined along our property lines with mature evergreen trees, non leaf bearing, that would obstruct views into our property.
7. Require that all entry and exits out of the development be made onto Golf Course road.
8. Restrict the apartments to adult only living, no children to impact schools.
9. Require that the development be properly landscaped with the most landscaping allowed under city ordinances. Previous developments by this developer have been poorly landscaped and even when new look somewhat desolate.
10. Require that the developer, in conjunction with the city, complete Westside road, with improvements made to the intersection of Westside and Golfcourse. Have a Stoplight installed for traffic control.
11. Require that no parking be allowed adjacent to the property lines of the surrounding neighborhoods.
12. Require that the developer only can build during the hours of 8:00 am to 5:00 pm.
13. Require the developer, while in the process of construction to keep soil erosion to a minimum by requiring the soil be kept watered down 24 hours a day to limit dust and contamination of our existing landscapes.
14. Require the developer during construction to provide 24 hour response to respond to neighborhood issues that result from construction.
15. Require the developer to maintain a fund to cover any claims by the homeowners and property owners. It should not be incumbent upon the homeowners to fight the battle to have repairs made. It should be the responsibility of the developer to make accommodations for damage to the satisfaction of the current homeowners.
16. Require a traffic study, to identify the problems that this development will induce.
17. Require an environmental impact study to determine the detrimental effects of a project of this size.
18. Require that management of this complex be located on site with 24 hour access.
19. Require that Management provide a security guard to patrol the property at all times.
20. Require that lighting be positioned to minimize the impacts to adjacent property owners.
21. Require the property to be a gated community with gates being consistently monitored with financial penalties to be assessed for non conformance.
22. Require the developer to be personally accountable for promises made to the community, as opposed to the development company.
23. Require that all design and structures in addition to paint be compatible with the surrounding neighborhoods.
24. Meet regularly with the neighborhood to mediate issues that result from construction. Twice a month. Preferably.
25. Require that any requirements made on the developer, be incumbent on any future owners to be enforced.
26. Require that all trash bins be designed to be stored away from any adjacent properties. Only on Golf course side of complex.
27. Require that no storage be allowed in areas adjacent to existing developments. Only allowed on Golf course side of complex.

Thank You,
Mike D. Mirabal
505-898-8612
10951 Carreta N.W.
Albq. N.M.
TIMOTHY V. FLYNN-O'BRIEN
Attorney at Law
817 Gold Avenue SW
Albuquerque, N.M. 87102-3014
Phone: 505-242-4088 / Fax: 505-884-4143

January 16, 2006

Roberto Alberterio, Esq.
Zoning Hearing Officer
City of Albuquerque
600 Second Street NW
Albuquerque, NM 87102

RE: 05ZHE-01863; 05ZHE-01864

Dear Mr. Alberterio:

I have been retained by Kitts Development LLC concerning the applications Nos. 05ZHE-01863 and 05ZHE-01864 which are set for hearing on January 17, 2006 as Nos. 52 and 53. It has come to my attention that a similar application originally set in November was deferred to January. We understand the purported reason for the deferral in November was the anticipation that legislation to amend the zoning code might be introduced. We further understand that a proposed ordinance has been introduced and that all conditional use applications for residential uses may again be deferred.

The City Council has not passed a moratorium on conditional use applications for residential uses. Since there is no moratorium, Kitts Development has a protected property right and is entitled to a hearing on its conditional use application. A property right or constitutionally protected interest exists when there are substantive limitations on official discretion. Olim v. Wakinetona, 461 U.S. 238, 249 (1983) (when particularized standard or criteria guide official discretion a protected interest is created).

Delay or deferral because of speculation that the City Council might possibly pass amendments in the future is wholly inappropriate. Delay in hearing a case can be a denial of due process. Certainly a governing body can enact a moratorium after notice with certain limitations. However, a moratorium must be enacted by the governing body. It is inappropriate for a hearing officer or EPC to impose a de facto moratorium by deferral. The sole entity with the legislative authority to enact a moratorium is the governing body, or City Council. Subordinate bodies and officers are not empowered to enact or impose de facto moratoria. The Zoning Code does not give authority to the ZHE to impose a moratorium. Sec. for example, EPC minutes January 17, 1995 when the EPC considered deferral of a case because of a memorial passed by the Council and the City Attorney advised the EPC that a memorial was an insufficient basis for deferral. Mr. White stated: “the Brazos case and other cases similar to that have said that, really, a moratorium is an exercise of the police power and an exercise of the legislative authority of a municipality.
Roberto Alberterio, Esq.
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The zoning statutes create what is called the Zoning Authority and they designate the governing body of a municipality or a county as the zoning authority; in this case, it’s the City Council. They have the authority to impose a moratorium … “ Mr. White continued to define moratorium as a legislative act and said that that power has not been delegated.

I acknowledge that some parties may wish to defer their cases until there is a final outcome of pending legislation. They may wish to avoid the time and expense of a hearing given the possibility that legislation may affect their project. Others, like my clients, will chose to proceed as is their right. I respectfully request, therefore, that Kitts Development be allowed to proceed to hearing without regard to any pending legislation.

Very truly yours,

Timothy V. Flynn-O’Brien

TVFOB/mlg
Schools Grow At Fringes

Figures Show City's Middle Losing Kids

By Andrea Schoolkoff
Journal Staff Writer

Two months into the school year, enrollment figures show what district officials predicted: Schools on the fringes of the city are exploding and schools in older neighborhoods are shrinking.

Overall, the district grew by less than 2 percent.

"The older parts of the city are losing all the kids," said APS demographer Betty King. "The edges of the city are sucking kids out of the middle part of the city."

Case in point: James Monroe Middle School. The 4-year-old Paradise Hills campus may not have been the fastest-growing school this year, but principal Vernon Martinez said he can't take any more students.

"It's crowded," said Martinez, whose school in Paradise Hills has been the state's largest middle school for the last two years. This year, it has more than 1,300 students.

The school doesn't have room for any more portable classrooms, he said. Last year, 35 portable buildings ofly 8,000 student capacity, the school could grow to 1,900 students by 2009.

"I don't think anybody could've anticipated the growth in the Ventana Ranch area," he said.

The problem is most apparent at lunchtime, during passing periods, and when parents and buses are picking up and dropping off students.

The school grew by 136 students over last year and is now in line to get its boundaries redrawn next year, possibly sending some 400 to 500 West Siders to North Valley schools.

And nearby Ventana Ranch Elementary, which feeds into Monroe, added another 240 students this year, roughly equivalent to the city's smallest school, Martha Arthur Elementary, in the North Valley.

Overall, APS had 88,920 students enrolled on the 40th day of school, and another 5,761 students in charter schools. Which APS had to count for the first time this year.

The enrollment on the 40th day of classes dictates the oper-
Panel Denying Housing Requests

Preapproved Homes Still Being Built

BY RORY MCCLANAHAN
Journal Staff Writer

Don't count on the city's Environmental Planning Commission approving any annexations, zone changes or major subdivisions for housing development on the West Side for a while. The commission has been turning down those requests for the past year or so, using Policy 2.5 of the West Side Strategic Plan as justification. That policy states that school crowding cannot be used in consideration of these types of requests. So why are homes still being built? The short answer is that those areas under construction already have the approval to build, sometimes made three decades ago. Over the past year, the Environmental Planning Commission has denied at least a half-dozen requests for zone changes, site development plans and annexation requests using Policy 2.5 as the reason. For example, in the past six months:

- A proposed 20-unit apartment complex near Coronado Mall was only approved by the EPC if the developer promised to dedicate a portion of the complex to senior housing. A zoning change request from the developer was denied.

