

PLANNING DEPARTMENT
URBAN DESIGN & DEVELOPMENT DIVISION
600 2nd Street NW, 2nd Floor, Albuquerque, NM 87102
PO Box 1293, Albuquerque, NM 87103
Office: (505) 924-3860



OFFICIAL NOTICE OF DECISION

December 18, 2025

Consensus Planning for
9521-9525 Central Property LLC
302 Eighth Street NW
Albuquerque, NM 87102

Plan# [ZMA-2025-00016](#)
Zoning Map Amendment (Zone Change)

LEGAL DESCRIPTION:

Consensus Planning, Inc., agent for Tirol Housing, LLC requests a Zoning Map Amendment from NR-BP to MX-M for all or a portion of lot 27, Block 9, Original Townsite of the Westland Atrisco Grant, located at 9525 Central Ave. NW, at the SE Corner of 94th St. and Volcano Rd, approximately 9.5 acres.

(K-09)

Staff Planner: Rachel Gross

On December 18, 2025, the Environmental Planning Commission (EPC) voted to APPROVE Plan # ZMA-2025-00016, Zoning Map Amendment (Zone Change), based on the following Findings.

FINDINGS – ZMA-2025-00016, Zoning Map Amendment (Zone Change)

1. This is a request for a zone map amendment for all or a portion of Lot 27, Block 9, Original Townsite of the Westland Atrisco Grant, located at 9525 Central Ave. NW and containing approximately 9.1 acres.
2. The Zone Map Amendment is from NR-BP (Non-Residential Business Park) to MX-M (Mixed-Use Moderate Intensity) for the northern 6.2-acre portion of a 9.1-acre lot located at 9525 Central Avenue NW, near the intersection of 94th Street and Volcano Road. The rezone is intended to facilitate future multi-family residential development, which is not permitted in the existing NR-BP zone.
3. The zone change would create a floating zone line on the property. The parcel is proposed to be subdivided into a 6.2-acre project site and a 2.9-acre parcel for the existing auto repair business which is required to coincide with the future subdivision action. A zoning certificate will not be issued until the plat is finalized that reconciles the property line with the zone boundaries.
4. The EPC is the final decision-making body for this request because the subject site is in an Area of Change and is less than 20 acres [[IDO §14-16-6-7\(G\)\(1\)\(a\)3](#)]. The request is a quasi-judicial matter.

5. The Albuquerque/Bernalillo County Comprehensive Plan and the City of Albuquerque Integrated Development Ordinance (IDO) are incorporated herein by reference and made part of the record for all purposes.
6. The subject site is within the Central Ave. Major Transit Corridor and the Southwest Mesa Community Planning Area (CPA) as designated by the Comp Plan.
7. The subject site is within an Area of Change as designated by the Comprehensive Plan and the following policies apply:
8. The request partially facilitates POLICY 4.1.1 DISTINCT COMMUNITIES: Encourage quality development that is consistent with the distinct character of communities from Comp Plan Chapter 4 Community Identity.

Policy 4.1.1 is about “quality development” and “distinct character,” but the request for ZMA-2025-00016 doesn’t really document either: the applicant’s justification letter doesn’t define what “quality” means in terms of site design, building form, or amenities, and it doesn’t describe the specific character of the surrounding Southwest Mesa community beyond general terms or show how the proposed intensity, scale, and uses will reinforce that character rather than just introduce multi-family as a permissive use. The request will create a spot zone and a floating zone line until replatted, which can cut against a clear, pattern-based community form. Without a stronger link to Southwest Mesa’s existing or desired character (e.g., built form, transitions, community input, Southwest Mesa-specific policies), it is more accurate to say the request may facilitate Policy 4.1.1 but does not yet clearly do so.

9. The request clearly facilitates POLICY 4.3.12.4 SUPPORT AND INCREASE DENSE AND MIXED-USE HOUSING OPTIONS IN THE SOUTHWEST MESA. [A]

d) Support higher-density housing projects along major thoroughfares.

