INTER-OFFICE MEMORANDUM

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

SUBJECT: AC-20-3, PR-2019-002184, SI-2019-00379 SD-2020-00027 VA-2020-00057: Alicia Quinones, appeals the decision of the Development Review Board (DRB) to approve a site plan for All or a portion of TR G-1 PLAT OF TRACTS F-1 & G-1, ACADEMY PLACE SUBDIVISION, zoned MX-L, located at 4909 JUAN TABO BLVD NE between OSUNA RD and MONTGOMERY BLVD, containing approximately 2.3795 acre(s). (F-21)

OVERVIEW

This is a request for a Site Plan DRB to allow the development of 116,7000 square foot; 35-foot-tall indoor storage facility.

The applicant participated in a Pre-Application Review Team (PRT) meeting with City Staff on January 15, 2019, to discuss the project. The applicant was informed that a conditional use approval would be required and that the request would be processed as a Site Plan DRB. The conditional use approval was granted by the Zoning Hearing Examiner (ZHE) in May 2019 (VA-2019-0086) and included two conditions of approval. The ZHE decision was later appealed to the City Council through Land Use Hearing Officer who recommended that the ZHE decision stand. The City Council affirmed this decision on August 21, 2019.

A facilitated meeting occurred on November 7, 2019, during which the attendees expressed concerns about views, crime flood control, regulatory compliance and traffic. Attendees also expressed general opposition to the project.

The applicant submitted a complete application on November 22, 2019, and the project was scheduled for the December 18, 2019, hearing. The DRB heard the project at their December 18, 2019, meeting and they deferred the case to their January 15, 2020, meeting to allow the applicant time to address the board comments. Members of the public who attended the December 18th meeting spoke in opposition to the
project, citing concerns about traffic, views, and drainage. The City Engineer addressed their comments regarding drainage and confirmed that the site is not located within a floodplain. The Transportation Engineer confirmed that the project did not meet the thresholds for Traffic Impact Study.

The case was heard a second time on January 15, 2020, and was deferred again to allow time for a platting action to dedicate right-of-way along Juan Tabo Boulevard and to address outstanding DRB comments provided by the City Hydrologist.

The case received a final hearing on January 29, 2020. The DRB approved the plat and the Site Plan DRB at this meeting, based on the findings in the Notice of Decision.

The appellant filed the appeal on February 13, 2020, within the allowed deadline.

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).

APPEAL

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 Alicia Quinones’s appeal application, dated February 13, 2020, which is included in the record.

1. Appellant: The DRB did not acknowledge that the site is part of the floodplain and dam management area. The DRB should have incorporated non-CABQ regulation that has a direct and specific effect on the site plan, i.e., FEMA, NFIP, and NM State Dam Safety. Several sources of dam runoff water are not accounted for in the drainage plan. The drainage plan is not stamped by a professional engineer.

Staff Response: All the applicable review for safe hydrological function of the site in the surrounding area was considered in full by the DRB, staff hydrologists, and the applicant’s engineer. Albuquerque Metropolitan Flood Control Authority (AMAFCA) signed off on the site plan. Details of hydrologic review are:

a. The site in question according to FEMA floodplain mapping is listed as Zone X with a listed 0.2% chance of flood hazard. Sites listed as Zone X are not considered to be within the floodplain and do not require flood protection or construction considerations. This site does not violate NFIP intent or regulations.
b. The site is not within the delineated floodplain and referencing it as such is not accurate. The dam breach mapping is not complete, but it is not required under NFIP. Many of the homes in the Oso Grande Neighborhood fall within the same zone.

c. The site is not located in the Dam toe or west embankment. This property is not part of the John B. Roberts Dam and does not fall under the jurisdictional requirements of the State Engineer’s Office or the New Mexico Dam Safety Bureau.

d. The culvert which runs from the Dam to the channel south of the site does not enter the site. There is no Dam drainage infrastructure on this property.

e. Storm runoff in the street to the northeast was considered in the grading and drainage plan. There are four storm-drain inlets in the street along Juan Tabo at the intersection with Osuna. One inlet is at each corner. A water block was also added at the driveway to prevent street runoff from entering the site along Osuna.

f. This site is not in the floodplain. Incidental flows are carried by culverts into the drainage channel south of the property and street flows are captured in the inlets along Juan Tabo.

g. There is no observable history of leakage from the John B. Roberts Dam. The Dam is normally dry and does not hold water long enough for seepage to occur. This site is not a drainage field.

h. The appeal states that spillway overtopping would depend on the magnitude of the storm event. The Dam holds a minimum of the 100-year, 24-hour storm event. Dam failure is a separate event wherein the damage to the entire downstream area would be substantial. Much of the Oso Grande Neighborhood is within the same FEMA Zone X with a 0.2% chance of flood hazard regardless of the development of this site.

i. This property does not modify the John D. Roberts Dam, therefore no dam modification permit is required.

j. The site Grading and Drainage Plan has been designed according to the City published standards in the Development Process Manual.

k. The Grading and Drainage plan has been stamped and signed by a registered NM Professional Engineer. All engineering for grading and drainage is included with this plan. The Site plan and Landscape plan do not cover this engineering and are not required to be stamped by a P.E.

2. Appellant: The building the DRB permitted is not the building the Zoning Hearing Examiner (ZHE) approved.

Staff Response: The ZHE reviews applications for the use of a property based on the review and decision criteria in IDO 14-16-6(A)(3). At a subsequent stage, the DRB Site Plan review approves the site plan, including building elevations.

The ZHE Notice of Decision (NOD) references the application materials that had a drive-in loading area depicted.\textsuperscript{1} However, the ZHE’s Conditional Use Notice of Decision imposes only two conditions, neither of which require an indoor loading area. The first condition is:

\textsuperscript{1} ZHE Notice of Decision Finding 9: “All storage units for the proposed use will be located inside the structure, with access through interior corridors; with no outdoor storage of vehicles or goods on the subject property.”

ZHE Notice of Decision Finding 31: “The building will have interior drive-in loading area with garage door ingress and egress to each unit.”
Applicant shall comply with the Specific-use Standards Section 14-16-4-3(D)(28): Self-Storage.

The applicant changed the site design and submitted it to DRB for approval, as the DRB reviews and approves site development plans, while the ZHE is responsible for reviewing land uses. An applicant may change site designs after ZHE approval, as long as it complies with any conditions established in the ZHE approval. For this project, the DRB applied the Use Specific Self-Storage standards along with other IDO development standards, and found that the provisions of the IDO, DPM, and other City regulations had been met. There was not a specific requirement for indoor drive-in access that carried over from the conditional use approval to the DRB approval of the site plan.

The overall site design works to mitigate adverse impact on the neighborhood to the west. The building is set back 40 feet from the north property line adjacent to the residents. The building will sit 18 feet below Juan Tabo Boulevard. The full height of the building is not apparent until viewed from the western portion of the property.

Furthermore, the design of the building reduces the potential negative impact of loading areas on the neighborhood. The design of the building has two inset loading areas: one at the south façade and one at the west façade. Both of those loading areas are distant from the neighborhoods which face the east façade. Additionally, the applicant added a note to the approved site plan documenting that the hours of operation for gate access is until 7 pm.\(^2\) Therefore, the gate access is from 7:00 am to 7:00 pm which is more limited than the general IDO restriction of public access between 10:00 pm and 7:00 am.

3. Appellant: The applicant did not meet requirements for sensitive lands requirements.

Staff Response: The sensitive lands requirements were met. The second of the two ZHE’s conditions of approval is:

Applicant shall comply with Section 14-16-5-2(C); specifically Applicant shall conduct an analysis of the site constraints of the property as it relates to sensitive lands prior to the design process.\(^3\)

IDO Section 14-16-5-2(C) of the IDO identifies the types of sensitive lands that should be avoided: Floodplains and flow hazard area; steep slopes; unstable soils; wetlands; irrigation

\(^2\) ZHE Notice of Decision Finding 33: The business will operate from 7:00 am through 5:30 pm, with gate access closed at 7:00 pm.

\(^3\) Finding 35: The subject site is located adjacent to the Bear Canyon Arroyo Major Public Open Space, making it subject to the regulations of Section 14-16-5-2(C).

Finding 36: The Applicant shall conduct an analysis of the site constraints of the property as it relates to sensitive lands prior to the design process.
facilities (acequias); escarpments; rock outcroppings; large stand of mature trees; and archaeological sites.

The applicant’s submittal includes a letter dated October 30, 2019, from Scott Culler, PLA, ASLA, “Analysis of Sensitive Lands at Guardian Storage Osuna Property.” Mr. Culler’s letter noted that “steep slopes with unstable soils exist on the east side of the property with some extension west toward north and south property lines” (outlined on Exhibit A and photographed on Exhibit B). The applicant’s letter, landscaping plan, and grading and drainage plan shows that any disturbed areas will be revegetated to stabilize the slope. The letter states “trees will be planted in tree wells with landscape boulder retention to capture water and help reduce erosion and stabilize the slope.” The building is set back 63 feet from Juan Tabo Boulevard.

The “Analysis of Sensitive Lands at Guardian Storage Osuna Property” also addressed Section 14-16-5-2(H)(1) of the IDO concerning properties within 330 feet of Major Public Open Space. The report stated – and the DRB concurred – that the building façade colors blend with the natural environment with the allowed exception for trim colors to be any hue. The site landscaping materials are native or naturalized, roof mounted mechanical equipment is screened by parapet walls on all sides, and outdoor lighting and signage comply with relevant sections of the IDO. Additionally, the pedestrian and bicycle facilities connect to Major Public Open Space and were approved by the Parks and Recreation Department.

It is important to note that the only Major Public Open Space (zoning category NR-PO-B) adjacent to the Guardian Storage parcel is the Bear Canyon Arroyo. The Storage site and the Bear Canyon Arroyo are separated by Juan Tabo Boulevard, yet the sites meet the definition of ‘adjacent.’ The other parcels to the south and west of the subject site are not zoned Major Public Open Space, even though they may appear to the observer as being “open space.”

The final area of the “Analysis of Sensitive Lands at Guardian Storage Osuna Property” covers Section 14-16-5-2(H)(2) of the IDO; Properties Adjacent to Major Public Open Space. The report shows – and the DRB concurred – that these provisions were addressed. In summary, the applicant is complying with requirements regarding single-loaded street, in that Juan Tabo Boulevard functions as the single-loaded street adjacent to Major Public Open Space. The majority of the open space on the site is the steep slope with the associated native landscaping that is next to Juan Tabo Boulevard and, therefore, the closest one could be to Major Public Open Space. The DRB found that the site plan complies with the other IDO provisions in this section, including landscaping strips near parking; site lighting; Crime Prevention through Environmental Design; managing stormwater; designing grading; vehicle circulation; walls and fences; retaining walls; and preventing and mitigating construction impact.

4. **Appellant:** Several conditions for prior approval for development were supposed to be accomplished prior to DRB approval and the the approvals are out of sequence.

---

4 Adjacent is defined by IDO 14-6-7 “Those properties that are abutting or separated only by a street....”

5 The parcel adjacent on the west of the subject parcel is zone R1-D and is a Water Utility Authority non-potable reservoir. West of this parcel is El Oso Grande Park zoned NR-PO-A or “City owned or Managed Parks.” The parcel adjacent on the south of the subject parcel is zoned Unclassified and is an AMAFA drainage channel. South of this parcel is the Central New Mexico Community College Montoya campus which is zone R1-D.
Staff Response: The DRB applied the two (2) conditions of the ZHE’s approval to review of the Site Plan for Guardian Storage. Condition #1 emphasized application of the Use Specific Standards, and the DRB’s review of that condition is covered in item 3 above. Condition #2 emphasized application of the Sensitive Lands Provisions. The DRB’s review of that condition is also addressed above in item 3.

The approvals for the Guardian Storage project have occurred in the proper sequence. The IDO specifically requires that the conditional use approval be obtained prior approval of the Site Plan DRB. Section 14-16-6-6(G)(2)(c) states, “A Site Plan – DRB may not be approved until after any necessary Conditional Use Approvals are obtained pursuant to Subsection 14-16-6-6(A).”

CONCLUSION

The decision of the DRB was supported by substantial evidence in the record, which included a complete review of hydrological issues for the subject property and the surrounding area. The DRB determined that the application met the Specific Use Standards in the IDO for an indoor storage facility, and the Sensitive Lands provisions in the IDO; and therefore, met the conditions of the Conditional Use approval issued by the ZHE. The DRB did not act fraudulently, arbitrarily, or capriciously. The DRB acted within its authority in applying the applicable requirements.

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

Guardian Storage
7501 Holly Avenue NE
Albuquerque, NM 87113

Project# PR-2019-002184
Application#
SI-2019-00379 SITE PLAN DRB
SD-2020-00027 PRELIMINARY/FINAL PLAT

LEGAL DESCRIPTION:
All or a portion of TR G-1 PLAT OF TRACTS F-1 & G-1, ACADEMY PLACE SUBDIVISION, zoned MX-L, located at 4909 JUAN TABO BLVD NE between OSUNA RD and MONTGOMERY BLVD, containing approximately 2.3795 acre(s). (F-21)

On January 29, 2020 the Development Review Board (DRB) held a public meeting concerning the above referenced application and approved the request, with delegation to Hydrology and Planning to address issues, based on the following Findings:

SI-2019-00379 SITE PLAN DRB

1. This is a request for a Site Plan DRB for a 116,700 square-foot self-storage building 35-feet in height.
2. The proper notice was given as required by the IDO in Table 6-1-1.
3. The applicant held a meeting with the affected neighborhood associations on November 5, 2019.
4. 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. Specifically, the height, parking, open space, landscaping and façade meet or exceed the IDO requirements.
   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. The site has access to a full range of urban services including utilities, roads, and emergency services. The ABCWUA issued an availability statement for the site. A Traffic Impact Study was not required. A grading
Official Notice of Decision
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and drainage plan for the entire site has been approved by Hydrology.

6-6[6][3][c] The Site Plan mitigates any significant adverse impacts on the surrounding area to the maximum extent practicable. The site has significant perimeter landscaping: 39,809 square feet of landscaping is proposed and 9,544 square feet are required. The applicant agreed to and added a note on the Site Plan that interior lighting would be reduced to 50% by 9 pm and 25% by 11 pm. The applicant added an additional note stating that the hours of operation for office and gate access are from 7AM to 5:30 PM and gate only access is available until 7 PM.

SD-2020-00027 PRELIMINARY/FINAL PLAT
1. This Preliminary/Final Plat dedicates 2,670 square feet of right-of-way to the City of Albuquerque along Juan Tabo Boulevard NE on the southwest corner of Osuna Road NE and Juan Tabo Boulevard NE.
2. The applicant provided the required notice as outlined in the IDO Table 6-1-1.

Conditions:
1. This Site Plan is valid 5 years from DRB approval (2-13-2020). An extension may be requested prior to the expiration date.
2. Final Sign off is delegated to Hydrology to check for the stamped date for the grading and drainage plan and Planning for the infrastructure List.
3. The applicant will obtain final sign off from Hydrology and Planning by March 29, 2020 or the case may be scheduled for the next DRB hearing and could be denied per the DRB Rules of Procedure.
4. Once the site plan has all the required signatures, a pdf of the complete, a signed-off set shall be emailed to the PLNDRS.

APPEAL: If you wish to appeal this decision, you must do so within 15 days of the DRB’s decision or by FEBRUARY 13, 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). A Non-Refundable filing fee will be calculated at the Land Development Coordination Counter and is required at the time the appeal is filed.

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).
Official Notice of Decision
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Sincerely,

Jolene Wolfley
DRB Chair

JW/jr

CSI – Cartesian Surveys, Inc. 1005 21st Street SE, Suite A, Rio Rancho, NM 87124
City of Albuquerque

DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD APPLICATION

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

SUBDIVISIONS
☐ Major - Preliminary Plat (Form P1)
☐ Minor - Preliminary/Final Plat (Form S2)
☐ Major - Final Plat (Form S1)
☐ Amendment to Preliminary Plat (Form S2)
☐ Extension of Preliminary Plat (Form S1)
☐ MISCELLANEOUS APPLICATIONS
☐ Amendment to Site Plan (Form P2)
☐ Extension of Infrastructure List or IIA (Form S1)
☐ Minor Amendment to Infrastructure List (Form S2)
☐ Temporary Deferral of SW (Form V2)
☐ Sidewalk Waiver (Form V2)
☐ Vacation of Easement(s) DRB (Form V)
☐ Vacation of Private Easement(s) Form V
☐ Sketch Plat Review and Comment (Form S2)
☐ Decision of DRB (Form A)

SITE PLANS
☐ Waiver to IDO (Form V2)
☐ Waiver to DFM (Form V2)
☐ Waiver to DRB (Form P2)

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF REQUEST

REASON OF APPEAL - RE IDO 6-4 (U)(I)(G)(C)

APPLICATION INFORMATION

Applicant: \textit{Alicia Guinones}
Address: PO BOX 21006
City: \textit{Albuquerque, NM}
Phone: 505 267 5495
Email: info@sccsnc.edu
State: NM
Zip:

Professional/Agent (If any):
Address:
City: \textit{Albuquerque, NM}
State: NM
Zip:

Proprietary Interest in Site: List all owners:

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

Lot or Tract No.: TR-01 PLAT OF TRACTS F-1 & G-1
Block:
Unit:
Subdivision/Addition: ACAD EMY PLACE
MRGCD Map No.:
UPC Code:
Zone Atlas Page(s): 00-00000 F-21
Existing Zoning: Mx-L
# of Existing Lots:
# of Proposed Lots:
Total Area of Site (Acres): 2.3795

LOCATION OF PROPERTY BY STREETS

Site Address/Street: 4909 AMAN TAFOO
Between: and:

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

PR-2019-002184

Signature: \textit{Vera Pat for Alicia Guinones}
Printed Name: V. APAT
Date: \textit{February 15, 2020}

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Numbers</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Fees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VA-2020-00057</td>
<td>Appeal</td>
<td>$130.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meeting Date: 2-13-2020
Staff Signature: \textit{N/A}
Fee Total: $130.00
Project #: PR-2019-002184
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? Yes, indicate language: ______________

   A Single PDF file of the complete application including all documents being submitted must be emailed to PLNDRS@cabo.gov prior to making a submittal. Zipped files or those over 8 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: 2019-002184

   Application number of the case being appealed, if applicable: T-2019-00379

   Type of decision being appealed: Site Plan Approval

   Letter of authorization from the appellant if appeal is submitted by an agent

   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)(c)

   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.

Signature: [Signature]
Printed Name: [Printed Name]
Date: 2-13-20

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
Case Numbers:
VA-2020-00057
PR-2019-003184

Staff Signature: [Signature]
Date: 2-13-2020

Revised 2/6/19
Notice of Appeal OF DRB Notification of Decision

AND SUBSEQUENT

REQUEST FOR DISALLOWANCE OF PERMITTING UPON APPEAL FOR PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT OF SELF-STORAGE LOCATED AT 4909 JUAN TABO BLVD. (PR:2019-002184-ON-13-FEB 2019)
Oso Grande Neighborhood Association  
PO Box 21006; Albuquerque, NM 87111  
info@osograndena.org

Planning Department  
Development Services Division  
600 2nd, St. NW, Ground Floor, 87102  
Office (505) 924-3946

Date: Feb. 13, 2020  
From: Oso Grande Neighborhood Assn.  
ATTN: Joleen Wolfley, DRB Chair  
Re: Appeal of Project PR 2019 002184; Application #SI-2019-00379 Site Plan DRB; SD-2020-00027 Preliminary/Final Plat. Applicant: Guardian Storage  
Reference Documents to this Appeal:  
1) NFIP Floodplain Management Requirements: Unit 5.  
https://www.fema.gov/floodplain-management-requirements (not attached to conserve paper)

2) Rules And Regulations Governing Dam Design, Construction and Dam Safety; Dec. 31, 2010:  
https://www.ose.state.nm.us/dams/RegsRules/19-25-12-NMAC-2010%202016-05-27.pdf (not attached to conserve paper)

3) Oso Grande Neighborhood Assn. Regulatory Analysis, Site Risk Factors, Adverse Impacts for Sensitive Lands & Request for Disallowance. (on file with DRB)

Ms. Wolfley:  
Oso Grande Neighborhood Association is appealing the above-named project for proposed storage units located at 4909 Juan Tabo. We disagree with findings in the Official Notification of Decision.

The realities and complexities of attempting to locate a building directly in front of John B. Robert Dam Spillway are daunting. OGNA is not willing to support the utilization of tax dollars on development which increases adverse impacts to the neighborhood, increases harm to life and property, increases flood and dam safety risks, increases nuisance levels, and increases
FEMA flood insurance premiums to homeowners. There are multiple and broad regulations, at County, Federal and State levels that apply in this situation and have direct bearing on the proposed grading, drainage, landscaping, and building design.

Hence far, DRB has not acknowledged that the property, whose character is firmly established as water and flood control infrastructure, is embodied within a comprehensive set of regulations for floodplain and dam management. These regulations exist for a purpose; to assure the safety of the public and to preserve the rights of other property owners.

DRB, has previously justified that it’s within its purview to side-step FEMA and NFIP and NM State Dam Safety regulation. And that may be the case. However, we strongly request that DRB incorporate provisions of pertinent but non-CABQ regulation that has a direct and specific effect on the site plan. This is a means of anticipating that the development still needs to comply with non-IDO regulation. This is to assure the integrity of public safety and hazard mitigations.

We also request that DRB apply the strictest provisions of the IDO because human life and property are at risk as regards the location of proposed development being within floodplain and dam property.

Below are specific issues with the site plan and or proposal that do not meet IDO processes, procedures or code or pertinent regulation or intent of regulation:

- **NFIP Regulation: 44 CFR 59.2 (b):** Calls for communities to adopt floodplain management best practices and meet floodplain management criteria. This is not optional. Federally subsidized flood insurance, upon which Oso Grande Neighborhood depends, requires this adoption. FEMA is not obligated to respond to flood damage in cities where NFIP regulation has been disregarded, side-stepped, or otherwise demonstrates a lack of will to reduce community flood hazard. This imposes significant flood risk for Oso Grande. The Site Plan is inconsistent with NFIP intent and regulation that it asks communities to adhere to. CABQ Planning is obligated to reduce hazards, not increase them as the current proposed site plan does.

- Inundation mapping for John B. Robert dam, drainage field, flood hazard area has not been completed. This mapping is expected to considerably increase the size of the inundation zone, increasing potential damage to Oso Grande residences. The proposal’s 2.3-acre removal of valuable floodplain, via its drainage field, increases hazards to Oso Grande neighborhood. It’s a reasonable request for developer to wait to determine if a building on such a lot is advisable with new floodplain inundation maps and subsequent future requirements of NFIP.

- Site Plan proposes to build on the John B. Robert dam drainage field, west embankment and toe region. OGNA requests that the drainage plan be in accordance, and
coordination with State Engineer and NM Dam Safety Bureau so that the Site Plan will be able to comply with relevant dam safety regulations.

- Several sources of dam runoff water are not accounted for in the drainage plan.
  
  - Subsurface dam drainage pipeline extending from toe to flood channel shows that the property contains dam drainage infrastructure, a public asset. The pipeline water is unaccounted for in the drainage plan. Inspection of this pipe would be hindered with the current site proposal..., hence increasing hazard.
  
  - Site Plan does not consider street runoff on the north-east corner of the property, under ordinary and extraordinary flows.
  
  - Site Plan does not consider John B. Robert Dam western spillway and embankment incidental runoff which was designed to flow specifically onto 4909 Juan Tabo floodplain. Juan Tabo was designed and sloped to drain either partially or fully onto floodplain during times of ordinary or large storm event.
  
  - Site Plan does not consider western embankment subsurface leaking and drainage. Dam is subject to leakage from underneath the dam core. This drainage embankment leakage was designed and intended for the 4909 Juan Tabo drainage field. As in the 2013 rainfall, the dam does not need to detain significant amounts of water for under-embankment leakage to occur. This should be accounted for on the site plan.
  
  - Existing drainage plan P.E. comments section indicates that a spillway overtopping could cause considerable damage to downstream properties. This spillway water needs to be accounted for on PE stamped site plan and accompanying analysis. Displaced flood water from property imposes hazards to Oso Grande residential property that otherwise would not be incurred.
  
  - A dam modification permit is required from NM Dam Safety Bureau. That permit will inform the site plan and should become part of CABQ’s permitting documents.
  
  - The 10-yr. surface rating for the parking lot, is inconsistent with the 100-yr. rating designed on the drainage plan.
  
  - PE Stamped pages are not evident on Site Plan or landscape plan.
Other Appeal Items:

- The building that DRB has permitted is not the building the ZHE approved.
  - The original plan called for noise reduction via indoor loading docks and insulating garage doors. This gave way to noise inducing exterior loading docks located into the acoustically altered canyon and onto the adjacent Trail. Site Plan needs to be re-approved by ZHE.
  - The original plan attempted to satisfy site character issues by dropping the building below grade by up to 15 feet. Hence making the building less obtrusive. Character of the property has been defined as water infrastructure, recreation, and nature experience (See ZHE statement, and LUHO presentation) The building does not meet character criteria. Site Plan should be reapproved by ZHE since character issues were not previously vetted.
  - Subject site was to meet sensitive lands requirements and be studied as such, as designated by ZHE. Because there was no planning for the zoning designation, the approval sequence is out of order. Applicant did not meet requirements for sensitive lands and did not seek to avoid locating in it as required. Appellants have been denied their appeal rights by side-stepping the sensitive lands requirements.
  - OGNA requests that DRB review and double-check that each provision of approval criteria 6-6(G) (3)(a-c) has been met. OGNA notes that several conditions for prior approval for development were supposed to be accomplished prior to DRB approval. Hence these provisions could not be raised at prior hearings. We request that out-of-sequence approvals be rectified. Please contact us for specifics to assure mutual understanding.

OGNA requests to meet with you to discuss the complexities, hazards, safety and adverse impacts of the proposed site plan. Thank You.

Regards
Alicia Quinones, BSEngr., MBA, CRM, Certified Engineering Risk Manager
President, Oso Grande Neighborhood Assn.
quinones@cybermesa.com

OFFICIAL NOTIFICATION OF DECISION

Guardian Storage
7501 Holly Avenue NE
Albuquerque, NM 87113

Project# PR-2019-002184
Application#
SI-2019-00379 SITE PLAN DRB
SD-2020-00027 PRELIMINARY/FINAL PLAT

LEGAL DESCRIPTION:
All or a portion of TR G-1 PLAT OF TRACTS F-1 &
G-1, ACADEMY PLACE SUBDIVISION, zoned MX-L,
located at 4909 JUAN TABO BLVD NE between
OSUNA RD and MONTGOMERY BLVD, containing
approximately 2.3795 acre(s). (F-21)

On January 29, 2020 the Development Review Board (DRB) held a public meeting concerning the
above referenced application and approved the request, with delegation to Hydrology and Planning
to address issues, based on the following Findings:

SI-2019-00379 SITE PLAN DRB

1. This is a request for a Site Plan DRB for a 116,700 square-foot self-storage building 35-feet in
   height.
2. The proper notice was given as required by the IDO in Table 6-1-1.
3. The applicant held a meeting with the affected neighborhood associations on November 5,
   2019.
4. 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. Specifically, the height, parking, open space,
      landscaping and façade meet or exceed the IDO requirements.
   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. The site has access to a full range of urban
      services including utilities, roads, and emergency services. The ABCWUA issued an
      availability statement for the site. A Traffic Impact Study was not required. A grading
and drainage plan for the entire site has been approved by Hydrology.

c. 6-6(G)(3)(c) The Site Plan mitigates any significant adverse impacts on the surrounding area to the maximum extent practicable. The site has significant perimeter landscaping: 39,809 square feet of landscaping is proposed and 9,544 square feet are required. The applicant agreed to and added a note on the Site Plan that interior lighting would be reduced to 50% by 9 pm and 25% by 11 pm. The applicant added an additional note stating that the hours of operation for office and gate access are from 7AM to 5:30 PM and gate only access is available until 7 PM.

SD-2020-00027 PRELIMINARY/FINAL PLAT

1. This Preliminary/Final Plat dedicates 2,670 square feet of right-of-way to the City of Albuquerque along Juan Tabo Boulevard NE on the southwest corner of Osuna Road NE and Juan Tabo Boulevard NE.

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

Conditions:

1. This Site Plan is valid 5 years from DRB approval (2-13-2020). An extension may be requested prior to the expiration date.

2. Final Sign off is delegated to to Hydrology to check for the stamped date for the grading and drainage plan and Planning for the infrastructure List.

3. The applicant will obtain final sign off from Hydrology and Planning by March 29, 2020 or the case may be scheduled for the next DRB hearing and could be denied per the DRB Rules of Procedure.

4. Once the site plan has all the required signatures, a pdf of the complete, a signed-off-set shall be emailed to the PLNDRS.

APPEAL: If you wish to appeal this decision, you must do so within 15 days of the DRB’s decision or by FEBRUARY 13, 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). A Non-Refundable filing fee will be calculated at the Land Development Coordination Counter and is required at the time the appeal is filed.

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).
Official Notice of Decision
Project # PR-2019-002184 Application# SI-2019-00379, SD-2020-00027
Page 3 of 3

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Jolene Wolfley
DRB Chair

JW/jr

CSI – Cartesian Surveys, Inc. 1005 21st Street SE, Suite A, Rio Rancho, NM 87124
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. DR-2019-002184
Application No. SE-2019-00379

TO:
✓ Planning Department/Chair
✓ Hydrology
✓ Transportation Development
✓ Albuquerque/ Bernalillo Co. WUA
✓ Code Enforcement
✓ Parks & Rec
*(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: 01-29-2020 HEARING DATE OF DEFERRAL: 01-15-2020

SUBMITTAL DESCRIPTION: Revised site plan set; infrastructure list; updated A615
Zoning exhibit; Hydrology approval letter.

# Deferral at the January 15, 2020 hearing was based in part on the submittal of a plat. The plat was submitted on January 21, 2020 to be heard on January 27 at DRB.

CONTACT NAME: James K. Strozier

TELEPHONE: 205-764-7500 EMAIL: CPBConsensusPlanning.com
**FIGURE 12**

**INFRASTRUCTURE LIST**
(Rev. 3-16-18)

**EXHIBIT "A"**

TO SUBDIVISION IMPROVEMENTS AGREEMENT
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD (D.R.B.) REQUIRED INFRASTRUCTURE LIST

TRACT G-1 PLAT OF TRACTS F-1 & G-1 ACADEMY PLACE
PROPOSED NAME OF PLAT AND/OR SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN

TRACT G-1 PLAT OF TRACTS F-1 & G-1 ACADEMY PLACE
EXISTING LEGAL DESCRIPTION PRIOR TO PLATING 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 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 owner/agent. 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>Type of Improvement</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PCC SIDEWALK &amp; 2 RAMPS</td>
<td>OSUNA RD NORTH OF SITE</td>
<td>NW CORNER OF SITE</td>
<td>NE CORNER OF SITE @ TABO (312 FT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18&quot; RCP SD TO CHANNEL OUTFALL</td>
<td>SW CORNER OF SITE</td>
<td>SOUTH PL</td>
<td>ARROYO OUTFALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUTFALL STRUCTURE &amp; CONC RUNDOWN</td>
<td>SW CORNER OF SITE</td>
<td>TOP OF SHOTCRETE CHANNEL SLOPE</td>
<td>TOP OF CONC CHNL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVICE CONN TO NON-POTABLE WL</td>
<td>JUAN TABO RD</td>
<td>8&quot; NON-POTABLE WL</td>
<td>BACK OF CURB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Certification</th>
<th>Private Inspector</th>
<th>P.E.</th>
<th>City Cnst Engineer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18&quot; RCP SD TO CHANNEL OUTFALL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUTFALL STRUCTURE &amp; CONC RUNDOWN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVICE CONN TO NON-POTABLE WL</td>
<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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Type of Improvement</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AGENT / OWNER**

**DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD MEMBER APPROVALS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME (print)</th>
<th>DRB CHAIR - date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JESUS LOPEZ</td>
<td>PARKS &amp; RECREATION - date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESPEC</td>
<td>TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT - date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRM</td>
<td>AMAFCA - date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGNATURE</td>
<td>UTILITY DEVELOPMENT - date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CODE ENFORCEMENT - date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CITY ENGINEER - date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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>
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(Rev. 3/16/18)
December 23, 2019

Jesus Lopez
Respec
5971 Jefferson St. NE
Albuquerque, NM 87109

RE: Guardian Storage- Juan Tabo
4909 Juan Tabo NE
Conceptual Grading and Drainage Plan Stamp Date: 12/20/19
Hydrology File: F21D081

Dear Mr. Lopez:

Based on the submittal received on 12/19/19, the Conceptual Grading and Drainage Plan is approved for Site Plan for Building Permit.

Prior to Building Permit (For Information):
1. Remove all "Conceptual" markings.
2. As a reminder, if the project total area of disturbance (including the staging area and any work within the adjacent Right-of-Way) is 1 acre or more, then an Erosion and Sediment Control (ESC) Plan and Owner’s certified Notice of Intent (NOI) is required to be submitted to the Stormwater Quality Engineer (Doug Hughes, PE, jhughes@cabq.gov, 924-3420) 14 days prior to any earth disturbance.
3. Provide hydraulic calculations for the proposed storm drain outfall, calculated along the Energy Grade Line; include both the HGL and EGLs. The 10-yr water surface in Bear Canyon Arroyo may be used as the control surface for the storm drain HGL calculations.
4. Additional comments may be provided at Building Permit, based on the outcome of the above remarks and level of detail shown on plans.

If you have any questions, please contact me at 924-3695 or dpeterson@cabq.gov.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Dana Peterson, P.E.
Senior Engineer, Planning Dept.
Development Review Services
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
☐ Major - Preliminary Plat (Form P1)
☐ Amendment to Site Plan (Form P2)
☐ Vacation of Public Right-of-way (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)
☐ Minor Amendment to Infrastructure List (Form S2)
☐ PRE-APPLICATIONS
☐ Extension of Preliminary Plat (Form S1)
☐ Temporary Deferral of SW (Form V2)
☐ Sketch Plat Review and Comment (Form S2)
☐ Sidewalk Waiver (Form V2)
☐ APPEAL
☐ Waiver to IDO (Form V2)
☐ Waiver to DPM (Form V2)
☐ Decision of DRB (Form A)

SITE PLANS
☐ DRB Site Plan (Form P2)

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF REQUEST

APPLICATION INFORMATION
Applicant:
Address:
City: Albuquerque, NM 87113
State: NM
Zip: 87113
Phone: 505-450-6385
Email: m roads72@comcast.net

Professional/Agent (if any):
Address:
City: Albuquerque, NM 87113
State: NM
Zip: 87124
Phone: 896-3050
Email: wplohterjr@gmail.com

Proprietary Interest in Site:
List all owners:

SITE INFORMATION (Accuracy of the existing legal description is crucial! Attach a separate sheet if necessary.)
Lot or Tract No.: Tract G-1, Plots of F1 and G1
Block: Unit:
Subdivision/Addition: Academy Place
MRGCD Map No.: UPC Code:
Zone Atlas Page(s): E-21
Existing Zoning: MX-2
Proposed Zoning:
# of Existing Lots: 1
# of Proposed Lots: 1
Total Area of Site (Acres): 2.3790

LOCATION OF PROPERTY BY STREETS
Site Address/Street: 4909 Juan Tabo
Between: and: Montgomery NE

CASE HISTORY (List any current or prior project and case number(s) that may be relevant to your request.)
2019-00379 2019-002184

Signature: Date: 1/21/2020
Printed Name: Willo Plotner Jr.
☐ Applicant or Agent

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Numbers</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Fees</th>
<th>Case Numbers</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Fees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Meeting Date:
Staff Signature:

Fee Total:
Project #
FORM S2: SUBDIVISION OF LAND - MINOR ACTIONS

Please refer to the DRB minor schedule for meeting dates and deadlines unless noted differently below. Bring original Mylar of plat with property owner's and City Surveyor's signatures on it to the meeting. Your attendance is required.

A Variance – DRB for the Bulk Transfer of Land requires application on Form V in addition to this FORM S2.

>> INFORMATION REQUIRED FOR ALL MINOR SUBDIVISION APPLICATIONS

☑ Interpreter Needed for Hearing? __________ if yes, indicate language: ____________________________

☑ A Single PDF file of the complete application including all documents being submitted must be emailed to PLNDRS@csab.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 S2 at the front followed by the remaining documents in the order provided on this form.

☑ Zone Atlas map with the entire site clearly outlined and labeled

☐ SKETCH PLAT REVIEW AND COMMENT

- Letter describing, explaining, and justifying the request
- Scale drawing of the proposed subdivision plat (7 copies, folded)
- Site sketch with measurements showing structures, parking, building setbacks, adjacent rights-of-way and street improvements, if there is any existing land use (7 copies, folded)

☐ MAJOR SUBDIVISION FINAL PLAT APPROVAL (requires published notice, heard on the DRB Major Case Schedule)

- Letter describing, explaining, and justifying the request
- Copy of recorded IIA
- Proposed Final Plat (7 copies, 24" x 36" folded)
- Design elevations & cross sections of perimeter walls (3 copies)
- Landfill disclosure and EHD signature line on the Mylar if property is within a landfill buffer
- DXF file and hard copy of final plat data for AGIS submitted and approved

☑ MINOR SUBDIVISION PRELIMINARY/FINAL PLAT APPROVAL

☑ Letter describing, explaining, and justifying the request per the criteria in IDO Section 14-16-6-6(f)

☑ Sites 5 acres or greater; Archaeological Certificate in accordance with IDO Section 14-16-6-5(A)

☑ Form DRWS Drainage Report, Grading and Drainage Plan, and Water & Sewer Availability Statement submittal information

☑ Required notice with content per IDO Section 14-16-6-4(k)(6)

☑ Office of Neighborhood Coordination Public Notice Inquiry response

☑ Proof of emailed notice to applicable Neighborhood Association representatives

☑ Proposed Preliminary/Final Plat with property owner's and City Surveyor's signatures on the plat prior to submittal (7 copies, folded)

☑ Sidewalk Exhibit and/or cross sections of proposed streets (3 copies, 11" x 17" maximum)

☑ Site sketch with measurements showing structures, parking, building setbacks, adjacent rights-of-way and street improvements (to include sidewalk, curb & gutter with distance to property line noted) if there is any existing land use (7 copies, folded)

☑ Landfill disclosure statement per IDO Section 14-16-5-2(G) if site is within a designated landfill buffer zone

☑ Proposed Infrastructure List, if applicable

☑ DXF file and hard copy of final plat data for AGIS submitted and approved

☐ MINOR AMENDMENT TO PRELIMINARY PLAT OR INFRASTRUCTURE LIST

- Letter describing, explaining, and justifying the request per the criteria in IDO Section 14-16-6-4(X)(2)

- Original Preliminary Plat, Infrastructure List, and/or Grading Plan (7 copies, folded)

- Proposed Amended Preliminary Plat, Infrastructure List, and/or Grading Plan (7 copies, folded)

Note: Any application that does not qualify as a Minor Amendment in IDO Section 14-16-6-4(X) must be processed as a Major Amendment. See Form S1.

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

Signature: ____________________________

Printed Name: ________________

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Case Numbers: ____________

Project Number: ____________

Staff Signature: ____________________________

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

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).

Gray Shading Represents Area Outside of the City Limits

Zone Atlas Page: F-21-Z

- Easement
- Escarpment
- Petroglyph National Monument
- Areas Outside of City Limits
- Airport Protection Overlay (APO) Zone
- Character Protection Overlay (CPO) Zone
- Historic Protection Overlay (HPO) Zone
- View Protection Overlay (VPO) Zone

0 250 500 1,000 Feet
January 21, 2020  
Development Review Board  
City of Albuquerque  

Re: Proposed Tract G-1-A, Academy Place  

Members of the Board:  

Cartesian Surveys is acting as an agent for the owner and request a final plat review and approval of a plat to dedicate additional right-of-way to the City of Albuquerque along Juan Tabo Blvd. N.E. It is located at 4909 Juan Tabo Blvd. N.E. on the southwest corner of Osuna Rd. N.E. and Juan Tabo Blvd. N.E. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Jayson Pyne
Clarifications,

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Association Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Address Line 1</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip</th>
<th>Mobile Phone</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ambrogi, Don-Owner/Owner</td>
<td>Teresa</td>
<td>Lewis</td>
<td><a href="mailto:teresa@wei.com">teresa@wei.com</a></td>
<td>2952 Pueblo Alto</td>
<td>Santa Fe</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>87507</td>
<td>5054998574</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambrogi, Don-Owner/Owner</td>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Ferrel</td>
<td><a href="mailto:superman@gmail.com">superman@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4908 Serena Drive NE</td>
<td>Albuquerque</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>87111</td>
<td>5054817463</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desert &amp; Coalition of Neighborhood Associations</td>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>Kuklins</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mkkuklins@gmail.com">mkkuklins@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>13709 Canyon Rd NW</td>
<td>Albuquerque</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>87111</td>
<td>5052898483</td>
<td>5052894838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desert &amp; Coalition of Neighborhood Associations</td>
<td>Donald</td>
<td>Cochran</td>
<td><a href="mailto:DFCochran@gmail.com">DFCochran@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>6841 Coorsville Rd NW</td>
<td>Albuquerque</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>87111</td>
<td>5052898129</td>
<td>5052891221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Grove NA</td>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>Kuklins</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mkkuklins@gmail.com">mkkuklins@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4912 Berman Court NE</td>
<td>Albuquerque</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>87111</td>
<td>5052898483</td>
<td>5052894838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Grove NA</td>
<td>Albert</td>
<td>Kuklins</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mkkuklins@gmail.com">mkkuklins@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>10117 Camino Del Oro NE</td>
<td>Albuquerque</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>87111</td>
<td>5052898129</td>
<td>5052891221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John R Roberts NA</td>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>Heib</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sueh@comcast.net">sueh@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>11314 Overlook NE</td>
<td>Albuquerque</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>87111</td>
<td>5052891758</td>
<td>5052891758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John R Roberts NA</td>
<td>Larry</td>
<td>Wall</td>
<td><a href="mailto:larrywil@ymail.com">larrywil@ymail.com</a></td>
<td>11308 Overlook NE</td>
<td>Albuquerque</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>87111</td>
<td>5052891758</td>
<td>5052891758</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Respectfully,

Vincente M. Quevedo, AICP
Neighborhood Liaison
Office of Neighborhood Coordination
City of Albuquerque - City Council
(505) 768 3572

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

Confidential 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. As 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 at mailinator.com (webmaster-cabq.gov at mailinator.com); On Behalf Of IDO WestMaster
Sent: Wednesday, August 21, 2019 9:52 PM
To: Office of Neighborhood Coordination; johnson@comcast.net; planning@cityofalbuquerque.org
Cc: Office of Neighborhood Coordination; johnson@comcast.net; planning@cityofalbuquerque.org
Subject: Neighborhood Meeting Inquiry Form

Neighborhood Meeting Inquiry Form:
Development Review Board
If you selected "Other" in the question above, please describe what you are seeking a Neighborhood Meeting Inquiry form for below.

Contact Name
Ch lene Johnson
Telephone Number
5052894838
Email Address
johnson@comcast.net/planning.com
Company Name
Compass Planning, Inc.
Company Address
202 El Estor Street NW
City
Albuquerque
State
NM
ZIP
87105

Legal description of the subject site for this project:

4909 Juan Tabo Boulevard, NE

Subject site area: 2.7975 acres

This message has been analyzed by Sony Discovery Email Inspector.
CSI-Cartesian Surveys Inc.
PO Box 44414, Rio Rancho, NM 87174
896-3050   Fax 891-0244

RE: The Southwesterly corner of the intersection of Osuna Rd NW and Juan Tabo Rd NW

Hello,

If you are receiving this notice, it is because you were entered into a the cities data base as a neighborhood association contact and the project in which we are working in is located within an area that the city has decided is “within your area” and we are obligated to notify you of any platting actions that is in that area.

The location of the proposed plat is at the southwesterly corner of Osuna and Juan Tabo NE also known as Tract G-1, Academy Place. I’ve also attached a Plat and Zone Atlas Page showing the proposed subdivision and the plat.

This letter is notification that CSI-Cartesian Surveys Inc. will submit the plat to dedicate right of way along Juan Tabo NE to the City of Albuquerque Development Review Board who has oversight in these matters.

As part of the IDO regulations we are required to formally notify you of our application submittal. If you would like more information, you can call me at 896-3050 or should you desire to attend the DRB hearing it will be held on January 29, 2020, 9:00 A.M. at the Plaza Del Sol building in the basement. The address of the Plaza Del Sol Building is 600 2nd Street NW, Albuquerque NM 87102. The meeting has an agenda and each items is called in order of that agenda, so the exact time is not known. Usually the entire meeting lasts about 2-3 hours, however, there have been meetings that have lasts 5-6 hours.

Will Plotner, Jr.
CSI-Cartesian Surveys Inc.
P.O. Box 44414
Rio Rancho, NM 87174
(505) 896-3050 you must first dial 1 and then the Ext. 103
Good Morning,

This email is to inform you of a final platting action with your neighborhood. I have attached a PDF of the Plat, Notification letter and Zone Atlas Page. Let me know if you have any questions or concerns.