- The city has proposed adding the West Side to a site development plan on the property that asked for annexation. The tract to be used for professional offices was approved. It's almost to the point where developers won't even bring such proposals to the commission, city Planning Director Richard Dineen said. "There are a lot of factors that go into a decision whether to develop residential lots," Dineen said, "but I think developers know they will have a hard time getting these types of requests past the commission."

A few brave souls still take their requests to the commission, however. A group called Regent Park Partners asked the EPC at its Sept. 25 meeting to annex 12 acres off Irving Street, between Ventura and Ridge Road, Rainbow and change the tract's zoning to residential from agricultural. City planners acknowledged that the annexation and zoning for most of the city's policies, except that residential development would have an adverse effect on schools. The EPC sent the annexation and zone change requests to the City Council with the recommendation to deny it. The council could consider the proposal at its next meeting.

But Councilor Michael Cadigan said it is unlikely he would support any request for annexation or zone change requests that will add more homes to the West Side. Cadigan has proposed amending the West Side Strategic Plan to county changes from commercial to residential would not be approved. The EPC voted against this request, but it will be on the council in October. Cadigan also proposed that the city cannot build up its infrastructure in anticipation of annexation that it knows will never happen. [continued on PAGE 2]
December 10, 2005

Roberto Albertorio, Esq.
Zoning Hearing Examiner
City of Albuquerque
Albuquerque, New Mexico

Dear Mr. Albertorio:

DAC Enterprises, Inc. has been retained to represent Kitts Development, LLC to request a conditional use to allow the construction of 252 dwelling units in the C-2 zone on Golf Course Road and Westside Boulevard NW.

Section 14-16-2-17(B) 7 of the Zoning Code allows for dwelling units in the C-2 zone “provided usable open space is provided on-site in an amount no less than specified in the R-3 zone.” This request complies with the open space requirement.

Applicant proposes an upscale development of 252 dwelling units in 63 buildings. The dwelling units will range from 800 square feet for a two bedroom unit to 1100 square feet for a three bedroom unit. There will be an approximately equal number of two bedroom and three bedroom units on the property.

This request is for a conditional use. The standards for approval of a conditional use are: 1) the use will not be injurious to the adjacent property, the neighborhood or the community; and 2) the use will not be significantly damaged by surrounding structures or activities.

The use will not be injurious to the adjacent property.

This is a large tract of land on the northern edge of the Albuquerque city limits. North of Westside Boulevard is the city of Rio Rancho. The properties to the east and south of this proposed development are zoned R-2. Across Golf Course Road to the west, the property is zoned C-2.

Applicant has met several times with representatives of the neighborhood and the adjacent neighbors to the east. As this property is zoned C-2, any commercial development would require no more than a 15’ rear yard setback.
Adjacent neighbors have expressed concerns about any use being that close to their property, as well as the possibility of multi-story development that could negatively impact their privacy.

In order to accommodate these adjacent neighbors, applicant has provided a 58’ rear yard setback and landscape buffer, and has designed the buildings so that second story balconies will face the front of the units to the west. The 58’ setback, when combined with the rear yard setbacks of the existing homes means that no existing home will be closer than 78’ to the proposed dwelling units. The entire 58’ will be densely landscaped with trees and tall shrubs, and will also be fenced. There will be no parking within the setback.

Properties to the south are buffered by both the landscaping of this development as well as by an arroyo and walking trail. The distance between this development and the existing single family homes will be well over one hundred feet.

As this property is zoned C-2, there are many commercial uses which could accommodated permissively, that would be more injurious to the adjacent properties. Applicant has made every effort to provide an attractive sight, noise, lighting and privacy buffer for those properties.

Further, as they are upscale multi-family dwelling units that will rent for up to $1100 a month and will be maintained through perpetual covenants, there is no evidence that residential property values will be negatively affected.

**The use will not be injurious to the neighborhood.**

The design of the buildings will be modern brick and stucco, painted in southwestern colors that will vary from building to building. This development will harmonize with the residential character of the neighborhood. There will be 522 on site parking spaces provided, with all access from Golf Course Road, thus ensuring that there will be no problem with cars parking in the existing single family residential areas. The development will likely be gated.

This development will be heavily landscaped and surrounded by an appropriate wall or fence. It will provide a highly attractive first impression into Albuquerque from Rio Rancho to the north.
A large playground for families with young children will be provided on site, as will a half-court basketball facility and a barbecue area open to all residents. There will also be a pool. An on-site office will maintain both the integrity of the physical property as well as to ensure that the residents are respectful of the community.

Policy 5 h of the *Albuquerque/Bernalillo County Comprehensive Plan* strongly encourages high density multi-family development at this location. Nonetheless, there is a real concern regarding the overcrowding of schools on the west side. Attached is a chart showing the minimal impact this development will have on the schools in the area.

In order to get more information regarding this issue, the applicant contacted officials from APS in order to determine the impact of the proposed development on the school system.

The three schools in the immediate vicinity are Seven Bar Elementary, James Monroe Middle School and Cibola High School. According to APS demographer Betty King, Seven Bar Elementary School is not experiencing overcrowding. Furthermore, APS facilities master plan director Kizito Wijenje stated that James Monroe Middle school should be relieved this year by a proposed boundary change sending 400 students to the Taft and Taylor middle schools, both under capacity. Likewise, the second phase of the James Monroe middle school should begin construction in February and finish within 9 to 12 months, increasing the capacity of James Monroe middle school to 1200 students.

Additionally, Governor Bill Richardson recently announced that he will ask the State Legislature to appropriate enough money to build the proposed northwest high school on schedule so that they will open no later than 2007. This will relieve Cibola High School of 500-600 students in 2007 and be fully operational by 2009. This proposed development will not be completed until 2008, well after these relief efforts are implemented.

Also, the applicant will contribute more than 1.4 million dollars in impact fees, which will be used for parks, roads, schools and other public projects in the neighborhoods.
The applicant has a proven track record of working with the local schools to help provide facilities, computers, playground equipment or any other immediate needs that will enhance those schools.

The use will not be injurious to the community

Dwelling units are common in commercial zones. There is still shortage of upscale and affordable housing stock in this area of the west side. Additionally, as stated earlier, the Comprehensive Plan encourages this type of development.

The use will not be significantly damaged by surrounding structures or activities.

This development will be a fenced and gated community. It will be buffered from traffic along both Golf Course Road and Westside Boulevard. The C-2 property across the street to the west will have no significant impact on the use.

Conclusion

In conclusion, applicant believes that all relevant criteria for approval of a conditional use have been addressed and met. This development will enhance the area and provide an attractive gateway to Albuquerque, while providing much needed housing in the area.

Your consideration of this request is sincerely appreciated.

Yours truly,

Doug Candall, Principal
DAC Enterprises, Inc.
Agent for Kitts Development, LLC
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Apartment Complex</th>
<th>Total Number of Units</th>
<th>Number of School Age Children</th>
<th>Percent School Age Children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manzano Ridge</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valencia Court</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Aspens</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villa de San Felipe</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottonwood Ranch</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventana Ranch</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>1729</strong></td>
<td><strong>162</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of Students per Grade Level

**Westside Apartments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Current Enrollment</th>
<th>Students Added By West Side Apartments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEVEN BAR</td>
<td>861</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONROE MS</td>
<td>1394</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIBOLA</td>
<td>2977</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SEVEN BAR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**

115%

98.85%
CIBOLA HIGH SCHOOL

871
(16) Wireless Telecommunications Facility, provided that the requirements of § 14-16-3-17 of this Zoning Code are met, and as specifically allowed below:

(a) A free-standing wireless telecommunications facility, up to 65 feet in height.