Rezoning from NR-BP to MX-M enables the development of higher-density housing near a major thoroughfare. MX-M permits multi-family residential as a permissive use, which is a meaningful shift from the NR-BP zone that prohibits such housing entirely. Since the subject site sits just north of Central Avenue, a Major Transit Corridor and major thoroughfare, the rezoning removes a regulatory barrier to building higher-density housing in a location where the policy explicitly encourages it. While at this stage, the applicant has not committed to a specific density, building form, or project concept, the request creates the *opportunity* for higher-density housing in the Southwest Mesa.

10. The Request generally or clearly facilitates the following Goals and Policies from Comp Plan Chapter 5: Land use.

A. GOAL 5.1 CENTERS & CORRIDORS: Grow as a community of strong Centers connected by a multi-modal network of Corridors.

The site is within 660-feet of the Central Avenue Major Transit Corridor, and is nearby but not within Westland and West Route 66 Activity Centers. The zone change would facilitate future multi-family development on the subject site, which would be reviewed as a future Site Plan request. MX-M is a zone district that can support transit-oriented development, but it can also yield auto-oriented layouts and low-intensity commercial uses that do little to reinforce Centers or Corridors. Because the justification does not demonstrate how the request will clearly and directly contribute to corridor vitality—through form, intensity, connectivity, or multimodal design.

- B. GOAL 5.2 COMPLETE COMMUNITIES: Foster communities where residents can live, work, learn, shop, and play together.

The request from NR-BP to MX-M broadens the range of uses that could *potentially* be developed, including multi-family housing, limited commercial services, and neighborhood-oriented retail—uses that are more compatible with the concept of a community where people can live, work, learn, shop, and play in closer proximity. By enabling residential development on a currently vacant, underutilized parcel near transit and existing commercial uses along Central Avenue, the request incrementally supports a more mixed land-use pattern than the NR-BP zone could accommodate.

- C. GOAL 5.3 EFFICIENT DEVELOPMENT PATTERN: Promote development patterns that maximize the utility of existing infrastructure and public facilities and the efficient use of land to support the public good.

This request allows redevelopment of an undeveloped parcel that is already served by public infrastructure: water, sewer, electric, and the Central Avenue transit corridor. Infill housing or mixed-use development on a site with existing capacity can contribute to more efficient use of infrastructure compared to leaving the land unused or restricting it to low-intensity industrial or commercial uses. The applicant's justification highlights these points, noting the proximity to public facilities such as Central & Unser Public Library and existing transportation networks. The zone change from NR-BP to MX-M would facilitate future multi-family development that utilizes existing infrastructure and public facilities.

- D. POLICY 5.3.1 INFILL DEVELOPMENT: Support additional growth in areas with existing infrastructure and public facilities.

The subject site is already fully served by existing infrastructure and the request would enable development on a vacant, underutilized tract within an Area of Change. The policy's emphasis is straightforward: support growth in places where infrastructure and public facilities already exist, and the applicant directly ties the rezoning to that purpose by identifying the site as a well-established area with available utilities, transit service, and proximity to public amenities such as the Central & Unser Public Library. Allowing MX-M expands feasible development options on a site that is already service-ready.

- E. GOAL 5.6 CITY DEVELOPMENT AREAS: Encourage and direct growth to Areas of Change where it is expected and desired and ensure that development in and near Areas of Consistency reinforces the character and intensity of the surrounding area.

The subject site is located entirely within an Area of Change, where the Comprehensive Plan explicitly encourages new growth, redevelopment, and more flexible land-use patterns. Rezoning from NR-BP to MX-M would direct development to a location where change is both expected and desired, while also aligning the site with surrounding mixed-use and commercial zoning along Central Avenue. Since the property is *not* in or near an Area of Consistency, there is no risk of disrupting an established, stable neighborhood character. Instead, MX-M expands the range of feasible uses, including housing and moderate-intensity commercial, consistent with the City's goal of channeling growth into Areas of Change to support reinvestment and corridor vitality.

- F. POLICY 5.6.2 AREAS OF CHANGE: Direct growth and more intense development to Centers, Corridors, industrial and business parks, and Metropolitan Redevelopment Areas where change is encouraged.