--

Thanks,

Jayson Pyne
May 9, 2019

Jesus Lopez
RESPEC
5971 Jefferson St. NE Suite 101
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87109

RE: Water and Sanitary Sewer Availability Statement #190317
Guardian Storage
4909 Juan Tabo

Dear Mr. Lopez:

Project Description: The subject site is located on the southwest corner of Osuna Rd. and Juan Tabo Blvd. within the City of Albuquerque. The proposed development consists of approximately 2.4 acres and the property is currently zoned MX-L for Mixed-Use Low Intensity. The property lies within the Pressure Zone 7E in the Montgomery trunk. The request for availability indicates plans to construct a three story indoor self-storage building with a small office.

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

- Six inch ductile iron pipe distribution main (project #26-2010-84) along Osuna Rd.
- 16 inch concrete cylinder transmission main (project #) along Juan Tabo Blvd.

Non-potable infrastructure in the area consists of the following:

- 16 inch ductile iron pipe transmission main (project #26-5762.08-05) along Osuna Rd.
- Eight inch ductile iron pipe distribution main stub-out (project #26-5762.08-05) along Juan Tabo Blvd.

Sanitary sewer infrastructure in the area consists of the following:

- Eight inch PVC collector line (project #26-5402.81-97) along Osuna Rd.

Water Service: New metered water service to the property can be provided via routine connection to the existing six inch distribution main along Osuna Rd. Please note that connections to waterlines 16 inch or greater are prohibited.

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.

Non-Potable Water Service (if applicable): New metered non-potable water service to the property can be provided contingent upon a developer funded project to extend the eight inch stub-out along Juan Tabo as per as-builts 5762.08. The waterline should be extended far enough to have a perpendicular connection to provide irrigation service.
to the proposed property. Please note that connections to waterlines 16 inch or greater are prohibited.

**Sanitary Sewer Service:** New sanitary sewer service can be provided via routine connection to the existing infrastructure mentioned above. All food service establishments 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 3,625 gallons-per-minute and four required fire hydrants. As modeled using InfoWater™ computer software, the fire flow can be met. The required fire flow was analyzed and split at the two proposed fire hydrant connections along Osuna Rd.

The fire one plan is proposing four onsite fire hydrants. The fire hydrants were not indicated if they are going to be private or public. Please note that any on-site fire hydrants are considered private and should be painted safety orange.

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 289-3439 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 Water Authority Mini Work Order process. If the non-potable water line is extended, then a City Work Order will be required. Construction must be performed by a licensed and 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 availability statement provides a commitment from the Water Authority to provide services to the development, as long as identified conditions are met. It will remain in effect for a period of one 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,

Mark S. Sanchez
Executive Director

Enclosures: Infrastructure Maps (2)

f/ Availability Statement 190317
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Surveyor's Certificate

U. NEIL PLATER, R.L. (PLATER/ 121271)

CSI-CARTESIAN SURVEYS INC.
P.O. BOX 44114 RIO RANCHO, N.M. 87174
Phone (505) 896-3490 Fax (505) 899-0344

Sheets 1 of 2

Easement Notes
1. Existing 130' drainage easement and underground sewer and water line easement (09/24/1975, DE-172)
2. Existing 10' underground PNM easement (11/15/2004, BK 466, PO. 5811, DOC. NO. 004156043)
   Based upon real location of the electric line in place
3. Existing 10' utility easement (10/13/1967, BK DE, PG 16)
4. Existing 10' public sidewalk easement (02/25/2003, 2003-40)

Plat for
Tract G-1-A
Academy Place
Being Comprised of
Tract G-1
Academy Place
City of Albuquerque
Bernalillo County, New Mexico
January 2020

Legend
- Measured bearings and distances
- Recorded bearings and distances
- Found monument as indicated
- Set survey marker "SL 14277"
- Unless otherwise noted
- Found control monument "LS 7779"

Public Utility Easements
PUBLIC UTILITY EASEMENTS shown on this plat are granted for the common and joint use of:

A. Public Service Company of New Mexico ("PNM") A New Mexico Corporation (PNM Electric) for installation, maintenance, and service of overhead and underground electrical lines, transformers, and other equipment and related facilities reasonably necessary to provide electrical services.

B. New Mexico Gas Company for installation, maintenance, and service of natural gas lines, valves and other equipment and facilities reasonably necessary to provide natural gas service.

C. Great Corporation 404/0 CenVeck Inc. QC for the installation, maintenance, and service of such lines, cable, and other related equipment and facilities reasonably necessary to provide communication services.

D. Cable TV for the installation, maintenance, and service of such lines, cable, and other related equipment and facilities reasonably necessary to provide Cable services.

Included is the right to build, rebuild, construct, reconstruct, locate, relocate, change, remove, replace, modify, renew, operate and maintain facilities for purposes described above, together with free access to, from, and over said easements, with the right and privilege of going upon, over and across adjoining lands of grantor for the purposes set forth herein and with the right to utilize the right of way and easement to extend services to customers of Grantor, including sufficient working area space for electric transformers, with the right and privilege to trim and remove trees, shrubs or bushes which interfere with the purposes set forth herein. No building, sign, pool (aboveground or subsurface), hot tub, concrete or wood pool deck, or other structure shall be erected or constructed on said easements, nor shall any well be drilled or operated thereon. Property owners shall be solely responsible for correcting any violations of National Electrical Safety Code by construction of pools, decks, or any structures adjacent to or near easements shown on this plat.

Easements for electric transformer/switchgears, as installed, shall extend ten (10) feet in front of transformer/switchgear doors and five (5) feet on each side.

Disclaimer
In approving this plat, Public Service Company of New Mexico (PNM) and New Mexico Gas Company (NAMG) did not conduct a Title Search of the properties shown herein. Consequently, PNM and NAMG do not waive or release any easement or right-of-way rights which may have been granted by prior plat, replat or other document and which are not shown on this plat.

CSI-CARTESIAN SURVEYS INC.
P.O. BOX 4414 RIO RANCHO, N.M. 87174
Phone (505) 896-3092 Fax (505) 891-9944
Sheet 2 of 2
wukenre@gmail.com
Plat for Tract G-1-A
Academy Place
Being Comprised of Tract G-1
Academy Place
City of Albuquerque
Bernalillo County, New Mexico
January 2020

Project Number: PR-781-00184
Application Number: 80-100-00017

Treasurer's Certificate
This is to certify that the taxes are current and paid on this property.
Property owner of record: St. Juan Tabo Land, LLC
Bernalillo County Assessor's Office

Subdivision Data

- Acres: 2.3790
- Zone Atlas Page: J-21-Z
- Number of Lots: 1
- Miles of Full-Width Streets: 0.00 Miles
- Half-Width Streets: 0.00 Miles
- Date of Survey: July 2018

Solar Collection Note
No property within the area of this plat shall be subject to a deed restriction, covenant, or building agreement prohibiting the installation of solar panels on the lots or parcels within the area of proposed plat. The foregoing requirement shall be a condition to approval of this plat.

Legal Description
Lot number G-1 A as the same is shown and designated on the plat of Tracts F-1 and G-1 Academy Place, City of Albuquerque, New Mexico, filed in the office of the county clerk of Bernalillo County, New Mexico, on February 23, 2003, in book 2003, page 40.

Surveyor's Certificate
The undersigned, a professional land surveyor under the laws of the state of New Mexico, do certify that this plat and description were prepared by me, or under my supervision, and that all easements shown on this plat of record on file with the county clerk are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.

[Signature]
[Stamp]

CSI-CARTESIAN SURVEYS INC.
P.O. Box 4414, Rio Rancho, N.M. 87174
Phone: (505) 896-3060 Fax (505) 891-0344
wpcartesii@gmail.com
Sheet 1 of 2
1/8/2020
Public Utility Easements

PUBLIC UTILITY EASEMENTS shown on this plat are granted for the common and joint use of:

A. Public Service Company of New Mexico ("PXM"), a New Mexico corporation, (PXM Electric) for installation, maintenance, and service of overhead and underground electrical lines, transformers, and other equipment and related facilities reasonably necessary to provide electric services.

B. New Mexico Gas Company for installation, maintenance, and service of natural gas lines, valves and other equipment and facilities reasonably necessary to provide natural gas services.

C. Quest Corporation d/b/a Continental GC for the installation, maintenance, and service of such lines, cables, and other related equipment and facilities reasonably necessary to provide communication services.

D. Cable IV for the installation, maintenance, and service of such lines, cables, and other related equipment and facilities reasonably necessary to provide cable services.

In approving this plat, Public Service Company of New Mexico ("PXM") and New Mexico Gas Company ("NMGC") did not conduct a Title Search of the properties shown herein. Conclusively, PXM and NMGC do not waive or release any easement or covenant rights which may have been granted by prior plat, replat or other document and which are not shown on this plat.

CSI-CARTESIAN SURVEYS INC.
P.O. Box 4444 Rio Rancho, N.M. 87124
Phone (505) 896-3820 Fax (505) 891-0244
wypersonal@gmail.com
From: Wolfley, Jolene  
Sent: Wednesday, January 15, 2020 11:15 AM  
To: Gomez, Angela J. 
Cc: Gould, Maggie S. 
Subject: FW: Guardian Storage DRB Follow-up 
Attachments: PD_ELEVATIONS-JUAN TABO & OSUNA RD_W TREES.pdf

Angela,
Sorry for not sending these to you.
Please send to all DRB members and include in the record for the case.

From: Charlene Johnson <Johnson@consensusplanning.com>  
Sent: Thursday, December 19, 2019 10:46 AM  
To: Gould, Maggie S. <MGould@cabq.gov>  
Cc: Jim Strozier <cp@consensusplanning.com>; Scott Culler <Culler@consensusplanning.com>; Sheldon Greer (Sheldon.Greer@respec.com) <Sheldon.Greer@respec.com>; Paul Hedges <pdhedges@hotmail.com>; Dawson Hedges <hedges72@comcast.net>; Wolfley, Jolene <jwolfley@cabq.gov>  
Subject: Guardian Storage DRB Follow-up

Hi Maggie,

I’m emailing with some of the items we identified for follow up from the City. Please look this over and let me know if I’m missing anything or you need clarification.

- **Water Authority Comments**: Please send us the Official Water Authority comments. They were missing from the group you sent on Tuesday evening.

- **Color of Trim Materials**: Review IDO Section 5-2(4)(1)(b) 1 – Page 205. Trim materials on facades constituting less than 20% of the façade’s opaque surface may be any color. The wasabi green trim is far below 20%. We will be adding our calculations of the wasabi trim color to the site elevations.

- **Loading Spaces**: Review IDO Table 5-5-7 – Off Street Loading Space Requirements – Page 248. I believe you stated that you were going to check with Jacobo about whether the MX-L Zone falls into the “All Other Zone Categories” in the table. If so, we calculated that we are required one loading space which will be accommodated at the loading area on the south side of the building. Please verify.

- **Meeting to discuss west wall**: We would like to set up a meeting with Jacobo and Shahab to discuss the design and location of west wall abutting the Water Authority lot. Can you help us get that set up?

- **Grading elevations**: I’ve attached the elevations that were in the application. They were on the last page in the “Exhibits” section. These were also included in the Site Plan package we sent to the Neighborhood Associations as part of the application notification.

Thank you for all your help Maggie. Have nice holidays!
Charlene Johnson, Planner
CONSENSUS PLANNING, INC.
302 Eighth Street NW
Albuquerque, NM 87102
phone (505) 764-9801 :: fax (505) 842-5495

This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
Add this email to the file for Project at 4904 Juan Tabo.

From: Charlene Johnson <Johnson@consensusplanning.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 16, 2020 3:10 PM
To: dhc@zianet.com; 'Alicia Quinones' <quinones@cybermesa.com>; viv_at@yahoo.com; 'Lars Wells' <larswells@yahoo.com>; Sue Hilt <suzy0910@comcast.net>
Cc: Jim Strozier <cp@consensusplanning.com>; Dawson Hedges <hedges72@comcast.net>; Paul Hedges <pdhedges@hotmail.com>; Gould, Maggie S. <MGould@cabq.gov>; Wolfley, Jolene <jwolfley@cabq.gov>; Charlene Johnson <Johnson@consensusplanning.com>
Subject: RE: Guardian Storage Site Plan Supplemental Submittal

As neighborhood representatives requested at the January 15th meeting, here are the horizontal elevations of the proposed Guardian Storage building from Juan Tabo Boulevard and Osuna Road with landscaping. These were included in the original submittal as an exhibit.

Best,

Charlene Johnson, Planner
CONSENSUS PLANNING, INC.
302 Eighth Street NW
Albuquerque, NM 87102
phone (505) 764-9801 :: fax (505) 842-5495

From: Charlene Johnson
Sent: Monday, January 13, 2020 4:16 PM
To: dhc@zianet.com; 'Alicia Quinones' <quinones@cybermesa.com>; viv_at@yahoo.com; 'Lars Wells' <larswells@yahoo.com>; Sue Hilt <suzy0910@comcast.net>
Cc: Jim Strozier (cp@consensusplanning.com) <cp@consensusplanning.com>; Dawson Hedges <hedges72@comcast.net>; Paul Hedges <pdhedges@hotmail.com>; Gould, Maggie S. <mgould@cabq.gov>
Subject: Guardian Storage Site Plan Supplemental Submittal

Dear neighbors,

We submitted supplemental materials to DRB on Friday, January 10 for the DRB hearing on January 15th. As a courtesy, I’ve attached the submitted updated site plans for your review.

Thank you for your time –

Charlene Johnson, Planner
CONSENSUS PLANNING, INC.
302 Eighth Street NW
Albuquerque, NM 87102
phone (505) 764-9801 :: fax (505) 842-5495
This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
December 8, 2019

In Matters Regarding Proposed Storage Units at 4909 Juan Tabo, by Guardian Storage & Extra Space Storage.

Case Number: PR-2019-002184 on 18December2019

FROM: Residents of Oso Grande (signatures are provided at the end of this letter.)
TO: Development Review Board

Jolene Wolfley, DRB Chair, Planning Dept: JWolfley@cabq.gov
Maggie Gould, Sr. Planner for DRB: MGould@cabq.gov
Administrator: AGomez@cabq.gov

Info Copy to:
Mayor Keller’s office: MRoss@cabq.gov
Joe Valles, CABQ: joevalles@cabq.gov

We are concerned residents in the neighborhood of El Oso Grande with homes located or near the floodplain downstream from the John B. Robert Dam. We are aware that the planned development on the floodplain identified as the 2.3 acre parcel, 4909 Juan Tabo is a FEMA defined floodway and FEMA defined flood prone area. The FEMA map dated 2008 indicates moderate risk to downstream residents. However, this map is extremely outdated. In our opinion, the 2008 map is likely underestimating the level of damage that could occur in the event of a significant flood.

Over the past two years, the floodplain located on the subject property has eroded and does not appear to be able to handle a significant flood. Any type of construction on this property will not only remove the capacity of the floodplain to appropriately function as its intended purpose resulting in increased flood waters downstream, but it will increase risks for loss of life and property.

The annual flood insurance premium is already extremely high. We are concerned that as FEMA re-evaluates current flood risk in this area along with the increases risks associated with the development in the floodplain, the annual cost for flood insurance will be unaffordable. These increased risks will significantly and unfairly increase the financial burden of the downstream residents – additional risks that could and should be avoided by disallowing any and all building structure on the floodplain. Executive Order 11988 emphasizes the requirement for agencies to select alternative sites for projects outside the floodplains. Alternatively, the authorities with the power to make such decisions should seek to maintain the floodplain in its natural state and improve its ability to function as intended. ~
December 8, 2019
In Matters Regarding Proposed Storage Units at 4909 Juan Tabo, by Guardian Storage & Extra Space Storage.
Case Number: PR-2019-002184 on 18December2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beth Baker</td>
<td>Beth Baker</td>
<td>10308 Camino Del Cielo</td>
<td>12/10/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gene Golden</td>
<td>Gene Golden</td>
<td>10333 Camino Del Cielo</td>
<td>12/10/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Neff</td>
<td>V. Neff</td>
<td>10317 Camino Del Oso</td>
<td>12/10/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Tinley</td>
<td>Patricia Tinley</td>
<td>10376 Camino Del Oso</td>
<td>12/10/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. A. V. G.</td>
<td>H. A. V. G.</td>
<td>10362 Camino Del Oso</td>
<td>12/10/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Baker</td>
<td>Ed Baker</td>
<td>10308 Camino Del Cielo</td>
<td>12/10/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Squires</td>
<td>Dan Squires</td>
<td>10309 Camino Del Oso</td>
<td>12/10/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn Jackson</td>
<td>Kathryn Jackson</td>
<td>10409 Camino Del Oso</td>
<td>12/10/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauren Munsfield</td>
<td>Lauren Munsfield</td>
<td>10413 Camino Del Oso</td>
<td>12/10/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne Wermhood</td>
<td>Wayne Wermhood</td>
<td>10304 Camino Del Oso</td>
<td>12/10/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Hirtz</td>
<td>Linda Hirtz</td>
<td>10374 Camino Del Oso</td>
<td>12/10/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Fish</td>
<td>Stephen Fish</td>
<td>10350 Camino Del Oso</td>
<td>12/10/2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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December 8, 2019  
In Matters Regarding Proposed Storage Units at 4909 Juan Tabo, by Guardian Storage & Extra Space Storage.  
Case Number: PR-2019-002184 on 18 December 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steven Gonzales</td>
<td></td>
<td>4913 Noreen Ct NE</td>
<td>9 Dec 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara Brant</td>
<td></td>
<td>4913 Noreen C NE</td>
<td>9 Dec 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td>4901 Noreen Ct</td>
<td>10 Dec 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAROLYN KELLY</td>
<td>Carolyn Kelly</td>
<td>4900 Purcell Dr NE 12-9-19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheryl Yurko</td>
<td>Cheryl Yurko</td>
<td>4905 North East NE 12/10/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
December 8, 2019
In Matters Regarding Proposed Storage Units at 4909 Juan Tabo, by Guardian Storage & Extra Space Storage.
Case Number: PR-2019-002184 on 18 December 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theresa S. Quinones</td>
<td></td>
<td>4900 Alvarado NE</td>
<td>Dec. 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Evansovich</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Notification of the Public via Written Statement of Findings

* FEMA regulations and procedures for E.O. 11988 must incorporate the development and issuance of a written statement of findings and public explanation which includes the following items as articulated in E.O. 11988:
1. A description of why the proposed action must be located in the floodplain.
2. A description of all significant facts considered in making the determination, including alternative sites and actions.
3. A statement indicating whether the actions conform to applicable State or local floodplain protection standards.

Section 2(a)(4) of E.O. 11988 requires the same public notice procedures as E.O. 11514 for actions in the floodplain even though impacts are not significant enough to require the public review required for preparation of an environmental impact statement (EIS).


I respectfully ask City Staff to consider these issues and regulations per IDO 1-8(8) in their assessment of appropriateness of the possible issuance of a building permit for Project PR 2019-002184, 4909 Juan Tabo Blvd. NE.

Sincerely,

Janie McGuigan
B.A., M.C.R.P. (Masters in City and Regional Planning)
Member of the Oso Grande Neighborhood Association
4924 Purcell Dr. NE
Albuquerque, NM 87111
janiemc07@gmail.com
505-918-1884

Attachment: Oso Grande FEMA National Flood Hazard Layer Map
December 9, 2019

Ms. Jolene Wolffey  
Associate Director and Chair  
Development Review Board  
Planning Department, City of Albuquerque  
600 Second NW  
Albuquerque, NM 87102

Re: Project PR 2019-002184, 4909 Juan Tabo Blvd. NE

Dear Ms. Wolffey,

As you are aware Consensus Planning has submitted an application to the Development Review Board for a Site Plan-DRB for the property located at 4909 Juan Tabo Boulevard NE on behalf of Guardian Storage and the property owner SL Juan Tabo Land, LLC. The site plan calls for an Indoor Storage Building to be constructed on this 2.37 acre area. The site is located near: a) John Roberts Dam overseen by AMAFCA and the Bear Canyon Arroyo Resource Management Plan Area Rank III; and b) within a 100-year Federal Emergency Management Administration (FEMA) designated flood plain. The site plan review for this property is scheduled for the Wednesday, December 18, 2019 DRB meeting.

The City of Albuquerque Development Review Board (DRB) is charged with administering the Integrated Development Ordinance regulations, as revised and updated May 2018; and, in particular IDO section 1-8(B) which states:

IDO 1-8(B)  If any regulation in this IDO conflicts with other applicable laws or regulations of the City, or conflicts with applicable state or federal law, the more restrictive provision shall prevail, unless the provisions of state or federal law, as interpreted by the courts, prevent that result.

The following issues have been identified relative to the applicable laws and regulations.

Location of Project in the Bear Canyon Arroyo Floodplain

Per the attached map from the FEMA National Flood Hazard Layer Firmentte, the proposed project is located in a Flood Hazard Zone AE area (shaded tan on the map). In addition, John Robert Dam [ID: NM000406] is located on the Bear Canyon Arroyo River and is rated by the US Corp of Engineers in its National Inventory of Dams as a “High” Risk. See US Army Corp of Engineers, National Inventory of Dams --


Additionally, it could be said that the City of Albuquerque is in essence encouraging location of new construction in a flood prone area, by zoning the subject property as MX-L. In this document, Floodplain Management in the United States: An Assessment Report, Volume 2, Page 1012, it states that: “Government agencies are generally not liable for flood damage unless the flood was caused by a government action [Editor’s note: government action could be interpreted as a zoning classification
granted to a property owner). It is only where a government unit causes flood damages or increases natural flood damages that liability may arise.”

Listed below are the applicable Local, State or Federal Laws that the proposed project PR 2019-002184 should be assessed by as to whether the provisions are being upheld:

* National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, as amended (42 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.), and the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (Public Law 93-234, 87 Star. 975), states that a proposed project shall “avoid to the extent possible the long and short term adverse impacts associated with the occupancy and modification of floodplains to avoid direct or indirect support of floodplain development wherever there is a practicable alternative.” In reality, the proposed indoor storage building will: a) remove the capacity of an estimated 2.37 acres of watershed absorption ability and flood containment from the OsO Grande portion of the floodplain; and, b) transfer property damage risks and adverse impacts onto nearby private property owners.

* Federal Executive Order 11988 dated May 24, 1977 regarding Floodplain Management, requires executive departments and agencies:

a) “to avoid, to the extent possible, the long- and short-term adverse impacts associated with the occupancy and modification of floodplains and to avoid direct or indirect support of floodplain development wherever there is a practicable alternative”.

b) further, the importance of the [proposed construction] location must clearly outweigh the requirements and intent of E.O. 11988, to wit, E.O 11988 Section 6.A. LOCATION IN THE FLOODPLAIN states: “In determining whether the proposed action will be located in the floodplain, the agency must ascertain that the floodplain site is the only practicable alternative.”

Required Encroachment Review and Certification

* All development projects in a ‘regulatory floodway’, [see definition ^1 below ], must undergo an Encroachment Review and Certification (called a ‘No-Rise Certification’), to ensure the project will not increase flooding hazards on other properties. 44 CFR 60.3(d)[3] states that: [in a regulatory floodway, communities must...!] ”Prohibit encroachments, including fill, new construction, ... and other development within the adopted regulatory floodway unless it has been demonstrated through hydrologic and hydraulic analysis performed in accordance with standard engineering practice that the proposed encroachment will not result in any increase in flood levels within the community during the occurrence of the base flood discharge.” Projects must be reviewed to determine whether they will obstruct flood flows resulting in any increase in flood heights.

/^1 Per FEMA, a “Regulatory Floodway” means the channel of a river or other watercourse and the adjacent land areas that must be reserved in order to discharge the base flood without cumulatively increasing the water surface elevation more than a designated height. March 18, 2019. Reference: National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) Floodplain Management Requirements

https://www.fema.gov/media-library-data/1481032638839-48ec3cc10cf62a7911ab44ec0dd4900e/FEMA_480_Complete_reduced_v7.pdf
December 4, 2019

Ms. Jolene Wolfley
Associate Director and Chair
Development Review Board
Planning Department, City of Albuquerque
600 Second NW
Albuquerque, NM 87102

Re: Project PR 2019-002184, 4909 Juan Tabo Blvd. NE

Dear Ms. Wolfley,

Consensus Planning has submitted an Application re: Project PR 2019-002184 to the Development Review Board for a Site Plan-DRB for the property located at 4909 Juan Tabo Boulevard NE on behalf of Guardian Storage and the property owner SL Juan Tabo Land, LLC. The site plan calls for an Indoor Storage Building to be constructed on this 2.37 acre area. The site plan review for this property is scheduled for the December 18, 2019 DRB meeting.

Concerns about the Applicant’s Analysis of Sensitive Lands Study:

The IDO Part 14-16-5: Development Standards in the 5-2(C) Avoidance of Sensitive Lands (pg 198) section has provisions that state ‘to the maximum extent practicable, new subdivisions of land and site design shall avoid locating development, in the following types of sensitive lands that are: sensitive, sloped, in corridors, in arroyos, next to trails, next to landmark cultural and artistic structures, next to diversion channels, are in viewsheds, next to neighborhood edges, in floodplains, and other’. It should be noted that the Consensus Planning’s Application contains a Sensitive Lands Analysis which was conducted by a Landscape architect, Scott Culler employed by Consensus Planning. This Sensitive Lands Analysis is flawed in two respects: a) the Analysis was not conducted by a registered Civil Engineer with direct experience in sensitive lands analysis — but by a landscape architect that is unqualified to undertake such a detailed analysis; and b) the Analysis was not conducted by an independent and impartial professional, but an employee of the Applicant.

Additionally the submitted Sensitive Lands Analysis states that “the only types of sensitive lands present on the site are steep slopes”. This is a flawed analysis in that the subject property site, in addition to containing steep slopes, is also: in a corridor (Bear Canyon Arroyo RMP and Design Overlay Zone); next to a trail (Bear Canyon Multipurpose trail); next to diversion channel (AMAFCA stormwater diversion channel to the South); in view sheds (view shed extends from the Sandia Mts. West to the Rio Grande) and in flood plains (FEMA designated 100 year flood plain).

I might suggest that a new Sensitive Lands Analysis be requested by City Staff that is completed by an independent, qualified professional who is not employed by the Applicant.

Best regards,

Janie McGuigan
B.A., M.C.R.P. (Masters in City and Regional Planning)
Member of the Oso Grande Neighborhood Association
4924 Purcell Dr. NE
Albuquerque, NM 87111
janiemc07@gmail.com
505-918-1884
REGULATORY ANALYSIS, SITE RISK FACTORS, ADVERSE IMPACTS FOR SENSITIVE LANDS

AND SUBSEQUENT

REQUEST FOR DISALLOWANCE OF PERMITTING FOR PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT OF SELF-STORAGE LOCATED AT 4909 JUAN TABO BLVD. (PR:2019-002184-ON-18DEC2019)
Cover Letter

Date: December 11, 2019

To: Development Review Board (DRB)

From: Oso Grande Neighborhood Association (OGNA)

Please accept, for DRB’s consideration, this document submitted by Oso Grande Neighborhood Association (OGNA). OGNA objects to the development of the subject 2.3-acre parcel which applicant intents to use for self-storage. The lot is a FEMA designated area of flood hazard and it has problematic encroachments from John B. Robert dam which is safety-rated as high hazard potential. Currently, it’s valuable and functional flood mitigation capacity for the public which should not be displaced. Applicant’s intended use is not related to flood infrastructure and is unacceptable socially and economically in relationship to the hazards, environmental disturbances, and hardship imposed on surrounding residents.

The proposed self-storage building through infilling and displacement would disrupt the floodway channels and increase runoff to the point that public safety becomes issue. The likelihood of residential property damage from flood and even loss of life is increased during a large storm event that exceeds the capacities of the floodplain to accommodate. The Oso Grande Floodplain is already experiencing some flood damage even in small storms. Private residences adjacent to the proposed site should not be forced to bear the extra impacts and risks associated with development.

Flood insurance risk is expected to increase and residents would experience a diminishment of peace-of-mind, hardship and suffering through increased likelihood of floodplain and/or dam failure. These adverse impacts should not be borne by Bear Canyon residents. It is unnecessary to expose residents to added risk. Regulation exists to mitigate this risk. There are solutions and alternatives to satisfy the claims of the applicant without causing hardship. The DRB has ample justification through IDO conflicts and legal authority to disallow this permitting.

CABQ, via mutual agreement and ordinance, acquiesces to a considerable body of regulations, ordinances, rules, resolutions and management best practices regards floodplain and dam management. We request that all pertinent regulation is applied regards the disposition of this property. As well, the application of regulations precludes development of the property.

FEMA is the chief Federal floodplain and dam catastrophic risk and disaster recovery agency. Oso Grande residents also concede to FEMA’s risk mitigation processes by purchasing flood insurance. Development of the subject lot would increase risk for flood in adjacent properties hence increasing the costs to mitigate personal residential flood risk. Yet flood is not fully
mitigatable through insurance. Loss of life or loss of property brings intense suffering and hardship that is unnecessary. Self-storage units pose an unreasonable threat to quality of life to all users of Oso Grande, residential and recreational.

Development of the lot would not only diminish existing capacity of the lot to function as valuable flood control but would increase flood related risks to surrounding residential property owners. Oso Grande downstream residents should not be forced to bear additional burdens of risk to life and property damage because upstream development of self-storage has removed valuable flood control capability and replaced it with development that exacerbates and intensifies flood risks.

The self-storage application, as submitted, with its site design, imposes additional threat to residential property with noise, traffic, land usage, environmental degradation, and through loss of enjoyment by residents utilizing the nearby trail system. These threats will be detailed below and when combined with the floodplain and dam risks constitute untenable losses for area residents and recreational users which number in the tens of thousands of Albuquerque residents.

Significantly, the applicant failed to meet sensitive lands requirements established in IDO and reinforced by ZHE to conduct analyses and studies of site constraints prior to preparation of the site plan. If conducted adequately, many risk factors and constraints would have surfaced. Analysis conducted by applicant’s professional engineer and landscape architect were wholly inadequate, omitted calculations and analyses, and denied presence of floodplain and John Robert Dam which are major issues. To bring clarity to this complex situation, OGNA has conducted high-level analysis to identify applicable regulation, risk factors, and constraints and adverse impacts affecting the sensitive lands’ site and has made suggestions. DRB Review and Decision Criteria IDO-6-6(G)(3) which calls for compliance with all IDO provisions provides justification to nullify the application on this ground alone.

We are looking to the DRB to fairly assess our claims, verify our facts, analyze applicable regulation, and validate our conclusion that flood management and a large building cannot coexist in this ecologically sensitive and flood intensive parcel of land without seriously harming the public.
Following are details which illustrate Oso Grandes position on the application and development proposal.

1) **OGNA Requests Adherence to More Restrictive Codes**: IDO Code # 14-161-8-B states that any regulation in IDO that conflicts with federal or state regulation, would default to the more restrictive regulation. OGNA contends that the more restrictive regulations are justified because of the intensely complex regulatory landscape, and serious risk factors the subject lot and application poses to neighborhoods. These regulations are meant to protect the public and we ask they be applied.

   - OGNA observes conflict in federal and state floodplain regulation, especially that for FEMA and for State Dam Safety regulation. These are applied in the analysis offered subsequently.
   - OGNA finds IDO codes conflicting with procedures. These will be highlighted subsequently.

OGNA requests that all pertinent Federal and State regulations, generally being more comprehensively promulgated, be applied to our request. Our case in point is FEMA, NFIP, regulation for floodplain management and State Dam Safety Regulations.

2) Sensitive Lands Ordinance & Regulation. These are three applicable regulations regards avoidance and legal duty to not cause damage to others in lands’ development. “Avoidance” means just that. Self-storage is not related to flood management and has no possible benefit to flood infrastructure, federal floodway management, the public, the environment, or to recreational users of the Trail nor to downstream residents. Alternatives do exist for the applicant. It's up to CABQ to determine these alternatives in coordination with OGNA and the applicant. OGNA does not consent to any variance from regulation or best practice nor to the deliberate intensification of flood risk intended to be borne by downstream residents.

   a. IDO calls for Avoidance of Sensitive Lands (IDO 5-2(C)(1). “site design processes shall begin with an analysis of site constraints related to sensitive lands. To the maximum extent possible ...site design shall avoid locating in sensitive lands.....”

   b. Federal Register, Executive Order # 11988; May 24, 1977; (Floodplain Management) requires executive departments and agencies to avoid to the extent possible the long and short-term impacts associated with the occupancy and modification of floodplains and to avoid direct or indirect support of floodplain development wherever there is a practicable alternative.
c. AMAFCA Resolution No 1980-15 Drainage Policy states: compliance with this regulation will not relieve any person or public body from any legal duty to pass and discharge storm water runoff in a manner which will not cause damage to the person or property of another.

3) Sensitive Lands Requirements Have Not Been Observed by Applicant. ZHE Notice of Decision, May 1, 2019, Conclusion states that applicant must provide analysis regards sensitive lands. Applicant has failed to disclose, much less comprehensively analyze both the presence of floodplain and the encroachment of the dam onto the private lot, despite being notified of such by OGNA. Attachment contains these notifications during ZHE process and through LUHO hearing. These omissions are so egregious as to constitute negligence to public safety and are meant to mislead the DRB. IDO Review and Decision Criteria 6-6(G)(3)(a) requires that applicant meet all requirements of ZHE and of IDO for approval.

4) Applicant Has Not Provided Adequate Analysis or Studies of Sensitive Lands as Directed by the ZHE. Instead, applicant provided statement by a landscape architect that “steep slopes” were the only type of sensitive land present on site with no backup documentation. The steep slope mentioned is the downstream embankment of Robert Dam and is highly sensitive regards overall dam safety and the source for embankment failures already experienced recently in the US in other flood prone areas. The statements and site renderings are narrowly focused on cosmetic aspects of landscape issues, do not consider site constraints, and do not cover the scope or complexity of these sensitive lands involved, excavation issues, drainage issues, nor safety and risk factors. The applicant did not meet the requirements of ZHE because omission of key sensitive lands’ factors did not inform the site design processes. The submitted site plan is a mockery of extensive FEMA rules and regulations meant to protect the public and, if the site plan is executed, could lead to untold ecological devastation to the Oso Grande floodplain and adjacent homes.

5) John B. Robert Dam Ownership Issues.
   a. The steep slope landscape architect refers to as the only operant sensitive land issue is the western embankment of John Robert Dam. This assertion remains to be qualified by AMAFCA and State Engineers Office because of the problematic legal questions this presents. Rectification could take years since this may be newly discovered information. The steep slope, regardless of ownership functions as dam infrastructure and is nonetheless subject to failure during flood events at this high-hazard potential dam (NID.gov).
b. 4909 Juan Tabo is John B. Robert dam embankment, toe, and toe blanket drainage region as best as can be determined by statements made by third party experienced reservoir engineer and P.E. upon visual inspection of the dam. (See Attachment). Entire property could function as dam subsurface drainage. Applicant conducted geotechnical core sampling of the site in Oct. 2019 in preparation for the DRB deadline. It does not appear that the geotechnical summary and report were made available to CABQ in the application. Core sampling could possibly constitute damage to the sensitive dam blanket drain if one exists. OGNA requests that summary report of geotechnical sampling on-site be made available to all parties for examination. OGNA requests that qualified, experienced independent dam inspectors conduct evaluation of the western embankment, toe and subsurface drainage. Unintended consequences of dam failure could mean catastrophe for many. Publicly available Robert Dam construction site designs of dam are not currently available for inspection at State Engineer’s Office and can be made available to CABQ in the future upon request.

c. 4909 Juan Tabo is John B. Robert dam toe region: much of the dams’ functionality is underlying the subject private property. This means a federally regulated dam, the bulk of which is owned and managed by AMFACA, is technically and partially privately owned by SL Properties Juan Tabo, LLC. Private owners of dams must observe all State Dam Regulations and Rules (State of NM, Rules & Regulations Governing Dam Design, Construction, and Dam Safety, 12-31-2010). Private owners of subject lot have no known history of observing dam regulation. Dam owners must comply with Rule: 19.25.12.11.F establishing dam boundaries and Rule 19.25.12.12A requires owner certification.

d. Ownership of a dam requires owner to conduct maintenance, NM State: 19.25.12.17 of it. Maintenance of the “steep slope” embankment, it’s toe, and any toe drainage was not considered by landscape architect during Site design. To be clear, a landscape architect is not the right professional to make assessments better suited to a reservoir engineer. The PE who did make a statement in the application process denied impacts associated with the dam and claimed that he was in “certainty state” that drainage plans would not affect drainage plans. Maintenance planning would be a key feature of the resultant site design. Non-disclosure of these dam drainage constraints and adequate maintenance of the dam is highly important. It’s equivalent to safety management. Applicant should have coordinated with AMFACA to strategize the entire dam maintenance program for the AMFACA managed dam/floodplain complex. Instead applicant chose to hide the highly-visible facts, and expose downstream residents to future
safety risks. It’s disingenuous. The property functions as flood infrastructure and is not a vacant lot as contended.

e. With the possibility of dam failures at John Robert Dam being high (NID.gov), any excavation of toe regions could precipitate an internal failure of the dam. (Western Dam Engineering Technical Note: Vol. 4, August 2016).

f. Applicant Civil Engineer, PE, RESPEC, Applicant Planner with Consensus Planning disclosed in a credential-stamped letter to ZHE and to LUHO that he was certain that there would be no impacts to the dam with the grading and drainage plan. Nobody can be in “certainty state” about such matters of dam failure, especially when the dam, overdue for inspection, has not been inspected by AMAFCA in 6 years. Greer provided no known calculation package, nor a risk-assessment for dam or floodplain failure with his statement which should invalidate his submission. Therefore, it should be disallowed. His statement is irresponsible and was misleading when presented to LUHO in July 2019, who, subsequently made a decision in-part based on this falsehood. Consensus developer was notified in advance by OGNA of such serious dam issues and were ignored in the application. Attached is presentation made by OGNA to LUHO in July 2019 on the matter. It was dismissed as hearsay. Alternatively, OGNA submits a PE statement, by an experienced reservoir engineer and engineering risk manager speaking to the matter. (See attachment). Stakes are quite high for downstream residents. Unintended consequences of breaching the dam embankment include death to downstream residents. OGNA takes this matter extremely seriously.

g. Dam owners who intend on breaching, modifying or removing a dam that is considered high-hazard potential must submit plan to State Engineer (19.25.12.19B). (B-7) calls for only registered PE’s to supervise breach or removal of dam slopes. Landscape architect, is not qualified to evaluate or assess slopes that are functioning as dam embankments, nor conduct highly specific engineering analysis.

h. Dam owners contemplating modification of a dam must comply with 19.25.12.11-20 NMAC. Applicant has submitted no known dam alteration permit supplied by State Engineers office.

i. Dam owners, LS Juan Tabo Properties, LLC, have supplied no emergency action plan for their portion of John Robert Dam as called for in 19-25-12-21F. It’s noted that dam failures often occur on downstream embankments such as those located on proposed site.
6) **Sensitive Lands: Floodplain Issue:** Applicant offered non-factual commentary to LUHO in July that denied the subject self-storage lot at 4909 Juan Tabo Blvd. is in floodplain. OGNA has found the following floodplain designations and contends that subject lot is in FEMA designated floodplain. Denial of basic constraints of floodplain parameters is contrary to ZHE requirement for analysis of sensitive lands.

   a. Article 5, Albuquerque Code of Ordinances, Flood Hazard & Drainage Control. 14-5-1-6; FEMA designated flood areas are identified by FIS report, City of Albuquerque: Shows FIRMette: subject lot is identified as: in 1) area of flood hazard; 2) .2% annual chance flood hazard. 3) Zone X (shaded) to confer "moderate" flood risk.

   b. [www.fema.gov](http://www.fema.gov); flood maps: shows 4909 Juan Tabo lot as 100% shaded as flood hazard area.

   c. IDO (14-16-7) Definitions: further confers the area as floodplain, flood fringe, and floodway.

   d. FEMA additionally identifies complex or confined flood areas such as this as being flood prone, and a flood hazard area.

7) Applicant site plan should be subjected to the most restrictive practices found in both FEMA floodplain management rules and the CABQ Article 5: Ordinance on flood control because of the complex and interdependent floodway (44 CFR 59.1), encroachment (44 CFR 60.3 (d) (3)), and hazard risks presented in the confined location. The subject lot is exceptional in the number and effect of the risk factors presented and cumulative risk from multiple factors being operative in the confined space of the water complex. Sensitive lands' analysis should have identified the following risk factors, but did not. These risk factors include:

   a. Parcel east boundary is high hazard Robert Dam embankment.

   b. Increased erosion and sedimentation of all involved and adjacent infrastructure imposed by AMAFCA, federal waterway near southern boundary.

   c. Changing and variable water paths in the floodway.

   d. Greater flood volume due to removed absorption capacity introduced by storage units.

   e. Removal of catchment of dam downstream reservoir by infilling conducted by storage units.

   f. AMAFCA concrete channel back flowing or bottlenecking during storm due to downstream obstructions.

   g. Diminished permeability of soils due to drought.

   h. Adjacent street storm sewers rated as 100-yr are known to overflow in small rains.
i. upstream development of High Desert neighborhoods increase downstream flood volumes in shorter periods of time.

j. risks for contamination of ABCWUA adjacent water wells with hazardous material runoff from storage units and from existent contamination from known on-site illegal landfill from the 1970’s. Point source discharge permit, MS4, of Clean Water Act should be applicable with all terms and conditions, just as CABQ discharge in the same area is applicable. NMED administers the federal regulation and permitting.

k. sedimentation of AMAFCA channel decreases capacity of the channel leading to greater likelihood of channel overflow.

l. presence of dam spillway introduces non-controllable risk during heavy storm.

m. Site contribution towards downstream erosion, presence of adjacent underground ABCWUA tanks cause Oso Grande floodplain obstruction and increase erosion and earth drifting diminishing the functionality of flood plain.

Comprehensive risk and decision analysis, by qualified professionals regards floodplain management is called for. The cumulative nature of these risk factors require analysis and study that is comprehensive and accounts for all hazards. These are not theoretical risks rather each are real and known to be operant as observed by residents traversing the floodplain on daily recreational walks.

8) Higher Regulatory Standards Needed for Floodplain Management. FEMA has established minimum floodplain management requirements for communities participating in NFIP. Communities must also enforce more restrictive State requirements. NFIP requires communities to at least consider additional measures which are found in 44CFR 60.22. Planning Considerations for Floodprone Areas. These considerations are comprehensive and include: 1) permit only in areas taking into consideration probability of flood damage, 2) is socially and economically acceptable in relation to the hazards involved 3) does not increase danger to human life 4) preservation of floodprone areas for open space purposes 5) prohibition of facilities with hazardous substances 6) acquisition of land for public purposes. OGNA is not knowledgeable of CABQ efforts to aspire to the higher regulatory standards for floodplain management established by NFIP; but, it requests this degree of consideration. It’s noted that downstream residents of floodplains are required to comply with NFIP regulation when purchasing flood insurance products and CABQ should follow suit. OGNA request that for the good of the public, that NFIP standards are adhered to throughout Albuquerque’s numerous floodplains where applicable.

9) Oso Grande (and Amberglen) Residents Have the Most to Lose From Self-Storage development. And, it’s unfair to saddle residents with extra risk. Oso Grande
understands dam and flood safety. They are guided by document: FEMA: Living With Dams, which is a grim and frank assessment of existing dam and floodplain risks to downstreamers. FEMA asks residents to purchase flood insurance as does CABQ. Depending on the degree of risk FEMA and NFIP assign to a locality, flood insurance can range from low hundreds to thousands per annum. Since the proposed development increases the likelihood of a property claim from flood (FEMA does not reimburse families for flood deaths), why should residents have to bear extra expense for flood insurance? Why should residents lose peace of mind because, now, flood risks are increased? Some flood insurance premiums will not be affordable by homeowners. FEMA only gives one chance to make a claim and then cuts off their risk by terminating coverage, hence, forcing homeowners into the more costly commercial markets. What do Oso Grande residents do when repeated floods affect their homes? The logical solution is to tear down the building which is the cause of the flood exacerbation? Who are the liable parties when the cause is a newly operating commercial establishment with no stakes whatsoever in public safety?

a. Extra Space Storage, Inc. Should Be Liable, But Their Name Does Not Appear on the Application. Apparently they are/ plan to have financial interest in the development. Shouldn’t CABQ know the name of parties that can be found negligent in creating public flood hazards? Extra Space (NYSE EXR, BBB rated (lowest for investment grade) could be held liable). Extra Space, Inc. appears to be building a monopoly in self-storage in Albuquerque, Rio Rancho, and Corrales. Does CABQ know this? Has CABQ, Economic Development become involved? CABQ has justified to OGNA that IDO codes can be set-aside to assist mom and pop ventures in order to give them a leg-up in their enterprise. Yet, Extra Space is no mom and pop venture as evidenced by their NYSE trading status. They fully intend to leverage, for profit, anomalies and mistakes found in zoning code, even at the expense of neighbors, should they be allowed. Make no mistake, the MX-L designation of this floodplain property is a mistake and anomaly and residents are vulnerable to predatory development practices. Oso Grande NA requests that CABQ follow all federal regulation to protect vulnerable residents from predatory development practices. DRB is justified in disallowing the application in its existent state. Additionally; Order and Sections 102, 202,205 of Flood Protection Act of 1973, as amended, (42 U.S.C. 4012a, 4106, and 4128) require any agency involved in area subject to base-flood, shall inform all private parties of the hazards of locating structures in the area of the base flood.
10) Who is Liable for Added Flood Risk? If permitting commences, Extra Space Storage Inc. should be prepared to indemnify Oso Grande residents for all liability arising out of their construction and operations. Indemnification would be costly because the estimated 125 Oso Grande homes affected with increased flood risk have a combined estimated replacement value of $30M. CABQ through Article 5, Flood Hazard and Drainage Control, and through Federal Register: Executive Order, same as above, (floodplain management) is required to notify all parties to include Extra Space, Inc. of all transactions regarding floodplain property. The reasons for this are clear and understandable. The public liability associated with building in floodplains should be borne by those who are creating the risk. The same executive order referenced earlier allows CABQ to avoid transferring risk to downstreamers. OGNAs request that CABQ utilize existing regulation to avoid public liability issues and prevent inappropriate development on behalf of residents who should not be expected to bear added risk and adverse impact.