(b) A collocated free-standing wireless telecommunications facility, up to 75 feet in height.

(c) A face-mounted wireless telecommunications facility.

(d) A roof-mounted wireless telecommunications facility, up to 6 feet above the parapet of the building on which it is placed.

(e) A concealed wireless telecommunications facility.

(f) A Community Identity Feature if it is approved by the Planning Commission pursuant to § 14-16-3-17 of this Zoning Code.

(g) A wireless telecommunications facility, the antennas of which all are mounted on an existing vertical structure.

(Conditional Uses)

(1) Antenna, over 65 feet in height.

(2) Cold storage plant.

(3) Church or other place of worship, including incidental recreational and educational facilities. Incidental uses allowed include but are not limited to an emergency shelter operated by the church on the church’s principal premises which is used regularly for public worship, notwithstanding special limitations elsewhere in this Zoning Code.

(4) Community residential program, provided that the standards of § 14-16-3-12 of this Zoning Code are met.

(5) Drive-in theater.

(6) Dwelling unit (house, townhouse, or apartment), provided usable open space is provided on-site in an amount no less than specified in the R-3 zone; no more shall be required than specified in the R-2 zone except if located in an area designated by the master plan as "Developing" or "Semi-Urban," the total open space requirements of the R-D or RA-1 zone, respectively, shall be met.

(7) Emergency shelter, provided the standards of § 14-16-3-13 of this Zoning Code are met.

(8) Fire wood sales and related storage, provided the wood is not visible from land not zoned C-2, C-3, M-1, or M-2.

(9) Kennel.

(10) Mobile home development, provided the development contains at least three acres. Approval of a site development plan and landscaping plan is required prior to development.
more than one animal is permitted in the run at any one time.

(l) One mobile home for a watchman or caretaker on the same lot with commercial uses, permissive or conditional in this zone, which do not have or normally require a permanent structure, including but not limited to used car sales lot; mobile home or recreational vehicles sales or rental lot; and circus, carnival, or similar enterprise. However, the mobile home shall not be within 100 feet of a lot in a residential zone or a dwelling unit in any zone.

(m) Parking lot, as regulated in the O-1 zone.

(n) Pets, as regulated in the C-1 zone.

(o) Restaurant with outdoor seating.

(p) Sample dwelling unit used to sell such units, including incidental sales office activity.

(q) Secondhand store, including outside storage in the side or rear yard and if enclosed by a solid wall or fence at least six feet high.

(r) Stand or vehicle selling fruit, vegetables, or nursery stock, provided it is limited to a period of 90 days in any calendar year. However, one renewal for an additional 90 days may be permitted by the Planning Director.

(s) Not permissive as retailing or services are uses listed as conditional in this section and uses that are in substantial part industrial or manufacturing activities, e.g., automobile dismantling, sheet metal working, or tire recapping and retreading.

(13) Storage structure or yard for equipment, material or activity incidental to a specific construction project, provided it is of a temporary nature and is moved after the specific construction project is completed or work on the project has been dormant for a period of six or more months, and further provided that it is limited to a period of one year unless the time is extended by the Planning Director.

(14) Wholesaling of jewelry.

(15) Uses or activities in a tent, if the uses or activities are listed elsewhere in this subsection, provided:

(a) The tent may not be erected for more than seven days at a time and may not be erected more than two times a year on a given premises;

(b) There is sufficient paved off-street parking available on the premises to meet parking requirements for all uses on the premises, including the activity in the tent. The Zoning Enforcement Officer shall approve the site plan for the tent, which shall demonstrate adequate parking and vehicle circulation, prior to erection of the tent; and

(c) There are toilet facilities on the premises available to the users of the tent; and

(d) The City Fire Marshall or his authorized representative gives prior approval of the tent as meeting the requirements of Chapter 14, Article 2, Fire Code.
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Plan Ships 300 More Kids Elsewhere
NOTICE OF APPEAL

October 15, 2020

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

The Planning Department received an appeal on October 14, 2020. You will receive a Notice of Hearing as to when the appeal will be heard by the Land Use Hearing Officer. If you have any questions regarding the appeal please contact Alfredo Ernesto Salas, Planning Administrative Assistant at (505) 924-3370.

Please refer to the enclosed excerpt from the City Council Rules of Procedure for Land Use Hearing Officer Rules of Procedure and Qualifications for any questions you may have regarding the Land Use Hearing Officer rules of procedure.

Any questions you might have regarding Land Use Hearing Officer policy or procedures that are not answered in the enclosed rules can be answered by Crystal Ortega, Clerk to the Council, (505) 768-3100.

CITY COUNCIL APPEAL NUMBER: AC-20-12
PLANNING DEPARTMENT CASE FILE NUMBER: PR-2020-004030, SI-2020-00540, VA-2020-00356,

APPLICANT: Mike Mirabal
10951 Carreta Dr. NW
Albuquerque NM, 87114

AGENT: Marsha Kearney
10927 Carreta Dr. NW
Albuquerque NM, 87114

cc: Crystal Ortega, City Council, City county bldg. 9th floor
Kevin Morrow/Legal Department, City Hall, 4th Floor-ZHE file
Mike Mirabal,
Marsha Kearney, rmeek1978@gmail.com
Tierra West LLC, rstevenon@tierrawestllc.com
CALABAC IIIAS Group c/o Donald Harville peterstalland@hotmail.com
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD  
AGENDA  
ONLINE ZOOM MEETING  

September 30, 2020  

Jolene Wolfley.......................................................... DRB Chair  
Jeanne Wolfenbarger ........................................... Transportation  
Kris Cadena .......................................................... Water Authority  
Ernest Armijo. ..............................................................Hydrology  
Carl Garcia..............................................................Code Enforcement  
Cheryl Somerfeldt......................................................Parks and Rec  

Angela Gomez ~ DRB Hearing Monitor  

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

NOTE: INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES WHO NEED SPECIAL ASSISTANCE TO PARTICIPATE AT THIS MEETING SHOULD CONTACT ANGELA GOMEZ, PLANNING DEPARTMENT, AT 924-3946. HEARING IMPAIRED USERS MAY CONTACT HER VIA THE NEW MEXICO RELAY NETWORK BY CALLING TOLL-FREE:1-800-659-8331.  

NOTE: DEFFERRAL OF CASES WILL BE ANNOUCED AT THE BEGINNING OF THE AGENDA.  

NOTE: IF THE APPLICANT/AGENT IS NOT PRESENT WHEN THEIR REQUEST IS CALLED, THEN THE REQUEST MAY BE INDEFINITELY DEFERRED ON A NO SHOW. PER THE DRB RULES OF PROCEDURE, AN INDEFINITE DEFERRAL REQUIRES A RE-APPLICATION AND REPAYMENT OF ALL APPLICATION FEES.  

