

CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE
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



ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING COMMISSION

NOTICE OF DECISION

Case Number: [ZMA-2026-00010](#)– Zoning Map Amendment (Zone Change)

Hearing Date: 08-20-2026

Applicant: Loretta Chavez

Agent: The Hensley Engineering (THE) Group

Subject Property: Sage Rd. SW, Albuquerque NM, 87121

Case Description: The Hensley Engineering (THE) Group, agent for Loretta Chavez, requests a Zoning Map Amendment from PD to R-1 for all or a portion of Tract 400-A of Bulk Land Plat of Tract 400-A of Tracts allotted from Town of Atrisco Grant, Unit 3, located on Sage Rd south of San Ygnacio Rd SW between Coors Blvd SW and the Amole del Norte Diversion Channel, approximately 6.6 acres. (L-10)

Staff Planner: Catherine Heyne

DECISION

On August 20, 2026, the Environmental Planning Commission (EPC) voted to APPROVE Case # ZMA-2026-00010, a Zoning Map Amendment, based on the following Findings.

FINDINGS

1. This is a request for a Zoning Map Amendment (zone change) for all or a portion of Tract 400-A of Bulk Land Plat of Tract 400-A of Tracts allotted from Town of Atrisco Grant, Unit 3, located on Sage Rd. SW, south of San Ygnacio Rd SW between Coors Blvd. SW and the Amole del Norte Diversion Channel (the “subject site”), containing approximately 6.6-acres. The subject site does not have an assigned street address.

2. The applicant is requesting a zone change from PD (Planned Development Zone District) to R-1 (Residential – Low-Density Zone District) to facilitate future low-density residential development, specifically a single-family subdivision.
3. History/Background:
 - A. The subject site, as well as the adjacent lots to the east, northwest, and west (Amole del Norte Diversion Channel), were annexed by the City in March 2005 (O-04-50/O-2005-20).
 - B. Prior to the IDO, the subject site was zoned R-D (Residential and Related Uses Zone, Developing Area) and was originally bisected north-south by 75th St. SW. This right-of-way was vacated with portions of the Amole del Norte Diversion Channel/Sage Rd. in April 2008 (Project # 1004526, 08DRB-70093).
4. The Albuquerque/Bernalillo County Comprehensive Plan, the Southwest Mesa Community Planning Area (CPA) Assessment Report, and the City of Albuquerque Integrated Development Ordinance (IDO) are incorporated herein by reference and made part of the record for all purposes.
5. The subject site is within an Area of Consistency, and is located within 1,320 feet (1/4 mile) of the Coors Blvd Major Transit Corridor Area, as designated by the Comp Plan.
6. The subject site is within Southwest Mesa Community Planning Area.
7. The subject site is zoned PD. The purpose of the PD zone district is to accommodate small- and medium-scale innovative projects that cannot be accommodated through the use of other zone districts, provided that those projects are consistent with the Albuquerque/Bernalillo County Comprehensive Plan (ABC Comp Plan), as amended, and include standards that would not otherwise be required of the applicant in order to provide significant public, civic, or natural resource benefits [IDO § 14-16-2-6(A)].
8. The request is to change the existing zoning to R-1. The purpose of the R-1 (Residential – Low-Density) Zone District is to provide for neighborhoods of low-density residential development with a variety of housing options. When applied in developed areas, an additional purpose is to require that redevelopment reinforce the established character of the existing neighborhood. Primary land uses include single-family and two-family dwellings, with limited civic and institutional uses to serve the surrounding residential area [IDO § 14-16-2-3(B)].
9. The request furthers GOAL 4.1 CHARACTER: Enhance, protect, and preserve distinct communities from the Comprehensive Plan Chapter 4 - Community Identity:

The request to change the zone from PD to R-1 is intended to facilitate the future development of a single-family residential subdivision on the nearly 6.6-acre subject site. This zone change would support a traditional land development approach, resulting in a long-established suburban form that aligns with the existing character of the surrounding city limits. Therefore,

R-1 zoning could enhance, protect, and preserve residential and community-focused uses within city limits.

10. The request furthers the following applicable goal and policies from the Comprehensive Plan Chapter 5 - Land Use:

A. POLICY 5.3.2 LEAPFROG DEVELOPMENT: Discourage growth in areas without existing infrastructure and public facilities.

The request is in an area with access to adjacent existing infrastructure and public facilities, including roads, utilities, city parks, bus service, etc. The subject site also neighbors properties within the City limits that have been or are in the process of being developed as single-family housing subdivisions.