The subject site is located within an Area of Change adjacent to the Central Avenue Major Transit Corridor and near existing commercial and industrial zoning where the Comprehensive Plan explicitly encourages more intense development. Allowing MX-M zoning would expand development opportunities, which include multi-family residential, moderate-intensity commercial, and limited industrial uses, on an underutilized parcel that is nearby similar and higher-intensity zones. By enabling redevelopment in a location already identified for growth and change, and by aligning the site's zoning with the established mixed-use pattern along the Central Major Transit Corridor, the request supports the policy's direction to channel growth toward corridors than into stable neighborhoods.

11. The request partially facilities POLICY 8.1.1 DIVERSE PLACES: Foster a range of interesting places and contexts with different development intensities, densities, uses, and building scale to encourage economic development opportunities from Comp Plan Chapter 8: Economic Development.

Rezoning from NR-BP to MX-M introduces the possibility of a greater mix of uses, building types, and development intensities than the current zoning allows. MX-M supports uses that can increase variation in building scale and introduce more activity and diversity into an area that is currently dominated by business-park and commercial zoning. This shift has the potential to create a more varied and economically dynamic context along the Central Avenue corridor. The applicant states their intention to develop the subject site into multi-family housing, and does not mention a mix of uses. Because the MX-M zone does not guarantee mixed-use development, pedestrian-oriented design, or distinct placemaking outcomes, the facilitation remains partial rather than clear, dependent on how the site is ultimately designed and developed.

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

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

The proposed zone change is consistent with the health, safety, and general welfare of the City as shown by furthering (and not being in conflict with) a preponderance of applicable Goals and Policies in the ABC Comp Plan as shown in the sections above. However, since the request would create a spot zone the applicant needs to "clearly facilitate" applicable Goals and Policies in the ABC Comp Plan. To this end, the applicant has demonstrated the request furthers and clearly facilitates some referenced policies, but does not clearly facilitate others as shown in the sections above.

- B. Overall, the request shows consistency with policies that direct growth to appropriate locations, particularly Policy 5.3.1 (Infill Development), Goal 5.6 (City Development Areas), and Policy 5.6.2 (Areas of Change), because the site is vacant, already served by infrastructure, and located within an Area of Change near a major corridor. It shows moderate consistency with broader goals such as Goal 5.2 (Complete Communities) and Policy 8.1.1 (Diverse Places) by enabling a wider range of housing and commercial options than NR-BP allows, though the outcomes are dependent on how the site is ultimately developed. However, the request does not clearly facilitate policies related to community character, transit orientation, park activation, placemaking, or reduced auto demand, including Policy 4.1.1 (Distinct Communities), Policy 4.3.12 (Park Safety & Activation), Goal 5.1 (Centers & Corridors), Policy 6.1.3 (Auto Demand),

and Policy 8.1.1 (Placemaking), because the justification relies on speculative benefits and does not demonstrate how MX-M zoning would directly implement these policy directives. 6-7(G)(3)(b) If the proposed amendment is located wholly or partially in an Area of Consistency (as shown in the ABC Comp Plan, as amended), the applicant has demonstrated that the new zone would clearly reinforce or strengthen the established character of the surrounding Area of Consistency and would not permit development that is significantly different from that character. The applicant must also demonstrate that the existing zoning is inappropriate because it meets any of the following criteria:

- 1) There was typographical or clerical error when the existing zone district was applied to the property.
- 2) There has been a significant change in neighborhood or community conditions affecting the site.

The subject sites are wholly located within an Area of Change and not wholly or partially in an Area of Consistency, as designated by the Comp Plan.

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

1. There was typographical or clerical error when the existing zone district was applied to the property.
2. There has been a significant change in neighborhood or community conditions affecting the site that justifies this request.

The Subject Site is located wholly within an Area of Change, which satisfies the threshold requirement. The applicant's justification for item (2) ("significant change in neighborhood or community conditions") relies largely on the existence of the 98th & Central Shopping Center, a development that has been present for several years.