11) Development of Self-Storage Adversely Impacts Residents and Users of Oso Grande in Several Quality-of-Life and Environmental Measures other than floodplain and dam risks. Existing Code, and adherence to established CABQ procedure and best practice, when applied, should disallow such usage as proposed. ONGA does not consent to variance from any IDO code or ordinance and expects fair application and comprehensive accounting for the exceptional and complex nature of the issues the self-storage proposal presents.

a. Character of the Dam/Floodplain Complex is Chiefly Recreational Rather Than Industrial-like. Footpaths, and nature trails, extend between Oso Grande Park and Bear Canyon Public Open Space and Arroyo of which the subject site sits entirely within. Tens of thousands of pedestrians, bicycle commuters utilize the adjacent trail yearly. The proposal calls for obliteration of the sweeping view of the Sandias for each of these users as they walk past the proposed 35+ ft. metal structure with one of its two noise-intense loading docks squeezed into the Trail so closely that trucks backing out of the loading dock, beeping as they go, could alarm, scare and break the peace of pedestrians only feet away. Approximately 75 recreational users have submitted into CABQ Zoning processes mindfully prepared comments objecting to this out-of-character imposition. This should be observed by CABQ as a significant indicator that there is something terribly wrong with the proposal. One woman confided that "my psychological and spiritual health depend on my daily walk accross the Trail. It's now going to be gone". There is no way to mitigate an inappropriately conceived, 1.3 acre-sized, loud, busy, traffic filled operation with industrial-type activity as a replacement for an experience of peace that so many have come to depend as valued sanctuary in their lives. This
illustrates the problematic nature of attempting to insert industrial activity into residential and recreational space. The two uses are contrary to one another. ZHE, May 1, 2019, NOD commented that: paraphrasing “adverse impact might occur and mitigations should be able to compensate”. We respectfully disagree about mitigations, in this case being compensatory and agree that adverse impacts are operant and contrary to IDO in this case. We request, on behalf of tens of thousands of Park and Trail visitors, that the proposal be dismissed as not meeting the Character-of-Place requirements of the IDO and or MPOS plans. This imposition is very real in the daily lives of thousands of people who depend on the Nature Trail as a counterpoint to urban experience.

b. When Noise Becomes A Health Issue for Thousands. Self-storage proposal discloses an estimated traffic volume of 50 vehicles /day visiting the operations. This amounts to 17,500 vehicle visits per year. If each vehicle unloads or loads for a mere 30-min. each, then the equivalent average noise duration per each 12 hour day is two vehicles continuously in activity. And, each making some level of code-exceeding noise and vibration. Each vehicle would be arriving at one of two loading docks...each pointed towards, and within feet of the nearby Trail or into the downstream residential neighborhoods which start at between 100ft and 300ft away. To provide context and perspective, Univ. of CA, Santa Barbara, sound contour studies have measured car decibel levels in parking lots as follows: car horn chirps, 70-75 dBA; slow drive-by of car, 70-75dbA; squeezing tires, 90dbA. These are cars, not trucks which are expected to have higher DbA levels. The Site operations call for loading docks, which can be noise -exceeding. The reference level in CABQ Ordinance, Article 9: Noise Control; 9-9-4 General Noise, Table 1 (A-weighted measurements in decibels (dB)) as both source and receptor premises is not to exceed 55dBA day, and 50dBA night. Clearly, the industrial-like activity of the proposed operations do not mix with residential and recreational uses.

c. The noise issue is further compounded by Bear Canyon acoustic profile where noise dampens less than expected the further away it travels. This means more residents are subjected to the excessive noise. Noise, particularly intermittent noise is a psychological and physical health issue, at the very least creating stress. Oso Grande is specifically utilized for stress-relief by thousands of users. Nearby Trail users and residents should not be subjected to continuous DbA levels that exceed ordinance. This is an egregious incursion into the peace-of-mind of neighbors. Oso Grande is a sensitive noise area which further compounds the issue. ZHE requested that applicant conduct sensitive lands studies. Noise abatement was never considered. OGNA request that applicant retain the
services of a qualified acoustic engineering service to document the intended levels of noise from operations and abatement measures if at all mitigatable.

d. Noise mitigation in such confined spaces, when mixing industrial-like usage with residential and recreational is not anticipated to be possible. CABQ noise ordinance calls for the cessation of operations that cannot meet noise regulation. Noise is a very real issue for any resident. Example: one resident residing 300ft away from a proposed loading dock, a paramedic, needs to sleep during the day, with his livelihood depending on his quality of sleep. Should this resident be expected to sacrifice his health and livelihood as a first-responder for the sake of an inappropriately sited operation? OGNA does not consent to any variance or relaxed standards for noise ordinance and will vigorously advocate for enforcement of noise codes should the permit be approved, and especially without required noise studies and a construction noise abatement plan.

e. When Self-Storage Becomes Warehousing. In accordance with the IDO, MX-L can be used for self-storage only, and explicitly excludes warehousing. The Site design, which was changed from the originally presented application, called for indoor storage corridors which allowed for noise suppression. The new Site Design calls for exterior loading docks with echo producing insets. This makes the structure appear as if it can be utilized more for warehousing rather than self-storage. OGNA does not consent to warehousing activity as a casually applied variance. Industrial-like operations such as warehousing defy the character of the neighborhood as residential and recreational. IDO codes are not in compliance in several areas regards site design and usage.

i. IDO 14-16-4-3(D)(28)(e) calls for “access to storage units shall be through interior corridors”. While Site Plan may indeed call for interior corridors, the most important portion of the access, the exterior, is the noisiest part. Loading dock access on the exterior accounts for about 10% of access but is 100% of the loading noise. Site Plan defies the intent of interior corridors by utilizing exterior loading docks, hence is out-of-compliance. It suggests that much more intensive warehousing activity is planned.

ii. How intensive would activity be? True self-storage would have each of 600 rentals being visited approximately 4x per year or 2400 customer visits per year. Yet, applicant is calling for 17,500 customer visits per year. That's about one visit per every two weeks for every customer. How is this discrepancy in use reconciled? Warehousing could account for it.
Distribution, shipping, third-party retailing etc. IDO does not allow this activity for self-storage.

iii. After reviewing Guardian promotional materials warehousing activity is suggestive through Twitter Feed, which features: 1) storage of hazardous materials 2) provision of rental space for unsheltered individuals, 3) distribution activity. All these activities are disallowed on-site per IDO. If applicant’s business model indeed is dependent on conducting IDO disallowed operations, which exacerbate the publicly affective noise and traffic issues previously identified, then they should seek alternative locations to conduct business and respect the intent of the IDO.

iv. Guardian submitted a sample lease agreement (Extra Space Storage, Inc. lease) which disallows storage of hazardous materials but, it does not specify how the rules would be enforced. Any storage units present the ever-present circumstance of unenforceable lease terms. While storage of illicit goods like drugs, explosives, fuels, corpses, pesticide, and unsheltered people don’t affect applicant, they certainly would affect neighbors if something went wrong...like a fire, explosion or contamination of groundwater. This is not a fabricated risk, Dept. of Homeland Security names storage units as significant environmental hazards and scenes for crime. NFIP : 44CFR 60.22. addresses storage of hazardous substances in floodplains. OGNA does not consent to casual variance from IDO standards regards hazardous material storage because they have the most to lose from this inappropriate development. Floodplains, Dam sites, and federal waterways are no places for environmental accidents.

v. Self-storage which calls for (in IDO, 14-16-7) “three or more small,...units”, yet proposed structure calls for 600 units, some not small at all. Technically, it qualifies, yet, there is a large differential of scale, threethreeish vs. 600 or more. OGNA calls for the intent of self-storage to not be bent beyond reason. Overambitious development should not be tolerated in a confined, sensitive lands’ site.

12) Zoning Procedure and Process Contain Discrepancies and Conflict.

a. Destination Uses Are Contrary to IDO. 14-16-2-4(B)(1) Mixed-Use Low Intensity Zone District (MX-L) describes the purpose of the area for neighborhood-scale, “non-destination” commercial uses serving the surrounding area. The mega-
proportions of the storage would call for destination visits for customers. This is conflicting in the IDO and should be disallowed.

b. Required Traffic Study Has Not Been Conducted. Contrary to statements made by applicant a traffic study is specified in Official Notification of Decision, EPC, Project 1001993, [regards tracks F & G, Academy Place Subdivision—4909 Juan Tabo]; Sept. 20, 2002; FINDINGS: Part (6) (a). "A traffic impact study for the C-1 parcel shall be deferred until DRB submittal". OGNA does not consent to relief from this requirement. Traffic study should have been included in the application per IDO criteria for approval. (6-6-G,3,a). In order to comply with IDO condition that a for prior approval the traffic study w Intersection at Osuna/ Juan Tabo is difficult in any circumstance, much less, for destination travelers in non-familiar territory. Additionally, vibration studies should be made part of the traffic studies as Dam infrastructures can be sensitive to vibration and become damaged..... leading to a potential catastrophic embankment failure.

c. A Variance Between ROW on Sketch Plat for Zone Variance and ROW from Site Plan-DRB contains a 4ft. discrepancy. DRB site-plan deliberations should be based on accurate information. The four-foot discrepancy must be offset against the right of way for Osuna. Osuna which is already too narrow to accommodate large trucks. Site Design should be reworked to account for the discrepancy and shortage.

13) Widespread Concern Over Proposal. OGNA is not alone with deep concern over the proposal. OGNA's Social Media Chair has observed that since Jan. 2019 when the application surfaced that commentary on NextDoor.com in the 40+ neighborhoods of NE Heights, increased from 3,000 to over 10,000 subscribers. Many commentaries on Oso Grande NextDoor have centered around the self-storage proposal with unanimous objection on very reasonable grounds of adverse impact. Neighbors know something is terribly wrong with storage units in the natural space.

OGNA requests that CABQ acknowledge the efforts of Oso Grande in patiently and fairly answering questions of neighbors who are not in understanding of floodplain and dam hazard issues, and to do so without bias. District 8 Coalition of Neighborhoods is deeply concerned as to send a letter to DRB supporting fair regulatory treatment of the proposal. Attached is an email chain of issues and homeowner FAQ sheetlh meant to educate residents on pertinent floodplain, dam, FEMA, NIFIP, environmental, noise, and insurance risks. As a measure of
reciprocity, OGNA requests equitable assessment during DRB’s evaluation of self-
storage permit approval and recognition of myriad State and Federal regulation.

CONCLUSION: IDO 6-6(G) (3) Review and Decision Criteria requires strict standards for
approval. All criteria, not selective compliance. OGNA has documented considerable
inconsistency, conflict, and contrary usage with IDO.

As well, regulatory analysis clearly shows that attempts to build in sensitive lands’ which
are regulatorily intensive and complex regards with State and Federal statutes are to be
avoided. Applicant failed to meet requirements for sensitive lands analysis based on ZHE
conditions. Approval cannot be granted based on selective compliance.

Most significantly, the plan calls for residents of Oso Grande to shoulder multitudes of
adverse impacts ranging from increased flood risk, property damage, and loss of peace-
of-mind over irresponsible dam embankment issues which could lead to life-threatening
failure.

Applicant has options for cost-effectively locating to alternative locations where they
would thrive. OGNA respectfully suggests that DRB is fully justified in disqualifying the
application.
ATTACHMENT

REGARDING OGNA REQUEST FOR DISALLOWANCE OF PERMITTING FOR PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT LOCATED AT 4909 JUAN TABO BLVD.

Risk Factors for Storage Unit Site

by

David Quinones, P.E. License C56025

I am a professional California civil engineer having worked as a project manager on 6 of San Francisco’s dam rehabilitation/construction projects over a period of 23 years. Below I make some observations, make some suggestions, and point out some risk factors regarding the proposed construction of a large self-storage building on west side of the John B. Robert Dam (referred to as Robert Dam), an Albuquerque flood control dam.

The Robert Dam is classified by the U.S. Army National Inventory of Dams (NID) [NID number NM 00406] [https://nid.sec.usace.army.mil/ords/?p=105:113:17301439009808::NO:::] as a high hazard dam due to downstream loss of life and property damage following a potential dam failure.

High hazard dams are supposed to be inspected periodically and Robert Dam has not been inspected in over 5 years per the NID database. The dam embankment, outlet tunnel, outlet channel, and spillway require inspection to ensure safe operation.

The effective toe of the dam embankment is on the west side of Juan Tabo Boulevard N.E. in Albuquerque. Generally, when the dam embankment or the dam embankment toe region is excavated, special dam stability calculations are necessary which are reviewed by the State Engineer. These calculations need to address the case of a full dam when the downstream water level is higher than for the normal case of an empty dam.

Placement of about 1.5 acres of impermeable building and pavement in Bear Canyon Arroyo increases the flow into the dam outlet channel/arroyo during a rainstorm event. This increase in flow impedes the dam outlet facility and increases the downstream flood risk.

Suggestions:

The building permit approval should be delayed until which time that the past-due dam safety inspection has been performed by a qualified dam engineer under the supervision of the dam owner.

The building permit approval should be delayed until which time that the developer has prepared a P.E. stamped report demonstrating that the grading and excavation at the building site will not destabilize the dam embankment when the dam is full. This report should be approved by the State Engineer.
The building permit approval should be delayed until which time that the developer addresses the flood impact of proposed building and addresses the associated risks of construction of impermeable surfaces in Bear Canyon Arroyo.

The developer should hire a qualified professional engineer to review the dam geotechnical data, the hydraulic/hydrology data of the dam vicinity, the dam design criteria, the dam operations plan, the dam as-built construction drawings, and the dam instrumentation data (if any) to better ascertain the suitability of building a large building in the flood plain below a high hazard dam.

Regards

David Quinones, PE, Reservoir Engineer
Summary
See basis for OCNAA Appeal: 1) Point
Improper
Surrounding application were improper procedures and processes

Of life property damage and potential loss surrounding residents through sensitive land impose flood risk for high hazard potential dam which is building in front of John Roberts' constituents of trying to locate a regulation, complexities and

Based on two grounds, request that permit not be granted basis to surrounding residents and adverse impact on a post-migration. We have demonstrated significant

Storage Units
To Notice of Decision to Approve Association Appeal and Opposition Osceola Neighborhood
Infrastruture. Regulated Floodplain Management Needs Frist and
Character of area is about Flood & Drainage Control & Water
John Roberts Dam is rated as a High Risk Hazard dam.

He says the state is working to repair some of the more at-risk dams, but there is not a state fund dedicated to address the problem. He says the state is working to repair some of the more at-risk dams, but there is not a state fund dedicated to address the problem. He says 33% of the dams are in satisfactory shape or exceed satisfactory condition. He says 33% of these dams are in satisfactory shape or exceed satisfactory condition.

Dinizinho says 170 dams are considered "high hazard," meaning a failure of one of these dams would likely result in at least one death. Dinizinho says 170 dams are considered "high hazard," meaning a failure of one of these dams would likely result in at least one death.

The Santa Fe New Mexican reports State engineer John Dinizinho told lawmakers Tuesday that one or more New Mexico's engineer says dams are at risk of over flowing or bursting following the wet winter and strong spring runoff.

New Mexico's engineer says dams are at risk of overflowing or bursting following the wet winter and strong spring runoff.

New Mexico Engineer Warns of Dam Risks After Wet Winter - Santa Fe New Mexican, Associated Press

Aired on KUNM Radio

June 6, 2019
Climate change is anticipated to continue into the foreseeable future. It presents a threat to the physical infrastructure of the area, as well as to the natural systems that support it. The effects of climate change can be seen in the increase in frequency and intensity of extreme weather events, such as storms, floods, and droughts.

Infrastructure damage due to anything size storm, driving rain, and flood waters is needed to continue moderating sediment. Equipment, including pumps and flood protection, are critical to prevent further damage. With enough sediment in the channel, canals and dewatering are necessary to prevent further erosion and sediment deposition. These sediments are a major challenge for floodplain and stream management.

Due to the danger, Executive Engineer AF-MAFFC, stated...

The statement suggests that the impact of climate change is significant and requires proactive measures to mitigate its effects. The infrastructure and natural systems are vulnerable to the increase in extreme weather events, and the response to these challenges is crucial for the continued operation of the area.

The text also mentions the importance of infrastructure and equipment in managing the sediment and preventing further damage. The channel needs to be maintained to prevent further erosion and sediment deposition. The statement by the Executive Engineer highlights the need for proactive measures to address the challenges posed by climate change.
hool. A dam overtopping, no permit should be allowed. (Point 6)

deciding the feasibility of such a project. All affected parties should be informed, and should have a
determine the consequences of dam failures and
deciding voice. Determining downstream populations need to be educated about the consequences of dam failures and
determine the feasibility of such a project. All affected parties should be informed and should have a
conduct due diligence first to determine applicable regulations. Federal and state regulations, and engineers should
regulations and federal risk and safety standards. Dam and floodplain regulations and engineers should
for an analysis of site constraints by the applicant prior to design is out of sequence and ignores existing
decision-making can occur. With the possibility of dam failures, the Notice of Decision, Decision calling
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high-density downstream populations be off-limits to further development because it is already functioning as foothills of the surrounding hills. The cumulative set of highly interdependent constraints. The sensitive land deserves sensitive deliberation. We request that serious issues be applied.

- Rock Outcrops (dams are major structural outcrops and is associated with multiple issues)
- Escarpments (state engineer office is determining if eastern escarpment juncture is too close range)
- Integration Facilities (AMAPCA has recommended no construction within 125 ft of an escarpment juncture)
- Arroyos (AMAPCA has recommended no construction within 125 ft of an escarpment juncture)
- Wetlands (less than 12% of zone, foothills and is likely floodplain and is likely last remaining opportunity)
- Unsuitable Soils (potential high water table, uncertain geology is stated for 20%)
- Steep Slopes (slopes are storm catchment, storm diversion, abstractions of floodwaters)
- Floodplains & flood hazard areas (slopes are floodplain serves the flood hazard area)

practical site design shall avoid locating....in the following sensitive lands...
Admistigators for Factual Information and understanding of risk and safety is 
Failure to elevate high-risk complex decision-making to upper levels of CBDA 

After submission date Point 3, Point 6 Application changes after submission deadline: Zoning admin allowed application 

Point 11, in conducting an analysis of site constraints, imposition of subsequent risks for Notice of Decision, Conditions, lacks, procedures and lacks accountability 

Point 4, failed to acknowledge and deliberate policy formulated in the plan. Point 4, F, concluded with constraints and risks associated with development. Finding #51 noted the bear statement with subsequent conclusion acknowledging acknowledgment of the gravity OGNA Impact Statement was disregarded: Notice of Decision made no reference 

OGNA and individuals were ignored and not made part of record. per process 

Double standards are applied for protection of property rights. While Consensus 

Application Process Contained Irregularities in Procedures. Call to
There were too many irregularities in the application to consider it valid. The permit determining the feasibility and consequences of such a project has been side. The most important is safety and property of many. All stakeholders including regulators, administrators, and hoopla engineers should have been consulted. The complexity and importance of this decision reaches far into the future. Deny the permit. Significant but also a serious and costly safety threat associated with the project. ONGA has amply demonstrated that adverse impact mitigation would be effective. ZHE grossly underestimated and trivialized it. ZHE admitted that adverse impact can occur (finding #72) and suggested the conclusion:
Senator William Tallman:
I can not tell you how appreciative Oso Grande Neighborhood Assn. (OGNA) is to hear from you and your offer to assist regards the proposed storage unit proposal in Bear Canyon Arroyo and John Robert Dam area.

To Directly Answer Your Questions:

On Dec. 18, 9:00am the application for permit to proceed on the storage units will go before the Development Review Board (DRB). DRB has the option to elevate it to City Council or to EPC at that meeting, or they can just approve the permit.

Dec. 11, 5:00 pm is the last day the DRB will take public comment on the matter. Dist. 8 Coalition of 22+ NE Heights neighborhoods, with approx. 35,000 homes has approved, via Board vote, to object to the permitting application with a letter to be sent to DRB and City Council.

To Inform You of the Main Issues:

We are Oso Grande Neighborhood Assn. (OGNA) of 452 homes that is located directly downstream of John B. Roberts Dam, partially in floodplain of Bear Canyon Arroyo. FEMA maps show that 125+ of these homes are in or near a FEMA designated flood hazard area and could likely be subject to loss of life (per the State Engineer, John, D’Antonio) and to property damage should a significant flood event occur. Estimated Oso Grande residential property replacement value from such an event, should it occur, is in the $30 million range for these at-risk properties. The proposed storage unit property has a BERNCO assessed tax valuation of approx. $25,000. The property owner of the proposed development has voiced to us that she had been trying to get CABQ to buy the property for decades.

Is there possibility that our State representatives and senators can gain an appropriation from the NM legislature to acquire the property located at 4909 Juan Tabo? The flood mitigation value of the acquisition is clear and justifiable. In addition, AMAFCA and State Engineers Office needs funding to address the high-hazard potential of John Roberts Dam; that is to conduct independent inspections and to implement safety monitoring systems, and any required dam stabilization measures, which would warn of potential dam failures, estimated to be about $1.2 million.

I suspect Sen. Martin Heinrich should be informed of this situation because it involves federally regulated water and flood infrastructure and public safety matters. His offices, in early 2019, have promoted watershed reclamation grants which could be applicable in this situation. We’d welcome such assistance should his offices become responsive.

We think the risks of significant flood events are actually higher than FEMA’s estimates due to climate change, and the observation that our Oso Grande floodplain is filling up with sediment and drought-driven accretion of dirt which diminishes the capacity of the floodplain to work properly during flood events. We have already observed not-insignificant property damage during even small rains because the Oso Grande floodplain is not working as designed. This is climate change in action,
right here in Bear Canyon Arroyo and Watershed!

There is a federally regulated floodway (WOTUS) directly south of the property which the storage unit proposal calls for discharging runoff which is anticipated to be contaminated. EPA's, MS4 permitting regulation (administered by NMED) should be adhered to, but, CABQ has made no known movement to apply Federal or State regulation to matters regarding the storage unit proposal.

The storage units will increase the likelihood that downstreamers will experience flood damage to homes as a result of a flood event. The storage units, are proposed to remove some acre-feet of existing and functional floodplain capacity and increase the runoff during storm, exacerbating the matter. The adverse impacts imposed by the proposed development to affected downstream residents is unconscionable.

If this is not bad enough, we have been advised by an independent third party professional engineer that the Army Corps of Engineers, in 1974, likely encroached on this storage-unit proposed private property and built the toe region of the dam on top of this private property. Excavation and grading of such an environmentally sensitive, and unstable soil region is strongly discouraged by Federal dam administrators. We did notify the Land Use Hearing Officer (LUHO) about this encroachment, but, OPGA's testimony was dismissed as hearsay.

We may be a bit naive as neighborhood stakeholders, but, we are absolutely shocked that CABQ has been unwilling to acknowledge and observe State and Federal regulation, all while dismissing their own IDO codes and Ordinance. Human lives and residential property damage is at stake, not to mention environmental degradation during times when planning for climate change and for disaster planning is either called for or mandatory. Your assistance on this matter would be greatly appreciated. While federal and state regulation might be sidestepped, we are interested in our government applying and enforcing all pertinent regulations and best practices towards floodplain and dam infrastructure management as well as environmental regulation.

You are welcome to respond to this email with any questions and our knowledgeable OPGA Zoning Committee would be happy to meet with you for further discussion. We've evaluated, risk-assessed, and conducted regulatory analysis on this situation since Jan. 2019 and have gained valuable insights into the state of floodplain and dam risk management and flood infrastructure in Bear Canyon Arroyo.

Sincerely,
Oso Grande Neighborhood Association, Board of Officers
President,
Alicia Quinones, BSEngr., MBA, Certified Engineering Risk Manager;
Principal, AMQuinones Energy Advisory Services, LLC

P.S. I've attached below a homeowner FAQ sheet about the storage unit proposal and floodplain and dam issues because they are complex and not readily understood.
Since your home is in a "FEMA designated flood hazard area", your voices should have primary weight (rather than little weight) because you have much to lose during a significantly-sized flood event. Here are some talking points regards the situation at hand.

- CABQ must not give away 12% of its publicly owned floodplain capacity (that's 2.3-acre parcel/ 20 acres of floodplain in Oso Grande between Morris and Juan Tabo = 12%). Oso Grande floodplain was originally placed and planned to be public flood water management and John B. Robert dam infrastructure.
State Engineer, John D’Antonio, testified to NM Legislature earlier in 2019 that human lives were at risk at high-hazard potential dams. John B. Robert dam is safety rated as high-hazard potential [verified on NID.gov]. This means what it says: downstream residents in Oso Grande are at risk of losing life from a dam failure. An emergency action plan has not been filed to-date as required by State of NM Dam Safety Regulations. The NM State Dam Safety Office in the State Engineers Office is grossly underfunded and do not have the capacity to enforce their own regulations. NM Legislature has responsibility in seeing that residents’ concerns are mitigated through sound engineering risk-management practices. CABQ has no business whatsoever interfering with State and Federal initiatives to manage flood infrastructure; nor by making matters worse by removing the flood capacity permanently from the valuable Bear Canyon Arroyo. Yet, CABQ persists that development at any cost is justified, even to the extent of giving away, for free, this floodplain capability by converting it to commercial use.

FEMA flood map is dated 2008. It’s outdated. Hence, floodplain mapping parameters are underestimated. Actual residential flood risks are likely much higher than shown on official mapping. One of many reasons is that climate change is causing rainfall variability, with extremes occurring more frequently; hence greater chances for losses. Another reason is that the 20-acre Oso Grande floodplain is subject to wind driven erosion and flood-driven sedimentation; hence, causing the floodplain to fill up with dirt, redirect waters towards valued properties, and have reduced absorption capacity. AMAFCA is in receipt of a $100M bond funded by taxpayers. A portion of this bond money is slated to be used for flood inundation studies in John Robert Dam area, to map locations of potential future flooding. The inundation studies are not known to be underway. Therefore, AMAFCA and CABQ and City Hydrologist has no business whatsoever making decisions regards human life and property risk utilizing outdated mapping and without competently prepared adverse impact or risk analysis.

CABQ asks at-risk residents to purchase flood insurance from FEMA’s insurance program or from a commercial carrier. Insurance premiums increase as risk increases. While residents are fully aware that proposed storage units are not fully responsible for area-wide flood risks, this particular development is responsible for a significant increase in flood risk due to the crucial location of the proposed property. Downstream residents should not have to shoulder the extra expense of flood insurance brought about by CABQ decision to INCREASE flood risk and hence associated property damage and risks to human life. Currently, flood insurance yearly premium is estimated at $480. [www.FEMA.gov]. With risk-based increases based on actual calculated impacts, annual premiums could be in the $3,000 range given the extra risk imposed by commercial development on dam and floodplain infrastructure. These adverse impacts disclosed to Zoning Hearing Examiner (ZHE) in May, 2019 were disregarded as being hearsay to CABQ’s decisions regards the development.

Residents demand that CABQ observe all IDO processes meant to consider adverse impact to others as both material and significant and observant of all pertinent regulation.

FEMA is known to be functionally insolvent. FEMA has a history of resisting payments to residential
Juan Tabo drainage from upper Bear Canyon has drained into the reservoir at 4909 Juan Tabo for 44 years without the original property owners objecting to this use of their land. In fact, the drainage infrastructure was designed to flow into this property as it is a FEMA defined floodway and FEMA defined flood prone area. The lot is not "vacant" as developers contend. Rather it's important infrastructure capacity for Bear Canyon residents.

Since CABQ is required to observe FEMA federal regulation and FEMA floodplain management practices, then CABQ should not be allowed to give away this taxpayer owned regulated infrastructure capacity to commercial parties as removed capacity.

FEMA, is a floodplain administrator, and is a responsible agency for catastrophic risk and natural disaster management. Just because CABQ City Hydrologist justifies that floodplain standards are being met, it does not mean that FEMA required risk-based standards and best practice are being met. NEPA Federal regulation (ask for specifics) requires consideration of environmental risks, beyond any arbitrarily set standards during decision-making. Federal Executive Orders (ask for citation) requires that development avoid locating in floodplain properties. That means exactly what it says. Avoid Locating!

IDO Sensitive Lands ordinance (14-16-5-2(C)(1)) also calls to avoid locating on floodplain sensitive lands. Since this particular parcel qualifies for several categories of sensitive lands such as: steep slopes, unstable soils, arroyos, irrigation facility, escarpment, dam proximity, then the cumulative effects of harmful and crucial adverse impacts or risk on this sensitive land should cause decision makers to be far more observant of the IDO and other regulation......not less.

4909 Juan Tabo undeveloped lot has a BERNCO assessed property value of approx. $25,000. FEMA estimates of at-risk homes in Oso Grande area is 125 homes. Collectively, these carry a replacement value of approx. $30+ million dollars. Why would CABQ even consider risking such large losses to residential properties when the legally justified mitigation solution is to disallow all development. There is a gross inequity operating as downstream residents are imposed upon to pay for poor decision making caused by CABQ’s lack of initiative in observing all regulation. CABQ must do the right thing and acquire the property they’ve been freely utilizing for 44 years, with owner consent, as flood containment infrastructure.

CABQ did not conduct long-term planning or zoning analysis on this parcel prior to designating it inappropriately as MX-L, hence allowing it to be utilized as self-storage. This is despite Oso Grande’s active participation in zoning processes. Oso Grande’s voices, warning of floodplain risk, were dismissed in the 2016-2018 timeframe when CABQ should have been conducting due diligence on this particular parcel.

4909 Juan Tabo is John B. Robert dam toe region; much of the dams functionality is underlying the...
Angela,
Sorry for not sending these to you.
Please send to all DRB members and include in the record for the case.

Hi Maggie,

I’m emailing with some of the items we identified for follow up from the City. Please look this over and let me know if I’m missing anything or you need clarification.

- **Water Authority Comments**: Please send us the Official Water Authority comments. They were missing from the group you sent on Tuesday evening.

- **Color of Trim Materials**: Review IDO Section 5-2{H}[1]{(b)} 1 – Page 205. Trim materials on facades constituting less than 20% of the façade’s opaque surface may be any color. The wasabi green trim is far below 20%. We will be adding our calculations of the wasabi trim color to the site elevations.

- **Loading Spaces**: Review IDO Table 5-5-7 – Off Street Loading Space Requirements – Page 248. I believe you stated that you were going to check with Jacobo about whether the MX-L Zone falls into the “All Other Zone Categories” in the table. If so, we calculated that we are required one loading space which will be accommodated at the loading area on the south side of the building. Please verify.

- **Meeting to discuss west wall**: We would like to set up a meeting with Jacobo and Shahab to discuss the design and location of west wall abutting the Water Authority lot. Can you help us get that set up?

- **Grading elevations**: I’ve attached the elevations that were in the application. They were on the last page in the “Exhibits” section. These were also included in the Site Plan package we sent to the Neighborhood Associations as part of the application notification.

Thank you for all your help Maggie. Have nice holidays!
This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
Dear DRB Members and Staff,

Please Note:
This resent email notes in the email Subject line [ IDO 1-8(B) ] that there are 2 separate Public Comment letters that were submitted by me to the DRB Members and Staff regarding: PR 2019-002184: (a) one letter addresses the inadequacies of the Sensitive Lands Study, and, (b) the 2nd letter addresses the requirements of IDO Section 1-8(B).

Please let me know if you have any further questions.
Best regards,
Janie McGuigan

On Tue, Dec 10, 2019 at 10:41 PM Jane McGuigan <janiemc07@gmail.com> wrote:

Dear DRB Members and Staff,

Attached please find the my Letter of public comment (4 separate pdf pages) re: PR 2019-002184, 4909 Juan Tabo Blvd NE, that will be heard at the 12/18/2019 DRB meeting.

The City of Albuquerque Development Review Board (DRB) is charged with administering the Integrated Development Ordinance regulations, as revised and updated May 2018; and, in particular IDO section 1-8(B) which states:

IDO 1-8(B) If any regulation in this IDO conflicts with other applicable laws or regulations of the City, or conflicts with applicable state or federal law, the more restrictive provision shall prevail, unless the provisions of state or federal law, as interpreted by the courts, prevent that result.

There are several issues that have been identified relative to applicable Federal laws and regulations in the attached Letter as regards to the above Application including but not limited to:

* National Flood Insurance Act of 1968
* Federal Executive Order 11988
* Encroachment Review and Certification as required by the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) Floodplain Management Requirements

Please take these public comments regarding Federal laws and regulations into consideration as you are evaluating the suitability of whether or not to issue a Building Permit related to PR 2019-00218.

Sincerely,

Janie McGuigan
B.A., M.C.R.P. (Masters in City and Regional Planning)
Janie
Janie McGuigan
4924 Purcell Dr. N.E.
Albuquerque, NM 87111
janiemc07@gmail.com
505-918-1884

This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
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CHAIR WOLFLEY: (Off audio) and Site Plan 2019-379. This is Guardian Storage at 4909 Juan Tabo. And we'll go ahead and have you all introduce yourself, and then I'll swear you in.

MR. LOPEZ: I'm Jesus Lopez, with RESPEC, civil engineer.

MR. STROZIER: Jim Strozier, with Consensus Planning.

MR. PINE: Jason Pine, with Cartesian Surveys.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Excellent.

(Witnesses sworn.)

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Thank you. The parties have sworn in. Okay. Go ahead and give us an update. Your preliminary final plat is new. The other site plan has been deferred, so...

MR. STROZIER: Okay. That is --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Previously.

MR. STROZIER: That is correct.

Madam Chair and Board Members, we have addressed the comments that we received by the DRB members at the last meeting. This item was primarily deferred in order to allow the plat to catch up to the site plan. And the purpose of the plat was to dedicate the additional right-of-way as requested along Juan Tabo.

That -- the plat is before you today, and the site plans have been revised to show the additional right-of-way dedication. We did receive additional comments from transportation this week, which we have addressed. And I believe those were sent to you via e-mail, but we have them here as well, addressing your latest comments. And we also updated the infrastructure list to reflect the water authority's request.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Great. All right.

Is there anyone here to speak on this case?

MS. GOMEZ: No, (inaudible).

CHAIR WOLFLEY: No? Okay. Just a reminder, if you do want to speak on any case, please sign up at the desk over there with Ms. Gomez.

We'll go ahead and take board comments. Water authority.

MR. CADENA: Good morning. In regard to the preliminary plat, there's no objection.

With regard to the site plan, if you could just show me that change of vegetation.

The irrigation service is great. Okay. And for information only, you have an availability Statement 190317 which provides the conditions for service. Thank you.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Code enforcement.

MR. MARTINEZ: Code enforcement has no objection to either request.
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CHAIR WOLFLEY: Parks.
MS. SOMERFELDT: Parks has no (inaudible).

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Hydrology.

MR. BIAZAR: Hydrology has no objection to the plat. For the site plan, we have an approved conceptual grading and drainage plan with engineer stamp dates of December 20th, 2019, and January 9th, 2020. So we just need to make sure that the latest approved site plan is -- grading and drainage plan is included with the site plan.

(Inaudible crosstalk.)

MR. STROZIER: And this is -- this is the latest updated stamp.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: You want the stamp on it? (Inaudible) stamp it.

MR. BIAZAR: (Inaudible). Okay.

MR. STROZIER: All right.

MR. BIAZAR: Since we have an updated site plan, we need this one to be approved before we go further --

MR. LOPEZ: Okay.

MR. BIAZAR: -- so hydrology can defer, if necessary.

(Inaudible crosstalk.)

MR. LOPEZ: So there were no changes since the latest.

MR. BIAZAR: Okay.

MR. LOPEZ: I think there might -- we just -- the samples update the (inaudible).

MR. BIAZAR: Right. And that -- and that -- that -- since it is an updated stamp, it's not the stamp from either of the two approved ones, then we'd have to check it again.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Okay. Is that a deferral or delegation item?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: (Inaudible).

MR. BIAZAR: They have a new stamp date on their grading and drainage plan. The last approved one was on January 9th, and they have one that's now stamped the 23rd, so we would need to --

MR. LOPEZ: (Inaudible).

MR. BIAZAR: Yeah.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay.

MR. BIAZAR: So yeah, just delegated.

MR. LOPEZ: Okay.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: All right. And those comments are being made by our city engineer, Shahab Biazar.
DRB Minutes, Agenda Item 8
January 29, 2020

(Witness sworn.)

CHAIR WOLFLEY: So you -- Okay. All right. So the comments from
the city engineer were that this could be a delegation item.

Let's go to transportation.

MS. WOLFENBARGER: Okay. Transportation has no objection to the
approval of the plat, the 10-foot dedication, and to the
infrastructure list provided.

I did receive the fire marshal stamped plan. That was sent to me
by e-mail, however, I still had a few remaining comments that I
didn't see addressed by e-mail. And they were minor comments,
such as including the stamp on the site plan showing the ADA
cross slope on the drive pads. And also, calling out the city
standard details for the drive pad and sidewalk.

And then there were some -- just some minor dimension park --
dimensioning on the parking island radii.

MR. STROZIER: I believe that we have addressed all of those, and
I have a copy of the updated site plan with the stamp, engineer
stamp site plan today, so --

MS. WOLFENBARGER: And I would need to take (inaudible) before I
approve.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. So your comment -- your continued needs
relate to the site plan and the --

MS. WOLFENBARGER: Yes, minor --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: -- site plan as well?

MS. WOLFENBARGER: -- needs related to the site plan, yes.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: And the site plan, as well.

MR. BIAZAR: The site plan and grading and drainage.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Ms. Gould, can you give me some advice.
It looks like we might be okay with the plat, but not the site
plan. Should we --

MS. GOULD: Let's -- let's give Ms. Wolfenbarger a moment.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay.

MS. GOULD: And then I think we can go from there.

MS. WOLFENBARGER: Will you please show me the drive pad and --
and sidewalk? Those are the only two things I need to check. I
see you addressed two of my comments.

MR. STROZIER: (Inaudible) detail sheet.

MS. WOLFENBARGER: Okay. You addressed by third comment. And
then the references to the city standard details on the sidewalk
and drive pad.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So those will be on the work order.

MS. WOLFENBARGER: You are going to do a work order?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: That's correct.
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MS. WOLFENBARGER: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Is that's okay?

MS. WOLFENBARGER: And that will be okay. So with the comments that you addressed, I -- I approve the site plan.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Okay.

MR. STROZIER: Thank you.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. And planning comments are that you have addressed the comments made in previous comment sheets on your site plan and plat.

Okay. So we're going to first look at taking action on the plat. I'll ask each board member to vote to approve or deny the preliminary final plat. If you're accepting delegation, please summarize that delegation and the time needed.

Let's start with water.

MR. CADENA: Approved. Water authority approved.

MR. MARTINEZ: Code enforcement approves.

MS. SOMERFELDT: Parks approves.

MR. BIAZAR: Hydrology approves.

MS. WOLFENBARGER: Transportation approves.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. And planning approves.

So there is a consensus vote to approve Item 8, preliminary plat, Item 8, which is Project 2018-4, preliminary final plat 2020-27, because the application meets all the applicable requirements of the IDO and DPM, period.

Okay. All right.

Now we're going to take action on the --

MS. GOULD: (Inaudible) --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Oh, excuse me.

MS. GOULD: (Inaudible) and delegation for any required (inaudible).

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Gould.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes. I have all the utilities, and I also have (inaudible).

MS. GOULD: Okay.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: That shows Academy Place.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah.

MS. GOULD: That's the --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Oh, that is? Okay. That's -- all right. That's right. Academy Place. I'm focused on Juan Tabo. Okay. So
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our -- Okay. We're good.

Now we will -- I'll ask each board member to vote to approve or deny Item 8, Project 2019-2184, the site plan, which is 2019-379. And if you're accepting delegation, please summarize that delegation and the time needed.

I'll start with water.

MR. CADENA: Water authority approves.

MR. MARTINEZ: Code enforcement approves.

MS. SOMERFELDT: Parks and rec approves.

MR. BIAZAR: Hydrology takes delegation for -- to recheck the grading and drainage plan. We can say four weeks. I think it'll be done much quicker.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: (Inaudible).

MR. BIAZAR: Okay.

MS. WOLFENBARGER: Transportation approves.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: And planning approves, with delegation for final sign-off. Okay? And the infrastructure list. Okay. Thank you. Cue cards.

There is a consensus vote to approve Item 8, Project 2019-2184, and Site Plan 2019-00379, because the application meets all the applicable requirements of the IDO and DPM, with delegation to hydrology and planning for the items just stated.

MR. GOULD: And there's an infrastructure list attached to it. And you probably are looking at a delegation date of a couple of months out.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Gould. I forgot to say that the delegation would be for eight weeks.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Did the infrastructure list (inaudible)? Is that what we --

MS. GOULD: And we also need to sign this -- the infrastructure list.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: For the site plan?

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Yeah, so there's an infrastructure list and a site plan to sign.

(Inaudible crosstalk.)

(Co...
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 15th day of March 2020.

Kelli A. Gallegos

Kelli A. Gallegos
## FIGURE 12

**INFRASTRUCTURE LIST**  
(Rev 2-15-18)  
*EXHIBIT "A"*  
TO SUBDIVISION IMPROVEMENTS AGREEMENT  
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD (D.R.B.) REQUIRED INFRASTRUCTURE LIST  

**TRACT G-1 PLAT OF TRACTS F-1 & G-1 ACADEMY PLACE**  
PROPOSED NAME OF PLAT AND/OR SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN  

**TRACT G-1 PLAT OF TRACTS F-1 & G-1 ACADEMY PLACE**  
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>Size</th>
<th>Type of Improvement</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6' WIDTH</td>
<td>PCC SIDEWALK &amp; 2 RAMPS</td>
<td>OSUNA RD NORTH OF SITE</td>
<td>NW CORNER OF SITE @ JUAN TABO (312 FT)</td>
<td>NE CORNER OF SITE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30'</td>
<td>18&quot; RCP SD TO CHANNEL OUTFALL</td>
<td>SW CORNER OF SITE</td>
<td>SOUTH PL</td>
<td>ARROYO OUTFALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17'x6'</td>
<td>OUTFALL STRUCTURE &amp; CONC RUNDOWN</td>
<td>SW CORNER OF SITE</td>
<td>TOP OFSHOTCRETE CHANNEL SLOPE</td>
<td>TOP OF CONC CHNL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/4&quot;</td>
<td>IRRIGATION SERVICE CONN TO NON-POTABLE WL</td>
<td>JUAN TABO RD</td>
<td>8&quot; NON-POTABLE WL</td>
<td>BACK OF CURB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Certification</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>City Const Engineer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inspector P.E.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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BEFORE THE CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE
LAND USE HEARING OFFICER

APPEAL NO. AC-19-9

OSO GRANDE NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION, Appellants,

SL JUAN TABO LAND, LLC and GUARDIAN STORAGE, Party Opponents.

1. BACKGROUND

This is an appeal of a decision from the Zoning Hearing Examiner (ZHE) granting a
conditional use permit to construct an indoor storage facility in an MX-L zone in the Northeast
Heights. The proposed location of the indoor storage facility is on a 2.37-acre vacant,
undeveloped lot at the Southeast corner of Osuna Road and Juan Tabo Boulevard. The
following background is relevant to this appeal.

There is no dispute that an indoor storage use is a conditional use in an MX-L zone and
that the site is a 2.37-acre vacant, undeveloped lot that is zoned MX-L [R. 143]. It is also
undisputed that the site is in a designated Area of Consistency as referenced in the
Comprehensive Plan. On the East side of Juan Tabo Blvd., and East of the site is the John B.
Robert Dam and the Bear Canyon Arroyo [R. 144]. The Arroyo and Dam are designated as
Major Public Open Space (MPOS) in the City’s Comprehensive Plan. Abutting the site to the
West is the El Oso Grande Park which includes a trial system that runs adjacent on the South
side of the site. The Dam and Arroyo to the East, along with the Park on the West side are
zoned NR-PO-A and B, respectively [R. 168]. On the South side of the site is a lot owned by
the City of Albuquerque Water Utility. The land directly North of the site and on the North
side of Osuna Rd. is zoned RT and encompasses townhome uses. There are smaller mixed-use
zones and commercial uses to the North and Southeast of the site [R. 168].