NOTE: CLICK ON THE BLUE HIGHLIGHTED LINK TO ACCESS THE CASE. (Place mouse over hyperlink, right-click, choose “open hyperlink”)  

A. Call to Order: 9:00 A.M.  

B. Changes and/or Additions to the Agenda  

   1. Motion to amend the rules to allow a virtual meeting because of the public health emergency.  

   2. Remote Meeting Information:  

      https://cabq.zoom.us/j/92918179483 (Place mouse over hyperlink, right-click, choose “open hyperlink”)  

      Meeting ID: 929 1817 9483  
      By Phone +1 312 626 6799  
      Find your local number: https://cabq.zoom.us/u/aok6a1cbD  

MAJOR CASES  

1. Project # PR-2019-002651 SD-2020-00159 – EXTENSION OF PRELIMINARY PLAT  

   TIERRA WEST, LLC agent for AIRPORT PARKING/KATHLEEN CHAVES request(s) the aforementioned action(s) for all or a portion of: PARCEL 2A BLK 4 PARK PLAT OF LTS 1A, 1B, 2B IN BLK 3, PARCEL S 1A1, 1A2, 1B1 IN BLK 4, PARCELS 2A, 2B, 2C & 2D OF SUNPORT PARK, zoned NR-BP, located at 1501 AIRCRAFT AVE SE between UNIVERSITY and I-25, containing approximately 48.6651 acre(s). (M-15)  

   PROPERTY OWNERS: AIRPORT PARKING/KATHLEEN CHAVES  

   REQUEST: EXTENSION OF PRELIMINARY PLAT  

DRB 9/30/20  

878
2. **Project # PR-2019-002277**
   (1002962)
   SI-2019-00246 – SITE PLAN

RESPEC agent(s) for RAINBOW PASEO, LLC request(s) the aforementioned action(s) for all or a portion of TRACT A PLAT OF TRACTS A, B AND C CANTATA AT THE TRAILS UNIT 2 (BEING A REPLAT OF TRACT OS-4 THE TRAILS UNIT 2 & TRACT A TAOS AT THE TRAILS UNIT 2), zoned R-ML, located on OAKRIDGE ST NW between OAKRIDGE ST NW and TREE LINE AVE NW, containing approximately 3.26 acre(s). (C-9)
[Deferred from 8/15/19, 10/9/19, 12/4/19, 2/5/20, 3/4/20, 4/15/20, 6/3/20, 8/5/20]

**PROPERTY OWNERS:** RV LOOP LLC
**REQUEST:** 52 UNIT TOWNHOME DEVELOPMENT

**AGENT HAS REQUESTED DEFERRAL TO OCTOBER 7TH.**

3. **Project # PR-2020-004030**
   (1002566, 1004501, 1004503)
   SI-2020-00540 – SITE PLAN

TIERRA WEST, LLC agent(s) for CALABACILLAS GROUP C/O DONALD HARVILLE request(s) the aforementioned action(s) for all or a portion of: A-12 & A-13, zoned MX-M, located at GOLF COURSE RD NW between GOLF COURSE RD NW, BLACK ARROYO and WESTSIDE BLVD containing approximately 8.77 acre(s). (A-12,13)
[Deferred from 7/22/20, 8/5/20, 8/26/20]

**PROPERTY OWNERS:** CALABACILLAS GROUP C/O DONALD HARVILLE
**REQUEST:** SITE PLAN FOR APARTMENT WITH MORE THAN 50 UNITS

4. **PR-2019-003169**
   SD-2020-00115 – PRELIMINARY PLAT
   VA-2020-00192 – TEMPORARY DEFERRAL OF SIDEWALK
   (Sketch Plat 12/18/19)

RON HENSLEY/THE GROUP agent(s) for CLEARBOOK INVESTMENTS INC. request(s) the aforementioned action(s) for all or a portion of: 01 UNIT 3 ATRISCO GRANT EXC NW’LY POR TO R/W, zoned MX-M, located at SAGE RD between COORS and 75TH ST, containing approximately 9.56 acre(s). (L-10)
[Deferred from 7/22/20, 8/5/20, 9/2/20]

**PROPERTY OWNERS:** CLEARBOOK INVESTMENTS INC, HENRY SCOTT TRUSTEE HENRY RVT
**REQUEST:** SUBDIVISION OF TRACT INTO 62 LOTS AND 2 TRACTS AND SIDEWALK DEFERRAL

---

**MINOR CASES**

---

DRB 9/30/20
5. **Project # PR-2020-004465**  
**SD-2020-00163** – PRELIMINARY/FINAL PLAT  
ALDRICH LAND SURVEYING agent(s) for JEANETTE L. MONAHAN, TRUSTEE – MONAHAN FAMILY TRUST  
request(s) the aforementioned action(s) for all or a portion of:  
LOTS 15 & 16 BLOCK 14, RAYNOLDS ADDITION, zoned R-ML, located at 1105 SILVER AVE SW between 11th ST SW and 12th ST SW, containing approximately 0.1616 acre(s). (K-13)  
**PROPERTY OWNERS:** MONAHAN FAMILY TRUST  
**REQUEST:** LOT LINE ELIMINATION

6. **PR-2020-003455**  
**SI-2020-00824** – FINAL SITE PLAN SIGN-OFF  
CONSSENSUS PLANNING agent(s) for DYNAMIC INVESTORS  
request(s) the aforementioned action(s) for all or a portion of:  
B-3-A, KOA, UNIT 2, zoned PD, located at 540 PAISANO STREET NE between JUAN TABO BLVD and I-40, containing approximately 5.04 acre(s). (K-22) [Deferred from 9/2/20, 9/16/20]  
**PROPERTY OWNERS:** DYNAMIC INVESTORS INC  
**REQUEST:** FINAL SIGN-OFF OF EPC APPROVED SITE PLAN

7. **Project # PR-2019-002928**  
**VA-2020-00107** – STREET WIDTH VARIANCE  
**SD-2020-00074** – PRELIMINARY/FINAL PLAT  
**SD-2020-00072** – VACATION OF PUBLIC EASEMENT  
**SD-2020-00075** – VACATION OF PUBLIC EASEMENT  
(Sketch Plat 10/9/19)  
COMMUNITY SCIENCES CORPORATION agent(s) for JOHN R. DeBASSIGE FOR RIGHT ANGLE HOMES BY DeBASSIGE  
request(s) the aforementioned action(s) for all or a portion of:  
LOTS 43 THRU 47, BLOCK 4 UNIT 4, PARADISE HEIGHTS, zoned R-1A, located on BROOKLINE DR. NW between ARDMORE AVE NW and ENDEAVOR RD NW, containing approximately 1.1320 acre(s). (A-10) [Deferred from 4/29/20, 5/13/20, 6/24/20, 8/26/20]  
**PROPERTY OWNERS:** JOHN DeBASSIGE FOR RIGHT ANGLE HOMES BY DeBASSIGE  
**REQUEST:** DIVIDE 5 EXISTING LOTS INTO 10 NEW LOTS, VACATE EXISTING EASEMENTS

