Hi Shanna,

Thanks for the follow up regarding Community Residential Facilities and appropriate amendments to the current ordinances governing such.

This one got a bit of dialog going between my neighbors. We would like to accept the proposed amendments, but be would like to see an additional amendment be added back into the section to help protect residential areas.
The background on this includes a situation of poor management at a few Community Residential Facilities in WLCNA. We had identified 7 (7 of the 16 in District 4 in our NA!) within a two mile radius. An additional site was proposed - a fourth site across from already established multiple Community Residential sites that sit side by side at the end of a street, around the corner from known drug dealers in a mobile home community. We had had numerous, documented, transgressions by the site management and we protested the establishment of a new site nearby.

We were successful, but we learned quite a bit regarding the issues of discrimination and shared knowledge of these mostly worthy operations. However if if were not for this limitation regarding the distancing or these sites from one another, we likely would not have been able to use any arguments to oppose the creation of a fourth site. So getting rid of this protection for neighborhoods resonates for our community.

We would like you all to consider an additional amendment to this type of site permit in residential areas that doesn't focus on the nature of the resident, but the commercial aspect of the operations. We believe that if run well, a neighborhood prospers from these facilities embedded across our areas. However, when they are co-located in multiple numbers there are problems that can occur in the management these commercial endeavors. Giving the neighborhood the opportunity to voice their concerns and echo any standing problems of mismanagement that are documented at the sites, prior to the approval of an additional site in close proximity to where several sites already exist, will help protect neighborhoods.

What we witnessed was that the commercial nature of the sites weakened the capacity to be good neighbors. Between the sites, staffing was compromised as those responsible would be given oversight for multiple sites (an impossible task), necessary parking was increased along the residential streets, more policing was necessary as oversight was compromised for profits, on sight medical and emergency services were much more frequent than in a normal residential setting.

It occurred to us in dialog about how to best forward the need to protect communities from these businesses was that an analysis could be required for proposed sites that are near to existing facilities. This would be to determine if this grouping of homes presents a basic abuse to the residential nature of our community - fundamentally changing the context of a residential area to a commercial area. So, we have drafted an amendment, we know it needs work, but it approaches the need to continue to protect communities with any amendments that are put forward. Please send your feedback.

Ref: Page 155, 4-3(B)(8) after deleting subsections (c) and (d) add back a new subsection (c) and

Amend to add "Where multiple Community Residential Facility sites exist and an additional site(s) is (are) proposed within 1,500 ft of the existing two or more sites, there exists the likelihood that the creation of a new Community Residential Facility(s) will fundamentally change the nature of the area where the sites exist from residential to commercial. In this case, an analysis will be completed by the planning department in collaboration with the NA and agent of the proposed new Community Residential Facility to ascertain if the zoned area is correct for this increase of commercial density. The analysis will include projected increases in parking needs, institutional activity, policing, medical and emergency services and other measurable commercial activities as appropriate."

Looking forward to hearing your recommended next steps on this one.

Kind regards,

Peggy Neff

Peggy Neff Other Path LLC 505-977-8903

On Tuesday, January 5, 2021, 08:48:13 AM MST, Schultz, Shanna M. <smschultz@cabq.gov> wrote:

Hi Peggy,

During our meeting a couple of weeks back you asked for how many Community Residential Facilities (CRFs) are in each Council District. I reached out to the Planning Department and got that information for you. Here's what they provided me:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council District</th>
<th>CRFs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you have further questions about these particular numbers, please reach out to Angelo Metzgar, the Code Compliance Manager who oversees the division in the Planning Department responsible for tracking this data - ametzgar@cabq.gov.

If you have further questions about the Council amendment related to CRFs, please reach out to me or Petra.

Thank you,
Shanna

Shanna Schultz, MPA, MCRP
Council Senior Planner
Albuquerque City Council
505.768.3185
smschultz@cabq.gov
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