It appears from the record that the applicants (Party Opponents in this appeal) through
their agents, Planners with Consensus Planning, met with City Planning Staff on January 15,
2019 for a pre-application meeting, required under IDO, § 6-4(B) [R. 146]. A City sponsored
Facilitated Meeting then took place between the applicants, their agents, and with the Oso
Grande Neighborhood Association (OGNA) on February 7, 2019 [R. 62].¹ Thereafter, on
March 7, 2019, Consensus Planning submitted their conditional use application to the ZHE [R.
139].

Before the ZHE hearing took place, the OGNA submitted to the ZHE what they
considered to be a statement of impacts from the proposed use [R. 285]. On April 16, 2019,
the ZHE held a public hearing on the application [R. 322]. On May 1, 2019, the ZHE approved
the conditional use application [R. 29]. The OGNA filed their timely appeal and a LUHO
hearing was held on July 1, 2019.

In their appeal, the OGNA present twelve issues in their appeal which they claim supports
a reversal of the ZHE’s decision [R. 15].² After careful consideration of their oral and written

---
¹ Apparently the OGNA is not the only association in the area. There is also the Amberglen Homeowners
Association (AHOA). However, the record demonstrates it was only the OGNA that requested the Facilitated
Meeting [R. 156].
² Many of appeal issues raised by Appellants concern IDO standards for variances, of which are inapplicable to this
appeal.
arguments, and after reviewing the record, I find that the ZHE did not err in his decision because his decision is well supported with substantial evidence in the record. As described in detail below, I recommend that the City Council deny the appeal.

II. STANDARD OF REVIEW

At the appeal level of review, the decision and record must be supported by substantial evidence to be upheld. A review of an appeal is a whole record review to determine whether the ZHE acted fraudulently, arbitrarily, or capriciously; or whether the ZHE’s decision is not supported by substantial evidence; or if the ZHE erred in applying the requirements of the IDO, a plan, policy, or regulation [IDO, § 14-16-6-4(U)(4)].

III. DISCUSSION

As stated above, after reviewing the record of the evidence in this appeal, the decision of the ZHE is well-supported by the record. Although Appellants claim that the ZHE erred, I can find no such error. And although the Appellants claim that the use will materially and adversely impact surrounding neighborhoods from traffic and from the Bear Canyon Arroyo’s flood water runoff, their claims are unsupported and are contrary to the existing evidence in the record. I will take up the applicable appeal issues raised by Appellants individually. However, it is appropriate to first comment on the criteria in the IDO on which the ZHE based his decision. The use, an indoor storage facility, is a conditionally permissive use in the zone in which it is proposed. As stated above this is undisputed. Pursuant to § 6-6(A)(3) of the IDO, a conditional use “shall” be approved if the application meets all of the
following criteria:

6-6(A)(3)(a) It is consistent with the adopted ABC Comp Plan, as amended.
6-6(A)(3)(b) It complies with all applicable provisions of this IDO, including but not limited to any Use-specific Standards applicable to the use in Section 14-16-4-3; 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.
6-6(A)(3)(c) It will not create significant adverse impacts on adjacent properties, the surrounding neighborhood, or the larger community.
6-6(A)(3)(d) It will not create material adverse impacts on other land in the surrounding area through increases in traffic congestion, parking congestion, noise, or vibration without sufficient mitigation or civic or environmental benefits that outweigh the expected impacts.
6-6(A)(3)(e) It will not increase non-residential activity within 300 feet of a lot in any Residential zone district between the hours of 8:00 P.M. and 6:00 A.M.
6-6(A)(3)(f) It will not negatively impact pedestrian or transit connectivity without appropriate mitigation.

The ZHE expressly found that the proposed conditional use satisfies each of the above criteria. Appellants generally claim that there is evidence to support a denial of the application. But, because this is an appeal of a decision from the ZHE, the question is not whether substantial evidence exists to support the opposite result, but rather, the question is whether the evidence in the record supports the result reached. Notwithstanding, I also find however, that there is insufficient evidence to support the opposite result or Appellants’ claims.

Appellants however broadly and somewhat abstractly contend that any development of the 2.37-acre lot will cause significant negative impacts to surrounding property owners. I note for the City Council that Appellants have not submitted any factual evidence or evidence
prepared by any experts that support Appellants' broad contentions.

In this appeal, Appellants first claim that the IDO requires that 20% of neighborhood association members must give their approval of the application. In making this claim, they mischaracterize the application as a variance request. Notwithstanding, that the application is for a conditional use not a variance, there is no 20% rule in the IDO that is applicable to the conditional use.

Appellants next contend that the ZHE erred because he failed to include in the record what Appellants have characterized as "rebuttal documents" that they claim were submitted by various opponents of the application prior to the ZHE hearing. At the LUHO hearing, OGNA representative Alicia Quinones argued that at least 30 members of the community submitted letters opposing the application and that the ZHE or his Staff refused or failed to include the letters in the record. When queried about the alleged missing materials, Mrs. Quinones could not provide any more detail other than there is an email from the ZHE or his Staff demonstrating that the letters were submitted. I gave the Appellants (OGNA) an additional five days to submit the email and the alleged missing materials in this record. The OGNA did submit what appeared to be what they claimed to be the alleged missing materials and they have been included in the record. Many of the materials were already in the record. However, the materials that where not already in the record, I note that those materials appear to have been submitted only to the OGNA and not to the ZHE or his Staff. That is the email communications are clearly addressed only to the OGNA. I cannot find that there is evidence that the ZHE received and then refused these communications. Thus, there is insufficient evidence to support the Appellants' contention that the ZHE did not allow evidence in the
record. I also note that, although Appellants characterize the email communications as
"rebuttal documents," the substance of the materials do not rebut any fact in the record.
"Rebuttal" as the term is typically used, is specific evidence or argument, based on facts, that
tends to refute or contradict other evidence. The substance of the communications are voices
of opposition. The ZHE was already aware that there existed opposition to the request—he
noted it in his decision [R. 31]. Thus, adding more voices of opposition would not have
changed any of the ZHE’s findings regarding the conditional use criteria in the IDO. There
was no prejudice as Appellants seem to imply.

Next the Appellants claim that because the ZHE “allowed the applicant to change their
application after the submission deadline” the ZHE erred [R. 25]. Appellants generally claim
that the changed application was unfair to the OGNA. Appellants have not shown how the
changes were unfair and they have not shown that the changes impacted or prejudiced the
process or their rights in any manner. Appellants have not even identified what the changes
they are referencing were. In an appeal, it is the Appellants that must meet the substantial
evidence burden of proof.

I note that there is nothing in the IDO that prevents applicants from modifying various
aspects of their applications to satisfy certain neighborhood or City Staff concerns. In fact,
oftimes after applicants meet with neighborhood association members, application details
regarding setbacks, landscaping, height, design and other use specific issues are modified
specifically to address matters raised at facilitated meetings. Without more evidence from
Appellants, such as when the modifications were done, what the modifications were, and
how they were unfair, general unsupported arguments alone without supporting explanation
or evidence do not satisfy the burden of proof in an appeal hearing.

The OGNA next generally claim that the materials they submitted to the ZHE, namely a document they contend is an “Impact Statement,” was not considered by the ZHE or acknowledged in the ZHE’s decision. They further contend that this is a basis for reversal or remand. There is a document in the record labeled “Oso Grande Conditional Use – Impact Statement” (“Impact Statement”) which was submitted by the Appellants [R. 87].

Although not required, I note that in his official decision, (Findings 32 and 59), the ZHE expressly referenced the “Impact Statement” that the OGNA submitted into the record [R. 32]. The presumption is that the ZHE had familiarity with the record that he was deciding on and unless Appellants can prove with substantial evidence otherwise, the claim cannot withstand scrutiny. Said another way, without meaningful evidence to rebut the presumption that the ZHE reviewed the record, the argument in of itself is insufficient to disturb the ZHE’s decision. Appellants have submitted no such evidence to support their allegation that the ZHE did not review the document. Thus, the argument alone cannot survive an appeal.

Appellants also contend that the substance of the “Impact Statement” demonstrates that the proposed use will cause negative impacts on the surrounding area. After reviewing the entirety of the “Impact Statement,” I find that the document’s primary conclusions are unsupported. There are four main arguments and conclusions in the document. First, it is argued that the proposed 120,000 sq. ft. building will adversely affect and alter the flood

---

3 The document labeled “Impact Statement” is in quotes because in land use matters, an impact statement is typically prepared by professionals in the subject of study of the matters analyzed. For example, a traffic impact statement or an environmental statement is prepared by an engineer and or an expert in environmental issues respectively. This is so because the detail of analysis required on the issue requires highly technical engineering analysis. There is no evidence that the Appellants’ “Impact Statement” is supported by expert analysis.
water runoff and drainage in the area from the Bear Canyon Arroyo and the nearby Dam. Second, Appellants claim that the use will adversely impact traffic in the area. Third, the Appellants argue that the proposed 35-foot tall building will negatively impact the views of nearby residents. And, fourth, Appellants contend that the proposed storage use does not satisfy the Comprehensive Plan’s goals and policies.

Regarding the flood issues Appellants generally claim that the 2.37-acre lot is in a designated flood plain [R. 93]. They also broadly claim that the 2.37-acre lot is “unsuitable” for development because it is in a flood plain and the lot serves as runoff drainage for the Dam and the Arroyo [R. 103]. Yet, there is literally no evidence to support Appellants’ claims. In fact, their claim belies the evidence in the record.

Determining how flood waters and runoff water drains, in urban areas is a fact intensive, technical process. It is generally a matter that requires expert analysis based on many variables having to do with the details of soils, topography, contour elevations, and drainage resources in the area. Normally, certified professional engineers perform the analyses required for determining runoff and drainage matters, including drainage management.

In this matter, the analysis will not be complete until the applicants submit detailed plans showing detailed elevations, placement of impervious elements, and how drainage will be managed on the 2.37-acre lot. These issues have not yet been analyzed with the level of detail required for approval at this stage in the IDO review process. The details of grading and drainage is required to be reviewed by the City’s Hydrologist and the Development Review Board (DRB) subsequent to conditional use approval. Thus, many of Appellants general concerns are not ripe and unproven. Drainage cannot be resolved because the DRB
has not reviewed the numerous plans that must be submitted to the DRB before drainage
plans are rejected or approved by the DRB. At this stage in the application process, the ZHE
reviews drainage issues in a general way that revolves around the conditional use criteria
restated above in § 6-6(A)(3) of the IDO. The ZHE acknowledged this in his decision [R. 31,
Finding 53].

In addition, there is substantial evidence in the record that Appellants’ general claims
that development of the 2.37-acre lot will cause flooding are erroneous. Although much of
Appellants’ assumptions and claims of flooding rests on their claims that the site is in a flood
zone and is a designated watershed, the evidence in the record does not support either claim.
The lot is not in a flood plain as designated by FEMA or the City [R. 274]. In addition, the
2.37-acre lot is not in the designated Arroyo and it is not designated MPOS [R. 325]. The
site is adjacent to the Arroyo and the MPOS.

The facts in the record demonstrate that the development of the lot will increase
stabilization of the existing erosion that is taking place at the site [R. 263]. Appellants may
disagree, but they have not rebutted the expert opinions of the applicant’s engineer. The
applicants’ certified professional engineer opined that:

The existing storm water from the site leaves the site along the western
property line and is currently causing some minor erosion on the adjacent
property owned and maintained by the Albuquerque Bernalillo County
Water Utility Authority. The storm water runoff from the proposed site will
be directed via storm drain directly to the Bear Canyon Arroyo in a non-
erosive manner acceptable to the City of Albuquerque. This will benefit the
downstream properties.

The development of this site will have no impact on the John Robert Dam.

In closing, I can with certainty state that the development of this property as
proposed will generate no adverse impact with respect to grading and
drainage [R. 263].
I find that without competent evidence to rebut the engineer’s opinion on the issue of flooding and drainage, Appellants have not met their burden of proof.

Next, Appellants claim that the proposed storage use will adversely impact traffic in the area and specifically on Osuna Road [R. 94]. However, virtually all development creates some impacts on traffic. That is why the standard for a conditional use permit is that there must be substantial evidence in the record that the proposed use will not create “material adverse impacts... without sufficient mitigation or civic or environmental benefits that outweigh the expected impacts” [IDO, § 6-6(A)(3)(d)]. Appellants have not supplemented the record or their broad allegations with evidence that the proposed use will create material adverse impacts on the streets. They rely only on their assertion.

In this matter, the ZHE found that the indoor storage use generates 5 to 6 vehicles per hour even at peak times and the daily average trip generations amount to approximately 50 trips per day [R. 31]. The ZHE also found that the use generates less traffic that many other permissive uses allowed in an MX-L zone [R. 31]. This evidence was based on Consensus Planning’s statement that the proposed indoor storage use is deemed a “low intensity, low traffic generating use” when compared to other permissive uses described in the IDO [R. 59]. I reviewed the list of permissive uses in a MX-L zone from Table 4-2-1 in the IDO. An indoor storage use is a less intensive of a use, in terms of traffic generation than many of the permissive uses allowed in the zone. Many types of the permissive kinds of restaurant uses that are also allowed in the MX-L use generally generate many more vehicle trips per day than an indoor storage use. There is also evidence in the record that Juan Tabo Blvd carries approximately 24,000 vehicle trips per day [R. 328]. This was undisputed. The ingress and
egress to the proposed use will be placed only on Osuna Rd. where traffic is less prominent [R. 328].

During the DRB’s review, the City’s Traffic Engineer will review street access to assure that it mitigates any traffic concerns of the Engineer [R. 328]. Appellants did not rebut this evidence. Instead they just ignore it and speculate that traffic will create adverse impacts. Without any evidence, they also speculate that the proposed access will create safety issues but have not identified what safety issues will occur. [R. 94]. They claim the use will generate illegal activity and undue noise [R. 94]. Yet, there is no evidence in the record to support these broad claims.

Next Appellants claim that because the proposed indoor storage facility will be 35 feet tall, it will impair views of residents in the residential communities West of the site. There is evidence in the record that supports Appellants contentions insofar as views “might” be impaired. In the record, there is a memorandum that was submitted to the ZHE by Christine Sandoval, the City’s Parks and Recreation Department’s Principal Planner [R. 207]. Mrs. Sandoval wrote that “[v]iews from El Oso Grande Park may be impacted” and she seemed to recommend that the building not be 35-feet tall [R. 207]. Mrs. Sandoval also wrote that the views from above the site at the John B. Robert Dam will not be impacted by the 35-foot-tall building [R. 207]. The ZHE acknowledged this evidence and responded with a finding that the proposed height (35 feet) is permissive in the IDO [R. 31]. I would add that the City Parks and Recreation Planner’s opinion that views from the El Oso Grande Park “may be impacted” is not the standard in the IDO for judging whether a conditional use can be denied. Again, the standard is whether the proposed use will “create significant” or “material adverse
impacts’ under 6-6(A)(3)(c) or under 6-6(A)(3)(d) respectively without acceptable “mitigation.” Appellants, for whatever reason did not demonstrate to the ZHE that views looking up East from the El Oso Grande Park will be materially or significantly impacted. Thus, it is not enough to reverse the ZHE.

Notwithstanding, there is evidence in the record that there will be mitigation from the natural elevation of the lot on which the use will be placed. The evidence in the record demonstrates that the grade of the storage site “has an approximately 17-foot slope down from Juan Tabo Boulevard to the site floor” [R. 54]. Apparently, the finished floor of the building will be approximately 18 feet below the base elevation of Juan Tabo Boulevard [R. 328]. This is undisputed. And because the height is permissive at this location, the ZHE did not err.

Finally, in the Impact Statement submitted by Appellants, they argued that the proposed use does not satisfy the policies of the Comprehensive Plan. In their “Impact Statement” they contend that the proposed use or conditional use permit is contrary to several policies in the Comprehensive Plan. They generally contend that the use is “inconsistent with the character and community identity of the neighborhood” and that it will “destroy the natural setting” in the area [R. 90]. These arguments are based on the change of use at the site from its current undeveloped state to a developed state. Appellants also claim that the 2.37-acre site is or should be designated as “sensitive land” under the IDO and the Comprehensive Plan. These arguments are based on Appellants’ desire to keep the 2.37-acre lot vacant and undeveloped. Appellants ignore the rights of the landowner, the fact that the land is private property, and that the IDO allows, with the proper safeguards, development on private property.
Other than their subjective belief that the land should remain undeveloped, there is no support in the Comprehensive Plan or in the IDO for preventing vacant land from being developed. As stated above, the land is not in a flood zone or flood plain. There is no support for their contention that the land is or should be a designated “sensitive land” under the Comprehensive Plan and Appellants have not objectively identified the neighborhood’s “character” or “identity” that they contend is inconsistent with the proposed use. They merely contend that development of any kind is inconsistent with the area. There is no objective support in the record or in the Comprehensive Plan for Appellants’ subjective broad claims.

I find that the use is an infill project and infill within the City’s boundaries is a major priority policy goal of the Comprehensive Plan [Comp. Plan, 1-6, 1-8, 5-2, and 5-6]. Reducing urban sprawl and reducing burdens on existing infrastructure are just two of many demonstrated benefits described in the Comprehensive Plan regarding infill [Comp. Plan, 5-3, 5-4]. I also find that there is insufficient evidence to support a finding that the proposed indoor storage use is incompatible with the area’s identity and character. This is because, as stated above, the Appellants have not identified what that identity or character is which they believe is contrary to the use. Nor, have they shown how the ZHE erred in this regard. The burden is theirs to meet, and they have not done so. Again, in an appeal, the question is not whether substantial evidence exists to support the opposite result, but rather whether the evidence in the record supports the result reached. I find that the evidence in the record supports the result reached by the ZHE.
IV. CONCLUSION

The ZHE made 77 findings that are supported by the record. Although Appellants disagree, they have not rebutted any of the ZHE's findings with meaningful and substantial evidence. For all the reasons described above, I respectfully recommend that Appellants' appeal be denied in full.

[Signature]
Steven M. Chavez, Esq.
Land Use Hearing Officer

July 12, 2019

Copies to:
Appellants
Party Opponent
City Staff
Excerpt from the City Council’s Rules of Procedure (5/2019)*
Regarding the Hearing of the Land Use Hearing Officer’s
Recommended Decision by the City Council

A. The Hearing Officer shall enter his or her findings and
recommended decision ("decision") and forward the decision and findings to the
parties and the Council within 10 days of the close of the hearing.

B. The Hearing Officer shall base his or her decision on a
preponderance of the evidence. He or she may reweigh the evidence in the
record.

C. The Hearing Officer may decide to recommend that the Council
grant or deny an appeal in whole or in part, if the Hearing Officer determines that
the matter should be remanded, such remand may be ordered consistent with

D. When the Council receives the Hearing Officer’s findings and
decision, the Council shall place the decision on the agenda of the next regular
full Council meeting provided that there is a period of at least 10 days between
the receipt of the decision and the Council meeting. The parties may submit
comments to the Council through the Clerk of the Council regarding the Hearing
Officer’s decision and findings provided such comments are in writing and
received by the Clerk of the Council and the other parties of record four (4)
consecutive days prior to the Council “accept or reject” hearing. Parties
submitting comments in this manner must include a signed, written attestation
that the comments being submitted were delivered to all parties of record within
this time frame, which attestation shall list the individual(s) to whom delivery was
made. Comments received by the Clerk of the Council that are not in
conformance with the requirements of this Section will not be distributed to
Councilors.

E. The Council shall vote whether to accept or reject the Hearing
Officer’s decision and findings. The Council will make its decision to accept or
reject based solely on the record before it, and shall not hear from the parties or
any other person, other than its staff, at its hearing on this question. A motion to
reject or accept the Hearing Officer’s decision and findings must be approved by
a majority of the membership of the Council.

F. The Council may accept the decision and amend the findings of the
Hearing Officer if such an amendment is consistent with the decision of the
Hearing Officer.

G. If the Hearing Officer’s decision is rejected, or if the Council fails to
either accept or reject the recommendation, the City Council may take any one of
the actions identified in Section 14-16-6-4(U)(3)(e)(4) of the Integrated Development Ordinance.

H. If the Hearing Officer rules are in conflict with the Integrated Development Ordinance, the Integrated Development Ordinance shall prevail. If the Hearing Officer rules are silent regarding an area that is addressed by the Integrated Development Ordinance, the Integrated Development Ordinance shall apply.

*For the complete set of rules that apply to land use appeals, see the City Council Rules of Procedure, which can be viewed on the Council's website at http://www.cabq.gov/council
July 22, 2019

To all interested parties:

The following appeal is on the agenda of the Monday, August 5, 2019 City Council meeting, which will begin at 5:00 p.m. in the Vincent E. Griego Chambers, Basement Level, 1 Civic Plaza NW:

AC-19-9 PR-2019-002184 VA-2019-00086 VA-2019-00176: Oso Grande Neighborhood Association, appeals the Zoning Hearing Examiner’s (ZHE’s) decision to approve a conditional use to allow self-storage for Lot G1, Academy Place, located at 4909 Juan Tabo Blvd NE, zoned MX-L

The City Council will be voting to either “Accept” or “Reject” the Land Use Hearing Officer’s recommended Decision, therefore, public testimony is not taken at this time. Should the City Council reject the Land Use Hearing Officer’s recommended Decision, the appeal will then be scheduled for a full hearing before the City Council at a date no earlier than the next regular meeting of the full Council.

If you have any questions, I can be reached at 768-3100.

Sincerely,

Crystal Ortega
Clerk of the Council

Attachments:
Land Use Hearing Officer’s Recommendation
Excerpt from the Council’s Rules of Procedure
11. ANNOUNCEMENTS

12. PUBLIC HEARINGS: {Appeals, SAD Protest Hearings}

a. AC-19-6

Project #2018-001402/SI-2018-00171/VA-2019-00103: Thomas P. Gulley and Hessel Yntema III, Yntema Law Firm P.A., Agent for Taylor Ranch Neighborhood Association and surrounding property owners, appeal the decision of the Environmental Planning Commission (EPC) to approve a Site Plan-EPC for all or a portion of Lots 1 through 3, Block 1, Plat of West Bank Estates together with Tract A1, Lands of Suzanne H Poole, and Tracts C-1 and Lot 4-A of Plat of Tracts C-1, C-2 and Lot 4-A, Lands of Suzanne H Poole being a Replat of Tract C, Lands of Suzanne H Poole, Tract C, Annexation Plat Land in Section 25 and 36, T11N R2E, Lot 4, Block 1 West; zoned R-A, located at 5001 Namaste Road NW, between La Bienvenida Place NW and the Oxbow Open Space, containing approximately 23 acres

A motion was made by Councilor Sanchez that this matter be Remanded to the Environmental Planning Commission to consider issues related to clustering and open space. The motion carried by the following vote:

For: 9 - Peña, Borrego, Sanchez, Benton, Winter, Davis, Gibson, Jones, and Harris

b. AC-19-7

Project #2018-001402/SI-2018-00171/VA-2019-00103: Thomas P. Gulley and Hessel Yntema III, Yntema Law Firm P.A., Agent for Taylor Ranch Neighborhood Association and surrounding property owners, appeal the decision of the Environmental Planning Commission (EPC) to approve a Site Plan-EPC for all or a portion of Lots 1 through 3, Block 1, Plat of West Bank Estates together with Tract A1, Lands of Suzanne H Poole, and Tracts C-1 and Lot 4-A of Plat of Tracts C-1, C-2 and Lot 4-A, Lands of Suzanne H Poole being a Replat of Tract C, Lands of Suzanne H Poole, Tract C, Annexation Plat Land in Section 25 and 36, T11N R2E, Lot 4, Block 1 West; zoned R-A, located at 5001 Namaste Road NW, between La Bienvenida Place NW and the Oxbow Open Space, containing approximately 23 acres

A motion was made by Councilor Sanchez that this matter be Remanded to the Environmental Planning Commission to consider issues related to clustering and open space. The motion carried by the following vote

For: 8 - Peña, Borrego, Sanchez, Benton, Winter, Gibson, Jones, and Harris

Excused: 1 - Davis

c. AC-19-9

PR-2019-002184 VA-2019-00086 VA-2019-00176: Oso Grande Neighborhood Association, appeals the Zoning Hearing Examiner’s (ZHE’s) decision to approve a conditional use to allow self-storage for Lot G1, Academy Place, located at 4909 Juan Tabo Blvd NE, zoned
MX-L

A motion was made by Councilor Benton that this matter be To Accept the Land Use Hearing Officer Recommendation and Findings. The motion carried by the following vote:

For: 7 - Peña, Borrego, Sanchez, Benton, Gibson, Jones, and Harris

Excused: 2 - Winter, and Davis

d. AC-19-10

PR-2019-002175 VA-2019-00075 VA-2019-00177: JAG Planning & Zoning, Agent for Pamela L. Wiley, appeals the Zoning Hearing Examiner’s (ZHE’s) decision to approve a variance of 5 ft to the required 5 ft side yard setback (“Application”) upon the real property located at 6140 Full Moon Ave NW

A motion was made by Councilor Gibson that this matter be To Accept the Land Use Hearing Officer Recommendation and Findings. The motion carried by the following vote:

For: 7 - Peña, Borrego, Benton, Davis, Gibson, Jones, and Harris

Against: 1 - Sanchez

Excused: 1 - Winter

13. APPROVALS: {Contracts, Agreements, and Appointments}

a. EC-19-383

Report on Uses of 3/8ths Hold Harmless Gross Receipts Tax - FY2019 2nd Quarter

A motion was made by President Peña that this matter be Receipt Be Noted. The motion carried by the following vote:

For: 9 - Peña, Borrego, Sanchez, Benton, Winter, Davis, Gibson, Jones, and Harris

14. FINAL ACTIONS

f. O-19-67

Amending Article VI, Section 4 And Article XVI, Sections 3, 6, 7, 12, And 20 Of The Charter, Amending Chapter 2, Article 4, Part 13, ROA 1994, The Filing Of Petitions Ordinance, And Amending Chapter 2, Article 4, ROA 1994, To Add The Limitations On Seed Money And Maintenance Of Campaign In Off Years Ordinances (Sanchez, by request)

A motion was made by Councilor Sanchez that this matter be Amended. Councilor Sanchez moved Amendment No. 1. The motion carried by the following vote:

For: 9 - Peña, Borrego, Sanchez, Benton, Winter, Davis, Gibson, Jones, and Harris

A motion was made by Councilor Sanchez that this matter be Postponed as Amended to August 19, 2019. The motion carried by the following vote:

For: 9 - Peña, Borrego, Sanchez, Benton, Winter, Davis, Gibson, Jones, and Harris
SL Juan Tabo Land, LLC requests a conditional use to allow self-storage for Lot G1, Academy Place, located at 4909 Juan Tabo Blvd NE, zoned MX-L [Section 14-16-5-6]

Special Exception No:............ VA-2019-00086
Project No:........................ Project# 2019-002184
Hearing Date:....................... 04-16-19
Closing of Public Record:...... 04-16-19
Date of Decision:................. 05-01-19

On the 16th day of April, 2019, Jim Strozier, Consensus Planning, agent for property owner SL Juan Tabo Land, LLC (“Applicant”) appeared before the Zoning Hearing Examiner (“ZHE”) requesting a conditional use to allow self-storage (“Application”) upon the real property located at 4909 Juan Tabo Blvd NE (“Subject Property”). Below are the ZHE’s findings of fact and decision:

**FINDINGS**

1. Applicant is requesting a conditional use to allow Self-Storage.
2. The City of Albuquerque Code of Ordinances Section 14-16-6(A)(3) (Review and Decision Criteria– Conditional Use) reads: “An application for a Conditional Use Approval shall be approved if it meets all of the following criteria:
   (a) It is consistent with the ABC Comp. Plan, as amended;
   (b) It complies with all applicable provisions of the IDO, including, but not limited to any Use-specific Standards applicable to the use in Section 14-16-4-3; the DPM; other adopted City regulations; and any conditions specifically applied to development of the property in any prior permit or approval affecting the property;
   (c) It will not create significant adverse impacts on adjacent properties, the surrounding neighborhood, or the larger community;
   (d) It will not create material adverse impacts on other land in the surrounding area, through increases in traffic congestion, parking congestion noise, or vibration without sufficient mitigation or civic or environmental benefits that outweigh the expected impacts;
   (e) It will not increase non-residential activity within 300 feet of a lot in any residential zone district between the hours of 8:00 pm and 6:00 am;
   (f) It will not negatively impact pedestrian or transit connectivity without appropriate mitigation.
3. The Applicant bears the burden of ensuring there is evidence in the record supporting a finding that the above criteria are met under Section 14-16-4-(F)(2).
4. Jim Strozier of Consensus Planning, agent for SL Tqbo Land LLC, owner appeared and gave evidence in support of the application.
5. The address of the subject property is 4909 Juan Tabo NE.
6. The subject property is currently zoned MX-L.
7. The MX-L zone allows indoor storage as a conditional use.
8. The requested use is regulated by Specific-use Standards Section 14-16-4-3(D)(28): Self-Storage.
9. All storage units for the proposed use will be located inside the structure, with access through interior corridors; with no outdoor storage of vehicles or goods on the subject property.
10. The subject property does not abut any residential zone or any lots containing residential use.
11. The application complies with applicable Use-specific standards of the IDO, the DPM; other City regulations.
12. There are no other conditions applied on the property by a prior permit or approval.
13. All property owners within 100 feet and affected neighborhood association were notified of the application.
14. Amberglen HOA, Inc., Oso Grande Neighborhood Association, and John B. Roberts Neighborhood Association are the affected NAs.
15. A site plan and photographs of the subject property and viewscapes from the subject property were submitted in support of the Application.
16. The property owner does business as Guardian Storage.
17. The subject property is 2.37 acres in area and is currently vacant, and is located on the southeast corner of the intersection of Juan Tabo and Osuna Blvd. NE.
18. The subject property is located within an Area of Consistency as designated by the ABC Comp. Plan.
19. The subject property is near Juan Tabo Blvd. NE., a Multi-modal Corridor designated by the ABC Comp. Plan.
20. Juan Tabo Blvd. NE is an Urban Principal Arterial as designated in the LRTS Guide.
21. Adjacent to the subject site to the south is an ABCWUA parcel and the CNM Montoya Campus.
22. The site has a 17 foot slope from Juan Tabo to the site floor.
23. There is a mix of moderate density residential in the R-T and MX-T zones to the north.
24. NR-PO-B to the east includes the John B. Robert Dam; Bear Canyon Open Space and Office.
25. NR-PO-A and R-1D zones properties to the west are the Oso Grande Park and Utilities.
26. The proposed project would be a newly constructed facility that would house a climate controlled multi-story self-storage unit on the property.
27. The proposed use will serve the surrounding neighborhood with a business which is low intensity, generates low traffic volume and congestion, commercial infill on currently vacant and underutilized and underdeveloped land.
28. This proposed use is consistent with ABC Comp. Plan Goal 5.3: Efficient Development Patterns; in promoting a development pattern that will maximize the use of existing infrastructure and public facilities and the efficient use of land to support the public good.
29. The proposed building will be a 3 story, 120,000 square feet and 35 foot tall.
30. The proposed building will be constructed with an approximate 62 foot setback on the north; approximate 50 foot setback on the south; approximate 74 foot and 60 foot setbacks on the east; and a 75 foot setback to the west.
31. The building will have interior drive-in loading area with garage door ingress and egress to each unit.
32. Site access will be from an entrance to the north from Osuna Road.
33. The business will operate from 7:00 am through 5:30 pm, with gate access closed at 7:00 pm.
34. There will be no ingress or egress from Juan Tabo Blvd. NE.
35. The subject site is located adjacent to the Bear Canyon Arroyo Major Public Open Space, making it subject to the regulations of Section 14-16-5-2(C).
36. The Applicant shall conduct an analysis of the site constraints of the property as it relates to sensitive lands prior to the design process.
37. Agent for the Applicant participated in a site visit and a City of Albuquerque Land Use Facilitation meeting with representatives of the Oso Grande Neighborhood Association, Jon B. Robert Neighborhood Association and Amberglen Home Owners Association. held February 7, 2019 at the Holiday Park Community Center.
38. The Report from the facilitators was submitted with the Application.
39. The Report, Report Amendment, and Appendix summarizes potential adverse impacts to the adjacent area raised by opponents to the Application into three general areas of concern: Traffic impacts; Drainage; and Viewscape.
40. Opponents raised potential adverse traffic impacts relating to congestion and parking problems generated by the requested use.
41. Applicant pointed out that the requested conditional use generates far less traffic than many of the allowed uses on an MX-L zone district.
42. This use generates an average of 5 to 6 vehicles per hour, even during peak usage hours. With a daily average of approximately 50 per day.
43. The parking lot will be primarily used by employees of the proposed facility and potential new customers who want to rent a storage unit.
44. Existing customers will drive inside the building to drop off of pick up items.
45. Juan Tabo Blvd. currently generates 24,000 trips per average day.
46. Ingress and egress to the facility will only be from Osuna Blvd. There will be not access from Juan Tabo Blvd.
47. Osuna Blvd. does not continue to the west.
48. Access and circulation have been designed to ensure safe ingress and egress.
49. The City Fire Marshall’s office has approved the Fire 1 Plan.
50. Opponents were concerned that storm runoff and drainage from the proposed use would potentially adversely impact nearby City Open Spaces and wildlife habitat areas.
51. Applicant has acknowledged the subject property is adjacent to the Bear Canyon Arroyo Overlay Zone/Corridor.
52. Although the site is not in a flood plain as designated by FEMA, Applicant agrees and stipulated ; since it is adjacent, the development will be assessed for compliance with a) drainage policies that prevent unnatural erosion and degradation of drainage ways, and b) approval by the City engineer.
53. Applicant will prepare and submit a Grading and Drainage Plan (site plan) to be approved by City Hydrology, with specific plans to stabilize the existing steep slope on the east edge of the property; b) provide on-site improvements to eliminate adverse impacts to the property to the west (including the pedestrian path) and c) improve storm water quality.
54. Applicant will maintain contact with AMAFCA, the agency that regulates the adjacent channel, and comply with any regulations by that agency.
55. Opponents raised concerns that the development will block the viewscape of the John B. Roberts Dam, a cultural landmark; that the development will destroy the feeling of openness.
56. Applicant has testified that the subject site is lower than the residential neighborhood to the north and the businesses to the southeast; that the property is privately owned and is not city “Open Space”, and height is permissive in the MX-L zone.
57. Applicant has agreed to consider the viewscape from all directions with the intention and
goal to design and site the building so that impacts are acceptable.
58. The proposed building is planned to be a three-story building with glass and a finished
building materials that will blend in with other office, institutional, and commercial
developments surrounding the subject property.
59. The Oso Grande Neighborhood Association submitted a Conditional Use-Impact Statement
in opposition to the requested use.
60. Paige Baird, 2900 Louisiana Blvd. NE, appeared and gave testimony in support of the
Application.
61. Janie McGuigan, 4929 Purcell Dr. NE, appeared and gave testimony in opposition of the
Application.
62. Kathy Alvarado, 4920 Serena Cir NE, appeared and gave testimony in opposition of the
Application.
63. Phil Jester, 4225-C Paseo Del Oso NE, appeared and gave testimony in opposition of the
Application.
64. Alicia Quiones, Oso Grande NE, appeared and gave testimony in opposition of the
Application.
65. Tom Knoll, 9412 Northridge Dr. NE, appeared and gave testimony in opposition of the
Application.
66. Alan Markey, 10345 Camino Del Oso NE, appeared and gave testimony in opposition of the
Application.
67. Andrew Leverett, 10416 Karen Ave NE, appeared and gave testimony in opposition of the
Application.
68. Steve Armstrong, 9813 Mesa Arriba NE, appeared and gave testimony in opposition of the
Application.
69. Robert Fire, 10262 Gutierrez Road NE, appeared and gave testimony in opposition of the
Application.
70. The proposed use is consistent with the ABC Comp. Plan, as amended, as required by
Section 14-16-6-6(A)(3)(a).
71. The proposed use complies with all applicable provisions of the IDO, including, but not
limited to any Use-specific standards applicable to the use in Section 14-16-4-3; the DPM;
other adopted City regulations; any conditions specifically applied to the development of the
property in a prior permit or approval affecting the property, as required by Section 14-16-6-
6(A)(3)(b).
72. Although, the proposed use potentially might create adverse impacts on the adjacent
properties; the surrounding neighborhood, or the larger community, the Applicant has
proposed and stipulated mitigation that would outweigh the adverse impacts as required by
Section 14—16-6-6(A)(3)(c).
73. The proposed use will not create material adverse impacts on other land in the surrounding
area through increases in traffic congestion, parking congestion, noise, or vibration as
requires by Section 14-16-6(A)(3)(d).
74. The proposed use will not increase non-residential activity within 300 feet of a lot in any
Residential zone between the hours of 8:00 pm and 6:00 am as required by Section 14-16-6-
6(A)(3)(e).
75. The proposed use will not negatively impact pedestrian or transit connectivity, as required by
Section 14-16-6-6(A)(3)(f).
76. The proper “Notice of Hearing” signage was posted for the required time period as required by Section 14-16-6-4(K)(3).

77. The Applicant has authority to pursue this Application.

**DECISION:**

APPROVAL of a conditional use to allow Self-Storage.

**CONDITIONS:**

Applicant shall comply with Specific-use Standards Section 14-16-4-3(D)(28): Self-Storage. Applicant shall comply with Section 14-16-5-2(C); specifically Applicant shall conduct an analysis of the site constraints of the property as it relates to sensitive lands prior to the design process.

**APPEAL:**

If you wish to appeal this decision, you must do so by May 16, 2019 pursuant to Section 14-16-6-4(U), of the Integrated Development Ordinance, you must demonstrate that you have legal standing to file an appeal as defined.

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.

\[
\text{Stan Harada, Esq.}
\text{Zoning Hearing Examiner}
\]

cc: Zoning Enforcement
ZHE File
Paige Baird, 2900 Louisiana Blvd. NE, Ste 250, 87110
Janie McGuigan, 4929 Purcell Dr. NE, 87111
Kathy Alvarado, 4920 Serena Cir NE, 87111
Phil Jester, 4225-C Paseo Del Oso NE, 87111
Alicia Quinones, Oso Grande NE, 87111
Tom Knoll, 9412 Northridge Dr. NE, 87111
Alan Markey, 10345 Camino Del Oso NE, 87111
Andrew Leverett, 10416 Karen Ave NE, 87111
Steve Armstrong, 9813 Mesa Arriba Ave NE, 87111
Robert Fire, 10262 Gutierrez Road NE, 87111
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD
Agenda
Plaza del Sol Building Basement Hearing Room

January 29, 2020

Jolene Wolfley................................................................. DRB Chair
Jeanne Wolfenbarger .................................................... Transportation
Kris Cadena ................................................................. Water Authority
Ernest Armijo............................................................... Hydrology
Jacobo Martinez......................................................... 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 ANOUNCED 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 DEFFERRAL REQUIRES 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

MAJOR CASES

1. Project # PR-2019-003224
   SD-2019-00230 – PRELIMINARY/FINAL PLAT
   SD-2019-00430 – SITE PLAN AMENDMENT

   TIERRA WEST LLC agent(s) for AOC NEW MEXICO LLC request(s) the aforementioned action(s) for all or a portion of: TR 2-B-1-A PLAT OF TRACTS 2-A-1 AND 2-B-1A NEW PORT INDUSTRIAL PARK WEST, UNIT 1 CONT 19.3789 AC zoned NR-BP, located at 2501 BUENA VISTA DR SE, containing approximately 19.3789 acre(s). (M-15)

   PROPERTY OWNERS: AOC NEW MEXICO LLC
   REQUEST: MAJOR AMENDMENT TO SITE PLAN, PRELIMINARY/FINAL PLAT

   DEFERRED TO FEBRUARY 12TH, 2020
8. **Project # PR-2019-002184 (1001993)**  
SD-2020-00027 - PRELIMINARY/FINAL PLAT  
Sl-2019-00379 - SITE PLAN

**CONSENSUS PLANNING, INC.** agent(s) for **GUARDIAN STORAGE** request(s) the aforementioned action(s) for all or a portion of: **TR G-1 PLAT OF TRACTS F-1 & G-1, ACADEMY PLACE SUBDIVISION**, zoned MX-L, located at **4909 JUAN TABO BLVD NE between OSUNA RD and MONTGOMERY BLVD**, containing approximately **2.3795 acre(s)**. (F-21)(Deferred from 12/18/19, 1/15/20)

**PROPERTY OWNERS:** **SL JUAN TABO LAND LLC**  
**REQUEST:** **SITE PLAN FOR DEVELOPMENT ON A SITE UNDER 5 ACRES WITHIN 330 FEET OF MAJOR PUBLIC OPEN SPACE, PRELIMINARY/FINAL PLAT**


---

**MINOR CASES**

9. **Project # PR-2019-002607**  
SD-2020-00026 - PRELIMINARY/FINAL PLAT

**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)

**PROPERTY OWNERS:** **JOHN D PEARSON**  
**REQUEST:** **CREATE 2 LOTS FROM 1 EXISTING LOT**

**DEFERRED TO FEBRUARY 26TH, 2020**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>ZIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Larry P.</td>
<td>9000 Gala Rd, NE</td>
<td>8711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DRB PUBLIC HEARING SIGN IN SHEET

Project #: -R-2019-002184

Date: December 18th - 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>ZIP:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steve Freeman</td>
<td>5465 Pawliuses Rd NE</td>
<td>87111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD

Code Enforcement Comments

AGENDA ITEM NO: _ 8 ________________________________

DRB Project Number: _ PR-2019-002184 ________________________________

Application Number: ____________________________________________

Project Name: __________________________________________________

Request: Site Plan

COMMENTS:

Code enforcement 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: Jacobo Martinez, Code Enforcement Supervisor
      Planning Department
      924-3301 jacobomartinez@cabq.gov

DATE: 1/29/2020

ACTION:

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

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

- Hydrology has an approved conceptual grading and drainage plan with Engineer’s stamp dates: 12/20/19 & 1/9/20.
- This plan needs to be included in the Site Plan; if the plan has been modified since, then it will need to be resubmitted to Hydrology for re-approval.
- No objection to the infrastructure list.
- No objection to the plat.

RESOLUTION/COMMENTS:

Code:

Parks & Rec:

Water:

Transportation:

Planning:

☐ APPROVED  ☐ DENIED  
DELEGATED TO:  ☐ TRANS  ☐ HYD  ☐ WUA  ☐ PRKS  ☐ PLNG  
Delegated For:  
SIGNED:  ☐ I.L.  ☐ PSD  ☐ SPB  ☐ FINAL PLAT  
DEFERRED TO ___________________
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD
Planning Dept. - Major Case Comments

HEARING DATE/AGENDA ITEM : 8
Project Number: PR-2019-002184
Application Number: SI-2019-00379, SD-2020-00027
Project Name: Guardian Storage

Request: DRB Site Plan

COMMENTS:

- The previous comments in the December 18, 2019 Planning Department comments memo were addressed, and Planning has no objection to the site 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: 1/28/20
DRB Project Number: 2019-002184
Guardian Storage at Osuna

SUBJECT: Site Plan

ENGINEERING COMMENTS:

Comments that need to be addressed from last time:

1. Dimension parking island radii.
2. Include architectural/Engineer’s stamp on site plan.
3. For driveway detail cross-section showing the 1.3% cross-slope on Sheet 6 of 9, that should be a minimum of 4 feet wide to comply with ADA.
4. Unless this site plan is going to work order, call out COA standard details for drivepad and for sidewalk.

Disclaimer: The comments provided are based upon the information received from the applicant. 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: January 29, 2020

ACTION:

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

DELEGATED: __________ TO: (TRANS) (HYD) (WUA) (PRKS) (CE) (PLNG)
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD
TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT

DRB Project Number: 2019-002184
Guardian Storage at Osuna

AGENDA ITEM NO: 9

SUBJECT: Preliminary/Final Plat

ENGINEERING COMMENTS:

Comments on Plat:

1. Transportation has no objection to approval of the platting action.

Disclaimer: The comments provided are based upon the information received from the applicant. 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: January 29, 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-2019-002184</td>
<td>01/29/20</td>
<td>#8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone Atlas Page:</th>
<th>Legal Description: Lot(s) TR G-1 PLAT OF TRACTS F-1 &amp; G-1, ACADEMY PLACE SUBDIVISION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F-21</td>
<td>Location: 4909 JUAN TABO BLVD NE between OSUNA RD and MONTGOMERY BLVD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Request For:
SI-2019-00379 – SITE PLAN
SD-2020-00027 – PRELIMINARY/FINAL PLAT

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

1. SI-2019-00379 – SITE PLAN
   a. Label irrigation meter on infrastructure list so it is understood that this is not the domestic meter.
   b. For information only.
      i. Availability statement #190317 provides the conditions for service.
2. SD-2020-00027 – PRELIMINARY/FINAL PLAT
   a. No objection.
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-2019-003184 (1101999)
Application No. SI-2019-00379

TO:
✓ Planning Department/Chair
✓ Hydrology
✓ Transportation Development
✓ Albuquerque/ Bernalillo Co. WUA
✓ Code Enforcement
✓ Parks & Rec
*(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.