8. **PR-2020-003626**  
**SD-2020-00130** – PRELIMINARY/FINAL PLAT  
(Sketch Plat 4/22/20)  
ARCH + PLAN LAND USE CONSULTANTS agent(s) for JULIAN & SUSANA CULL  
request(s) the aforementioned action(s) for all or a portion of:  
7A & 7B, VAN CLEAVE ACRES zoned R-A, located at 1540 VAN CLEAVE NW between SAN ISIDRO ST and GRIEGOS LATERAL, containing approximately 0.8233 acre(s). (G-13) [Deferred from 7/15/20, 7/29/20, 8/12/20, 9/2/20]  
**PROPERTY OWNERS:** JULIAN & SUSANA CULL  
**REQUEST:** LOT LINE ADJUSTMENT BETWEEN 2 EXISTING LOTS
9. **PR-2019-002905**  
**SD-2020-00132 – PRELIMINARY/FINAL PLAT**  
*Sketch Plat 1/15/20*  
ARCH + PLAN LAND USE CONSULTANTS agent(s) for SUNPORT PARK HOSPITALITY LLC request(s) the aforementioned action(s) for all or a portion of: 2-A-2, SUNPORT PARK, zoned NR-BP, located at WOODWARD RD between UNIVERSITY BLVD and TRANSPORT ST, containing approximately 2.0473 acre(s).  
*Deferred from 7/15/20, 7/29/20, 8/19/20, 9/16/20*  
**PROPERTY OWNERS:** SUNPORT PARK HOSPITALITY LLC  
**REQUEST:** CREATE 2 LOTS FROM 1 EXISTING LOT, GRANT ADDITIONAL RECIPROCAL CROSS ACCESS, DRAINAGE EASEMENT

10. **Project # PR-2019-002607**  
**SD-2020-00026 - PRELIMINARY/FINAL PLAT**  
**SD-2020-00107 – VACATION OF PRIVATE EASEMENT**  
*Sketch Plat 7/17/19*  
ARCH+ PLAN LAND USE CONSULTANTS agent(s) for JOHN O. PEARSON request(s) the aforementioned action(s) for all or a portion of: LOT 8-B PLAT OF LOTS 8-A & 8-B UNIT 1 ALVARADO GARDENS CONT 0.8967 AC, zoned R-A, located on RIO GRANDE BLVD between ARTESANOS CT and CAMPBELL RD, containing approximately 0.8967 acre(s).  
*Deferred from 1/29/20, 2/26/20, 4/8/20, 5/20/20, 7/8/20, 7/29/20, 8/26/20, 9/16/20*  
**PROPERTY OWNERS:** JOHN D PEARSON  
**REQUEST:** CREATE 2 LOTS FROM 1 EXISTING LOT

11. **Project # PR-2020-004180**  
**VA-2020-00289 – BULK LAND VARIANCE**  
**SD-2020-00151 - PRELIMINARY/FINAL PLAT**  
*Sketch Plat 8/5/20*  
BOHANNAN HUSTON/MICHAEL BALASKOVITS agent for MESA DEL SOL INVESTMENTS, LLC request(s) the aforementioned action(s) for all or a portion of: A-1-A-1, MESA DEL SOL INNOVATION PARK, zoned PC, located SOUTH OF BOBBY FOSTER ROAD, EAST OF I-25, NORTH OF TRACT 3 BULK LAND PLAT of MESA DEL SOL TRACTS 1-15 and WEST OF STATE LAND OFFICE LA SEMILLA PRESERVE, containing approximately 1673.9117 acre(s).  
*Deferred from 9/23/20*  
**PROPERTY OWNERS:** MDS INVESTMENTS  
**REQUEST:** CREATE NEW 75 ACRE TRACT FROM EXISTING 1673 ACRE TRACT

---

**SKETCH PLAT**

---

DRB 9/30/20
12. **Project # PR-2020-004451**  
**PS-2020-00085 - SKETCH PLAT**  
CSI – CARTESIAN SURVEYS, INC. agent(s) for LA-Z-BOY FURNITURE GALLERIES request(s) the aforementioned action(s) for all or a portion of: LOTS 7 THRU 10, BLOCK 22, THOMAS ADDITION, zoned MX-M, located at MONTGOMERY BLVD NE between MOON ST NE and HILTON PL NE, containing approximately 0.5277 acre(s). (G-20)

**PROPERTY OWNERS:** ENDORPHINS GROUP LLC  
**REQUEST:** SKETCH PLAT REVIEW AND COMMENT

13. **Project # PR-2020-004452**  
**PS-2020-00086 - SKETCH PLAT**  
JASON COCHRAN agent(s) for MERRILY ROCCO request(s) the aforementioned action(s) for all or a portion of: LOT 22 & 23, BLOCK 2 UNIT 1, CASA GRANDE ESTATES, zoned R-1C, located at 3100 PALO ALTO between CANDELARIA and COMANCHE, containing approximately 0.4967 acre(s). (G-23)

**PROPERTY OWNERS:** BRUCE PAUL CHARLES & MERRILY ROCCO & SUE GOTTSCHALK TRUSTEE  
**REQUEST:** SKETCH PLAT REVIEW AND COMMENT

14. **Project # PR-2020-004457**  
**PS-2020-00087 - SKETCH PLAT**  
RIO GRANDE ENGINEERING agent(s) for JENNIFER SOULE request(s) the aforementioned action(s) for all or a portion of: LOT 22, VOLCANO CLIFFS UNIT 6, zoned RA, located at QUILVIRA DR between VISTA VIEJA AVE and RETABLO RD, containing approximately 6.0 acre(s). (D-09)

**PROPERTY OWNERS:** BARBARA A MUELLER  
**REQUEST:** SKETCH PLAT REVIEW AND COMMENT

15. **Project # PR-2020-004443**  
**PS-2020-00083 - SKETCH PLAT**  
MARK BURAK, PE agent(s) for SHARIF RABADI request(s) the aforementioned action(s) for all or a portion of: LOT 20, 21A, 22A, 22B, 23A, 23B, 24A, 24B, 25B, 26B, 27B, 28B, 29B, UNIT 1, PARADISE HILLS INVESTMENT PROPERTIES, zoned MX-T, located at LYON/GLUCKMAN/LILIENTHAL between UNSER BLVD and PARADISE, containing approximately 6.76 acre(s). (B-11)

**PROPERTY OWNERS:** SHARIF & SAMIA RABADI  
**REQUEST:** SKETCH PLAT REVIEW AND COMMENT

16. **Other Matters:**
17. ACTION SHEET MINUTES: September 23, 2020

ADJOURN
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD
Agenda
ONLINE ZOOM MEETING
August 5, 2020

Jolene Wolfley.......................................................... DRB Chair
Jeanne Wolfenbarger ................................................... Transportation
Kris Cadena .............................................................. Water Authority
Ernest Armijo. ............................................................ Hydrology
Carl Garcia............................................................. Code Enforcement
Cheryl Somerfeldt....................................................... Parks and Rec

Angela Gomez ~ DRB Hearing Monitor

*************************************************************************************************
NOTE: INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES WHO NEED SPECIAL ASSISTANCE TO PARTICIPATE AT THIS MEETING SHOULD CONTACT ANGELA GOMEZ, PLANNING DEPARTMENT, AT 924-3946. HEARING IMPAIRED USERS MAY CONTACT HER VIA THE NEW MEXICO RELAY NETWORK BY CALLING TOLL-FREE:1-800-659-8331.

NOTE: DEFERRAL OF CASES WILL BE ANNOUNCED AT THE BEGINNING OF THE AGENDA.

NOTE: IF THE APPLICANT/AGENT IS NOT PRESENT WHEN THEIR REQUEST IS CALLED, THEN THE REQUEST MAY BE INDEFINITELY DEFERRED ON A NO SHOW. PER THE DRB RULES OF PROCEDURE, AN INDEFINITE DEFERRAL REQUIRES A RE-APPLICATION AND REPAYMENT OF ALL APPLICATION FEES.

NOTE: MINOR CASES WILL NOT BE HEARD BEFORE 11:00 AM.