The argument under item (3) ("a different zone is more advantageous to the community") is stronger: MX-M does enable residential uses and broader redevelopment options consistent with some Comp Plan goals, particularly for infill and Areas of Change. Still, the applicant overstates these advantages without showing how MX-M will *actually* implement desired land-use patterns, intensities, or connectivity improvements rather than merely allowing them. Overall, **the applicant's response meets Criterion (c) on the basis of item (3)**, but the justification could be more robust, particularly in clarifying why NR-BP is no longer appropriate and how MX-M substantively advances Comp Plan outcomes rather than offering speculative benefits

- D. 6-7(G)(3)(d) The zone change does not include permissive uses that would be harmful to adjacent property, the neighborhood, or the community, unless the Use-specific Standards in IDO §14-16-4-3 associated with that use will adequately mitigate those harmful impacts.

The request **generally meets** Criterion (d). MX-M removes several heavy industrial and auto-oriented uses currently allowed under NR-BP, and introduces a broader set of residential, commercial, and group living uses that could create impacts on adjacent properties, particularly the single-family and mobile home areas to the north, if not carefully designed. Uses such as large group living facilities, medium-to-large retail, or auto-oriented commercial development could increase traffic, noise, and activity levels beyond what currently exists. The IDO's use-specific standards, height transitions, and buffering requirements can mitigate many of these impacts.

The auto repair shop on the southern portion of the property includes light vehicle fueling as a use-specific standard that prohibits “Any building that contains painting or vehicle repair ... within 25 feet in any direction of any Residential zone district or lot containing a residential use in any Mixed-use zone district.” [4-3(D)(19)(d)]. Therefore, if this property is replatted with the proposed zone designation, the new boundary will need to keep the auto repair far enough away to avoid making the auto repair nonconforming.

- E. 6-7(G)(3)(e) The City's existing infrastructure and public improvements, including but not limited to its street, trail, and sidewalk systems meet 1 of the following requirements:
1. Will have adequate capacity based on improvements for which the City has already approved and budgeted capital funds during the next calendar year.
 2. Will have adequate capacity when the applicant fulfills its obligations under the IDO, the DPM, and/or an Infrastructure Improvements Agreement.
 3. Will have adequate capacity when the City and the applicant have fulfilled their respective obligations under a City- approved Development Agreement between the City and the applicant.

There is no indication from reviewing agencies that these systems lack capacity to accommodate the type or scale of development allowed under MX-M. Any future development on the subject site, which is currently vacant, would be required to adhere to all obligations and standards under the IDO, DPM, and/or an Infrastructure Improvements Agreement. There is no reliance on unbudgeted City infrastructure, nor does the request require a Development Agreement to ensure adequate capacity. While detailed infrastructure comments are still pending, nothing in the record suggests capacity constraints that would prevent redevelopment, and the site's infill context makes adequate service highly likely. **Therefore, the applicant's response meets Criterion (e).**

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

The subject site is the northern portion of the parcel, which is located along Volcano Road, which is not a major street. The applicant acknowledges the subject site as being on Central Avenue.

The request technically meets Criterion (f) because the justification is *not entirely* based on the site's location near Central Avenue; the applicant also cites the desire to enable multi-family housing, the site's designation as an Area of Change, and the need to align zoning with surrounding development patterns. However, the narrative repeatedly leans on the site's proximity to the Central Avenue Major Transit Corridor, references to transit access, and corridor-related redevelopment potential. These points appear multiple times and form a substantial part of the argument for why MX-M is “more advantageous.” While the justification does include additional reasons beyond corridor location, it relies heavily on the major-street context to strengthen claims about economic vitality, reduced auto demand, and corridor activation—suggesting a dependence on this factor even if not the *only* one. Thus, the applicant's response **meets the criterion**, but the applicant should more clearly demonstrate that the rationale stands on its own without relying so heavily on the corridor setting.