SUBMITTAL DESCRIPTION: Revised Site Plan Set; Infrastructure List; and Responses to Staff Comments Memo.

CONTACT NAME: James K. Strozier, FAICP
TELEPHONE: 505.764.9801 EMAIL: CPO@consensusplanning.com
FIGURE 12

INFRAS TRUCTURE LIST

(Rev. 2/16/16)

EXHIBIT “A”

TO SUBDIVISION IMPROVEMENTS AGREEMENT
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD (D.R.B.) REQUIRED INFRASTRUCTURE LIST

TRACT G-1 PLAT OF TRACTS F-1 & G-1 ACADEMY PLACE

PROPOSED NAME OF PLAT AND/OR SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN

TRACT G-1 PLAT OF TRACTS F-1 & G-1 ACADEMY PLACE

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Type of Improvement</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6’ WIDTH</td>
<td>PCC SIDEWALK &amp; 2 RAMPS</td>
<td>OSUNA RD NORTH OF SITE</td>
<td>NW CORNER OF SITE</td>
<td>NE CORNER OF SITE @ JUAN TABO (312 FT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30’</td>
<td>18” RCP SD TO CHANNEL OUTFALL</td>
<td>SW CORNER OF SITE</td>
<td>SOUTH PL.</td>
<td>ARROYO OUTFALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17’x6’</td>
<td>OUTFALL STRUCTURE &amp; CONC RUNDOWN</td>
<td>SW CORNER OF SITE</td>
<td>TOP OF SHOTCRETE CHANNEL SLOPE</td>
<td>TOP OF CONC CHNL</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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financially Guaranteed DRC #</th>
<th>Construction Certification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under DRC #</td>
<td>Private Inspector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P.E.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Type of Improvement</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approval of Creditable Items:</th>
<th>Approval of Creditable Items:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact Fee Administrator Signature</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City User Dept. Signature</td>
<td>Date</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

---

AGENT / OWNER

DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD MEMBER APPROVALS

JESUS LOPEZ

NAME (print)

RESPEC

FIRM

SIGNATURE - date

DRB CHAIR - date

PARKS & RECREATION - date

TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT - date

AMAFCR - 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>

---

(Rev. 2-16-18)
Memorandum

To: Jolene Wolfley, Chair, Development Review Board

From: James K. Strozier, Principal Consensus Planning

Date: January 10, 2020

Re: Project Number: PR-2018-002184; Application Number: SI-2019-00379; Guardian Storage Site Plan-DRB Responses to Staff Comments

Please see the following responses to staff comments:

1. The property is shown AGIS as split-zoned MX-L and R-1D, your letter states that this is an error; please clarify the zoning on the site.

   **Applicant Response:** The entire 2-acre site is zoned MX-L. The Planning Department identified the error and it was sent to AGIS but has not been updated. Please see the first comment on PRT Notes dated January 15, 2019.

2. The use is allowed under the MX-L zone with a conditional use permit. The applicant has an approved conditional use permit.

   **Applicant Response:** A copy of the ZHE Notification of Decision and the LUHO recommendation has been provided as part of this application.

3. Confirm the number of parking spaces.

   **Applicant Response:** The parking space calculations are cited on the site plan. The site meets the required 41 parking spaces required for a 115,800 square feet Self-Storage facility. See additional response regarding loading spaces below.

4. No loading spaces are proposed, and 3 loading spaces are required.

   **Applicant Response:** *IDO Table 5-5-7: Off-Street Loading Space Requirements* outlines the minimum spaces needed for “Non-residential Zone Districts” and “All Other Zone Districts”. The subject property is zoned MX-L (a mixed-use zone) therefore, it falls into the latter category as defined by the IDO. As such the minimum requirement is 1 space per building on sites with adequate unbuilt lot area to accommodate a loading space meeting the standards of Subsection 14-16-5-5(H).

   To meet this requirement, the site plan has been reconfigured to add one 9 ft. x 25 ft. loading space to the loading area on the south side of the building. The Applicant
requests to not add an additional parking space for the following reasons that are related to this type of business: The loading space will be used by customers; an additional parking space is not needed for the function of the business; and by not adding a parking space the site maintains landscape area rather than adding additional asphalt. This meets the requirements in Subsection 5-5(H)(2)(b): Joint use of an off-street loading facility may be approved by the Planning Director (DRB) provided the applicant provides documentation demonstrating the adequacy of the facility to serve anticipated loading needs; and an executed agreement among the owners of the buildings or uses sharing the facility is submitted to and approved by the Planning Director (DRB).

5. Make sure that façade design in 14-16-5-11 is being met.

Applicant Response: The following responses pertain to IDO Section 5-11(E)(2)(a):

1. The first floor is 12' which provides a sense of human scale with the subsequent floors being 10', respectively. There are building material changes from the ground floor to the upper floors, providing a clear architectural distinction.

2. The building façades facing the public streets of Juan Tabo Boulevard and Osuna Road incorporate three of required façade features, exceeding the requirement of two. They include:
   a. Material changes with windows at the upper floors less than 40 linear feet apart.
   b. Primary pedestrian entrance on Osuna Road façade.
   c. Window elements contain canopies and shade awnings with accent color.

   These features comprise 42% (exceeding the required 30%) of the Osuna Road façade and 53% of the Juan Tabo Boulevard façade. On both streets, they occur every 36’ 3”.

3. Both frontages are greater than 100 feet and exceed design requirements by incorporating two of the required features:
   a. Color and material changes throughout the façade every 36’ 3” linear feet and extends at least 20 percent of the façade.
   b. Changes in parapet height occurring every 36’ 3”.

6. Clarify how fencing requirements in 14-16-4-3(D)(28) are met, the fencing appears to stop before the property ends and does not appear to be opaque.

Applicant Response: The fencing along the south side of the site will be modified to show a 6’ solid opaque wall, as stated in the above IDO section. The Applicant is requesting the DRB consider a combination wall/fence on in this location as it abuts a neighborhood trail, that provides connection to the City’s multi-use trail. The combination fence would contain opaque material up to 3’ and 5’ of tubular steel view fencing. This would make a more pleasant experience for users of the trail, provide visual access to the landscaping, and retain security for the site. The Site Plan will be modified to reflect the view fencing if it is approved by DRB.
7. See 5-3-(D)(3)(b) network of walkways for required walkways - the walkways provided are too narrow.

**Applicant Response:** The walkway on the north side of the building (facing Osuna Road), at the only pedestrian entrance to the building, has been widened to 15-feet, per IDO Section 5-3(D)(3)(d).

8. Please provide sign dimensions.

**Applicant Response:** The wall mounted sign is provided as a graphic representation only. This sign will be administered under separate permit under IDO Section 14-16-5-12(D). For informational purposes, the signage depicted on the elevations is approximately 25' long by 2'5" tall (60 square feet).

9. Will the buildings be internally lit at night? See section 14-16-5-8 for lighting requirements.

**Applicant Response:** The display windows containing faux roll-up doors will be backlit with internal lamps. The IDO does not provide requirements for interior lighting. However, to reduce the adverse impact on adjacent properties, the lights for these display windows will be dimmed to 50% at 9:00 PM and then dimmed to 25% at 11:00 PM.

10. The building appears to have internal access for trucks to enter and unload-please confirm.

**Applicant Response:** The trucks do not "enter" the building. These are dedicated covered loading areas that allow shelter from the elements. These keep cooling costs down and help save energy. They also provide relief for tenants loading/unloading their goods.

11. Please confirm the spandrel windows are opaque and not see through. Will these windows have lighting?

**Applicant Response:** Correct. The spandrel windows are opaque and not see through. The spandrel windows do not have lighting.

12. Will CMU block be split face?

**Applicant Response:** Yes.

13. Do building colors meet 5-2(H)(1)(a) for reflectivity. Please provide information for the colors used in the building.
**Applicant Response:** Yes, these colors are below the 50% threshold per IDO Section 5-2(H)(1)(a). A color and reflectivity table has been added to the elevation sheets for all painted exterior surfaces.

14. *Please clarify the shade of green, Pursuant to 5-2(H)(1)(b) colors must blend into the surrounding environment, yellow ochres, browns, dull reds and grey greens- please confirm that is a grey green.*

**Applicant response:** The shade of green illustrated on the elevations is Wasabi Green, a trim color. *Per 5-2(H)(1)(b)1, trim materials constituting less than 20% of the façade may be any color and the design is in compliance.* Please see below for percentage of trim on each elevation:

- Osuna Rd. Elevation
  - Trim Color w/Faux Units: 6%
- West Elevation
  - Trim Color: 5%
- South Elevation
  - Trim Color w/Faux Units: 7%
- East Elevation
  - Trim Color w/Faux Units: 12%

Total façade percentage with faux units = 7.5%

15. *Please provide elevations or a horizontal profile to illustrate the steep slopes.*

**Applicant response:** Elevations illustrating steep slopes are provided in the revised Grading and Drainage Plan. Additionally, a Street Elevation Study exhibit was submitted with the original application which shows the building elevation and slope along Juan Tabo Boulevard and Osuna Road.

16. *Transportation comment at December 18, 2019 hearing: A 10-foot right-of-way easement is required along Juan Tabo Boulevard per DMD.*

**Applicant response:** The Site Plan shows the 10-foot sidewalk easement along Juan Tabo Boulevard. It will be dedicated as right-of-way by future plat action.

17. *Water Authority comment at December 18, 2019 hearing: There are non-potable lines on the property that can be used for irrigation.*

**Applicant response:** The 33 PSI available from the water reuse line will not be sufficient pressure for the proposed irrigation system. Irrigation bubblers typically require a minimum of 30 PSI at each head to operate properly and the entire system will require a minimum of 50 PSI at the point of connection. To be able to use the water reuse line a booster pump will need to be install the irrigation system which would add considerable
cost to the system. The Utility Plan shows 1 meter coming off the potable water line. The Water Authority will be testing the pressure of the line for verification. The Utility Plans will be updated if it is determined the pressure is adequate for site irrigation.
CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE
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Agenda Item 4
Project Number 2019-002184-Site Plan

MEMBERS:

Jolene Wolfley, Chair
Jeanne Wolfenbarger, Transportation
Kris Cadena, Water Authority
Shahab Biazar, City Engineer/Hydrology
Jacobo Martinez, Code Enforcement
Cheryl Somerfeldt, Parks and Recreation

STAFF PRESENT:

Maggie Gould, Planning Manager
Jay Rodenbeck, Staff Planner
Nicole Sanchez, Attorney
Angela Gomez, Hearing Monitor
CHAIR WOLFPLEY: We are on Item Number 4, which is Project 2184, which is also Site Plan 2019-379. And this is Guardian Storage at 4909 Juan Tabo, Northeast.

And I'll let your team get gathered up here.

MR. STROZIER: Okay.

CHAIR WOLFPLEY: And once again, if anyone wants to speak on any item on the agenda, if you're not the applicant. Just go over to Ms. Angela Gomez, over there, and she can have you sign up to speak for public comment.

Okay. Please introduce yourselves, and connection to the project.

MR. STROZIER: All right. Jim Strozier, with Consensus Planning, agent for the application.

MR. LOPEZ: And I'm Jesus Lopez with RESPEC Engineering, civil.

(Witnesses sworn.)

CHAIR WOLFPLEY: Okay. Thank you. You both have sworn in. Go ahead and give us an update.

MR. STROZIER: Thank you, Madam Chair and Board Members. We provided a supplemental submittal with responses to the previous comments and an updated infrastructure list and updated drawings. I know we -- we did receive the additional comments, and so we are -- we're looking at those. We just wanted to make sure we're all on the same page as -- as far as those go.

With regard to the site plan, one of the significant changes, and I'll talk about this a little bit, is the request to dedicate the 10 feet of additional right-of-way along Juan Tabo; understanding is that is still the request from DMD, that we do that. There is -- we will be submitting a plat for that, hopefully by this next Tuesday, for the meeting on the -- the DRB meeting on the 29th.

So before we get too into this, we understand that we will need to defer this item in order for the plat to catch up and so that they can be heard together. But we did want to just make sure that we were all on the same page relative to the comments and our responses to them.

So with that, we needed to adjust the grading and drainage plan in order to accommodate the additional right-of-way, because that additional right-of-way comes out into that existing current steep slope that drops down into the property, so we've adjusted that to reflect that.

We have also adjusted the plans to reflect -- and this is in response to some of the water authority's comments, I believe, at the last meeting, and that is, we have added a retaining wall portion along the west property line that allows that slope to be less steep on the landscape buffer, and then we've added a wall on top of that for a combined height of 6 feet.

In our comments, we did propose an option of having a combination of retaining wall and open fence along that edge. My understanding is that we can't do that. I think if -- and our feeling was that that would just be nicer adjacent to the trail. But if there's no way to accomplish that, then we have shown the 6-foot wall on our plans at this time.
Let's see, I think -- we also brought a copy of the Fire One. I believe, Jeanne, you had asked about the fire approval, and I don't think that that was included in the original submittal set, but we do have that. And -- and we'll make sure that there's a copy in the file. We brought it with us today.

MS. WOLFENBARGER: Okay.

MR. STROZIER: And then, with regard to parking bumpers at the loading area, I think that was the -- a comment that we received, and we're okay with that. We just -- they need to -- we need to be careful. They create kind of -- in that loading zone, it creates a parking hazard a lot of times. But we -- but we also understand we don't want people driving into the building so -- so we -- we will -- we will put that -- show those on the -- on the plan moving forward.

I think -- oh, the only other -- I know we were in discussions about the nonpotable line and the pressure, and we got information regarding that the pressure is actually is adequate. Our original indication was that the pressure was not going to be high enough to allow the irrigation to actually utilize that line, but we understand that, based on additional research from the water authority, that there is the amount of pressure that we need for the irrigation, and so we've adjusted the utility plan to reflect that.

I think that's my update.

CHAIR WOLFEY: Okay. Thank you.

Let's hear board comments. Water authority.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay. So based on your comments, we did have notes to provide (inaudible). (Inaudible).

MR. STROZIER: Right.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Like you said, there's --

MS. GOMEZ: David, mic.


Okay. So like you said, the operation drainage pressure is 106 to 125 psi, so you might need like a pressure reducing. I'm not sure what your system looks like. But when the pump starts, it's up to 150 psi.

Service connection needs to go, I guess, east to Juan Tabo. There's an 8-inch nonpotable line.

Please, on the site plan, indicate which fire hydrant -- hydrants are public or private. That wasn't -- it wasn't there.

MR. LOPEZ: Sorry. Can I get clarifies on -- on that one?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes.

MR. LOPEZ: I had spoken with -- or, I had spoken with Mr. Cadena --

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay.

MR. LOPEZ: -- and he was allowing us to do an 8-inch stub off
the 16 on Osuna --

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay.

MR. LOPEZ: -- to avoid the work on Juan Tabo. And so adding that 8-inch stub, with a cap, then would allow us to tie that service line to that. Is that still an option?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: His comment here is to connect to the 8-inch on Juan Tabo. We don't want to do connections to any 16-inch --

MR. LOPEZ: Well, I'm sure that's why he had originally allowed us to do an 8-inch stub with a cap and then tie the service to that.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Right. Sounds like the 8-inch is actually there for connection already. So we would want to avoid that. But I would ask if you would talk to him about it, because that is his requirement.

Anything else on that?

MR. LOPEZ: No.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: You're good?

MR. LOPEZ: That's all I have.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay. So for -- on the site plan, there's some hydrants, because call out public or private. It looks like that wasn't clarified.

Previous correspondence with the engineer stated historically the site flows were 4.5 for cfs, which some of it historically flowed across the water authority property adjacent. That is now apparently reduced to .29 cfs. We want to confirm that there are will be no erosion issues with you. I don't know what that flow looks like.

MR. LOPEZ: Yeah, no, we -- it's -- the drainage plan kind of spells it out.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Right.

MR. LOPEZ: And that's correct, we had -- originally, because of those steep slopes, we did have kind of gravel to protect erosion there --

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Right.

MR. LOPEZ: -- but with that wall, we might -- at this point, we're not -- we might not even be draining anything into the -- the water authority's property. We're going to be doing a (inaudible) south. And then just for emergency purposes, we'll turn some blocks on that wall in case it ever gets backed up or something, (inaudible), but --

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay.

MR. LOPEZ: -- we're not anticipating actually any flows now of water.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So there shouldn't be any -- any erosion issues, then?

MR. LOPEZ: Correct, that's (inaudible).
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UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay. Okay. That's it for me, yeah.

CHAIR WOLFFLEY: Code enforcement.

MR. MARTINEZ: Thank you.

Jim, as we -- you mentioned, we did talk about the opaque wall, and we had a conversation about it. It pretty clear in the IDO that an opaque wall is a "shall" on those properties that are abutting a residential zone

MR. STROZIER: Right.

MR. MARTINEZ: -- property.

MR. STROZIER: So if I might just --

MR. MARTINEZ: Mm-hmm.

MR. STROZIER: -- have a request that as as the as the planning department is looking at technical edits to the IDO, that that's maybe something that gets addressed. Because this is -- we've had this problem a couple of times where we have a lot of the water authority properties that have existing reservoirs like this one. It's not -- it -- the conversion was to residential zoning, and so that -- those requirements come into play. But there -- in this case, I would say it's actually inappropriate to do what we're going to have to do, and it's going to create a worse situation. And so if the planning department could take a look at that as part of the technical edits.

I think we have situations where some of like CNM, Montoya campus is zoned R-1, the water authority properties are zoned R-1, I think maybe some of the PNM. So those utilities are allowed uses in the residential zones, so they got converted that way, but they created this unintended consequence of us having to -- to do things, like in this situation, that don't really make sense.

MR. MARTINEZ: I agree. Thank you.

MR. STROZIER: Okay. Thanks.

CHAIR WOLFFLEY: Parks department.

MS. SOMERFELDT: We have no objection. It's just noted that street trees are required on Juan Tabo, which I see there. And that any disturbance to the multi-purpose trail on the -- to the south would be -- it would be required to be remedied by the developer.

We have several comments on record from the strategic planning and design division and open space division citing whether -- 'why this wasn't an acquisition priority. So I just wanted to note that if anyone wanted to review those, those are on the record for this case.

MR. STROZIER: Thank you.

CHAIR WOLFFLEY: Okay. Hydrology.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Hydrology has (inaudible) conceptual grading and drainage plan with engineer stamp date of January 9, 2020. There is no objection to the infrastructure list.
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CHAIR WOLFLEY: Transportation.

MS. WOLFENBARGER: Hi, Jim. You've already mentioned the 10-foot right-of-way dedication, which was my major comment, and the Fire One plan. And also, I just had left- -- leftover comments from last time that -- that were pretty minor.

MR. STROZIER: We realize that we -- we have those details and we realize that we did not update the sheets to include those. So we will make sure that that is done.

MS. WOLFENBARGER: Just updated the details in dimensioning, and that's it --

MR. STROZIER: Right.

MS. WOLFENBARGER: -- pretty much. And the signage as well. That's it.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. For planning, it looks like you've addressed many of our comments. We talked to you, as well, about dimming lights or having motion sensored lights. You've offered an alternative that talks about -- do you want to go ahead and outline that?

MR. STROZIER: Sure. What we have -- what we have done as part of the changes on the -- there's basically -- I don't know how to characterize -- on the display windows, if you will, that are at the corner of Osuna and Juan Tabo, that corner of the building, and we've proposed in response to the concerns that were expressed by the planning department, that those -- that those lights would be dimmed to basically 50 percent at 9:00 p.m., and then down to 25 percent. So another reduction at 11:00 p.m., which tied it -- so we tied it to 9:00 p.m., just because we felt that that was an appropriate time to -- to dim it. And then 11:00 p.m. is when the exterior lighting provisions in the IDO kick in. And so we dimmed it even more at that time. So that was done to address the comment of adverse impact. And we've noted that on the site plan.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Oh, it's noted on the site plan. Perfect. Okay. And is that the only corner where you have windows?

MR. STROZIER: I believe that we've...

CHAIR WOLFLEY: I know you have some of the faux windows --

MR. STROZIER: Right.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: -- that...

MR. STROZIER: There's -- actually, on the -- along the east elevation, the other corner has a smaller area. And that -- the same restrictions would apply --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Would apply there?

MR. STROZIER: -- (inaudible) be there --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay.

MR. STROZIER: -- where those display windows exist.

And then we noted that the spandrel glass that was in those other elements is opaque. So we've noted that on the -- on the elevations, as well. So those areas, I think that had been a
question before. So we identified that on the updated (inaudible), that those windows are opaque.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Remind me, had you shown us signage on your building?

MR. STROZIER: Yes.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay.

MR. STROZIER: So we -- and -- and we have responded to that comment in our memo addressing those comments, but we have identified those.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay.

MR. STROZIER: And I believe we identified the -- the size of those. And with a note, what we've noted on the site plan and the elevation sheet is, that the signage will be based on a sign permit that is separate from the building permit process --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay.

MR. STROZIER: -- and that we've identified. I think we tried to identify that on both the site plan for my -- what we've shown, and then a process for moving forward in the future.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. And I should note that you also provided staff with a horizontal -- horizontal profile of your building, and you provided that as well to members of the public?

MR. STROZIER: Yes.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: So -- okay.

MR. STROZIER: So we did a --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Uh-oh. I see some people shaking their heads yes and no.

So catch him afterward, if you didn't get that --

MR. STROZIER: Right.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: -- and -- because this -- this is not set for approval today. But that was very helpful.

MR. STROZIER: And we did prepare -- we did prepare a rendering that showed the grade change and the facade as it relates to Juan Tabo and the Osuna frontage, to show how that building sat within the -- within the site. And with the landscaping, consistent with the landscape plan, so...

MS. GOULD: Is that (inaudible)?

MR. STROZIER: I think that was part of our original submittal. And then we -- I believe we provided it again as part of our supplemental.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Right. It's possible we neglected to send that to the board members.

MR. STROZIER: Right.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: I -- I thought we did, but we'll make sure, since we have a catch-up time.
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MR. STROZIER:  Let -- let me --
CHAIR WOLFLEY:  We'll make sure that we --
MR. STROZIER:  -- (inaudible) people's e-mails for --
CHAIR WOLFLEY:  Yeah.

So, Angela, can you make note of that, that all board members need to get that horizontal profile, which was since our last meeting?

Okay. Did I miss anything, Ms. Gould, or Mr. Rodenbeck?

MS. GOULD:  I don't think so.

CHAIR WOLFLEY:  Okay. We appreciate your attention to many, many details. And in order to deal with your platting action, it looks like you're accepting a deferral to January 29th?

MR. STROZIER:  Yes.

CHAIR WOLFLEY:  Okay. Let's get the board's vote on that.

All right. All those in favor of deferring Item 4, which is Site Plan 2019-00379 to the January 29th meeting of the DRB, please raise your hand.

Unanimous vote to approve Item 4 to December -- or to January 29th.

MR. STROZIER:  Okay. Thank you very much.

CHAIR WOLFLEY:  Thank you.

   (Conclusion of recording.)
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 15th day of March 2020.

Kelli A. Gallegos

Kelli A. Gallegos
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD
Action Sheet Minutes
Plaza del Sol Building Basement Hearing Room

January 15, 2020

Jolene Wolfley .................................................. DRB Chair
Jeanne Wolfenbarger ........................................ Transportation
Kris Cadena ..................................................... Water Authority
Ernest Armijo ................................................... Hydrology
Jacobo Martinez .............................................. Code Enforcement
Cheryl Somerfeldt ......................................... Parks and Rec

Angela Gomez ~ DRB Hearing Monitor

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

MAJOR CASES

1. Project # PR-2019-003076
   SI-2019-00367 - SITE PLAN

   MODULUS ARCHITECTS INC. agent(s) for GYPSUM FLOORING request(s) the aforementioned action(s) for all or a portion of: LOT 27 and LOT 28, BLOCK 29, NORTH ABQ ACRES TR A UNIT B, zoned NR-BP, located at 6217 & 6221 SIGNAL AV NE between SAN PEDRO DR. NE and LOUISIANA BLVD NE containing approximately 1.78 acre(s).
   (C-18)(Deferred from 12/4/19)

   PROPERTY OWNERS: FINLEY C DARRYL
   REQUEST: DRB SITE PLAN

   DEFERRED TO FEBRUARY 5, 2020
2. Project #PR-2019-002677
   SI-2019-00252 – SITE PLAN

   MODULUS ARCHITECTS, INC. agent(s) for CARLISLE ASSOCIATES LP request(s) the aforementioned action(s) for all or a portion of TRACTS A & B CARLISLE & INDIAN SCHOOL SUBDIVISION BEING A PART OF BLOCKS 16 & 17 AND A PART OF BLOCKS 14 & 15 NETHERWOOD PARK SECOND FILING EXCLUDING PORTIONS OUT TO R/W, zoned MX-M, located at the NEC of INDIAN SCHOOL RD NE and CARLISLE BLVD NE, containing approximately 10.2 acre(s). (H-16) [Deferred from 8/21/19, 8/28/19, 9/18/19, 10/23/19, 10/30/19, 11/6/19, 12/4/19, 12/18/19]

   PROPERTY OWNERS: CARLISLE ASSOCIATES C/O ROSEN ASSOC MGMT GROUP
   REQUEST: 120,000+ SF RETAIL DEVELOPMENT
   DEFERRED TO JANUARY 29, 2020.

3. Project # PR-2019-002454
   (AKA: PR-2019-003125)
   SD-2019-00215 - PRELIMINARY/FINAL PLAT

   TIMOTHY SOLINSKY request(s) the aforementioned action(s) for all or a portion of: TRACTS A-1 A-2, zoned MX-FB-UD, located at 415 TIJERAS AVE, containing approximately 2.0314 acre(s). (J-14) [Deferred from 12/11/19]

   PROPERTY OWNERS: BERNALILLO COUNTY
   REQUEST: CONSOLIDATE 21 LOTS INTO 2/ GRANT EASEMENTS
   DEFERRED TO JANUARY 22, 2020

4. Project # PR-2019-002184
   (1001993)
   SI-2019-00379 – SITE PLAN

   CONSENSUS PLANNING, INC. agent(s) for GUARDIAN STORAGE request(s) the aforementioned action(s) for all or a portion of: TR G-1 PLAT OF TRACTS F-1 & G-1, ACADEMY PLACE SUBDIVISION, zoned MX-L, located at 4909 JUAN TABO BLVD NE between OSUNA RD and MONTGOMERY BLVD, containing approximately 2.3795 acre(s). (F-21) [Deferred from 12/18/19]

   PROPERTY OWNERS: SL JUAN TABO LAND LLC
   REQUEST: SITE PLAN FOR DEVELOPMENT ON A SITE UNDER 5 ACRES WITHIN 330 FEET OF MAJOR PUBLIC OPEN SPACE
   DEFERRED TO JANUARY 29, 2020
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD
TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT

DRB Project Number: 2019-002184
Guardian Storage at Osuna

AGENDA ITEM NO: 4

SUBJECT: Site Plan

ENGINEERING COMMENTS:

1. Platting action is needed to along Juan Tabo Blvd. to change the 10-foot sidewalk easement to 10-foot of dedicated right-of-way as noted by the supplemental submittal. Therefore, a platting action is required.

Comments that need to be addressed from last time:

2. Provide curb, curb ramp, and sidewalk details. Sidewalk detail shall show a maximum 2% cross-slope.

3. Dimension parking islands.

4. Provide signage details for the handicapped sign and motorcycle sign. On site plan, show existing and proposed sidewalk widths as well as distance from curb to property line. A minimum 4-foot wide sidewalk is required. The ADA accessible parking sign must have the required language per 66-7-352.4C NMSA 1978 "Violators Are Subject to a Fine and/or Towing." If that language is present it is not visible in the detail.

5. If curb does not separate parking spaces from sidewalk, provide parking bumpers.

6. Provide cross-section for new sidewalk along Osuna Road NE.


Disclaimer: The comments provided are based upon the information received from the applicant. 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: January 15, 2020

ACTION:

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

DELEGATED: ____________ TO: (TRANS) (HYD) (WUA) (PRKS) (CE) (PLNG)
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD - HYDROLOGY SECTION
Dana Peterson PE., 924-3695, dpeterson@cabq.gov

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DRB Project Number:</th>
<th>2019-002184</th>
<th>Hearing Date:</th>
<th>1-15-20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project:</td>
<td>Guardian Storage Juan Tabo &amp; Osuna</td>
<td>Agenda Item No:</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Sketch Plat
- Minor Preliminary / Final Plat
- Preliminary Plat
- Final Plat
- Temp Sidewalk Deferral
- Sidewalk Waiver/Variance
- Site Plan
- Bulk Land Plat
- 2 YEAR SIA Extension
- DPM Variance
- Vacation of Public Easement
- Vacation of Public Right of Way

ENGINEERING COMMENTS:

- Hydrology has an approved conceptual grading and drainage plan with Engineer’s stamp dates: 12/20/19 & 1/9/20.
- No objection to the infrastructure list.

RESOLUTION/COMMENTS:

Code:

Parks & Rec:

Water:

Transportation:

Planning:

☐ APPROVED
☐ DENIED

DELEGATED TO: ☐ TRANS ☐ HYD ☐ WUA ☐ PRKS ☐ PLNG
Delegated For: ________________________________
SIGNED: ☐ I.L. ☐ PSD ☐ SPBP ☐ FINAL PLAT
DEFERRED TO ________________________________
2. Project #PR-2019-002677
SI-2019-00252 – SITE PLAN

MODULUS ARCHITECTS, INC. agent(s) for CARLISLE ASSOCIATES LP request(s) the aforementioned action(s) for all or a portion of TRACTS A & B CARLISLE & INDIAN SCHOOL SUBDIVISION BEING A PART OF BLOCKS 16 & 17 AND A PART OF BLOCKS 14 & 15 NETHERWOOD PARK SECOND FILING EXCLUDING PORTIONS OUT TO R/W, zoned MX-M, located at the NEC of INDIAN SCHOOL RD NE and CARLISLE BLVD NE, containing approximately 10.2 acre(s). (H-16) [Deferred from 8/21/19, 8/28/19, 9/18/19, 10/23/19, 10/30/19, 11/6/19, 12/4/19, 12/18/19]

PROPERTY OWNERS: CARLISLE ASSOCIATES C/O ROSEN ASSOC MGMT GROUP
REQUEST: 120,000+ SF RETAIL DEVELOPMENT

No additional comments.

3. Project # PR-2019-002454
(AKA: PR-2019-003125)
SD-2019-00215 - PRELIMINARY/FINAL Plat

TIMOTHY SOLINSKY request(s) the aforementioned action(s) for all or a portion of: TRACTS A-1 A-2, zoned MX- FB-UD, located at 415 TUERAS AVE, containing approximately 2.0314 acre(s). (J-14) [Deferred from 12/11/19]

PROPERTY OWNERS: BERNALILLO COUNTY
REQUEST: CONSOLIDATE 21 LOTS INTO 2/ GRANT EASEMENTS

No additional comments.

4. Project # PR-2019-002184
(1001993)
SI-2019-00379 – SITE PLAN

CONSENSUS PLANNING, INC. agent(s) for GUARDIAN STORAGE request(s) the aforementioned action(s) for all or a portion of: TR G-1 PLAT OF TRACTS F-1 & G-1, ACADEMY PLACE SUBDIVISION, zoned MX-L, located at 4909 JUAN TABO BLVD NE between OSUNA RD and MONTGOMERY BLVD, containing approximately 2.3795 acre(s). (F-21) [Deferred from 12/18/19]

PROPERTY OWNERS: SL JUAN TABO LAND LLC
REQUEST: SITE PLAN FOR DEVELOPMENT ON A SITE UNDER 5 ACRES WITHIN 330 FEET OF MAJOR PUBLIC OPEN SPACE

Comments from the Parks and Recreation Strategic Planning and Design Division:

No additional comments.

Previous comments for reference:

Comments to developer:
- Street Trees required on Juan Tabo Boulevard upon development.
- Any disturbance to the multi-purpose trail by the development
will be required to be remedied by the developer.

The subject property is not eligible for PRD acquisition:

- PRD does not receive funding for acquisition through development or impact fees, and has limited resources for acquisition.
- The COA Parks and Recreation Department does not own the adjacent property to the east, it is owned by ABCWUA. Therefore, the subject property could not be a contiguous part of El Oso Grande Park, and the ABCWUA property, serves as an adequate buffer between the subject property and the park.
- The property has major frontage on Juan Tabo Blvd (a high traffic Community Principal Arterial) and is a relatively small size, making it less protected and less desirable for a neighborhood park.
- The subject property is zoned commercial (MX-L) rather than residential (a typical zone for a park), making it more expensive.
- The multi-purpose trail maintained by Parks would continue to provide physical access between El Oso Grande, an urban residential park, and the Major Public Open Space lands owned by the City to the east. Any disturbance to the multi-purpose trail by the development will be required to be remedied by the developer.
- The COA is currently working toward access for all citizens who currently do not have a park within a 10-minute walk. PRD would be required to conduct a needs assessment and the likely outcome would be that the neighborhood is sufficiently served by El Oso Grande Park.

Comments from Open Space Division:

- The applicant proposes 60-75 feet of set back from Juan Tabo giving plenty of buffer between the proposed development and the Major Public Open Space. Plus, Juan Tabo is another buffer between the two.
- It is proposed to be 35 feet tall or three stories which likely won’t have an impact on views when on top of the dam but I would recommend seeing some sort of photo renditions (elevation diagrams) of what it would possibly look like. The agent, Consensus Planning, may be able to render such elevation diagrams. A two story building may be a better option for viewsheds.
- Since it is a storage facility, I don’t see traffic being a problem. Plus, the applicant has stated ingress/egress will be off Osuna Rd and not Juan Tabo which will lessen any issues with people who park at the dam for use of the MPOS.
- Drainage shall stay off the Multi-use Trail and the
owner/developer shall be responsible for any erosion onto the M-U Trail from the property.

- The park may be affected by drainage from the site unless addressed; similar to the comment regarding the M-U Trail.
- The storage units are all indoors so noise shouldn't be an issue with this development.
- The developer/agent shall comply with all IDO regulations pertaining to sensitive lands and specific restrictions on colors, structure design, sheltering of roof utilities should be taken into account, and landscaping should be suitable for the surrounding sensitive lands.

The facility will have security cameras. The land directly to the west is not the park but a ABCWUA parcel. Nothing is built on that parcel so there would be a clear view of the park and trail.

5. Project # PR-2019-002559
SD-2019-00222 – VACATION OF 17-FOOT- WIDE PUBLIC ACCESS EASEMENT
SD-2019-00224 – VACATION OF 5-FOOT- WIDE WATER and SEWER PUBLIC EASEMENT
SD-2019-00225 – VACATION OF 10-FOOT- WIDE CROSS LOT PARKING PUBLIC EASEMENT
SD-2018-00220 – PRELIMINARY/FINAL PLAT

ARCH + PLAN LAND USE CONSULTANTS agent(s) for AGGIES LLC request(s) the aforementioned action(s) for all or a portion of: LOTS 1-A, 1-B,1-C and 1-D, BLOCK 10, UNIVERSITY HEIGHTS ADDITION zoned R-ML, located on SILVER AVE between CORNELL DRIVE and STANFORD DRIVE, containing approximately 0.334 acre(s). (K-16)

[Deferred from 12/18/19]

PROPERTY OWNERS: AGGIES, LLC
REQUEST: VACATE 3 PRIVATE EASEMENTS AND LOT CONSOLIDATION FROM 4 LOTS TO 2 LOTS

No additional comments.

6. Project # PR-2019-002044
(1011642)
SD-2019-00217 - FINAL PLAT

MARK GOODWIN & ASSOCIATES, PA agent(s) for CINNAMON MORNING DEVELOPMENT, LLC request(s) the aforementioned action(s) for all or a portion of: S 1/2 OF LOT 3 ALVARADO GARDENS ADDN UNIT 1, zoned R-A, located at 2700 RIO GRANDE BLVD NW, between MATTHEW and CAMPBELL RD containing approximately 2.5103 acre(s). (G-12 & 13)

[Deferred from 1/8/20]

PROPERTY OWNERS: PERCILCUE SUE E
REQUEST: FINAL PLAT APPROVAL

No additional comments.
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-2019-002184</td>
<td>01/15/20</td>
<td>#4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone Atlas Page:</th>
<th>Legal Description: Lot(s) TR G-1 PLAT OF TRACTS F-1 &amp; G-1, ACADEMY PLACE SUBDIVISION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F-21</td>
<td>Location: 4909 JUAN TABO BLVD NE between OSUNA RD and MONTGOMERY BLVD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Request For:
S1-2019-00379 – SITE PLAN

ABCWUA Comment:

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

1. Per the Expansion Policy, newly developed properties shall connect to public waterline, reuse and sanitary sewer if within 200’. The proposed utility plan indicates a single water meter. Is this to be also be used for irrigation? If an irrigation meter is proposed, it shall connect to the existing 8” non-potable line along Juan Tabo Blvd. The expected pressure has been confirmed by Operations to range from 106 psi to 125 psi, and up to 150 psi during pump start up.
   a. The service connection to the existing 8” non-potable line shall be included on an infrastructure list.

2. Please indicate which fire hydrants are public or private. Onsite fire hydrants shall be labeled as private. Proposed fire hydrants located within the public right-of-way are to be public.
3. In previous correspondence, the engineer has stated that historically, the subject site flows west across the existing Water Authority property. Based on the conceptual grading plan, the entire property had an existing flow rate of 4.54 cfs. How much of this historically flowed across the Water Authority property? Is it understood to be the entire 4.54 cfs? The proposed condition appears to lessen the flow on the Water Authority property as proposed Subbasin B is what is shown to discharge on the Water Authority site with a flow rate of 0.29 cfs. Please confirm.
   a. Somewhat steep slopes are being proposed along the western property line. What improvements will be done to minimize erosion on the Water Authority property?

4. For information only.
   a. Availability statement #190317 provides the conditions for service.
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
☐ Major – Preliminary Plat (Form P1)
☐ Minor – Preliminary Final Plat (Form S2)
☐ Major - Final Plat (Form S1)
☐ Amendment to Preliminary Plat (Form S2)
☐ Extension of Preliminary Plat (Form S1)
☐ Extension of Infrastructure List or IIA (Form S1)
☐ Minor Amendment to Infrastructure List (Form S2)
☐ Pre-Applications
☐ Temporary Deferral of SW (Form V2)
☐ Sidewalk Waiver (Form V2)
☐ Appear.
☐ Waiver to IDO (Form V2)
☐ Waiver to DPM (Form V2)
☐ Decision of DRB (Form A)

SITE PLANS
☐ DRB Site Plan (Form P2)
☐ Brief Description of Request

Site Plan-DRB for development on a site under 5 acres within 330 feet of Major Public Open Space.

APPLICATION INFORMATION
Applicant Guardian Storage
Address: 7501 Holly Avenue NE
City: Albuquerque
State: NM
Zip: 87113
Phone: 505-450-6385
Email: hedges72@comcast.net

Professional/Agent (if any): Consensus Planning, Inc.
Address: 302 Eighth Street NW
City: Albuquerque
State: NM
Zip: 87102
Phone: 505-764-9801
Email: cp@consensusplanning.com

Proprietary Interest in Site: Contract Purchaser
List all owners: SL Juan Tabo Land, LLC

SITE INFORMATION (Accuracy of the existing legal description is crucial! Attach a separate sheet if necessary.)
Lot or Tract No.: TR G-1 Plat of Tracts F-1 & G-1
Block:
Unit:
Subdivision/Addition: Academy Place
MRGCD Map No.:
Zone Atlas Page(s): F-21
Existing Zoning: MX-L
# of Existing Lots: 1
# of Proposed Lots: N/A
Proposed Zoning N/A
Total Area of Site (Acres): 2.3795

LOCATION OF PROPERTY BY STREETS
Site Address/Street: 4906 Juan Tabo Blvd. NE Between: Osuna Road and: Montgomery Boulevard

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

Signature: Date: 11/22/2019
Printed Name: James Strozier, FAICP

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
☐ Case Numbers Action Fees Case Numbers Action Fees

Meeting Date: Fee Total:
Staff Signature: Date: Project #
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

☐ 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)

☐ Explanation and justification of requested deviations, if any, in accordance with IDO Section 14-16-6-4(C)

☐ Proof of Pre-Application Meeting with City staff per IDO Section 14-16-6-4(B) (not required for Extension)

☐ Proof of Neighborhood Meeting per IDO Section 14-16-6-4(C)

☐ Office of Neighborhood Coordination neighborhood meeting inquiry response

☐ Proof of email with read receipt OR Certified Letter offering meeting to applicable associations

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

☐ Appraiser Certification

☐ 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 mailed 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)

☐ Copy of the original approved Site Plan or Master Development Plan (for amendments only) (1 copy, 24” x 36”)

☐ Site Plan and related drawings reduced to 8.5” x 11” format (1 copy)

☐ Landfill disclosure statement per IDO Section 14-16-5-2(G) if site is within a designated landfill buffer zone

☐ 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: 11-22-2019

Printed Name: James K. Strozler, FAICP

□ Applicant or □ Agent

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Case Numbers: ____________________________ Project Number: ____________________________

Staff Signature: ____________________________ Date: ____________________________

Revised 2/6/19
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
November 4, 2019

Jolene Wolfley  
Chair, Development Review Board  
City of Albuquerque  
600 Second Street NW  
Albuquerque, NM 87102

Dear Ms. Wolfley,

The purpose of this letter is to provide authorization to Consensus Planning, Inc. and Respec to act as agents on behalf of SL Juan Tabo Land LLC (owner of the property) for all requests related to the application for Site Plan – DRB for the property located at 4909 Juan Tabo Boulevard NE. The legal description for the property is: Tract G-1 plat of tracts F-1 & G-1 Academy Place containing 2.3795 acres.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Majority Member  
SL Juan Tabo Land, LLC  
2900 Louisiana Boulevard NE  
Suite 250  
Albuquerque, NM 87110
November 4, 2019

Jolene Wollfrey
Chair, Development Review Board
City of Albuquerque
600 Second Street NW
Albuquerque, NM 87102

Dear Ms. Wollfrey,

The purpose of this letter is to provide authorization to Consensus Planning, Inc. and Respec to act as agents for all requests related to the application for Site Plan – DRB on behalf of Guardian Storage, Contract Purchaser for the property located at 4909 Juan Tabo Boulevard NE.

Sincerely,

Dawson Hedges
Guardian Storage
7501 Holly Avenue NE
Albuquerque, NM 87113
CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE
TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDY (TIS) FORM

APPLICANT: Guardian Storage DATE OF REQUEST: 11/01/19 ZONE ATLAS PAGE(S): F-21

CURRENT:
ZONING MX-L
PARCEL SIZE (AC/SQ. FT.) 2.37 ac. / 103,629 sq. ft.

LEGAL DESCRIPTION:
LOT OR TRACT # G-1 BLOCK #
SUBDIVISION NAME Academy Place

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 [ ]

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF ACTION:
# OF UNITS: N/A
BUILDING SIZE: 116,700 sq. ft.
Indoor Self Storage

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

APPLICANT OR REPRESENTATIVE: [Signature] DATE: 11/1/2019

(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 924-3964

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

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

Notes:

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

TRAFFIC ENGINEER: [Signature] DATE: 11/1/19

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 183
FORM DRWS: DRAINAGE REPORT / WATER & SANITARY SEWER AVAILABILITY
THIS FORM IS REQUIRED WITH THE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD APPLICATION
FOR MAJOR SUBDIVISIONS AND SITE DEVELOPMENT PLANS.

PROJECT NAME: GUARDIAN STORAGE
AGIS MAP # F-21-Z

LEGAL DESCRIPTIONS: PLAT OF TRACTS F-1 AND G-1 ACADEMY PLACE

X DRAINAGE REPORT

A drainage report, as per the Drainage Ordinance, was submitted to the City of
Albuquerque Public Works Department, Hydrology Division (2nd Floor Plaza del Sol) on
11/12/19 (date).

RESPEC
Applicant/Agent

11/18/19
Date

Hydrology Division Representative

11/18/19
Date

X WATER AND SEWER AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

A Water and Sewer Availability Statement for this project was requested from the City of
Albuquerque Utilities Development Division (2nd floor, Plaza del Sol) on
3/20/19 (date).