A. Call to Order: 9:00 A.M.
B. Changes and/or Additions to the Agenda
   1. Motion to amend the rules to allow a virtual meeting because of the public health emergency.
   2. Remote Meeting Information:
   Join Zoom Meeting
   https://cabq.zoom.us/j/93846895555
   Meeting ID: 938 4689 5555
   By phone +1 312 626 6799 or find your local number: https://cabq.zoom.us/u/aLqNrIrNh

MAJOR CASES

1. Project #PR-2019-002277 (1002962)
   SI-2019-00246 – SITE PLAN
   RESPEC agent(s) for RAINBOW PASEO, LLC request(s) the aforementioned action(s) for all or a portion of TRACT A PLAT OF TRACTS A, B AND C CANTATA AT THE TRAILS UNIT 2 (BEING A REPLAT OF TRACT OS-4 THE TRAILS UNIT 2 & TRACT A TAOS AT THE TRAILS UNIT 2), zoned R-ML, located on OAKRIDGE ST NW between OAKRIDGE ST NW and TREE LINE AVE NW, containing approximately 3.26 acre(s). (C-9)
   [Deferred from 8/15/19, 10/9/19, 12/4/19, 2/5/20, 3/4/20, 4/15/20, 6/3/20]
   DEFERRED to the meeting of September 30, 2020
   PROPERTY OWNERS: RV LOOP LLC
   REQUEST: 52 UNIT TOWNHOME DEVELOPMENT

DRB 8/5/20
2. **PR-2019-003169**  
SD-2020-00115 - PRELIMINARY PLAT  
VA-2020-00192 - TEMPORARY DEFERRAL OF SIDEWALK  
*(Sketch Plat 12/18/19)*

RON HENSLEY/THE GROUP agent(s) for CLEARBOOK INVESTMENTS INC. request(s) the aforementioned action(s) for all or a portion of: **01 UNIT 3 ATRISCO GRANT EXC NW'LY POR TO R/W**, zoned MX-M, located at SAGE RD between COORS and 75TH ST, containing approximately 9.56 acre(s). *(L-10)* **Deferred from 7/22/20**

**PROPERTY OWNERS:** CLEARBOOK INVESTMENTS INC, HENRY SCOTT TRUSTEE HENRY RVT  
**REQUEST:** SUBDIVISION OF TRACT INTO 62 LOTS AND 2 TRACTS AND SIDEWALK DEFERRAL

3. **PR-2020-004030**  
**(1002566, 1004501, 1004503)**  
SI-2020-00540 - SITE PLAN

TIERRA WEST, LLC agent(s) for CALABACILLAS GROUP C/O DONALD HARVILLE request(s) the aforementioned action(s) for all or a portion of: **A-12 & A-13**, zoned MX-M, located at GOLF COURSE RD NW between GOLF COURSE RD NW, BLACK ARROYO and WESTSIDE BLVD containing approximately 8.77 acre(s). *(A-12,13)* **Deferred from 7/22/20**

**PROPERTY OWNERS:** CALABACILLAS GROUP C/O DONALD HARVILLE  
**REQUEST:** SITE PLAN FOR APARTMENT WITH MORE THAN 50 UNITS

---

**MINOR CASES - MINOR CASES WILL NOT BE HEARD BEFORE 11:00 AM**

4. **Project # PR_2018-001374**  
SD-2020-00118 - PRELIMINARY/FINAL PLAT

ARCH + PLAN LAND USE CONSULTANTS agent(s) for NM RESIDENTIAL FINANCIAL SOLUTIONS request(s) the aforementioned action(s) for all or a portion of: **214-A-X, 215-B AND LOT 1 BLOCK 21, TORREON SUBDIVISION**, zoned R-1A, located at 401, 407, 411 ANDERSON AVE SE between JOHN ST and BROADWAY BLVD, containing approximately 0.38 acre(s). *(L-14)* **Deferred from 7/8/20, 7/22/20**

**PROPERTY OWNERS:** NM RESIDENTIAL FINANCIAL SOLUTIONS  
**REQUEST:** LOT REALIGNMENT

5. **Project # PR-2020-003239**  
SD-2020-00114 - PRELIMINARY/FINAL PLAT  
*(Sketch Plat 1/15/20)*

ARCH + PLAN LAND USE CONSULTANTS agent(s) for SUNSET VILLA LLC request(s) the aforementioned action(s) for all or a portion of: **16-A, 23-A, 45-A, 49-A, 59-A, SUNSET VILLA**, zoned PD, located at **600 GARDEN PATCH LN SW, 1620 and 1701 GARDEN WAY, 508 TWILIGHT VISTA LN SW, 506 TYRACK LN SW between SUNSET GARDENS RD and HOOPER RD**, containing approximately 4.6535 acre(s). *(K-12)* **Deferred from 7/8/20, 7/29/20**

**PROPERTY OWNERS:** SUNSET VILLA LLC, JOE HAHN  
**REQUEST:** CREATE 12 LOTS FROM 5 EXISTING LOTS
6. **Project # PR-2019-002332**  
SD-2020-00085 – PRELIMINARY/FINAL PLAT  
VA-2020-00224 – DPM WAIVER  
*(Sketch Plat 1/15/20)*  

ARCH + PLAN LAND USE CONSULTANTS & RIO GRANDE ENGINEERING agent(s) for JODY MASTERS request(s) the aforementioned action(s) for all or a portion of: **MAP 38 300-A1, LANDS OF MASTER, BORIN AND MEMMER** zoned R-A, located at 2737 CARSON RD NW between MONTOYA ST NW and RIO GRANDE BLVD NW, containing approximately 0.92 acre(s). (H-12) [Deferred from 6/10/20, 6/24/20, 7/8/20, 7/15/20, 7/22/20, 7/29/20]  

**PROPERTY OWNERS:** JODY MASTERS  
**REQUEST:** CREATE 2 LOTS FROM ONE EXISTING LOT

---

7. **Project # PR-2019-002268**  
SD-2020-00110 – PRELIMINARY/FINAL PLAT  
*(Sketch Plat 12/18/19)*  

COMMUNITY SCIENCES CORPORATION agent(s) for OUR LAND LLC request(s) the aforementioned action(s) for all or a portion of: **LOT A-4, LANDS OF MICHAEL J. SNOW AND ELIZABETH T. SNOW,** zoned R-A, located at 2945 TRELLIS DR. NW between DECKER RD NW and CAMPBELL RD NW, containing approximately 0.8301 acre(s). (G-12) [Deferred from 7/8/20, 7/22/20, 7/29/20]  

**PROPERTY OWNERS:** OUR LAND LLC  
**REQUEST:** DIVIDE ONE EXISTING LOT INTO 3 NEW LOTS, GRANT EASEMENTS

---

8. **Project # PR-2020-003222**  
SD-2020-00116 – PRELIMINARY/FINAL PLAT  
*(Sketch Plat 1/8/20)*  

CSI – CARTESIAN SURVEY’S INC. agent(s) for **MALL AT COTTONWOOD II LLC C/O WASHINGTON PRIME GROUP LP** request(s) the aforementioned action(s) for all or a portion of: **TRACT B-4-A, 2ND REVISION COTTONWOOD MALL,** zoned MX-M, located at 10000 COORS BYPASS NW between 7 BAR LOOP and COORS BLVD NWP, containing approximately 11.6624 acre(s). (B-13) [Deferred from 7/8/20, 7/22/20, 7/29/20]  

**PROPERTY OWNERS:** MALL AT COTTONWOOD II LLC C/O WASHINGTON PRIME GROUP LP  
**REQUEST:** SUBDIVIDE ONE EXISTING TRACT INTO 2 NEW TRACTS