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

The applicant's justification is **not** based completely on land cost or economic factors. The applicant does not explicitly reference land cost, profit, or financial feasibility as reasons for

the rezoning, and it frames the request primarily around land use, infill development, and compatibility with surrounding zoning. However, the justification leans noticeably on economic arguments, such as stimulating redevelopment, supporting nearby businesses, and creating “economic vitality” along the Central corridor. While these points are framed as community benefits rather than private economic motivations, the applicant does not clearly separate public-interest economic outcomes from private development feasibility, which leaves ambiguity about whether economic considerations are playing a larger role than stated. Despite this weakness, the justification still provides enough policy-based reasoning to conclude that the request is **not predominantly based** on land cost or economic gain, and **therefore Criterion (g) is satisfied.**

- H. 6-7(G)(3)(h) The zone change does not apply a zone district different from surrounding zone districts to one small area or one premises (i.e. create a "spot zone") or to a strip of land along a street (i.e. create a "strip zone") unless the change will clearly facilitate implementation of the ABC Comp Plan, as amended, and at least one of the following applies:
1. The area of the zone change is different from surrounding land because it can function as a transition between adjacent zone districts.
 2. The site is not suitable for the uses allowed in any adjacent zone district due to topography, traffic, or special adverse land uses nearby.
 3. The nature of structures already on the premises makes it unsuitable for the uses allowed in any adjacent zone district.
13. The proposed MX-M zoning will create a **spot zone**, as the applicant acknowledges, because it applies a different zone district to a single 6.2-acre portion of a larger property surrounded primarily by NR-BP and NR-C. However, the request can still meet Criterion (h) because it satisfies **item (1)**: the site can reasonably function as a **transition** between residential zoning to the north (R-1B and R-MC) and more intense commercial/industrial zoning along Central Avenue and to the west. MX-M permits moderate-intensity residential and commercial uses that can buffer lower-density neighborhoods from heavier NR-BP and NR-C uses, and this transitional role is supported by the surrounding zoning pattern. The request partially meets Criterion (h) because it shows that the zone change will **partially facilitate certain key Comp Plan goals and policies** (e.g., infill development and directing growth to an Area of Change) and that MX-M can serve as a functional transitional zone. Still, the argument would be stronger if the justification more clearly explained *how* MX-M will implement Comp Plan goals beyond general statements.¹³ Recognized Neighborhood Associations within 660 feet, the Route 66 West Neighborhood Association and South West Alliance of Neighborhoods (SWAN Coalition), and property owners within 100 feet of the subject site were notified as required.
14. As of this writing, Staff has not received any correspondence in favor or opposition of the proposed Zoning Map Amendment.

APPEAL

If you wish to appeal, you must do so within 15 days of the EPC’s decision or by **January 5, 2026**. The date of the EPC’s decision is not included in this 15-day period. If the 15th day falls on a Saturday, Sunday, or Holiday, the next working day is considered the deadline for filing an appeal.

For more information regarding the appeal process, please refer to the Integrated Development Ordinance (IDO), §14-16-6-4(U) (Appeals). The IDO is available online here: <https://www.cabq.gov/ido>. A non-

OFFICIAL NOTICE OF DECISION

Project # ZMA-2025-00016

December 18, 2025

Page 8 of 8

refundable fee is required to be paid when the appeal is filed. It is not possible to appeal EPC recommendations to the City Council, because a recommendation is not a final decision.

You will receive notification if anyone files an appeal. If the decision is not appealed, you can receive building permits any time after the appeal deadline, provided all conditions of approval associated with the decision and all other applicable regulations have been met.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Megan Jones". The script is cursive and fluid.

for Alan Varela
Planning Director

AV/MRW/MJ/RG

cc:

Consensus Planning, CP@consensusplanning.com

Route 66 West NA, Cherise Quezada, cherguezada@yahoo.com

Route 66 West NA, Paul Fava, paulfava@gmail.com

South West Alliance of Neighborhoods (SWAN Coalition), Jerry Gallegos,
jgallegoswccd@gmail.com

South West Alliance of Neighborhoods (SWAN Coalition), Lorenzo Otero,
housealbchrome@gmail.com

City Legal, acoon@cabq.gov

EPC file