(RECEIVED AVAILABILITY STATEMENT 190317 ON 5/9/19)

RESPEC
Applicant/Agent

11/18/19
Date

Utilities Division Representative

11/18/19
Date

PROJECT #

Revised 4/03
November 22, 2019

Jolene Wolffey, Chair
Development Review Board
City of Albuquerque
600 Second Street NW
Albuquerque, NM 87102

RE: Guardian Storage – Site Plan-DRB

Dear Ms. Wolffey:

The purpose of this letter is to request approval for a Site Plan-DRB on behalf of Guardian Storage, the Contract Purchaser, for the property at 4909 Juan Tabo Boulevard NE. The subject property is under 5 acres and is located within 330 feet of the Bear Canyon Major Public Open Space (MPOS) therefore, development is subject to review by the Development Review Board (DRB) per Integrated Development Ordinance (IDO) Sub-section 14-6-6-6(G)(1)(b).

The subject property is legally described as *Tract G-1 plat of tracts F-1 & G-1 Academy Place containing 2.3795 acres*. It is located on the southwest corner of Osuna Road and Juan Tabo Boulevard (see Figure 1, below). The 2.37-acre site is currently vacant and zoned MX-L, and is located within an Area of Consistency, as identified in the ABC Comprehensive Plan.

![Figure 1 - Subject site outlined in blue.](image)

In May 2019, the Applicant was granted a Conditional Use Approval from the Zoning Hearing Examiner (ZHE) to permit indoor storage on the site as allowed in the MX-L Zone (POSSE Case Number VA-2019-00088). The decision was appealed, and the Land Use Hearing Officer recommended that the ZHE Approval of Conditional Use stand which was affirmed by City Council on August 21, 2019.
EXISTING CONDITIONS
The 2.37-acre subject property is currently undeveloped and sits on the southwest corner of Osuna Road and Juan Tabo Boulevard. As mentioned, the subject property is located approximately 85 feet west of the John Roberts Dam and Bear Canyon Major Public Open Space. Juan Tabo Boulevard, an Urban Principal Arterial is located between the site and the MPOS.

The subject property has mild to steep slopes from east to west with the steepest area to the east. Due to the 3:1 slope on the eastern side of the property, it sets approximately 18 feet lower than Juan Tabo Boulevard. The rest of the site has east-west slopes ranging from 3% to 7%. Stormwater flow is east to west and discharges to the west of the property line, draining onto the adjacent property and often washing out the adjacent pedestrian trail.

Adjacent Zoning and Land Use
The subject property is shown in Figure 2 outlined blue. The property was incorrectly identified as two separate parcels with the east zoned MX-L and the west R1-D. The City has since corrected this error, but AGIS has yet to show the change. Zoning and land uses around the subject property include mix of moderate density residential in in the R-T and MX-T zones to the north; R-1D to the south which includes a vacant portion of the CNM Montoya Campus and an AMAFCA maintained drainage channel; NR-PO-B to the east includes the John B. Robert Dam, Bear Canyon Open Space, and Offices; and NR-PO-A and R-1D for the El Oso Grande Park and Utilities to the west.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Land Uses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>RT, MX-T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>UNCL, R-1D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>NR-PO-B, MX-T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>NR-PO-A, R-1D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Land Uses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Single-family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Drainage Channel, Public institutional -CNM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Open Space, Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>ABCWUA, Oso Grande Park</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. Existing Zoning - Subject site outlined in blue.
Project Description
The Applicant is proposing to construct an indoor storage facility on the subject property. The building will be a 3-story; 116,700 square feet; 35-foot-tall building. The building will have inset loading areas with garage door type ingress and egress to each storage unit.

Site access will be from a drive-way entrance to the north on Osuna Road. There will be no ingress or egress from Juan Tabo Boulevard. Customer loading/unloading areas will be on the south and west sides of the building, away from adjacent residential to the north. The building will set back 40 feet on the north; 14 feet on the south; 76.2 feet and 63 feet on the east; and 14 feet on the west. Because of the eastern slope, the building finished floor will set approximately 18 feet below Juan Tabo Boulevard. Along Osuna Road, the slope is approximately 16 feet at the east and slowly narrows towards the facility entrance to the west. Street trees and natural landscaping will further conceal the building from the street fronts.

CRITERIA
The Applicant is requesting approval of a Site Plan-DRB in an MX-L zone to allow for the development of an indoor storage facility. The following provides an explanation of how this request meets the criteria for approval of Site Plan-DRB, as outlined in Section 6-6(G) Site Plan-DRB.

6-6(G)(3)(a) The Site Plan-DRB 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.

Applicant Response:
The proposed Site Plan complies with all applicable provisions of the IDO, the DPM, and other adopted City regulations. This property is located adjacent to Major Public Open Space and has sensitive lands characteristics. Pursuant to IDO Section 14-16-5-2 Site Design and Sensitive Lands, an analysis of the site was conducted to provide guidance to the site plan as it relates to sensitive lands and MPOS and is documented in the Sensitive Lands Analysis Memo, which is attached to this application. The following is a summary of the Sensitive Lands Analysis.

5-2 Site Design and Sensitive Lands; Avoidance of Sensitive Lands: 5-2(C)(1)(b) Steep Slopes and (c) Unstable soils.
The analysis of the site concluded that the only types of sensitive lands present on the subject property are steep slopes and unstable soils. The slopes are located to the east along the Juan Tabo Boulevard property line and extend west along a portion of the north and south property lines. Some unstable soils are found along these steep slopes and unmanaged stormwater has caused erosion in some areas. To minimize the impact of the steep slopes, the proposed building has been located to the south and west sides of the property. During construction, the slope may be disturbed, and any disturbed areas will be revegetated with native and/or naturalized seed mix to stabilize the slope. Along the slope, trees
will be planted with landscape boulder retention to capture water and help reduce erosion and stabilize the slope.

5-2(h) Major Public Open Space Edges; (1)(a-f) Properties within 330 feet of MPOS; and (2)(a)(1-11) Properties Adjacent to Major Public Open Space.

The proposed Site Plan complies with the provisions in the IDO sections pertaining to development within 330 feet of and on properties adjacent to Major Public Open Space. The Site Plan was designed to meet all design and development guidelines outlined in 5-2(h)(1) and (2) and will enhance and protect the John Roberts Dam and the Bear Canyon MPOS. Please see the Sensitive Lands Analysis Memo for details on how the proposed Site Plan meets all design guidelines.

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.

Applicant Response:

The City's existing infrastructure has adequate capacity to serve the proposed development and any burden to those systems have been mitigated to the maximum extent practicable. Osuna Road and Juan Tabo Boulevard can adequately support the vehicles visiting this commercial indoor storage business as indoor storage is a low traffic generating use. At other locations in Albuquerque, Guardian Storage facilities generate approximately 30 to 40 trips per day.

Juan Tabo Boulevard is an Urban Principal Arterial with adequate sidewalks and traffic lanes to accommodate the proposed development. Juan Tabo Boulevard also acts as a buffer between the subject property and the John Roberts Dam and Bear Canyon Open Spaces.

In this section of Osuna Road, where the entrance to the site will be located, there is minimal traffic due to the fact that Osuna Road dead ends approximately 96 feet west of the subject property. Currently, there is no sidewalk on Osuna Road along the north boundary of subject property. As part of this development, a sidewalk will be constructed for pedestrians.

As mentioned previously, drainage issues affecting the site are due to unmanaged drainage impacting the slope on the eastern edge that causes of erosion and discharge to the adjacent property and wash out the pedestrian trail located to the west. Trees and landscaping that will be added to the slope along Juan Tabo Boulevard which will stabilize the site from further erosion issues, improve drainage, and provide natural landscaping along the eastern edge of the site. Additionally, surface sheet flows and swales will concentrate flows to a low point south west of the storage facility that will discharge into an onsite water quality pond.
6-6(A)(3)(c) The Site Plan mitigates any significant adverse impacts on the surrounding area to the maximum extent practicable.

Applicant Response:
The Site Plan mitigates significant adverse impact on the surrounding area to the maximum extent practicable by providing a low impact land use and site design compatible with adjacent land uses. The following elements are incorporated into the proposed site design to further mitigate potential adverse impacts:

- Entrance to the site is to the north on Osuna Road which avoids the need for additional curb cuts on Juan Tabo Boulevard. This creates an overall safer environment for pedestrians and travelers in the area.

- Parking areas and building loading entrances are located on the west and south of the site, not visible or adjacent to residential or Major Public Open Space.

- Landscaping with natural plant material and fencing on the south and west sides of proposed development, will further screen the south and west of the subject property and provide for site security.

- The proposed development will landscape and install sidewalks (currently none existing) on the north side of the building facing Osuna Road with plant materials that will blend into the environment, provide security, and visually screen the indoor storage building for the neighborhoods.

- Drainage issues on the site will be mitigated with natural plant material and grading which will allow flow to discharge at a water quality pond located and prevent discharge to downstream properties.

We respectfully request that you review and approve this Site Plan-DRB based on the above criteria and the Site Plans submitted with the application. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

James K. Strozier, FAICP
Principal
PRE-APPLICATION REVIEW TEAM (PRT) MEETING NOTES

PA#: 19-019       Date: 01-13-2019       Time: 1:00 pm
Address: Osuna St & Juan Tabo (SW Corner)

AGENCY REPRESENTATIVES AT MEETING:
Planning: 
Code Enforcement: Jacobo Martinez
Fire Marshall: 
Transportation: Mojgan Moosandar
Other: Carrie

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-L       Size: Acres
Use: Vacant       Overlay Zone: NA
Comp Plan Area Of: 
Comp Plan Corridor: Multi-Modal
Comp Plan Center: 
MPOS or Sensitive Lands: NA
Parking: 
MR Area: Near Heights
Landscaping: 
Street Trees: 
Use Specific Standards: Yes 4-3 (D) 28
Dimensional Standards: 

*Neighborhood Organization/s: 

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

PROCESS:
Type of Action: 
Review and Approval Body: 
Is this PRT a requirement? 

PRE-APPLICATION REVIEW TEAM (PRT) MEETING NOTES

PA# 19.019  Date: 01-15-2019  Time: 1:00pm

Address: Osuna; Juan Tate (SW Corner)

NOTES:

- Cityfile 2 ACU : 2 road MX-1 - documentation has been forwarded to AGIS but has not been updated yet via ZHE.
- Need Conditional Use Permit A prior to Site Plan.
- Site Plan for DPB.
- Need to move MPOS but less than 2 acres so no BES.
- Still need all Site Design for Sensitive Lands 5-2.

- Has to be enclosed.
- Email Neighborhood as early as possible for ZHE & DPB. 45 days per 6-4. H-1 - Must provide all materials for application.

- Two off-premise signs. Are they conforming to 100 standards? Maybe CABQ would need to research. Likely non-conforming.
Chase,

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Association Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Address Line 1</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amberlawn HOA, Incorporated</td>
<td>Terry</td>
<td>Lewis</td>
<td><a href="mailto:terrylewis3@gmail.com">terrylewis3@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>2952 Pueblo Ave</td>
<td>Santa Fe</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>87505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amberlawn HOA, Incorporated</td>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Frens</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pfrens01@gmail.com">pfrens01@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4908 Sarena Drive NE</td>
<td>Albuquerque</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>87111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District II Coalition of Neighborhood Associations</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Karpian</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mary.karpian@gmail.com">mary.karpian@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>13705 Canada Del Oro Place</td>
<td>Albuquerque</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>87111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District II Coalition of Neighborhood Associations</td>
<td>Donald</td>
<td>Couchman</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dcochman@net.com">dcochman@net.com</a></td>
<td>8441 Constitution Blvd NE</td>
<td>Albuquerque</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>87111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Grande NE</td>
<td>Andre</td>
<td>Guevara</td>
<td>4321 Newmark Court NE</td>
<td>Albuquerque</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>87111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Grande NE</td>
<td>Veronese</td>
<td>Atlaf</td>
<td>10117 Commerce Del Oro NE</td>
<td>Albuquerque</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>87111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John H Robert, III</td>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>Hillert</td>
<td>11114 Greenbelt NE</td>
<td>Albuquerque</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>87111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John H Robert, III</td>
<td>Lyn</td>
<td>Volunteers</td>
<td>11128 Greenbelt NE</td>
<td>Albuquerque</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>87111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


IDO – Neighborhood Meeting Requirements & Template: [https://www.cabq.gov/Planning/urban-design-development/neighborhood-meeting-requirements-in-the-integrated-development-ordinance](https://www.cabq.gov/Planning/urban-design-development/neighborhood-meeting-requirements-in-the-integrated-development-ordinance)


Respectfully,

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

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

Confidentiality Notice: This e-mail, including all attachments is for the sole use of the intended recipient 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@cityofalbuquerque.org [mailto:webmaster@cityofalbuquerque.org] On Behalf Of DDD Webmaster
Sent: Wednesday, August 21, 2019 4:52 PM

To: Office of Neighborhood Coordination-Planning@cityofalbuquerque.org
Cc: Office of Neighborhood Coordination-Coordination@cityofalbuquerque.org

Subject: Neighborhood Meeting Inquiry for Development Review Board

If you selected "Other" in the question above, please describe what you are requesting a Neighborhood Meeting Inquiry for below.

Contact Name
Channing Salazar

Telephone Number
505-768-3332

Email Address
neighborhoodplanning@cityofalbuquerque.org

Company Name
Conservation Planning, Inc.

Company Address
305 Eighth Street NW

City
Albuquerque

State
NM

ZIP
87102

Legal description of the subject site for this project:

Orleans St. - Plat of Tracts P-1 & G-1 Academy Place. Containing 3.3765 acres

Physical address of subject site:

4509 Juan Tabo Boulevard NE

Subject site streets:

Juan Tabo Boulevard and Orms Road

Other subject site identifiers:

This site is located on the following map sites page:

This message has been digitally signed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
Dear Neighbors,

This email is notification that Consensus Planning is preparing a Site Plan for review by the City Development Review Board (DRB) on behalf of Guardian Storage. The site is located at 4909 Juan Tabo, NE and is 2.35 acres. The applicant proposes to construct a three-story, 120,000 square foot indoor storage facility on the site. The site is located adjacent to the John Roberts Dam and Bear Canyon Major Public Open Space and therefore, is required to come before the DRB to ensure the site meets all Integrated Development Ordinance (IDO) requirements for site design for sensitive lands.

The self-storage as a conditional use was approved by the Zoning Hearing Examiner and confirmed by the City Council.

As part of the IDO requirements, we are providing you an opportunity to discuss the application prior to submittal. Your associations may request a meeting regarding this project by replying to this email, cp@consensusplanning.com, or by phone at 505.764.9801. Per the IDO, you have 15 days or until September 10, 2019 to request a meeting. If you do not want to schedule a meeting, or support this project, please let me know.

Respectfully,

Jim Strozier, FAICP
Consensus Planning, Inc.
302 8th Street NW
(505) 764-9801
City of Albuquerque
Land Use Facilitation Program
Pre-Application Meeting Report

Project number: PR-2019-002184
Property description: 4909 Juan Tabo Blvd NE, Albuquerque, NM 87111
Date submitted: November 7, 2019
Submitted by: Leslie R. Kryder
Meeting date and time: November 5, 2019 6:30 – 8:30 pm
Meeting location: N Domingo Baca Community Center
Facilitator: Leslie R. Kryder
Co-facilitator: Jessie Lawrence

Parties:
Applicant: Dawson Hedges, Guardian Storage  hedges77@comcast.net
Agent: Jim Strozier, Consensus Planning  cp@consensusplanning.com

Affected neighborhood associations (per City of Albuquerque notification requirements):
- Oso Grande Neighborhood Association
- John B Robert Neighborhood Association
- Amberglen HOA Incorporated
- District 8 Coalition of Neighborhood Associations

Background/meeting summary:

The Applicant, Guardian Storage, is developing plans for a storage facility at 4909 Juan Tabo Blvd NE. The Agent requested a meeting with neighbors to review the site plan (which is still being finalized) and discuss questions and concerns from the neighbors. The Applicant expects to submit an application in the near future, perhaps within two weeks of this meeting.

Neighbors expressed concerns on a variety of topics regarding the impact of this project on the adjacent neighborhood as well as the nearby dam, arroyo, and flood control system. Neighbors want to make sure that all applicable governmental requirements and regulations are being adhered to with the design and execution of the plan. A number of additional topics were listed by neighbors as being of concern, but there was not sufficient time during the meeting to discuss all of them.

Follow-up Items:
1) Applicant will provide the measurement of the site from north to south.
2) Applicant will provide a rendering showing the building views from the sides along with the landscaping.
3) Applicant will make Sheldon Greer’s professional engineering report available to attendees.
4) Applicant will make available a copy of future Guardian Storage tenants’ leases showing what kinds of items are and are not allowed to be stored at the building.
5) Applicant will provide the grading and drainage plan as part of the application process.

Outcomes:
The applicant will continue to design the project taking into account a number of comments from neighbors.

Neighbors continue to be highly skeptical of the advisability or desirability of this project.
Areas of agreement:

- None noted among all participants. Agent did not agree to any specific changes, but said he will work with the Applicant to evaluate a number of concerns and suggestions brought up at the meeting.

Unresolved issues and concerns:

- Views blocked. Neighbors feel that a large, 35’ building in this location is out of character with the nature of the neighborhood and blocks views of the waterway and mountains that homeowners prize as part of their enjoyment and home value. The facility is also expected to emit bothersome light onto neighboring residences.
- Boundary controls. Neighbors are concerned that landscaping around the property will facilitate delinquency, crime, and vagrancy.
- Impacts on flood control system. Neighbors have concerns about the proximity of the planned development to the John B Robert Dam and the adjacent arroyo that could affect dam protection and stormwater runoff.
- Regulatory compliance. Neighbors want to know that the project will adhere to all applicable Federal, State, Municipal, and other governmental laws, requirements, and regulations.
- Traffic. Neighbors are skeptical that the number of trips per day will be as few as projected—about 40 trips per day on average.

Meeting Specifics:

1) Prior to the meeting, the Facilitator solicited agenda topics from invitees. The Facilitator provided three topics based on information received prior to the meeting: views, traffic, and impacts on neighborhood character.
   a) Neighbors were invited to add additional topics about which they had questions and concerns.
       The topics were:
       - Flood control, including:
         - AMAPCA Concrete Channel / Federal Waterways
         - EPA
         - State Engineer
         - City Engineering
         - Water Authority
       - Crime
       - Noise
       - Light pollution
       - Sensitive lands
       - Requirements of ZHE
       - Meeting the conditions of the zoning
       - Meeting all relevant regulations, laws, orders
       - Native habitat
       - EPA regulations
       - Setting precedent for non-residential commercial use
       - John Robert Dam
   b) The Facilitator indicated that with so many topics, there would be an average of about 4 minutes for each topic within the 2 hour timeframe of the meeting.
   i) Attendees preferred to address some topics at length rather than to strictly limit time for each topic. Consequently, not all topics were addressed directly during the meeting.
2) A neighbor wanted to know if it was the City’s intent is to get opinions on the plan as a foregone conclusion.
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a) The Facilitator responded that sometimes the developer is willing to adjust the plan based on concerns expressed by neighbors.

b) Neighbor (N): So, the City is not in this loop?
   i) Facilitator: The City receives the report.

c) N: There are 4 NAs here. District 8 coalition is here. I intend to present a statement that represents their support and the support of the citywide inter-coalition panel, and they are supportive of Oso Grande NA’s position. [See StatementReceivedOnBehalfOfOsoGrandeNA.pdf distributed with this report.]

3) N: Why isn’t the meeting recorded?
   a) The Co-facilitator explained that it’s the practice in this program to have a note-taker and to create a report that summarizes the meeting. After the report is distributed, if there are any errors, there is a process for amendments.

4) Development team present at the meeting:
   a) Paul and Dawson Hedges - Applicant
   b) Jim Strozier – Consensus Planning
   c) Scott Culler – Consensus Planning
   d) Charlene Johnson – Consensus Planning
   e) Also involved, but not in attendance – RESPEC, the engineers for the project.

5) Overview of the project: Jim Strozier, Agent (A):
   a) We have not submitted an application to the city yet.
      i) Drawings now are in process, not final. We are working on them.
   b) Property is zoned MX-L, mixed use low intensity. Self-storage as a use is allowed if you get a conditional use approved through the Zoning Hearing Examiner (ZHE). We went through that process. The ZHE approved our request for a conditional use. It was appealed by Oso Grande Neighborhood Association, went to hearing before the Land Use Hearing Officer (LUHO).
   c) A Site Plan DRB submittal is a number of drawings. It includes site plan, landscape plan, grading/drainage plan, and utility plan, all prepared by our engineering consultant, RESPEC. The site plan also includes architectural drawings, and the architects are part of the team as well.
   d) The property is located between Juan Tabo Blvd and the Water Authority property, which is where the reservoir is located. You can see from the landscape plan, a lot of emphasis is placed on the street edges, a lot of street trees along both Juan Tabo Blvd and Osuna Rd. One thing we paid special attention to is steep slope that wraps around the northeast corner and along east edge of property. That is relevant to sensitive lands section of Integrated Development Ordinance (IDO), which lists a number of different components. The one component out of that list that applies to this property is the steep slopes. We also have adjacent properties that affect us, including public open space.
   e) The orientation of the building hasn’t changed very much from the original concept. We had an interior loading corridor. We heard concerns about that relative to noise and the bay door, and we have modified the plan to include 2 loading areas with parking areas for loading/unloading, one on west side and one on south side. Those are insets at the first-floor level, with roof over them. The office is located at the northwest corner of property. Parking along west edge and around south edge, as far away as possible from the existing neighborhood and Osuna Rd and off Juan Tabo Blvd. Loading areas won’t be visible really unless you’re looking directly into them. Access is as far west along Osuna Rd as it can be. It puts the entrance as far from the existing intersection as possible, and also locates it on the portion of the property that is more at grade.
   f) By not having to have an exit on north side from interior corridor, we got rid of a bunch of driveway that had been along the north side. We have more landscaping along the north side that we didn’t have the ability to do before. We can keep the drive aisle along the west and south edge.
   g) Elevations: The IDO has a number of regulations that focus on the street side and on breaking up the facades. Along Osuna Rd, vertical elements are designed to break up long wall. On the shorter
west elevation, you can see the loading area, inset into building. East elevation along Juan Tabo Blvd. One thing we have talked about is, there is significant drop from Juan Tabo Blvd to property, about an 18-foot difference from Juan Tabo Blvd to the finished floor is my recollection. The total height of the building is 35 feet, That will appear to be about a 17-foot tall building from that street elevation along Juan Tabo Blvd. The property comes back down to grade as you travel west.

b) The Land Use Hearing Officer (LUHO) held a hearing and recommended to City Council that council uphold the approval of the ZHE and deny the appeal, and that was upheld by the City Council.

6) Questions, Concerns, and Responses

a) Questions about the site plan

i) Neighbor (N): What’s the X-Y, the dimensions of the building?
   (1) 160 feet x 250 feet.

ii) N: [In response to Agent’s statement by Agent that access is as far west along Osuna Rd as it can be. It gets puts the entrance as far from the existing intersection as possible, and also locates it on the portion of the property that is more at grade:] It also gets you closer, less than 100 feet, from residences. Having the driveway there is not an improvement over the previous site plan.

iii) N: [In response to Agent’s statement that the conditional use request was approved by the ZHE.] It was approved with conditions and requirements. We intend to talk about those requirements that the ZHE has asked of the applicant. It is not a foregone conclusion. It was approved if you meet the requirements and conditions.
   (1) A: The ZHE decision included a number of findings. I believe there was only one condition with several parts.
   (2) N: Within the 72 items, there were a number of other requirements.
   (3) A: We have to address those. Many of those made reference to requirements in the City zoning code, the IDO.

iv) N: (comment) At the LUHO meeting, I spoke for about an hour, and LUHO said my testimony was hearsay and was disallowed, and I don’t think that was fair. LUHO’s findings to uphold notice of decision was based on complete exclusion of Oso Grande’s testimony. LUHO did allow the expert opinion of the professional engineer regarding the dam.

v) N: Who is the application submitted to? DRB?
   (1) A: The application we intend to make will be for Site Plan to the Development Review Board (DRB). Under the IDO, there are different procedures for different types of projects. We will be making application fairly soon, we hope. Our intent is to get the application turned in as soon as we have everything complete, within the next two weeks. When we make the application, we will send out another notice to the neighborhood associations and also to property owners within 100 feet and let you know exactly when the hearing is scheduled. DRB meets most Wednesdays starting at 9 AM.

vi) N: Is this a major or minor project?
   (1) A: It will be a 30-day submittal. There is major and minor as relates to subdivisions; I don’t know if this site plan is considered either major or minor.

vii) N: What are the dimensions of the site from north to south?
   (1) A: (Scott) I’d have to take a measurement on that.

viii) N: For the record, will you state the revision date of this plan you’re presenting tonight?
   (1) A: November 5 [2019].

ix) Boundary control
   (1) N: On the landscape plan, below the loading dock, where it looks like you’ll drive into the channel, what is that?
      (a) That’s a turn-around for fire.
   (2) N: So it’s not an exit.
(a) A: Along the south edge of the property is a trail that runs right on the property line beginning at the west edge of the property. As it heads east, just as it passes the loading dock, it begins to veer slightly toward the southeast and goes up in elevation.

(3) N: Are you aware that the Bear Canyon Arroyo Plan says you need 2 or 3 feet between edge of trail and any fence?
(a) A: Correct. We have a significant landscape area between the property line and the fence.

(4) N: The western boundary, nothing there, but roughly how far is that from the tank?
(a) A: There’s the existing trail, a smaller paved asphalt trail that connects Osuna Rd to the trail that runs north to south right along the property line. Right at about ¼ of way south along edge, a smaller trail veers to the west. Today we noticed that along that edge, because of erosion that’s taking place across the property, that trail gets impacted by sand and dirt coming off the property. The edge will be finished and landscaped so that doesn’t happen anymore.

(5) N: Where exactly is the fence located? Will the fence be right on the property boundary?
(a) A: It’s a visually open fence that runs along the west edge beginning about ¼ way south from the north edge and runs along the property line. There’s a gate just south of the office. From a security standpoint, only people that are customers are allowed to get through that gate. There’s only one access in and out at the location. From the southwest corner of the property, the fence continues along the south edge of the property and connects to the southeast corner of the building. The Eastern and Northern sides of the building are open.

(6) N: There’s no fence to deter people from hanging out by the building at night. Presently, cops have to run people off from the dam, and I’ve had to make that call. They’ll just wander across the street and hang out next to your building.

ix) Landscaping and trees
(1) N: I’m concerned about the trees on the east side of the property, which is a steep slope, you make it look like a green park. Isn’t that steep for trees?
(a) A: That slope will be revegetated. Because of how the intersection and sidewalk have been designed, there’s water coming into the site at that Northeast corner of the property. That’s going to be corrected so that water is not allowed to come into the property at that location. The trees in the slope are designed with a boulder barrier, “eyebrows,” so they are little catchment areas to hold the trees, to stabilize the soil and assist with runoff.

(2) N: That sounds like a job for the City. How will you get the City to do that? Water is jumping the sidewalk, and that’s a City problem.
(a) A: It’s part of our responsibility to correct that situation. The City did the improvements out there, and that’s what’s caused the current problem. Our engineer will have to address that as part of the grading and drainage plans. There are two existing billboards along there that will be removed.

(3) N: I like the concept of interior trees, but along Juan Tabo Blvd it is very steep and those trees are not going to survive.
(a) A: I’d suggest that you look at the roadway behind St. Pius High School, Oxbow communities. At Oxbow Bluff you can see a similar slope where we did exactly what we’re talking about here to create pockets and leveling out and retaining eyebrows. It worked incredibly well.
(b) A: We will make sure all of that is available when we make the application.

(4) N: The vegetation is going to be irrigated?
(a) There will be at least some temporary irrigation to get them established.

7) Views and building height
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i) N: I live in a two level townhouse on the corner of Osuna Rd and Juan Tabo Blvd. When I bought this house 2 1/2 years ago, I bought it because of the views. With this project, my view is going to be blocked by at least 17 feet of this building. It’s a hideous view and I don’t want to live with it. It just doesn’t seem right to me that the closest entity to this building are residences. I’m 50 feet away. I’d love to see a street rendering view from my perspective. Lights will be shining in my bedroom window every night. But my main thing is the view. I will have a wall and security lights. The trees in the plan look lovely, but they won’t come close to masking the view. I think there are 8 of us that the backs of our townhouses face this.

ii) N: Has consideration of people’s views been taken into account? Whether looking west from the open space or east from Oso Grande? How will be the building affect the views that people in our neighborhood pay dearly for in taxes?
   (1) A: Views have been taken into consideration in terms of trying to work with the civil engineer to get the building as low on the property as we can. We have also looked at the landscaping along the edges, especially along Osuna Rd. We’ll work up a rendering that shows that. But I’m not going to say you’re not going to see this building. Zoning allows a building up to 35 feet tall, and it will impact your views.
   (2) N: That’s not going to work for us then.

iii) N: It’s a 35-foot building, but from Juan Tabo Blvd it will look like 17 feet high. That’s good work, but I don’t think it’s enough. I pity the people who live along Osuna Rd. I’d like to remind those owners that I hope they all sue for the value of their property, because that $1m view will now be worth $1. And then the gate, 7 AM – 7 PM, how will we enforce that? The owners can just change the times. There’s nothing we can hold the owner to. And then the fences, the street people and the partiers, they will go along the green vegetation and camp. We have campers in the arroyo building bonfires at night. I don’t know if the owners are aware of this stuff. Cities like San Francisco have full-time Hazmat people to clean up human feces, and this is what we’re coming to. Thank you for the 18-foot change, but that’s still a massive wall.
   (1) N2: To the point about homeless people and bonfires, in Sacramento, there are homeless people digging into and sleeping in the dam itself, and that’s a hugely dangerous practice. I’m very concerned that the attractive nuisance of this building will hurt a several-million-dollar dam that is meant for our safety.

iv) N: We’re talking about a 17-foot wall. That’s on the east side. What about the other side?
   (1) The building is 35 feet tall. The grade change from Juan Tabo Blvd to the floor is about 18 feet. Osuna Rd from Juan Tabo Blvd is a steady drop. Along that stretch, Osuna Rd is a fairly significant drop. By the time you get to the northwest corner of the property, the building is closer to the grade of the street. My comment was not that the building was 17 feet tall, but that’s the portion of the building that you’re going to see. Within that, you’re going to see a row of street trees that are designed to grow to be 35 feet high when full grown. That’s part of our analysis related to trying to work within the context of this location.
   (2) N: Juan Tabo Blvd is dropping at Osuna Rd. If you’re at 17 feet above ground at corner, going to be much higher above ground

v) N: Natural grade level of building is street level at northwest corner?
   (1) A bit lower, but much closer to grade at that point.

8) Traffic
a) N: I’d love to be able to say you could put in a no-left-turn lane from Osuna Rd to Juan Tabo Blvd to not bother traffic, but you couldn’t do that to homeowners. I wouldn’t mind making customers only turn right.

b) N: What is the estimated traffic load? The number of trucks? I understand it depends on the number of customers, and you have no control over how many times a truck might come. What is your estimate?
   i) Applicant: 30-40 vehicles/day. 3-4 vehicles/hour.
   ii) A: As far as commercial land use, storage is one of lowest traffic generators.
iii) N: But you have no control over that. When you have a customer who’s making many trips, what are you going to do?

c)  N: How many units will be in the storage facility?
   i)  A: 600.
   ii)  N: And only 40 people going in and out per day? On the first day, you’re going to have 600 people 4 times.
   iii) N2: And that’s not counting residential vehicles on the street. There are about 60-odd units there.

(1) A: As compared to a typical street, that road doesn’t go anywhere, so you don’t get as much traffic on this segment.

d)  N: Have you checked with City to see if the City might install a traffic light there? Do 40 cars move City at all in that regard?
   i)  A: When the City is making a determination of whether traffic signals are appropriate, they look at a series of things like traffic volume, turn volume, accidents. Since Osuna Rd doesn’t go through, it would be doubtful that this location comes anywhere close to meeting thresholds to require a traffic study. If this generated a lot of traffic, maybe, but existing conditions plus what this project would add doesn’t come close.

e)  N: The project is 600 units. I can see in February you’ll only get 40 trips per day. But when people are going to pick up Christmas ornaments, they’ll take two or three trips in a day, so in November, December, & January, I foresee hundreds or a thousand visits to the unit. 600 units means 600 people.

9) Neighborhood character
   a)  N: Choice of materials. What do you have in mind?
      i)  A: Design is still in progress, but because the property is adjacent to major public open space, the IDO has very strict requirements related to color and reflectivity and the architect has to provide analysis. Mostly browns, greens, grays. You’re limited to less than 20% of building facade can be any accent color. What we have now is a combination of metal, block, and looking at either painted stucco finish or metal that’s painted to have same kind of texture. They’ve used that on a couple of Guardian’s recent projects. If you look at the area behind St Pius, I’d encourage you to look at two Guardian projects, one at the end of La Orilla across from Sagebrush Church, and then the other is just north of the intersection of Unser and McMahon, Night Whisperer and Unser.
   b)  N: There’s a trade-off between the fencing on north and east sides, without a fence is probably more aesthetically pleasing, but more subject to graffiti.
      i)  A: We’ll have a conversation about the fencing and potentially make a modification. Our preference is not to have a fence, but we’re going to talk about it.

   c)  N: Is there some reason why the building couldn’t be two stories as opposed to three?
   d)  A: In the other location, zoning restricted height.
   e)  N: Just because it’s allowed doesn’t mean it has to happen. I don’t think there would be as much opposition to a 7-foot view of a building as opposed to twice that. If you were to knock the building down to 2 stories, I don’t think you’d have as much opposition.

d)  N: Isn’t there a nicer easier place to move into than that corner lot? There’s so much stuff at Paseo, maybe a little more expensive. Isn’t there an easier place to meet your needs? These people have views that are ruined, and I hope they sue the crap out of the applicant. The character of our neighborhood is that stuff. I love my view, and I feel for people who buy a house and two years later the view is gone. I want to put that seed out there. Why are they so gungho about that lot?
      i)  Applicant: We’ve been looking for property for a long time all over the southwest. The properties that we look at have the market for storage. If we came to Paseo, the zoning is not there, maybe the market is not there. This seems like a reasonable market, good
demographics, need for storage. We want to work with you and make it a nice building. The projects we’ve done, in the end, people are pretty happy with.

ii) N3: I’d suggest you listen and move the project somewhere else, because we will fight this down to the last minute and I think we have a pretty good chance of winning. A storage complex that huge doesn’t fit in. It takes away the character and integrity of the open space.

e) N2: I think the most salient point of the night is that the third story crushes the spirit of the neighborhood. If you lowered it, you’d have much less resistance. Then we’re also pissed at the City for blowing off the neighbors, and you’re going to live through that. But this just looks massive.

i) Applicant: We take that into account. We do feasibility studies, we do research on sites for many years, and we want to work with the surrounding community and give them the best in terms of our cooperation. But it’s a decision from our point of view that we’ve decided to pursue, and we’re here tonight in the hope that we can get some feedback that we can consider moving forward.

10) Crime, noise, light pollution

d) N: The gate will be closed as of 7:00?
   i) A: It will not be open 24 hours.
   ii) N: Is there a live-in employee?
   iii) A: No.

e) N: My major concern is over security lighting. I dread it. It would be like having street lights aimed right in my bedroom window. Come and take a look out of my bedroom window. Your building will eclipse it by over 10 feet. No matter where you put your lights, they will be shining in my bedroom. Also with security, a lot of partyers go to the dam. Most of them mean no harm, but when cops pull up, they’ll run right over to your building.
   i) A: On the subject of the lighting, we’ll look at that. Typically building mounted lighting is about 16 feet high, shielded down to light the area immediately adjacent to the building. We pay a lot of attention. The City has regulations related to the shielding and the limitations of light pollution. I assure you we will take those concerns into consideration, especially as related to security lighting. We will pay extra attention to that.
   ii) N: If you had the whole thing fenced, is it possible to not have lights burn 24 hours/day? Can you turn off lights during non-business hours?

(1) A: We’ll take a look at that.

f) N: At the ZHE meeting that we attended earlier in 2019, we said the noise pollution would be significant because Bear Canyon tends to amplify sound. 50 decibels can remain at 50 decibels all the way down the canyon. I can hear people whispering in the open space. I doubt whether this project can meet any of the noise ordinances. We would check that out. We have been saying this for a very long time.
   i) N2: To add to that, looking at your material choice, there will be a big sound-reflective surface off the building.

(1) A: We’ll look at that.

11) Flood Control

a) N: The eastern steep slope is also the toe of the dam and the toe region of the dam. There are lots of Federal regulations and best practices around operation and maintenance of the dam, including leaving the steep slope alone so the dam can be properly inspected. If there is ever a failure, it is highly likely it will occur along that steep slope. That slope is supposed to be inspected by AMAFCA on at least a 5-year basis. By putting landscaping there, you’re preventing AMAFCA from being able to properly inspect the dam. We have not been given the grading and drainage plan.
   i) A: The engineering plans will be reviewed and approved by City hydrology and AMAFCA. We aren’t done with it yet, and we will give it to you as part of the application process.
b) N: You commented that the dam is part of the open space. The dam is separate from the open space. I don’t think it can be both open space and dam.
   i) A: Regarding open space, there are two components. One is the land use component which defines the city’s plans and use maps, and the other is the zoning code component. In planning maps, the dam is not open space. From a zoning standpoint, it is zoned as MPOA (major public open space), and both the dam and the area behind are zoned MPOA. The dam isn’t what we think of as open space, but from a zoning standpoint, it is open space in the sense of MPOA.
   ii) N: Regarding the toe of the dam, it seems to me that the toe of the dam would be a lot lower (further West) than the other neighbor indicated.
   iii) N2: Really, it’s AMAFCA and the State Engineer (OSE) that are qualified to deliberate over where the actual toe is. Federal regulation and best practices disallow building on the toe and toe regions of a dam. Since you’re not prepared to talk about that, I want to stipulate that before we could get into the details of this, we want to know what you’ve done to analyze the regulations and form the correct analysis that you need and has been required by the ZHE. The ZHE very specifically said to conduct studies and analyses prior to a site plan.
   iv) N: Why haven’t the studies been done?
      (1) A: The engineers analyzed and responded to the comments made as part of the appeal. The engineering firm is RESPEC.
      (2) N2: I just got done saying that AMAFCA, State Engineer, and Army Corps of Engineers are only ones qualified.
      (3) A: I don’t have the ability to get those entities to do analysis on our behalf.
      (4) N2: Is your civil engineer a reservoir expert?
      (5) A: I can’t say whether he is or isn’t, I don’t know his qualifications.

c) N: I would like it to go on record that this is the third site plan we’ve received, and each one is like a moving target.
   i) A: As part of the conditional use, we started with a conceptual site plan. We refined that as part of developing our application, and have refined it more, which is what I’m showing you today.
   ii) N: Why are you not showing us the entire plan? You’ve said you have all these plans, and a lot of that is not available here.
   iii) A: Engineers are working on finalizing the grading/drainage and utility plan. There are a number of parts to this, and none of them is 100% complete. I typically don’t go through utility or grading/drainage at these meetings in the interest of time.
   iv) N: There is a lot of regulation embedded within the grading and drainage, environmental compliance, compliance with flood plain guidelines. Just so we can all be really clear that you’re not presenting all of that tonight.

d) N: That arroyo is already overused, with all of the buildings east of us.
   i) A: Overused from capacity?
   ii) N: Yes, capacity. There was a house built up the canyon, and the City had to build anchoring because of the erosion. I always saw that lot as the overflow for the dam. That arroyo is already overused when we get our two rains each year. We’re having this big building with a parking lot, taking up 90% of the land with the building and parking lot. Where is that water going? It will go into the little arroyo that’s already being overused.
   iii) A: We’ll build on-site ponding areas to manage the first flush waters. That’s a water quality issue, primarily. Before it goes into the public system, you’ve taken some pollutants and trash out of the cycle. We have to do hydrologic study, submitted to City hydrologist, and they review it with staff at AMAFCA, the manager of channel in this location. The City hydrologist acts as flood plain administrator. All of those things have to be taken into consideration with the review of the site plan. Before a site plan can be approved, we need to have grading and drainage and an approved hydrologic study.
e) N: FEMA promulgates a lot of federal regulation regarding floodplain management, and is very clear about the need to reduce the risks of flooding in floodplains. AMAFCA resolutions mirror that. Executive Order 11-988, ratified by President Obama in 2015, that says floodplain development whenever possible needs to be avoided and all practical alternatives must be considered before locating in floodplains. Federal regulations say you can't site there.
   i) A: This property is not in a mapped floodplain.
   ii) N: You are in a flood hazard area as designated by FEMA.
       (1) A: The same as the one houses are in?
   iii) N: They are in same flood hazard area.
       (1) A: We will pass that on to engineers.

f) N: I'm worried about, right now still allowing building in headwaters of canyon. What are you doing to reassure us downstream and those below us about water going into that arroyo?
   i) A: I'd assume there is a drainage management plan for the area east of Juan Tabo Blvd and Tramway that addresses the Bear Canyon Arroyo.
   ii) N: Mayor Berry allowed a building boom up there, and Mayor Keller just had to spend money anchoring this house upstream.
   iii) A: We will have to address that as it relates to our site as well as off-site waters. AMAFCA regulates the channel in this location and they will review our analysis, which looks at stormwater generated on our site and the system that we are addressing. I have not heard about a concern raised by City hydrology or AMAFCA about the concrete channel being over capacity, but I assume that is part of their analysis.

   g) N: Would you provide us with that engineering report? Sheldon Greer's professional engineer's report?
     i) A: Yes.

h) N: You mentioned capturing first flush. What's plan B if you need a bigger catchment area?
   i) A: The grading and drainage plan is still being worked on. We could accomplish some of this in different areas. The current philosophy is to depress areas to make curb cuts to get water into landscape areas, where plants are. We're going to try to keep as much water from coming onto the areas from outside, and then keep water on site, making sure water is not against building. There are a number of technical aspects.

   i) N: You have rights to discharge into the channel?
     i) A: That's part of the approval AMAFCA has to provide.

j) N: The water you want to prevent from going on this property, it doesn't just disappear, it runs down Osuna Rd. If that water is diverted to Osuna Rd, there will be significant property damage in a good-sized storm.
   i) A: We'll take a look at that.

k) N: I'm bothered that you don't consider this a flood plain. Those little things you're offering are good ideas, but I don't think they're enough.
   i) A: Re the flood plain, I'll have to look at the map.
   ii) Facilitator: Please explain the timeline and process for these approvals. At some point AMAFCA reviews the plan. When do they review that and how does that fit into the process? I'm also hearing a lot of concerns about, "If this plan doesn't work and can't get approved, then what?"

   iii) A: As part of our application, there's a separate submittal that goes to City Hydrology. City Hydrology interfaces with AMAFCA. Prior to the DRB acting on the site plan, we will have to have an approval letter from City for the hydrology. It's part of the application process. If you can't get through approval process, you can't get a building permit. We need to address all of those comments.
l) N: The whole idea of the dam, the flood plain starts when you get to level. When you have from Juan Tabo Blvd to the building such an incline, that tells me that’s part of the dam. Our sense is that the road is in the dam also. It’s too steep.

12) Other questions and comments

d) N: Can you tell us what is going to be in the storage building?
   i) Applicant: 99% is household goods.
   ii) N: You could have a whole bunch of cigarette lighters, and it becomes combustible. Is there such a thing as a range? Propane cylinders.
   iii) A: That’s not allowed. That’s illegal.
   iv) N: The Dept. of Homeland Security says storage units are among the most dangerous of facilities out there. It’s not just hazardous chemicals, but corpses, animals, whatnot. Despite best efforts and mitigation, Homeland Security has said that storage facilities are dangerous. They also say crime is an issue, storing drugs and the like.

e) N: Where can I find what is and is not allowed?
   i) A: We typically have a lease for potential tenants. They’re also concerned, because they want their items to be safe. No explosives, paints, propane, gasoline, fireworks. There’s a long list.
   ii) A: We can provide that.

f) N: This will be a climate controlled building, correct? Where will the air conditioning units be placed? I’m assuming on the roof. Is that something else I have to look forward to as a neighbor, hearing that?
   i) A: We’re required to screen those units. Part of the design is a parapet with screening of units. Sometimes, depending on architecture and layout, we may need additional screening, and there are ways to do that.
   ii) N2: But if you just have visual screening on roof, is that effective for acoustics?
   iii) A: I don’t know the answer to that. We can look into that.

g) N2: Is the HVAC system included in the 35’ of the building height?
   i) A: No, but screening is part of the IDO. Part of the challenge, because we’re sinking the building, you can see the roof a lot better. We have to take that into consideration.
   ii) N: So the total height will be 35 feet plus screening, so 37 feet?
   iii) A: Height of building including parapet is 35 feet.

h) N: When I drove in here on Carmel, I saw a building that kind of looked like that.
   i) A: Yes, that’s an older Guardian building on Holly.
   ii) N: That was a monster. Please don’t put that below a dam. That doesn’t belong below a dam and doesn’t belong in our neighborhood. It doesn’t fit in. There are walkers and runners and bike riders and dog walkers and we love the rabbits and coyotes. It just doesn’t fit. Juan Tabo Blvd with that traffic, I have a lot of trouble crossing because the traffic is fast.
   iii) N2: Is the building on Holly bigger or smaller?
   iv) Applicant: I believe it’s about the same size.
   v) A: It has a commercial/retail element in front that would not be part of this building.

i) N: Who enforces the decisions of the ZHE?
   i) A: ZHE decisions inform the work of the DRB. It’s Code Enforcement that would be the direct enforcement of that decision. DRB is made up of technical staff from many departments.

j) Facilitator: Neighbors have a number of outstanding concerns, principal among them, impacts on residential views and issues associated with the flood control system.
   i) N: We’re also very concerned that this project adhere to all applicable legal and regulatory requirements.
Land Use Program Facilitator’s Summary Report, Guardian Storage Project, 11/5/2019 meeting

Any further questions or comments for the City can be referred to:
Jolene Wolfley, City of Albuquerque Planning Department
jwolfley@cabq.gov
505 924-3891

Names and Affiliations of All Attendees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alicia Quinones</td>
<td>Homeowner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Fass</td>
<td>Homeowner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlene Johnson</td>
<td>Consensus Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawson Hedges</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric &amp; Ida Bender</td>
<td>Homeowner/JBRNA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan Squires</td>
<td>Homeowner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janie McGuigan</td>
<td>Homeowner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Strozier</td>
<td>Consensus Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Rogers</td>
<td>Neighbor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Alvarado</td>
<td>Homeowner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lars Wells</td>
<td>JBRNA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Hedges</td>
<td>Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard E Cooley</td>
<td>Homeowner/Vice President District &amp; Coalition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally Hoier</td>
<td>Neighbor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Culler</td>
<td>Consensus Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie Otts</td>
<td>Homeowner/JBRNA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue &amp; Jim Hiltz</td>
<td>JBRNA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Rogers</td>
<td>Homeowner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V Affat</td>
<td>Homeowner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SIGN POSTING AGREEMENT

REQUIREMENTS

POSTING SIGNS ANNOUNCING PUBLIC HEARINGS

All persons making application to the City under the requirements and procedures established by the City Zoning Code or Subdivision Ordinance are responsible for the posting and maintaining of one or more signs on the property which the application describes. 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. If the application is mailed, you must still stop at the Development Services Front Counter to pick up the sign.