---

**SKETCH PLAT**

9. **Project # PR-2020-004157**  
PS-2020-0065 -SKETCH PLAT  

TIM NISLY request(s) the aforementioned action(s) for all or a portion of: **Public Right of Way**, located south of FREEMAN between 5th ST and 6th ST, containing approximately 1,275 square feet. (G-14)  

**PROPERTY OWNERS:** City of Albuquerque  
**REQUEST:** TO VACATE A 74.1’ OF AN EASEMENT
10. **Project # PR-2020-004174**  
PS-2020-00067 - SKETCH PLAT  
FIERRO & COMPANY agent(s) for ARCHDIOCESE OF SANTA FE REAL ESTATE CORP. request(s) the aforementioned action(s) for all or a portion of: **TRACTS 1 & 2, OUR LADY OF GUADALUPE**, zoned RA-2, located at **1860 GRIEGOS RD between RIO GRANDE BLVD NW and SAN ISIDRO ST NW**, containing approximately 18.60 acre(s). *(F-13)*  
**PROPERTY OWNERS**: OUR LADY OF GUADALUPE CATHOLIC CHURCH  
**REQUEST**: REPLAT 12 EXISTING TRACTS INTO TWO NEW TRACTS

11. **Project # PR-2020-004171**  
PS-2020-00066 - SKETCH PLAT  
FIERRO & COMPANY agent(s) for WILLIAM E. GALBRETH LAND DEVELOPMENT CO. LLC request(s) the aforementioned action(s) for all or a portion of: **N-7-A-1, TANOAN PROPERTIES**, zoned PD located at **12300 SAN ANTONIO DR. between LOWELL DR NE and TENNYSON ST NE**, containing approximately 6.6 acre(s). *(E-22)*  
**PROPERTY OWNERS**: WILLIAM E. GALBRETH LAND DEVELOPMENT CO. LLC  
**REQUEST**: SUBDIVIDE ONE TRACT INTO 5 LOTS

12. **Project # PR-2020-004180**  
PS-2020-00069 - SKETCH PLAT  
BOHANNAN HUSTON, MICHAEL BALASKOVITS request(s) the aforementioned action(s) for all or a portion of: **A-1-A-1, MESA DEL SOL INNOVATION PARK**, zoned R-1C, located on **HAWKING BLVD between UNIVERSITY BLVD and BOBBY FOSTER BLVD**, containing approximately 1673.9117 acre(s). *(R-16, S-16)*  
**PROPERTY OWNERS**: CORAZON DEL MESA 4 LLC  
**REQUEST**: SUBDIVIDE ONE TRACT INTO 5 LOTS

13. **Project # PR-2020-004142**  
PS-2020-00064 - SKETCH PLAT  
JACK C. SKINNER request(s) the aforementioned action(s) for all or a portion of: **LOTS 13, 14, 15 BLOCK B, BACA AND ARMIJO ADDITION**, zoned R-ML, located at **3RD ST between CROMWELL and PACIFIC** containing approximately 0.0671 acre(s). *(K-14)* [Deferred from 8/5/20]  
**PROPERTY OWNERS**: SKINNER JAKE TRUSTEE SKINNER LIVING TRUST  
**REQUEST**: INSTALLATION OF SINGLE FAMILY MODULAR HOME

---

**OTHER MATTERS:**
Scheduling change for Board consideration for the following case:

14. **PR-2020-004049**
    **SD-2020-00121-PRELIMINARY/FINAL PLAT**

ALDRICH LAND SURVEYING agent(s) for WESTERN TRAIL TENANCY IN COMMON, GRAYLAND CORPORATION request(s) the aforementioned action(s) for all or a portion of: TRACTS A-2, LAVA TRAILS, zoned MX-L, located at WESTERN TRAIL between SOUTHEAST CORNER OF UNSER and WESTERN TRAIL, containing approximately 5.0236 acre(s). (F-10) [Deferred from 7/15/20]

**PROPERTY OWNERS:** GRAYLAND CORP & J2C LLC & LEE RVT & MESCALL THOMAS J & SPRING FRANK L & ETAL

**REQUEST:** CREATE 2 NEW TRACTS FROM 1 EXISTING TRACTS AND RELOCATE TEMPORARY DRAINAGE EASEMENT

15. **ACTION SHEET MINUTES:** July 29, 2020
ADJOURN
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD
Agenda
ONLINE ZOOM MEETING
July 22, 2020

Jolene Wolfley.......................................................... DRB Chair
Jeanne Wolfenbarger .................................................. Transportation
Kris Cadena ............................................................ Water Authority
Ernest Armijo. ...................................................... Hydrology
Carl Garcia............................................................ Code Enforcement
Cheryl Somerfeldt........................................... Parks and Rec

Angela Gomez ~ DRB Hearing Monitor

*************************************************************************************************
NOTE: INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES WHO NEED SPECIAL ASSISTANCE TO PARTICIPATE AT THIS MEETING SHOULD CONTACT ANGELA GOMEZ, PLANNING DEPARTMENT, AT 924-3946. HEARING IMPAIRED USERS MAY CONTACT HER VIA THE NEW MEXICO RELAY NETWORK BY CALLING TOLL-FREE:1-800-659-8331.

NOTE: DEFFERRAL OF CASES WILL BE ANNOUNCED AT THE BEGINNING OF THE AGENDA.

NOTE: IF THE APPLICANT/AGENT IS NOT PRESENT WHEN THEIR REQUEST IS CALLED, THEN THE REQUEST MAY BE INDEFINITELY DEFERRED ON A NO SHOW. PER THE DRB RULES OF PROCEDURE, AN INDEFINITE DEFERRAL REQUIRE A RE-APPLICATION AND REPAYMENT OF ALL APPLICATION FEES.

A. Call to Order: 9:00 A.M.
B. Changes and/or Additions to the Agenda
   1. Motion to amend the rules to allow a virtual meeting because of the public health emergency.
   2. Remote Meeting Information:
      Join Zoom Meeting
      https://cabq.zoom.us/j/94350930077
      Meeting ID: 943 5093 0077
      By phone 1-312-626-6799 or Find your local number: https://cabq.zoom.us/u/aqJL1OTkb

MAJOR CASES

1. **Project # 3169**
   **SD-2020-00115** – PRELIMINARY PLAT
   **VA-2020-00192** – TEMPORARY DEFERRAL OF SIDEWALK
   *(Sketch Plat 12/18/19)*

   RON HENSLEY/THE GROUP agent(s) for CLEARBOOK INVESTMENTS INC. request(s) the aforementioned action(s) for all or a portion of: **01 UNIT 3 ATRISCO GRANT EXC NW'LY POR TO R/W**, zoned MX-M, located at SAGE RD between COORS and 75**TH** ST, containing approximately 9.56 acre(s). *(L-10)*

   **PROPERTY OWNERS**: CLEARBOOK INVESTMENTS INC, HENRY SCOTT TRUSTEE HENRY RVT
   **REQUEST**: SUBDIVISION OF TRACT INTO 62 LOTS AND 2 TRACtS AND SIDEWALK DEFERRAL
2. **Project # 4030**  
(1002566, 1004501, 1004503)  
SI-2020-00540 - SITE PLAN  
TIERRA WEST, LLC agent(s) for CALABACILLAS GROUP C/O DONALD HARVILLE request(s) the aforementioned action(s) for all or a portion of: A-12 & A-13, zoned MX-M, **located at GOLF COURSE RD NW between GOLF COURSE RD NW, BLACK ARROYO and WESTSIDE BLVD** containing approximately 8.77 acre(s). (A-12,13)