The applicant is responsible for ensuring that the signs remain posted throughout the 15-day period prior to public hearing. Failure to maintain the signs during this entire period may cause for deferral or denial of the application. Replacement signs for those lost or damaged are available from the Development Services Front Counter at a charge of $3.75 each.

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 ________________

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,  ________________  ________________
________________________________________________________________________
(Date)  (Staff Member)

PROJECT NUMBER: __________________________

Rev. 1/11/05
See list of associations below and attached regarding your DRB submittal. In addition, we have included web links below that will provide you with additional details about the new Integrated Development Ordinance (IDO) requirements. The web links also include notification templates that you may utilize when contacting each association. Thank you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Association/Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Address Line 1</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip</th>
<th>Mobile Phone</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oso Grande NA</td>
<td>Alicia</td>
<td>Quevedo</td>
<td><a href="mailto:aiquevedo@vermex.com">aiquevedo@vermex.com</a></td>
<td>4441 Corrales Road NE</td>
<td>Albuquerque</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>87111</td>
<td>5052203835</td>
<td>5056217551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oso Grande NA</td>
<td>Valerie</td>
<td>Quevedo</td>
<td><a href="mailto:viquevedo@yahoo.com">viquevedo@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>4821 Menen Court NE</td>
<td>Albuquerque</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>87111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John B Robertson NA</td>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Wells</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tawells@yahoo.com">tawells@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>1207 Overlook NE</td>
<td>Albuquerque</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>87111</td>
<td>5052930168</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John B Robertson NA</td>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>Holls</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sholls@coronet.net">sholls@coronet.net</a></td>
<td>13134 Overlook NE</td>
<td>Albuquerque</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>87111</td>
<td>5052717176</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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


Respectfully,

Vicente M. Quevedo, MCDP
Neighborhood Liaison
Office of Neighborhood Coordination
City of Albuquerque - City Council
(505) 768-3323

Website: 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. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and destroy all copies of this message.

From: webmaster@cabq.gov (webmaster@cabq.gov) [mailto:webmaster@cabq.gov]
For: webmaster@cabq.gov
Sent: Monday, November 05, 2018 2:52 PM
To: Office of Neighborhood Coordination <perven@conservanplanning.com>
Cc: Office of Neighborhood Coordination <perven@conservanplanning.com>
Subject: 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: Chadine Johnson
Telephone Number: 2027409681
Email Address: JohnsonCh@conservanplanning.com
Company Name: Conservan Planning, Inc.
Company Address: 100 Eighth Street NW
City: Albuquerque
State: NM
ZIP: 87102

Legal description of the subject site for this project:
Tract G-1 plat of tracts F-1 & G-1 Academy Place containing 2,790 acres.
Physical address of subject site: 300 Eighth Street NW
Subject site cross streets: Osuna Road and Juan Tabo Boulevard, NE
Other subject site identifiers: This site is located on the following map site page: F-21

This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
November 22, 2019

Dear Property Owner:

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING
Notice is hereby given that the City of Albuquerque Development Review Board (DRB) will hold a Public Hearing on Wednesday, December 18, 2019 at 9:00 am in the Plaza del Sol Hearing Room, Lower Level, Plaza del Sol building, 600 2nd St. NW, Albuquerque, NM to consider the following item. You can check the agenda for the DRB online here: https://www.cabq.gov/planning/boards-commissions/development-review-board or call the Planning Department at 505-924-3860.

REQUEST
Consensus Planning, agent for Guardian Storage, requests approval of a Site Plan-DRB for the development of an indoor self-storage facility at 4909 Juan Tabo Boulevard, on the southwest corner of Juan Tabo Boulevard and Osuna Road. The undeveloped property is zoned MX-L. A Site Plan-DRB is required for this property as it is located 330 feet from Major Public Open Space and is under 5 acres in size.

If you have questions or need additional information regarding this request contact Jim Strozier, Principal at Consensus Planning at (505) 764-9801 or at cp@consensusplanning.com.

NOTE: Anyone may request, and the City may require an applicant to attend a City-sponsored facilitated meeting with Neighborhood Associations, based on the complexity and potential impacts of a proposed project [IDO Section 14-16-6-4(D)]. To request a Facilitated Meeting regarding this project, contact the Planning Department at devhelp@cabq.gov or 505-924-3955. To view and download the Facilitated Meetings Criteria, visit http://www.cabq.gov/planning/urban-design-development/facilitated-meetings-for-proposed-development.

Sincerely,

Consensus Planning, Inc.

Attached: Zone Atlas F-21
CENTRAL NEW MEXICO COMMUNITY
COLLEGE C/O KATHERINE LULIBARRI - VP
FIN OPS
525 BUENA VISTA DR SE
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87106-4023

CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE
PO BOX 1293
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87103-2248

ALBUQUERQUE BERNALILLO COUNTY
WATER UTILITY AUTHORITY
PO BOX 1293
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87103-1293
HOLLEY CURTIS
4900 SERENO DR NE
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87111-6932

AMPUEIRO FRANCISCO & AMPUEIRO
ESTELA TRUSTEES AMPUEIRO RVT
5305 CANYON BLUFF TRL NE
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87111-8242

TELCK JEANNENE
4904 SERENO DR NE
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87111
TABET RICHARD D & SUE C/O RAKS LUMBER
108 CARSON DR SE
LOS LUNAS NM 87031-9294

LEWIS TAMELA A
2952 PUEBLO ALTO
SANTA FE NM 87507-2519

MENEFEE ELTON G
4905 PLACIDO DR NE
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87111-6945
SL JUAN TABO LAND LLC
2900 LOUISIANA BLVD NE SUITE 250
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87110

CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE
PO BOX 2248
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87103-2248

FERIOLI PAUL
4908 SERENO DR NE
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87111
FRICKE DEBORAH ANN
4912 SERENA CIR NE
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87111-6942

WOLFE COMPANY INC A NEW MEXICO CORPORATION
2730 SAN PEDRO DR NE SUITE H
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87110-3334

TALLEY DEBBIE C
4901 SERENO DR NE
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87111
FRAHM KARLENE K
4901 PLACIDO DR NE
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87111-6945
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Association Name</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address Line 1</th>
<th>Address Line 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District 8 Coalition of Neighborhood Associations</td>
<td>Donald Couchman</td>
<td>6441 Concordia Road NE</td>
<td>Albuquerque, NM 87111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oso Grande NA</td>
<td>Alicia Quinones</td>
<td>4921 Noreen Court NE</td>
<td>Albuquerque, NM 87111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oso Grande NA</td>
<td>Vivienne Affat</td>
<td>10317 Camino Del Oso NE</td>
<td>Albuquerque, NM 87111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John B Robert NA</td>
<td>Lars Wells</td>
<td>11208 Overlook NE</td>
<td>Albuquerque, NM 87111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John B Robert NA</td>
<td>Sue Hilts</td>
<td>11314 Overlook NE</td>
<td>Albuquerque, NM 87111</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear Neighbors,

This email is to inform you that Consensus has submitted an application to the Development Review Board (DRB) for a Site Plan-DRB for the property located at 4909 Juan Tabo Boulevard NE on behalf of Guardian Storage, the Contract Purchaser for the property. The owner of the property is SL Juan Tabo Land, LLC. The proposed development is under 5 acres and is located within 330 feet of Major Public Open Space (John Roberts Dam and Bear Canyon Arroyo). For these reasons, the site plan must be reviewed and approved by the Development Review Board.

On November 5, 2019, during the pre-application phase of this submittal, a facilitated meeting was held with neighbors from Oso Grande, John B. Roberts, Amberglen HOA, and District 8 Coalition of Neighborhoods. At that time, the project team presented the preliminary landscape plan and building elevations and answered questions from the participants. The facilitated meeting notes were distributed to attendees and are part of the submittal to the DRB.

The DRB meeting for this Site Plan-DRB will be held on Wednesday, December 18, 2019, 9:00 a.m. in the Hearing Room (Basement Level) of the Plaza del Sol Building located at 600 2nd Street, NW. You can check the agenda for the relevant decision making body online here: https://www.cabq.gov/planning/boards-commissions or call the Planning Department at 505-924-3860.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions, would like to meet, or desire any additional information. Please note: Anyone may request, and the City may require an applicant to attend a City-sponsored facilitated meeting with Neighborhood Associations, based on the complexity and potential impacts of a proposed project [IDO Section 14-16-6-4(D)]. To request a Facilitated Meeting regarding this project, contact the Planning Department at devhelp@cabq.gov or 505-924-3955. To view and download the Facilitated Meetings Criteria, visit http://www.cabq.gov/planning/urban-design-development/facilitated-meetings-for-proposed-development.

Attached:
Zone Atlas F-21;
Color rendering of view from Juan Tabo Boulevard and Osuna Road; and
Proposed Site Plan Set.

Jim Strozier, FAICP
Consensus Planning, Inc.
302 8th Street NW
November 22, 2019

Alicia Quinones
4921 Noreen Court NE
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87111

Vivienne Affat
10317 Camino Del Oso NE
Albuquerque, NM 87111

Dear Representatives Quinones and Affat and the Oso Grande Neighborhood Association,

This letter is to inform you that Consensus has submitted an application to the Development Review Board (DRB) for a Site Plan-DRB for the property located at 4909 Juan Tabo Boulevard NE on behalf of Guardian Storage, the contract purchaser for the property. The owner of the property is SL Juan Tabo Land, LLC. The proposed development is under 5 acres and is located within 330 feet of Major Public Open Space (John Roberts Dam and Bear Canyon Arroyo). For these reasons, the site plan must be reviewed and approved by the Development Review Board.

On November 5, 2019, during the pre-application phase of this submittal, a facilitated meeting was held with neighbors from Oso Grande, John B. Roberts, Amberglen HOA, and District 8 Coalition of Neighborhoods. At that time, the project team presented the preliminary landscape plan and building elevations and answered questions from the participants. The facilitated meeting notes were distributed to attendees and are part of the submittal to the DRB.

The meeting for this Site Plan-DRB will be held on Wednesday, December 18, 2019, 9:00 a.m. in the Hearing Room (Basement Level) of the Plaza del Sol Building located at 600 2nd Street, NW. You can check the agenda for the relevant decision making body online here: https://www.cabq.gov/planning/boards-commissions or call the Planning Department at 505-924-3860.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions, would like to meet, or desire any additional information. Please note: Anyone may request, and the City may require an applicant to attend a City-sponsored facilitated meeting with Neighborhood Associations, based on the complexity and potential impacts of a proposed project [IDO Section 14-16-6-4(D)]. To request a Facilitated Meeting regarding this project, contact the Planning Department at davhelp@cabq.gov or 505-924-3955. To view and download the Facilitated Meetings Criteria, visit http://www.cabq.gov/planning/urban-design-development/facilitated-meetings-for-proposed-development.
Sincerely,

James K. Strozier, FAICP
Principal

Enclosed:
- Zone Atlas F-21;
- Color rendering of view from Juan Tabo and Osuna; and
- Proposed Site Plan (11x17).
Vivienne Affat
10317 Camino Del Oso NE
Albuquerque, NM 87111
SITE PLAN CHECKLIST

Project #: __________________ Application #: __________________

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

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

[Signature] 1/22/2019

Applicant or Agent Signature / Date

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

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

The electronic format must be organized in the above manner.

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

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

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

SHEET #1 - SITE PLAN

A. General Information

- [ ] 1. Date of drawing and/or last revision
- [ ] 2. Scale: 
  - .0 acre or less  1" = 10'
  - 1.0 - 5.0 acres  1" = 20'
  - Over 5 acres  1" = 50'
  - Over 20 acres  1" = 100'
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SITE PLAN CHECKLIST

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

B. Proposed Development

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

2. Parking, Loading and Internal Circulation

   ✓ A. Parking layout with spaces numbered per aisle and totaled.
      ✓ 1. Location and typical dimensions, including motorcycle spaces, bicycle spaces, ADA
          accessible spaces, and compact spaces
      ✓ 2. Calculations: spaces required and proposed (include any reduction calculations) for
          motorcycle, bicycle, compact and ADA spaces
      ✓ 3. On street parking spaces

   ✓ B. Bicycle parking & facilities
      ✓ 1. Bicycle racks – location and detail
      ✓ 2. Other bicycle facilities, if applicable

   ✓ C. Vehicular Circulation (Refer to DPM and IDO)
      ✓ 1. Ingress and egress locations, including width and curve radii dimensions
      ✓ 2. Drive aisle locations, including width and curve radii dimensions
      ✓ 3. End aisle locations, including width and curve radii dimensions
      ✓ 4. Location & orientation of refuse enclosure, with dimensions
      ✓ 5. Loading, service area, and refuse service locations and dimensions

   ✓ D. Pedestrian Circulation
      ✓ 1. Location and dimensions of all sidewalks and pedestrian paths (including ADA
          connection from ROW to building and from ADA parking to building)
SITE PLAN CHECKLIST

2. Location and dimension of drive aisle crossings, including paving treatment
3. Location and description of amenities, including patios, benches, tables, etc.

E. Off-Street Loading
   1. Location and dimensions of all off-street loading areas

F. Vehicle Stacking and Drive-Through or Drive-Up Facilities
   1. Location and dimensions of vehicle stacking spaces and queuing lanes
   2. Landscaped buffer area if drive-through lanes are adjacent to public R/W
   3. Striping and Sign details for one-way drive through facilities

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

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

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

SHEET #2 - LANDSCAPING PLAN

1. Scale - must be same as scale on sheet #1 - Site plan
2. Bar Scale
3. North Arrow
4. Property Lines
5. Existing and proposed easements
6. Identify nature of ground cover materials
   A. Impervious areas (pavement, sidewalks, slope pavings, curb and gutters, etc.)
   B. Pervious areas (planting beds, gravel areas, grass, ground cover vegetation, etc.)
   C. Ponding areas either for drainage or landscaping/recreational use
SITE PLAN CHECKLIST

7. Identify type, location and size of plantings (common and/or botanical names).
   A. Existing, indicating whether it is to be preserved or removed.
   B. Proposed, to be established for general landscaping.
   C. Proposed, to be established for screening/buffering.

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

9. Planting Beds, indicating square footage of each bed

10. Turf Area - only 20% of landscaped area can be high water turf; provide square footage and percentage.

11. Responsibility for Maintenance (statement)

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

13. Landscaped buffer areas provided; dimensions, label clearly that it is a landscape buffer, square footage and percent (specify clearly on plan)

14. Planting or tree well detail

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

16. Parking lot edges and interior – calculations, dimensions and locations including tree requirements

17. Show Edge Buffer Landscaping (14-16-5-6(D)) – location, dimensions and plant material

SHEET #3 – GRADING AND DRAINAGE PLAN

A separate grading and drainage plan (and drainage report) must be submitted to the DRS Hydrology Section prior to the DRB submittal for a site plan (See DRWS Form).

A. General Information

1. Scale - must be same as Sheet #1 - Site Plan
2. Bar Scale
3. North Arrow
4. Property Lines
5. Existing and proposed easements
6. Building footprints
7. Location of Retaining walls

B. Grading Information

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

SHEET #4- UTILITY PLAN

✓ A. Fire hydrant locations, existing and proposed. (or submit signed off Fire One Plan)
✓ B. Distribution lines
✓ C. Right-of-Way and easements, existing and proposed, on the property and adjacent to the boundaries, with identification of types and dimensions.
✓ D. Existing water, sewer, storm drainage facilities (public and/or private).
✓ E. Proposed water, sewer, storm drainage facilities (public and/or private)
✓ F. Existing electric lines both overhead and underground. Power Poles shown with dimensions to proposed buildings and structures must be clearly shown.

SHEET #5 - BUILDING AND STRUCTURE ELEVATIONS

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

B. Building Mounted Signage
✓ 1. Site location(s)
✓ 2. Sign elevations to scale
✓ 3. Dimensions, including height and width
✓ 4. Sign face area - dimensions and square footage clearly indicated
✓ 5. Lighting
✓ 6. Materials and colors for sign face and structural elements.
✓ 7. List the sign restrictions per the IDO
Exhibits:

1. Sensitive Lands Memo
2. Water and Sanitary Sewer Availability Statement #190317
3. Signed Fire One Plan
4. Color rendering of view from Juan Tabo Boulevard and Osuna Road
Guardian Storage Osuna
Sensitive Lands Analysis

To: Development Review Board

From: Scott Culler, PLA, ASLA

Date: October 30, 2019

Re: Analysis of Sensitive Lands at Guardian Storage Osuna Property

Pursuant to section the Integrated Development Ordinance (IDO) Section 14-16-5-2 Site Design and Sensitive Lands, the following analysis provided guidance to the site plan related to sensitive lands. The analysis was conducted using topographic survey data, site analysis, review of existing easement documents, aerial photography, and the City’s AGIS system.

5-2(C)(1) Both the subdivision and site design processes shall begin with an analysis of site constraints related to sensitive lands. To the maximum extent practicable, new subdivisions of land and site design shall avoid locating development, except for open spaces and areas that will not be disturbed during the development process, in the following types of sensitive lands:
- 5-2(C)(1)(a) Floodplains and flood hazard areas
- 5-2(C)(1)(b) Steep slopes
- 5-2(C)(1)(c) Unstable soils
- 5-2(C)(1)(d) Wetlands
- 5-2(C)(1)(e) Arroyos
- 5-2(C)(1)(f) Irrigation facilities (acequias)
- 5-2(C)(1)(g) Escarpments
- 5-2(C)(1)(h) Rock outcroppings
- 5-2(C)(1)(i) Large stands of mature trees
- 5-2(C)(1)(j) Archaeological sites

Analysis of the site concluded that the only types of sensitive lands present on the site are steep slopes. The steep slopes are located primarily along the Juan Tabo Boulevard property line and extend west along a portion of the north and south property lines (Exhibit A). The slopes begin at the property line along this frontage and descend east, into the site, at an approximate 3:1 ratio (33.5%). To minimize impact of the Steep Slopes the proposed building has been located to the south and west sides of the site to the maximum extent practicable. Vehicular and pedestrian access has also been located on the west end of the property to minimize impact to the slope. Some disturbance of the slope will be necessary due to construction. All disturbed areas of the slope will be treated with a native and/or naturalized revegetative seed mix, as recommended by the Landscape Architect, to aid in stabilizing the slopes. Small native and/or naturalized trees will also be used along the slope. Trees will be planted in tree wells with landscape boulder retention to capture water and help reduce erosion of the slope.
5-2(H)(1) MAJOR PUBLIC OPEN SPACE EDGES

5-2(H)(1) Properties within 330 feet of Major Public Open Space. These standards apply to development within 330 feet of Major Public Open Space in order to enhance and protect Major Public Open Space.
For additional standards regulating adjacent properties, see Subsection 14-16-5-2(H)(2) below. Projects within 330 feet of Major Public Open Space shall do all of the following:

5-2(H)(1)(a) Limit the colors of exterior surfaces of structures, including but not limited to mechanical devices, roof vents, and screening materials, to those with light reflective value (LRV) rating between 20 percent and 50 percent.

*The building elevations have been designed to comply with this regulation*

5-2(H)(1)(b) Colors shall blend with the surrounding natural environment and generally include yellow ochres, browns, dull reds, and grey greens.

1. Trim materials on façades constituting less than 20 percent of the façade’s opaque surface may be any color.

   *Trim colors have been restricted to less than 20 percent of each façade’s opaque surface.*

2. Use native and/or naturalized vegetation for landscaping materials.

   *Native and/or naturalized landscaping materials are used throughout the site as shown on the landscape plan*

5-2(H)(1)(c) Screen mechanical equipment pursuant to Subsection 14-16-5-6(G) (Screening of Mechanical Equipment and Support Areas).

*Roof mounted mechanical equipment is screened by an architectural parapet wall on all sides. Parapets will screen equipment from all sides. Ground mounted mechanical equipment is not anticipated, if required, it will be screened from view by an opaque decorative wall or fence or a vegetative screen.*

5-2(H)(1)(d) Design lighting pursuant to Section 14-16-5-8 (Outdoor Lighting).

*All outdoor lighting complies with Section 14-16-5-8 (Outdoor Lighting).*

5-2(H)(1)(e) Design signage per Subsections 14-16-5-12(C)(4) and Section 14-16-5-12(H)(2)(e) and locate signs to minimize visibility from Major Public Open Space.

*Building mounted and free-standing signage complies with Subsections 14-16-5-12(C)(4) and Section 14-16-5-12(H)(2)(e) and minimizes visibility from the Major Public Open Space to the maximum extent practicable.*

5-2(H)(1)(f) Provide pedestrian and bicycle access to the Major Public Open Space consistent with the City’s adopted Bikeways and Trails Facility Plan and as acceptable to the Open Space Division of the City Parks and Recreation Department.

*Pedestrian access from the site is provided to public sidewalks located in the Osuna Road and Juan Tabo Boulevard Rights-of-way which connects to the existing bike trail that runs along the south property line of the site. The existing bike trail has an existing street crossing at Juan Tabo Boulevard which connects to the Major Public Open Space.*
5-2(H)(2) Properties Adjacent to Major Public Open Space. In addition to the standards that apply within 330 feet of Major Public Open Space in Subsection 14-16-5-2(H)(1) above, the following standards apply to development adjacent to Major Public Open Space.

5-2(H)(2)(a) Development on properties of any size adjacent to Major Public Open Space shall:

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

   *The Juan Tabo Boulevard Right-of-Way is located between the site and the Major Public Open Space that includes the John Roberts Dam.*

2. Locate on-site open space to be contiguous with the Major Public Open Space, with access generally not allowed unless approved by the Open Space Division of the City Parks and Recreation Department.

   *On-Site landscaped open space is located along the east property line contiguous with the Major Public Open Space. The landscaped open space area varies from 76'-2" to 63'-0" wide from the proposed building and preserves, stabilizes, and enhances the existing steep slope area.*

3. Locate lower densities and less intense uses abutting the Major Public Open Space in any Mixed-use zone district.

   *Not applicable, there is only one use proposed for this small site.*

4. Include a landscaped strip between off-street parking and the Major Public Open Space with a minimum width of 6 feet that varies in width to avoid the appearance of a hard, straight line.

   *Proposed off-street parking is located on the west and south sides of the building not adjacent to or visible from the Major Public Open Space.*

5. Limit height of site lighting luminaires to 20 feet.

   *Sight lighting will be limited to 20 feet in height.*

6. Incorporate Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles to deter crime and to facilitate security measures.

   *Crime Prevention through Environmental Design is incorporated into the design of the site by maximizing visibility throughout the site, maintaining and limiting access with fences and gates, and ongoing maintenance of site features and plant material to communicate active occupancy.*
7. Manage stormwater per Section 14-16-5-4(H).

**Stormwater design will comply with Section 14-16-5-4(H)**

8. Design grading per Section 14-16-5-4(J).

**Grading design will comply with Section 14-16-5-4(J). See attached engineers’ comments.**

9. Locate and design vehicle access, circulation, and parking per Subsection 14-16-5-5(F) (Parking Location and Design) and Subsection 14-16-5-6(F) (Parking Lot Landscaping).

**Vehicle access, circulation, and parking will comply with Subsection 14-16-5-5(F) and Subsection 14-16-5-6(F).**

10. Locate and design all walls, fences, retaining walls, and combinations of those site features facing the Major Public Open Space in compliance with all applicable standards in Section 14-16-5-7(E)(4) (Walls Adjacent to Major Arroyos or Major Public Open Space).

**Walls, fences, and retaining walls facing the Major Public Open Space will comply with all applicable standards in Section 14-16-5-7(E)(4).**

11. Prevent and mitigate construction impact per the DPM.

**All applicable standards of the DPM will be followed to prevent and mitigate construction impact, especially as it relates to the steep slopes.**
April 16, 2019

Stan Harada, Esq.,
Zoning Hearing Examiner, CABQ Planning Department
C/O Jim Strozier, Consensus Planning

RE: Guardian Storage, Lot G1, Academy Place, located at 4909 Juan Tabo Blvd NE, Applicant’s
Engineers Response to Comments


Dear Mr. Harada,

I have reviewed the public comments regarding grading, drainage, the Bear Canyon Arroyo and the
John Robert Dam and offer in response, the following:

- The site will be graded, paved and landscaped in a manner that provides a finished site with stable,
  non-erosive surfacing.
- No offsite storm water runoff affects the site
- The existing storm water from the site leaves the site along the western property line and is
  currently causing some minor erosion on the adjacent property owned and maintained by the
  Albuquerque Bernalillo County Water Utility Authority. The storm water runoff from the proposed
  site will be directed via storm drain directly to the Bear Canyon Arroyo in a non-erosive manner
  acceptable to the City of Albuquerque. This will benefit the downstream properties.
- The development of this site will have no impact on the John Robert Dam.

In closing, I can with certainty state that the development of this property as proposed will generate no
adverse impact with respect to grading and drainage.

Sheldon Greer, PE
Senior Project Manager
May 9, 2019

Jesus Lopez
RESPEC
5971 Jefferson St. NE Suite 101
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87109

RE: Water and Sanitary Sewer Availability Statement #190317
Guardian Storage
4909 Juan Tabo

Dear Mr. Lopez:

Project Description: The subject site is located on the southwest corner of Osuna Rd. and Juan Tabo Blvd. within the City of Albuquerque. The proposed development consists of approximately 2.4 acres and the property is currently zoned MX-L for Mixed-Use Low Intensity. The property lies within the Pressure Zone 7E in the Montgomery trunk. The request for availability indicates plans to construct a three story indoor self-storage building with a small office.

Existing Conditions: Water infrastructure in the area consists of the following:
- Six inch ductile iron pipe distribution main (project #26-2010-84) along Osuna Rd.
- 16 inch concrete cylinder transmission main (project #) along Juan Tabo Blvd.

Non-potable infrastructure in the area consists of the following:
- 16 inch ductile iron pipe transmission main (project #26-5762.08-05) along Osuna Rd.
- Eight inch ductile iron pipe distribution main stub-out (project #26-5762.08-05) along Juan Tabo Blvd.

Sanitary sewer infrastructure in the area consists of the following:
- Eight inch PVC collector line (project #26-5402.81-97) along Osuna Rd.

Water Service: Now metered water service to the property can be provided via routine connection to the existing six inch distribution main along Osuna Rd. Please note that connections to waterlines 16 inch or greater are prohibited.

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.

Non-Potable Water Service (if applicable): New metered non-potable water service to the property can be provided contingent upon a developer funded project to extend the eight inch stub-out along Juan Tabo as per as-builts 5762.08. The waterline should be extended far enough to have a perpendicular connection to provide irrigation service.
to the proposed property. Please note that connections to waterlines 16 inch or greater are prohibited.

**Sanitary Sewer Service:** New sanitary sewer service can be provided via routine connection to the existing infrastructure mentioned above. All food service establishments 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 3,625 gallons-per-minute and four required fire hydrants. As modeled using InfoWater™ computer software, the fire flow can be met. The required fire flow was analyzed and split at the two proposed fire hydrant connections along Osuna Rd.

The fire one plan is proposing four onsite fire hydrants. The fire hydrants were not indicated if they are going to be private or public. Please note that any on-site fire hydrants are considered private and should be painted safety orange.

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 289-3439 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 Water Authority Mini Work Order process. If the non-potable water line is extended, then a City Work Order will be required. Construction must be performed by a licensed and 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 availability statement provides a commitment from the Water Authority to provide services to the development, as long as identified conditions are met. It will remain in effect for a period of one 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,

Mark S. Sanchez
Executive Director

Enclosures: Infrastructure Maps (2)
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CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. All (inaudible) in favor of deferring Items 6 and 11 to January 8th, would you please raise your hand.

Okay. So we will not be hearing those items today.

I just want to give a little overview of the development review board for those who are -- could be here for the first time.

The development review board was created in 1982 to offer efficient considerations of technical standards, a one-stop shop for property owners and developers alike, which would have otherwise required an applicant to meet individually with the city staff experts from divisions and departments across the city.

The vision continues to be that the DRB streamlines the application process by bringing together any department staff responsible for the specialized review of projects in a forum where staff and applicant meets to discuss projects, and the public can ask questions and share input for those decisions.

The DRB staff members apply the technical standards and requirements in the Integrated Development Ordinance and the Development Process Manual. As such, the DRB is not a policymaking board and functions very differently from the environmental planning commission.

I'd like to go ahead and have the board members introduce themselves today. So if we can start down there with Chris.

MR. CADENA: Hi. Kris Cadena of the water authority

MR. MARTINEZ: Jacobo Martinez, code enforcement.

MS. SANDOVAL: Christina Sandoval, parks and recreation.

MR. BIAZAR: Shahab Biazar, city engineer

MS. WOLFENBARGER: Jeanne Wolfenbarger, transportation department.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: And I am Jolene Wolfley, with planning, and I'm the DRB chair.

We have staff today. You may have met Angela Gomez. She's our hearing monitor. If anyone wants to speak on an item that is -- and you're not the applicant, please make sure you sign up over there with Angela.

And Nicole Sanchez here is -- if you'll just wave your hand -- is from your legal department, and she's counsel to the DRB.

Maggie Gould and Jay Rodenbeck, if you just wave your hands -- they're from our planning department, and they are staff and we'll swear them in.

(Witnesses sworn.)

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Thank you. If they speak with us, we'll have them sworn in. And on all our major cases, we will be swearing in both the applicant and then the speakers who may come before us.

Okay. With all of that, I think we're ready to proceed with Item Number 1, which is Project 2184. It's Site Plan 379 at 4909 Juan Tabo. And this is Guardian Storage.
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And if you want to go ahead and come forward, the applicant, and anyone you want with you.

MR. STROZIER: Good morning.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Good morning.

Okay. So if you each would state your name and your interest in the property, and then I'll swear you in.

MR. STROZIER: Jim Strozier, principal with Consensus Planning, and acting as the agent for the application.

MR. GRIER: Sheldon Grier, with RESPEC. I'm the engineer (inaudible) on the project, civil engineer.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay.

(Witnesses sworn.)

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Go ahead and present your applicant to the board.

MR. STROZIER: All right. Thank you, Madam Chair and Board Members. This is site plan DRB for a proposed indoor storage project located at the corner of Osuna Road and Juan Tabo.

It's -- the property is zoned MX-L, and as such, we are required to obtain a conditional use to allow the indoor storage use on this property, which we did. That use was appealed and upheld by the land use hearing officer and the city council.

So once that was completed, we put together the site plan, and this is our initial hearing to review staff comments on that, for that site plan.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Can you just go ahead, in your opening, explain the rezoning that occurred on the property.

MR. STROZIER: So this has been identified from the very initial PRP. The -- the AGIS map in is error. The -- and so the property to -- the western portion of this property has been shown R-1D. It is, in fact, MX-L. That was an error, I believe, in the conversion process.

The city is aware of that, and I am not sure why it's taking so long to get that updated in -- on AGIS. It's -- I think it's been verified at every step that it is, in fact, zoned MX-L.

The water authority property that the to the west is zoned R-1D, and so we do have that adjacency with the R-1 zoning, even though it's not developed as residential.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. I just kind of wanted to get the --

MR. STROZIER: Okay.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: -- get that.

MR. STROZIER: Thank you.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: All right. Anything else for now?

MR. STROZIER: I don't. I have some questions on the comments as we go through them.
CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay.

MR. STROZIER: Just a request for clarification on a few items, but --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: All right. And in our order of business, we're going to (inaudible) the public next --

MR. STROZIER: Okay.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: -- anyone who's signed up to speak. So if you want to take a chair back in the audience.

MR. STROZIER: We'll do that. Thank you very much.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. I have one person signed up to speak, Larry Pope. Okay.

Go ahead and come on forward, Mr. Pope. And if -- you might tell us your name and your interest in the -- the property. And then I'll swear you in.

MR. POPE: My name is Larry Pope. I'm the president of Albuquerque Estates East Neighborhood Association.

(Witness sworn.)


MR. POPE: The board member who attends our correlation meetings could not be here today because of illness, so I'm here as a backup. So I haven't been a party to the coalition meetings of the neighborhood association.

But many, or most of them, are not in favor of this particular project. And we wanted to formally let you know that as a neighborhood association, we also are not in favor of this particular project.

We have some questions and we're not qualified to answer them, and that is, with whether the proposal is compliant with all federal, state, IDO, City of Albuquerque requirement for the -- for the construction of the building in a flood zone. It's a floodplain.

And I'm aware of that, because when I relocated back to Albuquerque 40-some years ago, I contemplated building a home above where that damn now is, and I was told I'd have to have flood insurance.

And so one of the questions we have is, does the city require them, should this be approved, for them to carry flood insurance to minimize the liability the city might incur by having a constructed facility in a floodplain?

We're also concerned as to whether or not there might have been an external assessment made to make certain that their foundations and their footings and such are adequate to survive a flood when such event might happen.

Our biggest concern has to do with the focus of this project. It's proposed as a storage facility, but if you look at their company online, they indicate that they're also involved with distribution center, hazard waste storage, perhaps a homeless shelter. And based on some prior experiences with the facility, when Walmart expanded on Wyoming and Academy, their proposed
warehouse expansion was supposably for safety and other things, when, in fact, it turned out it was to have space for the food they wanted to sell.

And so we're concerned about a potential migration of this project from storage to hazardous waste, for example. We don't believe that we want a hazardous waste facility in a floodplain. We don't believe we ought to have a homeless shelter in a floodplain with all of the liability that that might entail.

And so if this proposal is approved, we would hope that there would be strong words added that they cannot migrate to some other use other than storage without advanced debate, evaluation and consideration to make certain we're not migrating one proposal into some function different than that.

And that would basically be the position of our neighborhood association.

CHAIR WOLFLFLEY: Okay. Excellent.

I think we've got a lot of experts here that will speak to that. But I think we'll also have the applicant go ahead and just respond to anything that you brought forward that they would like to respond to.

MR. POPE: Okay.

CHAIR WOLFLFLEY: All right. Thank you, Mr. Pope.

MR. POPE: Yes.

CHAIR WOLFLFLEY: Thank you.

If you want to speak on this item, you need to go and sign in with the hearing monitor.

MR. FREEMAN: Where should I sign?

CHAIR WOLFLFLEY: Just right up there with Angela.

Is there anyone else wanting to speak on Item Number 1?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I will say that --

CHAIR WOLFLFLEY: We just can't speak from the audience. I'm sorry. If you want to speak --

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: That's all right.

CHAIR WOLFLFLEY: -- you need to go sign up.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: It's okay.

CHAIR WOLFLFLEY: Okay.

MR. FREEMAN: Yes, I'd like to speak.

CHAIR WOLFLFLEY: Okay. Mr. Steve Freeman.

MR. FREEMAN: Yes.

CHAIR WOLFLFLEY: Go ahead and come up to the table.

MR. FREEMAN: Yes.
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CHAIR WOLFLEY: If you'll state your name and your interest in
the property for the record. And then I'll swear you in.

MR. FREEMAN: Steve Freeman, personally.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Do you live near this --

MR. FREEMAN: I do, yes.


(Witness sworn.)

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Go ahead.

MR. FREEMAN: I've been living in that area for about 32 years
when I moved there with the Air Force back in 1987. I've walked
around that area almost every day for those 32 years. If you
look at it, it's only a space of dirt and sagebrush, pretty much.
I don't know how many of you have looked at it.

But within that property is lots of rabbits and squirrels and
roadrunners, and yeah, coyotes, too. So my time there, my wife
and I feed the rabbits and the squirrels, and some of them even
have names.

So this project sort of hits me in a personal way. And
admittedly, I'm here for selfish reasons. So obviously, I
strongly oppose a project of this kind in that area. And I would
like -- and I'm not familiar with whatever considerations you
have for a project like this, but to consider the open space that
isn't what -- for an area such as that, particularly associated
with the park. So it's all -- to me, it's all one.

And the tenor of the storage facility there displacing all the --
all the wildlife that lives there, to me, is just totally
unacceptable and destroys the nature of the -- and the
tranquility of the area.

So I would ask the board to give that every consideration.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Freeman.

Mr. Strozier, do you have a response to the public testimony so
far?

MR. STROZIER: Thank you. Madam Chair, so just quickly, and I
think both AMAFCA and city hydrology's comments can probably
speak to the -- the floodplain issue. It's not in -- it's not in
a floodplain. But it is within the 500-year designation that
FEMA has.

In terms of the comment about the review of the foundation and
footings, my assumption is that that takes place as part of the
building permit process and review as -- which would happen
provided this site plan is approved.

The site plan does specifically state that the use proposed is
self-storage. And as defined in the IOD, we actually reference
the specific use standards associated with that, which, I
understand, would eliminate the ability to store hazardous
materials and use this building as a homeless shelter.

So I think that the site plan is clear with regard to that, what
the intent is. If -- if this board has additional language that
would clarify that, we'd certainly consider that.
With regard to the second -- Mr. Raymond's (sic) comments, I understand that this has been vacant for a long time, and -- and probably considered to be what I would characterize as borrowed open space for that period of time. But it is private -- private property and it is zoned for commercial and mixed use -- mixed use, and the property owner would like to sell it and somebody would like to develop it. So I understand that point, but I would just reference the fact that this is private property and zoned for development.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Thank you. I just also wanted to mention that the project has already gone through the zoning hearing examiner to get a conditional use, so if you want to do an indoor storage in a location like this, you need to go through the zoning hearing examiner.

That case was appealed. The land use hearing officer opinion was that the zoning hearing officer's approval of the indoor storage was correct.

Then it goes to the city council, and the city council determined that they would accept the recommendation of the land-use hearing officer.

So the parameter of the site being developed for indoor storage is sort of a settled matter with the city council. And the job of the DRB is to look at the site design and the engineering particulars. And we're going to go through those various portions of the site review that's within our purview. And once again, that's the Integrated Development Ordinance and the Development Process Manual, our guidelines. And we work within those guidelines.

Okay. So we're going to start now, and this will be a little bit of an interaction between the applicant and the board members to discuss those various site design parameters. So we'll start with water authority.

MR. CADENA: Good morning. You have (inaudible) landscape on this site, correct? Landscaping?

MR. STROZIER: Yes.

MR. CADENA: And that's (inaudible) one water meter that's to be used to (inaudible) irrigation?

CHAIR WOLFLEY: If anyone can't hear, would you please raise your hand at any moment you can't hear and we'll try to get the mics to the person speaking.

MR. STROZIER: I don't know the answer to that, but we can -- we can certainly check that. I assume it would need a --

MR. CADENA: Yeah.

MR. STROZIER: -- (inaudible).

MR. CADENA: The -- well, the reason is, there's not a potable line in the Juan Tabo to the east for district fire's connection to what is potable line, not potable or (inaudible) within 200 feet of the property. So that would be the requirement to connect for that irrigation, that there's a nonpotable line directly leading to the property.

MR. STROZIER: Okay.
MR. CADENA: (Inaudible) pressure (inaudible) for irrigation, but more a talking point that we talk about --

MR. STROZIER: Okay.

MR. CADENA: -- (inaudible) this meeting.

MR. STROZIER: Okay.

MR. CADENA: On-site waterline and fire hydrant shall be labeled "Private" on (inaudible). And (inaudible) correspondence with respect -- there was previous discussion about (inaudible) west (inaudible) grading and drainage plan. The existing flow, I think, was like four and a half cfs, and now going to the south drainage channel. And where, like, half the cfs is going up to the water property.

I noticed that there were steep slopes. I just wanted to see what your thoughts were for mitigating any possible erosion or high velocity (inaudible) very small, but (inaudible) engineer.

MR. STROZIER: So that's a -- there's a little thin strip, you're -- you're correct. And -- and so one of the -- one of the comments from code enforcement was that because the water authority property is zoned I, we need to have a solid wall on -- on that property line.

And so we would like to coordinate, and there may be some slight modifications to what's happening along that edge in order to accommodate the solid wall on that boundary. And then, there's a trail that comes across the water authority's property just immediately adjacent to this property.

So we want to make sure we coordinate with -- with drainage on the construction of that wall in order to make that area work.

MR. CADENA: That (inaudible) would be reflected in the site plan, correct?

MR. STROZIER: Correct.

MR. CADENA: Okay. So we have a (inaudible).

MR. STROZIER: Okay.

MR. CADENA: But I do understand that historical flows (inaudible) what's going to be on the site, right?

MR. GRIER: Yeah, we're greatly reducing the historic flow. There is -- there is some steep slopes there, and we're proposing a gravel surfacing on those slopes, together with the landscaping.

MR. CADENA: So private property --

MR. GRIER: Should take care of that.

MR. CADENA: -- (inaudible) property? Okay.

MR. GRIER: Yes, sir.

MR. CADENA: And for information, we have availability (inaudible) condition for service. Thank you.

MR. STROZIER: Thank you.
CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Before we go on, I just wanted to mention that for this case, there are some comments on the back table, if someone from the public would like those.

And then, Maggie, would you put those -- those are parks department comments on all the cases that --

MS. GOULD: Let me hand one over to the applicant, because we got these late last night, and I don't think the applicant (inaudible).

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay.

MR. STROZIER: No, we did not.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: And those are just available for anyone who would kind of like to have some of what we're talking about in their hands.

Okay. Code enforcement.

MR. MARTINEZ: Thank you.

As you had mentioned, (inaudible) for self-storage for the use specific standards requires that no big wall or fence at least 6 feet or no more than 5, or (inaudible) buffer (inaudible), no wall (inaudible) shall be provided along the lot line that abuts residential zones. That is an R-1 zone, so you're going to have to put that opaque wall.

MR. STROZIER: Correct.

MR. MARTINEZ: So I wasn't sure from the (inaudible) description if that was an opaque wall.

MR. STROZIER: It was not. That was an oversight on our part. We -- we didn't -- you know, it's -- it's -- it's not -- it's zoned residential, but it's the water authority's (inaudible) and -- and (inaudible) improvement. So -- but we -- we will make that modification.

And -- and then the one question we -- we had on that, does that need to actually be on the property line, or can it be inset? And this is just based on kind of this conversation about how that edge is being treated and the adjacent trail and wanting to potentially have -- if the -- if the wall was -- was built in from the property line, it would create less of a tunnel along that -- the trail is kind of right along that edge of the property, and so that's -- that was just a question that we had when looking at -- at the implementation of the requirement.

And -- and if it was located along the -- basically the back of the parking, along that, it would provide screening of that -- of that parking area, as well as allow that -- that buffer to the trail.

So I don't know if that's an option. That was one of the questions that we had about that comment.

MR. MARTINEZ: Thank you. That's something that we can help kind of clarify as we discuss this.

Now, the language itself says an opaque wall or fence, (inaudible) to be high, shall be provided along any lot line that abuts any residential zone district, but we'll discuss --
MR. STROZIER: Okay.
MR. GRIER: Thank you for the clarification.
MR. STROZIER: All right. Thank you.
MR. MARTINEZ: Also, we have 452 --
CHAIR WOLFLEY: And --
MR. MARTINEZ: Oh, I'm sorry.
CHAIR WOLFLEY: Can I just clarify for my purposes? So you're talking about your southern property.
MR. MARTINEZ: They're talking about the lot line to the west.
MR. STROZIER: The western property line.
CHAIR WOLFLEY: Oh, the western property line. Okay. So I guess it abuts a residential zone, but not a residential use.
MR. MARTINEZ: Correct.
CHAIR WOLFLEY: Correct. Okay.
MR. MARTINEZ: 4-3(D)(28)(d) also notes the public access to any storage unit within 100 feet of any residential zone district.
You said any mixed-use zone district does not allow between 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. I guess we'd like to see that note made on the -- on the site plan.
MR. STROZIER: We'll -- we'll add that note.
MR. MARTINEZ: Okay.
MR. POPE: And would you repeat that?
MR. MARTINEZ: Sure. Under the IDO, 4-3(D)(28)(d), it reads: Public access to any storage unit within 100 feet of any residential zone district or lot containing a residential use in any mixed-use zone district is not allowed between 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m.
MR. POPE: Are those times (inaudible) or --
CHAIR WOLFLEY: Excuse me, sir. We're not allowed to have you speak from the -- from the audience.
MR. POPE: Okay.
CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay?
MR. POPE: Should I come up front, or...
CHAIR WOLFLEY: Let me see where we're at. You kind of had your opportunity to speak, but let me see if we can --
MR. POPE: But this is new information.
CHAIR WOLFLEY: Right. Yeah, let's -- let's see if we can address that.
Let me ask one question. This might help. In your conditional
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use application, you said your hours would be 9:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. Is that -- excuse me?

MR. STROZIER: That -- yes. Well, that's when the office -- that's the office hours. And we can clarify that. We're okay with --

CHAIR WOLFFLEY: Yeah, it says hours of operation, 9:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. This is just your application. Customers will have gate access until 7:00 p.m.

MR. STROZIER: Correct.

CHAIR WOLFFLEY: Okay. So my question is, are you able to follow those time periods?

MR. STROZIER: Yes.

CHAIR WOLFFLEY: Yes?

MR. STROZIER: Yes.

CHAIR WOLFFLEY: Okay. That might help a little bit.

MR. POPE: (Inaudible).

CHAIR WOLFFLEY: Mr. Strozier just stated that they could follow the operational hours of 9:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. It's 9:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. for their hours of operation, where their office would be open, and then customers would have gate access until 7:00 p.m. Okay? And that's a little more restrictive than what the IDO --

MR. POPE: I would like to say something else.

CHAIR WOLFFLEY: Okay. We can -- I'll try to circle back to you --

MR. POPE: Thank you.

CHAIR WOLFFLEY: -- later on. Okay.

MR. POPE: How much later?

CHAIR WOLFFLEY: When we are done with the DRB comments. Okay? We're going to be going through each member of the DRB, and they're going to be giving comments, and there will be some interaction, and then I'll -- I'll try to give you a short, short time to speak, which is not our normal process, but --

MR. STROZIER: We will --

CHAIR WOLFFLEY: Yeah, but we can let you ask questions at the end, so...

MR. STROZIER: And we can add a note to the site plan that specifies those -- those hours more specifically.

CHAIR WOLFFLEY: Okay.

MR. STROZIER: Consistent with the application.

CHAIR WOLFFLEY: And while we're -- we're on that subject, this might be a little out further, I'll come back to Mr. Jacobo, you also showed an internal -- internal loading and storage bay, quite a larger -- could you describe that? Is that still your
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intention?

MR. STROZIER: That is not. So that was -- that was the -- that was one of the -- that was part of the plan when we went through the conditional use. We actually heard concerns about that exit of that internal loading area going out to the north. So we've actually modified the plans.

And the site plan before you shows inset loading areas that are on the -- on the west edge of the property and the southern edge of the building -- I mean, the building. The west side of the building and the south side of the building that doesn't face the residential neighbors. And those -- so it's not a drive-through --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Right.

MR. STROZIER: -- per the original concept. It's just inset -- an inset loading areas on both of those sides. And we did that in response to concerns --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Outdoor insets.

MR. STROZIER: -- that were expressed. They're outdoor --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Outdoor.

MR. STROZIER: -- but their covered.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: But they're covered.

MR. STROZIER: The second and third floor are above those areas.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay.

MR. STROZIER: Thank you for that clarification.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Let's go back to Mr. Martinez.

MR. MARTINEZ: The last comment I have is, this property is at least -- at the very least, within 330 feet of a major public open space, with a major open space edging to the back.

MR. STROZIER: Yes. And we -- so we did address that in our -- in our letter. And -- and you had the comment regarding -- is that 5-2(H)?

MR. MARTINEZ: 5-2(H).

MR. STROZIER: Is that the reference? Yes. Okay. So I guess my -- our question was just, we did address that and were there any concerns with how we addressed it?

MR. MARTINEZ: Right now, I didn't have a concern on how you addressed this. I just want to make sure that --

MR. STROZIER: Okay.

MR. MARTINEZ: -- it is addressed.

MR. STROZIER: Right.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: And I think we'll talk about that a little bit --

MR. STROZIER: All right.
CHAIR WOLFLEY: -- in planning comments.
Okay. Let's hear from parks.

MS. SANOVAL: Good morning.

MR. STROZIER: Good morning.

MS. SANOVAL: This development is on Juan Tabo, which street trees are required on that classification of street. Any disturbance to the multi-use trail all need to be mitigated by the developer and repaired as part of the construction.

Regarding the comment that was made earlier on the property being part of the park or, you know -- and those types of recreational uses, as is stated by the applicant, the property is privately owned. The park is buffered by a property owned by the water utility authority, so actually, this property is not contiguous or adjacent to park property.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Please refrain from speaking from the audience, but we will give you a chance to talk later.

MS. SANOVAL: We -- we have a (inaudible) request from the public, the neighbors, about purchasing that property. And at this time, parks does not feel that that is feasible for various reasons. One being that based on our service levels, the current neighborhood is already served by parkland, and so additional parkland is not needed, where there are other parts of the city that do not have park and recreation opportunities, so we'd rather focus our resources there.

In addition to that, placing the park on a street with such high traffic is not ideal. We don't want kids running into the street, things like that. And then, based on the zoning the cost of the property would be very high. Typically, when we're acquiring property, we look for something zoned residential that is more affordable.

Regarding open space comments and the buffer, we do also want to note that you are within the sensitive lands buffer zone, and so that those requirements need to be adhered to. Based on initial assessment, open space does not feel that this will impact their program through traffic noise or site issues, so they have no objection as well.

MR. STROZIER: Okay. Thank you.

Madam Chair, I would just point out that we've provided, as part of the landscape plans, street trees along Juan Tabo and along Osuna, as well.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. We're next going to hear from hydrology. And I'm going to ask -- ask for kind of a deep -- you can use this one or whatever you want.

I'm going to ask you to be detailed about the floodplain and issues of grading, drainage, all that sort of thing, so that the public is really clear on --

MR. BIAZAR: Sure.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: -- what will happen here.

MR. BIAZAR: Maybe I'll go through my comments --
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CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay.

MR. BIAZAR: -- and I'll go back and circle around and talk about the floodplain.

We -- we did receive a conceptual grading and drainage plan, and we did provide the applicant, you guys, the comments

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Microphone closer, please.

MR. BIAZAR: I'm sorry. Can you hear me?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I think it's off.

MR. BIAZAR: Oh, it got turned off. Sorry. Sorry about that.

All right. So we did receive a conceptual grading and drainage plan, and we did provide comments to the applicants. And as far as the pipe penetration into the channel, that needs to be a (inaudible).

And as far as floodplain, the site, itself, does not fall within a floodplain. It is next to a floodplain. And they are draining into that channel, so, you know, we have looked at it. We did have some concern about the -- the slopes, and the applicant is aware of that.

They are designing the site in such a way that it will drain into the channel. It will not be impacted by the floodplain themselves, nor there will be impacting anybody else. And, you know, the -- the engineer of record, they've done a lot of work within the city and they are pretty experienced with the floodplain. And our staff is fairly, you know, experienced with the floodplain. I have over 25 years experience doing a lot of design work in the city and in the floodplain area, so I also overlook our engineer's work and make sure that, you know, we don't miss anything as far as design goes.

I guess there was also a concern about -- excuse me -- foundation and -- so typically, the sites -- I mean, they -- it's -- the applicant's responsible to really how they prepare their own site and how well they grade it and they compact it. But typically, all the plans go through city building permit process for foundation design, and there's a structural engineer involved with all the foundation design, and they typically -- I mean, I'm assuming on this site, then, probably over-excavate the site and they compact it well enough that it won't be any issues with settling and any of that stuff.

Like I said, you know, we had some concerns about the slopes, and the applicant is going to look at that. And, you know, especially being closed to a right-of-way, we like to see three-to-one slopes. I mean, it's close to a right-of-way, and we have brought that to the applicant's attention.

There was a concern, Kris, that you had about the slopes to the west. We typically -- if it's anything steeper than three to one, we require the applicant to provide slope treatment so that -- I believe that would be addressed as far as that is concerned.

And regarding the wall, so if you guys are thinking about moving the wall to the back of the curb, how would be able to maintain the landscaping? So that's an issue, and...

MR. STROZIER: Right. Yeah, and I think -- we just wanted to,
and as we move forward with the design of that edge, make sure that we understood what the -- what the parameters were to design. It could be that that wall, rather than being right at the back of the curb, is somewhere within that upper area, and -- and we're able to maintain the landscaping on the inside, but also not create that tunnel effect next to the --

MR. BIAZAR: No, I agree.

MR. STROZIER: But there -- it's not the multi-use trail that's on that west edge, but it is a -- sort of a neighborhood trail that connects to the multi-use trail that comes across there. And we just want to make sure we're doing the best job we can along that -- along that boundary, and what our --

MR. BIAZAR: Sure.

MR. STROZIER: -- what our -- what flexibilities we have and what we don't in doing the design.

MR. BIAZAR: That would be definitely nice to have the landscaping along the trail.

MR. STROZIER: Right.

MR. BIAZAR: Yeah, if you put the wall right up there, I mean, it's -- yeah, it doesn't really -- it will defy purpose of the landscaping.

MR. STROZIER: Correct.

MR. BIAZAR: And now, let me see. I think -- and that's all I had.

CHAIR WOLFFLEY: Okay. Transportation.

MS. WOLFENBARGER: Yes. Have you received my comments?

MR. STROZIER: We have.

MS. WOLFENBARGER: From yesterday?

MR. STROZIER: Yes.

MS. WOLFENBARGER: So I had a lot of minor comments, provide curb, curb ramp and sidewalk, detailed, dimensioned parking, eye lines, provide (inaudible) details for the handicap sign and motorcycle sign. Provide a cross section for the new sidewalk that you're proposing along Osuna, and fire marshal approval. All of my basic standard comments.

And the bigger one is on Juan Tabo. It's requested a change, the 10-foot sidewalk easement to 10-foot dedicated right-of-way. That was -- that was brought up to me, actually, by DMD.

MR. STROZIER: Okay. Yeah.

MS. WOLFENBARGER: And I have a copy of the plat, if you'd like to see it.

MR. STROZIER: Yes. And I think we've shown that easement on there. I'm -- it's -- I guess it -- there might be some clarification on the purpose, so -- so there's a sidewalk built along -- within the right-of-way along Juan Tabo, and there's -- then there's a 10-foot sidewalk easement adjacent to that that isn't needed for the sidewalk, because the sidewalk's already
built within the right-of-way.
Is it just that it needs to be additional right-of-way?

MS. WOLFENBARGER: DMD is requesting additional right-of-way on Juan Tabo. They didn't state exactly --

MR. STROZIER: And that's part of the slope?

MS. WOLFENBARGER: Yes.

MR. STROZIER: Okay.

MS. WOLFENBARGER: So we -- we can probably meet with them for further clarification --

MR. STROZIER: Okay.

MS. WOLFENBARGER: -- if you wish afterward. That's probably --

MR. STROZIER: I just wasn't sure what --

MS. WOLFENBARGER: That's probably best. It was something they requested, so...

MR. STROZIER: Okay. All right. And that's kind of --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Part of the slope, which you have in your landscaping, plan, right?

MR. STROZIER: So -- yeah. So we --

MS. WOLFENBARGER: So if there's a conflict, it sounds like we need to work it out on-site.

MR. BIAZAR: I would definitely like to know what the purpose of that would be, because, you know, it is a steep slope, three to one. So if they're thinking about expanding the road in the future or something --

MS. WOLFENBARGER: I believe we are.

MR. BIAZAR: -- (inaudible) purposes.

MS. WOLFENBARGER: Yeah.

MR. BIAZAR: That would be good to know ahead of time. Okay.

MR. STROZIER: So, yeah, we just -- understanding the purpose of that and the intent would be good and how that -- how that could potentially impact -- you know, we paid special attention to that slope area because of the sensitive lands requirements and looking at how we're revegetating that and adding trees along that slope to help stabilize it. So that would -- we'll follow up with you and get clarification on that.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Did we get through your list? Okay.

And I'm going to work -- okay. And I'm going to work on the planning list with some help from Ms. Gould.

MR. STROZIER: Okay.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: So confirming the number of parking spaces meets the code, and that their three loading spaces are provided.
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MR. STROZIER: So we had a question on that. When we looked at the -- let me make sure I have my notes. So in the off-street loading space requirements, the table has nonresidential zone districts' identified and then all other zone districts. And so this is a mixed -- MX zone. So it would be our understanding that the second part of the table, under all other zone districts applies, and that requires one space that is 9-foot by 25 feet, which we would modify the site to accommodate.

MS. GOULD: Tell me -- tell me the page.

MR. STROZIER: So Table 5-5-7. I don't know what page it's on. So it does -- and the table differentiates between nonresidential zone districts and then all other zone districts.

And our understanding is the MX zones are -- would fall into the all other.

MS. GOULD: Let me --

MR. STROZIER: Check.

MS. GOULD: -- confirm with code enforcement --

MR. STROZIER: Okay.

MS. GOULD: -- but...

MR. STROZIER: And then our read of the code is that that loading space does not count as a parking space, so we would need to modify the site plan to replace that space, basically.

MS. GOULD: Yeah.

MR. STROZIER: And I -- and I don't know if there's -- so for this particular use, is there an ability to waive that? We have way more parking than we -- than we need for this particular use on-site. And, of course, that loading space for this use would be used by a customer. I think it does make sense to have that larger space available. But to have to then provide another parking space in addition to that space seems counterproductive, but we would -- would sort of --

MS. GOULD: Okay.

MR. STROZIER: -- like clarification on that, if it's possible to ask that we modify the plan to put that space -- replace that space, but not have to provide an additional parking space above and beyond that. And I don't know if there's a process to ask that.

MS. GOULD: Let me -- let me confirm with code enforcement outside --

MR. STROZIER: Okay.

MS. GOULD: -- of this meeting, and we'll -- because you -- what you've laid out is logical. And I want to make sure that we're -- we're looking at all the (inaudible) of the code, and I want to make sure that also transportation would be -- would be happy with that.

MR. STROZIER: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Then on your walkways, they appear to be too narrow.
MR. STROZIER: Correct. We will -- we will make that -- we will modify the site plan.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay.

MR. STROZIER: That was an oversight on our part.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. And now we're going to move into an area a lot about sort of building design and several of the comments here about what the building will look like.

So in general, we just want you to go through 5-11, on facade design, and outline how all of those requirements are being met.

MR. STROZIER: We will provide a detailed response to each of those --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay.

MR. STROZIER: -- elements.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: So, for example, the -- is the CMU block going to be split face?

MR. STROZIER: Yes. And we will -- we will clarify that on the elevation. We -- we will add to -- we've -- we've already been in contact with the architect, and they're going to add a more detailed color, material and reflectivity --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay.

MR. STROZIER: -- table to the building elevations that provide answers to those questions, along with those calculations that -- to ensure that we're -- I think there are several of those lists where we get to pick -- you have to pick at least two of this list and another one out of this list. And we actually, I think, comply with more than that. But we'll -- we can provide that -- a detail that goes through those as part of the -- and add that to the elevation.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Yeah. And just for the benefit of the audience, as well, I just wanted to detail that 5-2(H)(1)(a) regulates reflectivity of the exterior surfaces, and 5-2(H)(1)(b) requires that the colors blend into the surrounding environment, using yellow ochres, browns, dull reds and grey greens.

Can you confirm that you're using grey green?

MR. STROZIER: So with -- so the green that's -- that's identified on the elevations is identified to fall within the -- I believe that's 5-2(H)(1)(b)1, which allows trim materials, constituting less than 20 percent of the facade may be any color in the design.

And so we have gone through and done an analysis of each of the facades, and it's -- it ranges from a low of 5 percent of the facade to a high of 12 percent of the individual facades, for an average of 7.5. So we're sufficiently less than the 20 percent in that -- in that section. And so that would be our response, is that that is probably technically not a grey green. But that it would be utilized as our trim color.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. So we'll -- we'll look at those --

MR. STROZIER: And we'll provide those --
CHAIR WOLFLEY: -- calculations in the next round.
MR. STROZIER: -- calculations on the --
CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay.
MR. STROZIER: -- on the elevation sheet, as well.
CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Yeah. I mean, just look at the (inaudible) grey green.
Okay. We wanted to talk a little bit about windows and lighting. Do you have spandrel windows, that are opaque and not see-through?
MR. STROZIER: So the -- on the elevations, and we will clarify --
CHAIR WOLFLEY: So we're talking about the windows that are the -- in the kind of three columns in the center of the building --
MR. STROZIER: That's correct.
CHAIR WOLFLEY: -- on those elevations? Okay.
MR. STROZIER: And those -- those are opaque.
CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Will these windows have lighting?
MR. STROZIER: So those windows will --
CHAIR WOLFLEY: I guess they'll transmit a little bit of light?
MR. STROZIER: I don't know that they're -- we can check -- we can check that.
And we were -- we were unclear with regard to the interior lighting. The reference in the IDO is -- is -- speaks to exterior lighting. And so I'm -- we would like some clarification as to what -- what regulation we're responding to --
CHAIR WOLFLEY: Sure, sure.
MR. STROZIER: -- related to the interior --
CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. So --
MR. STROZIER: -- interior lighting.
CHAIR WOLFLEY: -- at the -- in that top elevation, which one is that? Your -- which elevation is that? The --
MR. STROZIER: That's Osuna.
CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. So that's your north elevation?
MR. STROZIER: Correct.
CHAIR WOLFLEY: Correct? Facing the neighborhood?
MR. STROZIER: Yes.
CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. So the -- on the far left edge, there are
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windows that are transparent, correct?

MR. STROZIER: Correct.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: And so the visual quality at night would be what?

MR. STROZIER: So --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: What would --

MR. STROZIER: -- there would be lighting --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: -- the neighborhood see at night?

MR. STROZIER: -- in that where -- and -- and once again, we're trying to figure out what -- what the parameters, what the regulatory...

CHAIR WOLFLEY: The regulatory aspect is no adverse impact on the surrounding properties.

MR. STROZIER: Okay. So in terms of --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: That's one of the site plan review criteria.

MR. STROZIER: Okay. So we -- we have -- we have started discussing that, and that's part of what I wanted to get some clarification on --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay.

MR. STROZIER: -- is exactly what the standard we're trying to achieve.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Right.

MR. STROZIER: Yes, so...

CHAIR WOLFLEY: That's the standard.

MR. STROZIER: Okay.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: And -- and I think in general, what we're seeing with indoor storage, with this -- these windows and everything, by day, it has a -- kind of a positive effect, and by night, there are complaints about it.

MR. STROZIER: Right.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: And it's being --

MR. STROZIER: I'm familiar --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: -- considered in the IDO annual cycle as well because of concerns from residents and other property owners in areas where these are lit at night.

Have you made a consideration to have those be motion activated lights, so only if someone is walking down the corridor, the lights would come on?

MR. STROZIER: So those areas are not actually -- they're -- they're display.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay.
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MR. STROZIER: You aren't really seeing into the interior of the building in those locations. Those are faux.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: I'm -- I'm talking about the -- the far left --

MR. STROZIER: The ones at the --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: -- edge.

MR. STROZIER: -- far left? Yes?

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Yeah.

MR. STROZIER: Correct. So the -- so the inside -- interior of the building, they will be -- if -- at night, they will be motion activated for the interior. But that's not what you're seeing there, just to be clear. And so what we're looking at is options in terms of the lighting design to minimize the impact of those -- that lit area at night. And so we're -- we'll come back with some --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay.

MR. STROZIER: -- suggestion as to how we would address that. I understand the concern better now.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. So right, and that could be -- I'm -- just give me one second.

Okay. So when we continue with this at another meeting, we'll get some more answers on that. Because I think that is important for not having a negative impact on surrounding properties, which it would include the open space as well, so...

MR. STROZIER: Correct. Okay.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay.

MR. STROZIER: We will -- we will come back with a -- a proposal --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: All right.

MR. STROZIER: -- for that.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Let me go through my list here.

All right. Could we talk about your -- your signage? We didn't have dimensions on the building-mounted signage.

MR. STROZIER: We'll --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: You'll provide that?

MR. STROZIER: We'll address that, as well.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. And your monument sign is on Juan Tabo; is that correct?

MR. STROZIER: Yes.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Would you give any consideration to just having the letters be lit and not the entire oval?

MR. STROZIER: We'll consider -- we will --
CHAIR WOLFLEY: You'll consider it?

MR. STROZIER: We can definitely consider that, yes.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Thank you.

MR. STROZIER: And I would note that right now, there are two off-premise signs on this property that will be being removed as part of that.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Oh, thank you for bringing that up. Because I did go visit this property this weekend; I wanted to see what everything looked like. And that was one of my questions. There was a small, mini billboard; there are two of them.

MR. STROZIER: There's two of them.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. And those will be removed. Thank you for reminding me of my question. Thank you.

Okay. Did I miss anything, Ms. Gould?

MS. GOULD: I -- I do not believe so.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. We'll go ahead and -- Mr. Freeman or Mr. Pope, if you have any questions that you would like to ask the applicant or the board members, if you'll just focus your comments. And go ahead and come right up here, where we can get you in the recording.

MR. FREEMAN: Thank you for that opportunity. I'm just a member of John Q. Public, and I feel like a fool, because I'm here on this --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Do you mind speaking into the microphone?

MS. GOMEZ: (Inaudible) on the mic, or if you want to hold the mic.

MR. FREEMAN: They can hear me. They can hear me just fine, ma'am.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Well, it's our recording device that we have to -- you can pull it out of the stand and hold it, standing if you'd like.

MR. FREEMAN: Because I was under the mistaken impression, due to your signage on the property, that this was sort of an approval hearing for the project. Obviously, that's not the case. So --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Is that your question?

MR. FREEMAN: No. So I feel like a fool being here for that purpose.

So from a personal basis, obviously, as I've said, I totally oppose this project. But that doesn't sound like the purpose of our being here today.

So my first comment is, maybe I misread your signage on the property. Or maybe the signage doesn't indicate what the actual purpose of this hearing is, so I'll go back and look at it again.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Yeah, I --

MR. FREEMAN: But --
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CHAIR WOLFLEY: If I -- Mr. Freeman, so I tried to say at the beginning, as we started our discussion, that there had already been action to --

MR. FREEMAN: I heard you say that.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: -- approve the conditional use.

MR. FREEMAN: Yes. But that wasn't apparent on your signage on the property --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay.

MR. FREEMAN: -- as to what the purpose of this meeting is.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Yeah.

MR. FREEMAN: Okay? So --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: And --

MR. FREEMAN: -- maybe I misread the sign.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Right.

MR. FREEMAN: I'm not sure.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: And please note, just for the future, there's always a phone number on there, I think a couple phone numbers, where you can call and get more information.

MR. FREEMAN: Right.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: But right now, the purpose of you being back up here is to ask any questions that you might have.

MR. FREEMAN: Well, I'm not here to ask a question.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay.

MR. FREEMAN: I'm just here to make comments.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: The -- I'll give you one more minute. The comment portion was sort of over. But we are allowing you to ask questions of the --

MR. FREEMAN: I'll address my friend, who -- with the homeowners association, is to say that if you guys oppose this project, then I -- you need to motivate your members to -- to get out in the public.

So -- and from a personal perspective, that project is totally unwelcomed in my neighborhood, and I -- that's what I want to say.

I know you guys (inaudible).

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Yeah, it's -- it's the ownership of the property and --

MR. FREEMAN: If I lived right there, I would -- I would just be appalled, you know, but...

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Freeman. And yes, what's -- what's governing what happens on this site is the
Ownership of the property, the --

MR. FREEMAN: Okay. I think your signage could do a better job.


Mr. Pope, did you have any questions? And once again, this is time for you to be able to ask questions, clarify anything that you've heard.

MR. POPE: Just a point of clarification to make -- make sure I understood the applicant.

The stated purpose of this facility is storage only? And there is no option either allowed by the city or intent by the applicant for any other use such as homeless or hazardous waste, et cetera?

And if that clarification that I've obtained is accurate, then our primary purpose of being here has been achieved.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Yes, the zoning -- the Integrated Development Ordinance, it lists the uses, and then as -- that are appropriate in MX-L, and then once they go through and get a conditional use permit, they're restricted to only that use on the property.

Do you have anything else to add, Mr. Martinez?

MR. MARTINEZ: Just the definition out of the IDO for self-storage, so that you're aware.

Self-storage is a use consistent of three or more individual small, self-contained units in a building that are leased or owned for the indoor storage of businesses and household goods or contractor spots.

That's the specific use that's going to be placed on this. If there's another use, it's got to -- that you're going to want to achieve in the future, they've got to go through the correct procedure. And it -- (inaudible) permitted use on that zone.

MR. POPE: That clarification helps a lot, and will help me interacting with our members.

The second one, to make sure I understood, this property is not part of the floodplain?

MR. BIAZAR: Not -- not the property itself. It is next to a floodplain.

MR. POPE: It's next to it, but not part of it?

MR. BIAZAR: Not part of it, yes.

MR. POPE: That also was clarification that would have helped us up front, had we known that. Thank you very much.

MR. BIAZAR: No problem.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. And I just have one more comment that I didn't bring up, was Number 15 on the planning comments. Please provide elevations of the horizontal profile.

I think anything you can do to sort of show how your building
fits into this site would help the -- the board and the neighbors to understand what it's going to look like. Because my understanding is you're going down a few feet. Could you explain that really quickly?

MR. STROZIER: So and -- and thank you, Madam Chair. Yes. So the -- so the elevation of Juan Tabo on the -- on the east side of the site is approximately 18 feet higher than the finished floor elevation of the building.

So from Juan Tabo -- and we did provide, I believe, as part of our application, a drawing that we prepared that showed the elevation with the landscaping both from Juan Tabo and Osuna, that shows that slope that comes down. And so from Juan Tabo, it basically appears to be a single story meeting -- if we didn't for some reason, I'll make sure that we -- that we get a copy --

CHAIR WOLFELEY: I think you might have had some materials in the ZHE application that was part of --

MR. STROZIER: This was done as part of the site plan --

CHAIR WOLFELEY: Was part of the --

MR. STROZIER: -- exercise. It's not in the -- in the site plan drawings, but it was an -- an exhibit. And I -- we will check to make sure that you have that and -- and -- and that's available for the public to see as well. Because that exhibit shows -- I think shows what we're trying to get at. And then we -- we will also provide some better cross-sections with the grading and drainage plan that show that relationship as well.

But basically, from Juan Tabo, the Juan Tabo edge, it basically appears to be a single-story building with street trees along that edge. And then on -- on Osuna, kind of starts at the east end of the building, it sort of is below that slope. And then by the time it gets to the west end of the property, it's a grade, basically, where our driveway and the office is. And so we did -- we did prepare an exhibit. I'll make sure that we actually --

CHAIR WOLFELEY: Okay.

MR. STROZIER: -- provided that to you. It may have been left -- we may have forgotten to attach that to our application. But we will -- we will make sure that it -- it gets added.

CHAIR WOLFELEY: Okay.

MR. STROZIER: And I think that -- I think that will address the concerns expressed about the context of the site relative to the grades of the surrounding streets and the neighbors across the street.

So the neighbors across the street --

CHAIR WOLFELEY: Would you be able to -- I'm sorry. Let me let you finish.

MR. STROZIER: So the -- so kind of similar to that, in sort of the opposite direction, is that the -- the existing houses on the north side of Osuna, at the east end, they're raised significantly above the grade of Osuna, and that kinds of comes down also. We didn't show that in that exhibit, but that's -- also part of the context is that the -- there's elevation for those houses above the grade of Juan -- of Osuna and Juan Tabo.
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on -- most pronounced at the east end of the subdivision, and then it kind of comes down to grade also, as you travel west.

CHAIR WOLFLE: Okay. Is there a way to get that material to the neighborhoods? Maybe at least through Mr. Pope?

MR. STROZIER: If we have their contact information, we can coordinate with Ms. Gould and -- and make sure we have contact information, and we can certainly send that out to -- to everyone.

CHAIR WOLFLE: Okay. I think those exhibits would be very helpful.

MR. STROZIER: And we'll want to know -- and -- and we -- if we can come up with a list of those individuals, then we can also identify and provide copies or a link to a Dropbox folder for the updated site plan, as well.

CHAIR WOLFLE: Okay. Why don't we do this.

Ms. Gomez, do you have just a sheet of paper?

And anyone who is here today that wants to leave your e-mail address, we could send those exhibits to you. And that would include Mr. Pope and Mr. Freeman.

So that'll just be, I guess, up there at the table, if you'd like to get those exhibits. And then they will be part of the city record and can be attainable through -- through Ms. Gould and myself.

MR. STROZIER: Yes.

CHAIR WOLFLE: Okay.

MR. STROZIER: Okay. That's good. The only other item, Madam Chair --

CHAIR WOLFLE: You're welcome to send them to whomever you know is interested in the project.

MR. STROZIER: Yes, I will. We will -- we will coordinate and make sure that that happens.

And -- and then the only thing I wanted to mention, that we did receive the comments from some of the outside agencies.

CHAIR WOLFLE: Yeah. Thank you.

MR. STROZIER: And we did review those and really have no -- there's a couple things that we will -- we will respond to in our updated submittal, but we didn't have any questions or clarifications. But that included mid region metropolitan planning organization, the police department CPTED review, AMAFCA, PNM, and DOT. Oh, and APS.

CHAIR WOLFLE: Okay. And just --

MR. STROZIER: Those are the only ones that I have.

CHAIR WOLFLE: -- for the benefit of the public, CPTED is Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design. And so there were some comments about good natural surveillance techniques to make the property safe related to landscaping and lighting and other things.
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And then, with PNM, just a comment about moving a couple of plants and things like that.

MR. STROZIER: It looks like we might have a tree in there, in one of their easements.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay.

MR. STROZIER: So we'll make sure that if that's the case, we get that relocated.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay.

MR. BIAZAR: If I may say something about sections.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Yes, please.

MR. BIAZAR: Make sure that when you prepare your sections, it's based on the latest grading. Because I guess you guys are thinking about doing some modifications to the grading design.

MR. STROZIER: Right (inaudible).

MR. BIAZAR: So --

MR. STROZIER: Okay. We'll make sure that's per the current --

MR. BIAZAR: -- you want to make sure, yeah.

MR. STROZIER: Okay. All right.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. So we're looking at a deferral of this project in order to work on the items we've discussed this morning. Let's look at a time frame for that, Mr. Strozier.

MR. STROZIER: So --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Do you have a time frame in mind?

MR. STROZIER: Well, so I think -- I think probably the main timing issue is responses to the grading and drainage comments and what the turnaround time is to get from RESPEC's standpoint, getting an updated submittal turned in, and then, from city hydrology, what the time period is. I think we got a couple holidays coming up.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Mm-hmm.

MR. STROZIER: But so what that -- I think that would really -- the other changes, we're already in process making those.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay.

MR. STROZIER: And I think we've -- we've got a good handle on them, so --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: So I think --

MR. GRIER: So I think we'll be submitting as soon as the end of the week for our resubmittal on hydrology. So I'd probably take the city engineer's advice on how long he thinks that will be to process.

MR. BIAZAR: We'll need at least a week or so. And given the holidays, I would say probably two weeks before we could take a
look at it.

MR. GRIER: Okay.

MR. STROZIER: So would that put us at the meeting after the 8th?

CHAIR WOLFLEY: I think so, at the least. So like the January 15th or January 22nd.

MR. STROZIER: I think January 15th would be our preference.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. All those in favor of deferring Item 1, Project 2184 and Site Plan 379 to the January 15th meeting of DRB, please raise your hand.

Okay. So you are deferred to January 15th.

MR. STROZIER: Thank you very much.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Thank you.

MR. STROZIER: We look forward to bringing it back to you at that time.

(Conclusion of recording.)
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MAJOR CASES

1. Project # PR-2019-002184 (1001993)
   SI-2019-00379 – SITE PLAN

   CONSENSUS PLANNING, INC. agent(s) for GUARDIAN
   STORAGE request(s) the aforementioned action(s) for all or
   a portion of: TR G-1 PLAT OF TRACTS F-1 & G-1, ACADEMY
   PLACE SUBDIVISION, zoned MX-L, located at 4909 JUAN
   TABO BLVD NE between OSUNA RD and MONTGOMERY
   BLVD, containing approximately 2.3795 acre(s). (F-21)

   PROPERTY OWNERS: SJUAN TABO LAND LLC
   REQUEST: SITE PLAN FOR DEVELOPMENT ON A SITE UNDER 5 ACRES
   WITHIN 330 FEET OF MAJOR PUBLIC OPEN SPACE

   DEFERRED TO JANUARY 15TH, 2020.

2. Project # PR-2019-002559
   SD-2019-00222 – VACATION OF PUBLIC
   EASEMENT
   SD-2019-00224 – VACATION OF PUBLIC
   EASEMENT
   SD-2019-00225 – VACATION OF PUBLIC
   EASEMENT
   SD-2018-00220 – PRELIMINARY/FINAL
   PLAT

   ARCH + PLAN LAND USE CONSULTANTS agent(s) for
   AGGIES LLC request(s) the aforementioned action(s) for all
   or a portion of: LOTS 1-A, 1-B,1-C and 1-D, BLOCK 10,
   UNIVERSITY HEIGHTS ADDITION zoned R-ML, located on
   SILVER AVE between CORNELL DRIVE and STANFORD
   DRIVE, containing approximately 0.334 acre(s). (K-16)

   PROPERTY OWNERS: AGGIES, LLC
   REQUEST: VACATE 3 PRIVATE EASEMENTS AND LOT CONSOLIDATION
   FROM 4 LOTS TO 2 LOTS

   DEFERRED TO JANUARY 15TH, 2020.
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-2019-002184

TR G-1 PLAT OF TRACTS F-1 & G-1, ACADEMY PLACE SUBDIVISION:

SI-2019-00379 – SITE PLAN

• No objections.
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
    Kalyn Finnell, Planner II, APS Capital Master Plan
    Diana Chavez Vargas, Intern Planner, APS Capital Master Plan

From: Diana Chavez, Intern Planner, APS Capital Master Plan

Re: CABQ Development Review Board Cases to be heard on December 18, 2019

1. Project # PR-2019-002184 (1001993)
   a. DRB Description:
      SI-2019-00379 – Site Plan
   b. Site Information: Tract G-1, Plat of tracts F-1 and G-1. Academy Place Subdivision.
   c. Site Location: 4909 Juan Tabo Blvd NE between Osuna Road and Montgomery Blvd
   d. Request Description: This is a request for a site plan approval of a 3-story storage space. The proposed project size is 2.3 acres. The site is located in an area zoned MX-L (Mixed-Use Low Intensity).
   e. APS Case Comments: No adverse impact.
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD

Code Enforcement Comments

AGENDA ITEM NO: 1

DRB Project Number: PR-2019-002184

Application Number: ____________________________

Project Name: ____________________________

Request: Site Plan

COMMENTS:

- Zone Map still shows a R1-D lot. This needs to be cleared up
- 4-3(D)(28)(b)- Opaque wall required abutting residential lot. Is this wall opaque? Wall needs to be constructed across the full length of the parcel line abutting residential
- 4-3(D)(28)(d)- Make a note on the site plan concerning this requirement to limit times of access within 100 ft of a residential zone.
- Must meet section 5-2(H)

(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: Jacobo Martinez, Code Enforcement Supervisor
Planning Department
924-3301 jacobomartinez@cabq.gov

DATE: 12/18/2019

ACTION:

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

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

To: Angela Gomez, DRB Hearing Monitor
From: Laura Kuehn, NCPS, ICPS - Crime Prevention/Crime Free Programs
Subject: PR-2019-002184 (1001993) Guardian Storage

Regarding the above referenced DRB application, I respectfully submit the following comments:

- Ensure adequate lighting throughout the project – exterior lighting on the building and any future building(s).
- Ensure natural surveillance and clear lines of sight throughout the project. Natural surveillance requires a space free from natural and physical barrier. Establish a clear line of sight from the building to the street and the street to the building. Also maintain natural surveillance between the primary development and any future building(s).
- Ensure that landscaping is installed so as not to obstruct windows, doors, entryways, or lighting.
- Maintain landscaping for visibility; trees should be trimmed to a canopy of six (6) feet and bushes should be trimmed to three (3) feet.
- Limit and clearly delineate access to the property; i.e. Loading/Unloading, Employee Parking, Customer Parking.
- Provide signage that clearly directs the client to the appropriate entrance.
- Ensure controlled access to the building through use of adequate door and lock systems.
- Control access between customer areas and employee-only areas.
- Consider video surveillance systems to monitor building, including entrance and exit points, parking lots, and any sensitive areas such as cash handling and the storage areas.
- Ensure that addresses are posted and clearly visible.
- Create a clear transition from public to semi-public to semi-private to private space throughout the project.

If you have any questions regarding these CPTED recommendations, please call me at 768-2006. I am available to do an on-site security survey after the project is complete.
City of Albuquerque Department of Municipal Development
Comments for DRB Hearing on 12/18/19

Project # PR-2019-002184
SD-2019-00379----SITE PLAN

Transportation and Drainage Section:

DMD requests a 10 ft. right of way dedication along Juan Tabo Blvd in lieu of the 10 ft. sidewalk easement shown on the plat of record, attached.
## DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD - HYDROLOGY SECTION

**Dana Peterson PE., 924-3695, dpeterson@cabq.gov**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DRB Project Number: 2019-002184</th>
<th>Hearing Date: 12-18-2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project: Guardian Storage Juan Tabo &amp; Osuna</td>
<td>Agenda Item No: 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| ☐ Sketch Plat | ☐ Minor Preliminary / Final Plat | ☐ Preliminary Plat | ☐ Final Plat |
| ☐ Temp Sidewalk Deferral | ☐ Sidewalk Waiver/Variance | ☐ Site Plan | ☐ Bulk Land Plat |
| ☐ 2 YEAR SIA Extension | ☐ DPM Variance | ☐ Vacation of Public Easement | ☐ Vacation of Public Right of Way |

### ENGINEERING COMMENTS:

- An approved conceptual grading and drainage plan is required.
- The pipe penetration into Bear Canyon Arroyo needs to be on the Infrastructure List

### RESOLUTION/COMMENTS:

**Code:**

Parks & Rec:

Water:

Transportation:

Planning:

☐ APPROVED  DELEGATED TO: ☐ TRANS ☐ HYD ☐ WUA ☐ PRKS ☐ PLNG
☐ DENIED  Delegated For:

SIGNED: ☐ I.L. ☐ SPSD ☐ SPBP ☐ FINAL PLAT
DEFERRED TO ________________

290
TO: Jolene Wolfley

FR: Forest Replogle, Transportation Planner

RE: MRMPO Comments for Development Review Board Applications Scheduled for December 18th, 2019

December 10th, 2019

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 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 #PR-2019-002184**

MRMPO commends the inclusion of low impact and green infrastructure principals in the proposed site design to supplement stormwater management and regional water quality/supply needs. The MTP and Long Range Transportation System Guide includes these as a recommended strategy for meeting a number of challenges related to projected climate change and transportation impacts.

For informational purposes:

- Juan Tabo Blvd is functionally classified as a principal arterial currently, and projected to be a community principal arterial in the Long Range Roadway System.
- Juan Tabo Blvd 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.
December 11, 2019

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
December 04, 2019
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: PR-2019-002184
Case Description: Site Plan
Location: 4909 Juan Tabo
Type of Development (Residential/Commercial): Commercial
Possible Impacted NMDOT roadway(s): NA
Department Comments:
- NMDOT does not have any comments at this time.

Michelle Lujan Grisham
Governor

Michael R. Sandoval
Cabinet Secretary

Commissioners
Jennifer Sandoval
Commissioner
District 1

Bruce Ellis
Commissioner
District 2

Keith Mortensen
Commissioner
District 3

Walter G. Adams
Commissioner
District 4

Vacant
Commissioner
District 5

Charles Lundstrom
Commissioner
District 6
December 11, 2019

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 December 04, 2019
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:** PR-2019-002184
**Case Description:** Site Plan
**Location:** 4909 Juan Tabo
**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

Digitally signed by Peter Kubiak
Date: 2019.12.11
14:36:45 -07'00'

Peter Kubiak, D3 Engineering Coordinator

cc: Nancy Perea, D3 Traffic Engineer (email)
cc: Margaret Haynes, D3 Assistant Traffic Engineer (email)
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD

Planning Dept. - Major Case Comments

HEARING DATE/AGENDA ITEM 1

Project Number: PR-2018-002184

Application Number: SI-2019-00379

Project Name: Guardian storage

Request: DRB Site Plan

COMMENTS:

1. The property is shown AGIS as split-zoned MX-L and R-1D, your letter states that this is an error; please clarify the zoning on the site.
2. The use is allowed under the MX-L zone with a conditional use permit. The applicant has an approved conditional use permit.
3. Confirm the number of parking spaces
4. No loading spaces are proposed, and 3 loading spaces are required.
5. Make sure that façade design in 14-16- 5-11 is being met.
6. Clarify how fencing requirements in 14-16-4 3(D)(28) are met, the fencing appears to stop before the property ends and does not appear to be opaque.
7. See 5-3-(D)(3)(b) network of walkways for required walkways- the walkways provided are too narrow
8. Please provide sign dimensions.
9. Will the buildings be internally lit at night? See section 14-16-5-8 for lighting requirements.
10. The building appears to have internal access for trucks to enter and unload- please confirm.
11. Please confirm the spandrel windows are opaque and not see through. Will these windows have lighting?
12. Will CMU block be split face?
13. Do building colors meet 5-2(H)(1)(a) for reflectivity. Please provide information for the colors used in the building.
14. Please clarify the shade of green, Pursuant to 5-2(H)(1)(b) colors must blend into the surrounding environment, yellow ochres, browns, dull reds and grey greens- please confirm that is a grey green.
15. Please provide elevations or a horizontal profile to illustrate the steep slopes.
16. Based on resubmittals and additional review by other board members there may be additional items to address.

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: Maggie Gould
Planning Department

DATE: 12-12-19
PNM comments for Approval for DRB #PR-2019-002184 (1001993) SI-2019-00379
Site Plan (3-story indoor Guardian Storage facility located at 4909 Juan Tabo Blvd NE between Osuna NE and Montgomery Blvd NE)

1. Existing underground distribution lines and adjacent switchgear are located on the north and west side of the subject property along Osuna NE. The developer will need to contact PNM’s New Service Delivery Department to address any potential encroachment to the existing easement which must be reviewed by PNM for maintenance or future use. This includes any proposed changes to the existing grade, existing or proposed signs, gates, walls or fences, landscaping, lighting, access, parking and driveway to ensure adequate access to equipment and to avoid interference with the existing distribution lines at the project site. Please submit a service application at www.pnm.com/erequest for PNM to review.

2. The proposed landscaping including one street tree as noted on the Landscape Plan (Sheet 2 of 7) at the northwest corner of the site appears to be located within the PNM underground distribution easement. PNM standard is for trees to be planted outside the PNM easement. It will be necessary for the applicant to coordinate with PNM regarding proposed tree species and placement as well as sign location in order to ensure sufficient safety clearances to avoid interference with the existing electric distribution lines along the project site.

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

DRB Project Number: 2019-002184
Guardian Storage at Osuna

AGENDA ITEM NO: 1

SUBJECT: Site Plan

ENGINEERING COMMENTS:

1. Along Juan Tabo Blvd., it is requested to change the 10-foot sidewalk easement to 10-foot of dedicated right-of-way. Therefore, a platting action is required.

2. Provide curb, curb ramp, and sidewalk details. Sidewalk detail shall show a maximum 2% cross-slope.

3. Dimension parking islands.

4. Provide signage details for the handicapped sign and motorcycle sign. On site plan, show existing and proposed sidewalk widths as well as distance from curb to property line. A minimum 4-foot wide sidewalk is required. The ADA accessible parking sign must have the required language per 66-7-352.4C NMSA 1978 "Violators Are Subject to a Fine and/or Towing." If that language is present it is not visible in the detail.

5. If curb does not separate parking spaces from sidewalk, provide parking bumpers.

6. Provide cross-section for new sidewalk along Osuna Road NE.


Disclaimer: The comments provided are based upon the information received from the applicant. 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 jwolbenbarger@cabq.gov

DATE: December 18, 2019

ACTION:

APPROVED __: DENIED __: DEFERRED __: COMMENTS PROVIDED __: WITHDRAWN __

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

293