**PROPERTY OWNERS:** CALABACILLAS GROUP C/O DONALD HARVILLE  
**REQUEST:** SITE PLAN FOR APARTMENT WITH MORE THAN 50 UNITS

3. **Project # PR-2019-002571**  
SD-2020-00097 – VACATION OF PUBLIC EASEMENT  
SD-2020-00098 – VACATION OF PUBLIC EASEMENT  
*(Sketch Plat 7/10/19)*  
DENNIS LORENZ agent(s) for PHILLIP PICKARD – DCLP TRUST request(s) the aforementioned action(s) for all or a portion of: NORTHWEST CORNER, NEW MEXICO STATE HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT, TRACT A UNIT A, NORTH ALBUQUERQUE ACRES, zoned NR-LM, located at 7550 PAN AMERICAN between SAN FRANCISCO NE and DEL REY AVE NE, containing approximately 0.14 acre(s). (D-18) *(Deferred from 6/10/20, 6/24/20)*

**PROPERTY OWNERS:** PHILLIP PICKARD  
**REQUEST:** VACATION OF PUBLIC DRAINAGE AND UTILITY EASEMENTS

4. **Project # PR-2020-003887**  
(1010532)  
SI-2020-00367 – SITE PLAN  
SCOTT ANDERSON agent(s) for MICHAEL DRESKIN request(s) the aforementioned action(s) for all or a portion of: LOT 5, BLOCK 23, BROAD ACRES ADDN, zoned MX-M, located at 2818 4TH ST NW, containing approximately 1.27 acre(s). (H-14) *(Deferred from 7/8/20)*

**PROPERTY OWNERS:** MICHAEL DRESKIN  
**REQUEST:** SITE PLAN FOR APARTMENT WITH MORE THAN 50 UNITS

**MINOR CASES**

5. **Project # PR-2018-001347**  
SD-2020-00118 – PRELIMINARY/FINAL PLAT  
ARCH + PLAN LAND USE CONSULTANTS agent(s) for NM RESIDENTIAL FINANCIAL SOLUTIONS request(s) the aforementioned action(s) for all or a portion of: 214-A-X, 215-B AND LOT 1 BLOCK 21, TORREON SUBDIVISION, zoned R-1A, **located at 401, 407, 411 ANDERSON AVE SE between JOHN ST and BROADWAY BLVD**, containing approximately 0.38 acre(s). (L-14) *(Deferred from 7/8/20)*

**PROPERTY OWNERS:** NM RESIDENTIAL FINANCIAL SOLUTIONS  
**REQUEST:** LOT REALIGNMENT

---

DRB 2019

890
6. **Project # PR-2019-002332**  
**SD-2020-00085 – PRELIMINARY/FINAL PLAT**  
**VA-2020-00224 – DPM WAIVER**  
*(Sketch Plat 1/15/20)*

ARCH + PLAN LAND USE CONSULTANTS & RIO GRANDE ENGINEERING agent(s) for JODY MASTERS request(s) the aforementioned action(s) for all or a portion of: MAP 38 300-A1, LANDS OF MASTER, BORIN AND MEMMER zoned R-A, located at 2737 CARSON RD NW between MONTOYA ST NW and RIO GRAND BLVD NW, containing approximately 0.92 acre(s). *(H-12)* *(Deferred from 6/10/20, 6/24/20, 7/8/20, 7/15/20)*

**PROPERTY OWNERS:** JODY MASTERS  
**REQUEST:** CREATE 2 LOTS FROM ONE EXISTING LOT

7. **Project # 3133**  
**SD-2020-00135 – PRELIMINARY/FINAL PLAT**  
**VA-2020-00230 – SIDEWALK WIDTH VARIANCE**  
*(Sketch Plat 6/3/20)*

JAG PLANNING & ZONING – JUANITA GARCIA agent(s) for SEAN AND YVONNE O’MALLEY request(s) the aforementioned action(s) for all or a portion of: LOT 19 BLOCK 4, FITZGERALD ADDITION, zoned R-1D, located at 805 FITZGERALD DR NW between 10TH ST NW and 7TH ST NW, containing approximately 0.3 acre(s). *(G-14)*

**PROPERTY OWNERS:** SEAN AND YVONNE O’MALLEY  
**REQUEST:** SUBDIVIDE ONE LOT INTO TWO LOTS, SIDEWALK WIDTH VARIANCE

8. **Project # PR-2019-002268**  
**SD-2020-0110 – PRELIMINARY/FINAL PLAT**  
*(Sketch Plat 12/18/19)*

COMMUNITY SCIENCES CORPORATION agent(s) for OUR LAND LLC request(s) the aforementioned action(s) for all or a portion of: LOT A-4, LANDS OF MICHAEL J. SNOW AND ELIZABETH T. SNOW, zoned R-A, located at 2945 TRELLIS DR. NW between DECKER RD NW and CAMPBELL RD NW, containing approximately 0.8301 acre(s). *(G-12)* *(Deferred from 7/8/20)*

**PROPERTY OWNERS:** OUR LAND LLC  
**REQUEST:** DIVIDE ONE EXISTING LOT INTO 3 NEW LOTS, GRANT EASEMENTS
9. **Project # PR-2020-003222**  
**SD-2020-00116 – PRELIMINARY/FINAL PLAT**  
(*Sketch Plat 1/8/20*)

CSI – CARTESIAN SURVEY’S INC. agent(s) for MALL AT COTTONWOOD II LLC C/O WASHINGTON PRIME GROUP LP request(s) the aforementioned action(s) for all or a portion of: **TRACT B-4-A, 2ND REVISION COTTONWOOD MALL**, zoned MX-M, located at 10000 COORS BYPASS NW between 7 BAR LOOP and COORS BLVD NWP, containing approximately 11.6624 acre(s). *(B-13)[Deferred from 7/8/20]*

**PROPERTY OWNERS:** MALL AT COTTONWOOD II LLC C/O WASHINGTON PRIME GROUP LP  
REQUEST: SUBDIVIDE ONE EXISTING TRACT INTO 2 NEW TRACTS

---

**SKETCH PLAT**

10. **Project # 4110**  
**PS-2020-00060 - SKETCH PLAT**

RIO GRANDE ENGINEERING agent(s) for MARTINEZ CARLOS TRUSTEE MARTINEZ RV request(s) the aforementioned action(s) for all or a portion of: **LOT 9 BLOCK 2, NORTH ALBUQUERQUE ACRES**, zoned R-1D, located on EAGLE ROCK between BARSTOW NE and VENTURA BLVD NE, containing approximately 0.87 acre(s). *(C-20)*

**PROPERTY OWNERS:** MARTINEZ CARLOS TRUSTEE MARTINEZ RV  
REQUEST: SKETCH PLAT REVIEW AND COMMENT

11. **Project # 4111**  
**PS-2020-00061 - SKETCH PLAT**

RIO GRANDE ENGINEERING agent(s) for GILLANI HANAIFA request(s) the aforementioned action(s) for all or a portion of: **LOT 10 BLOCK 1, NORTH ALBUQUERQUE ACRES**, zoned PD, located on MODESTO between BARSTOW NE and VENTURA BLVD NE, containing approximately 0.87 acre(s). *(C-20)*

**PROPERTY OWNERS:** GILLANI HANAIFA  
REQUEST: SKETCH PLAT REVIEW AND COMMENT

---

12. Other Matters:

13. **ACTION SHEET MINUTES: July 15, 2020**  
ADJOURN