B. 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 wholly within an Area of Consistency where the request should reinforce the surrounding development character and intensity within the city limits. For example, adjacent R-1 zoning to the north and southwest supports single-family home subdivisions, and the approximate 10-acre MX-T zoned property adjacent to the east, is also being developed with single-family homes. Although allowing residential structures, surrounding properties within the county would cap residential dwellings at 5 per acre. Agriculturally zoned lots are typically limited to one single-family dwelling or manufactured home per lot.

IDO Use and Development Standards, as well as other City regulations, would help ensure that the use, character, and intensity of any future growth and development would conform to the proposed zone district and protect adjacent city-limit properties.

C. POLICY 5.6.3 AREAS OF CONSISTENCY: Protect and enhance the character of existing single-family neighborhoods, areas outside of Centers and Corridors, parks, and Major Public Open Space.

The request would protect and enhance the character of existing single-family neighborhoods, especially those developed under R-1 zoning, as well as areas outside of Centers and Corridors, parks, and Major Public Open Space. This could be achieved through the addition of allowed low-density residential and community amenity uses permitted by R-1 use regulations at the subject site.

11. The request furthers Goal 9.3 Density: Support increased housing density in appropriate places with adequate services and amenities from the Comprehensive Plan Chapter 9 – Housing.

The R-1 zone district would allow for a variety of low-intensity residential uses at the subject site, a location that has adequate services and nearby amenities. This location along Sage Road

could be appropriate for R-1 zoning since adjacent properties within the city limits as well as adjacent R-1 properties in the county to the west, also support residential uses. However, the Southwest Mesa CPA Assessment Report Policy recommendations encourage zone changes that allow intense mixed-use, commercial, or light industrial land uses on undeveloped land as well as affordable homeownership opportunities and multigenerational living arrangements.

12. The request partially furthers POLICY 4.1.2 IDENTITY AND DESIGN: Protect the identity and cohesiveness of neighborhoods by ensuring the appropriate scale and location of development, mix of uses, and character of building design from the Comprehensive Plan Chapter 4 – Community Identity.

The requested zone change could facilitate the development of land uses that could maintain the suburban identity and cohesiveness of adjacent neighborhoods within city limits. The request would reinforce the established suburban identity and cohesiveness of city-based residential neighborhoods by contributing to the appropriate-scale of development and mix of uses although surrounded by a more dispersed, urbanizing unincorporated Bernalillo County. However, since this request is for a zone change, the actual mix of uses and building design cannot be reviewed until a future Site Plan is submitted.

13. The request partially furthers 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 from the Comprehensive Plan Chapter 5 - Land Use.

Although the request is intended to add a single-family housing subdivision to the area, a site plan is not being reviewed at this time and the EPC considers all future land uses made allowable with this zone change to R-1. The zone change could continue the development of a traditional suburban residential pattern that could take advantage of existing infrastructure and public facilities. R-1 zoning could also add to the area's housing supply. However, the addition of more single-family homes would contribute to the current unequal jobs-housing balance on the westside and associated necessity to commute.

14. The request partially furthers one goal and one policy from the Comprehensive Plan Chapter 9 - Housing:

- A. GOAL 9.1 SUPPLY: Ensure a sufficient supply and range of high-quality housing types that meet current and future needs at a variety of price levels to ensure more balanced housing options.

The request could facilitate the addition of low-density housing that could help meet current and future needs. R-1 housing options range from single-family dwellings to cluster and cottage development to duplex, town houses, and multi-family dwellings. A variety of housing types could lead to a variety of price levels to ensure more balanced housing options, although the intent of this zone change is to develop single-family homes in a subdivision setting. However, since this request is for a zone change and not a Site Plan review, the quality and housing supply cannot be evaluated in terms of price levels or

balanced housing options. Also, the proposed zone change could result in the construction of community-focused amenities and not housing.

- B. **POLICY 9.2.1 COMPATIBILITY:** Encourage housing development that enhances neighborhood character, maintains compatibility with surrounding land uses, and responds to its development context – i.e., urban, suburban, or rural – with appropriate densities, site design, and relationship to the street

The R-1 zone district allows for a variety of low-intensity residential uses that could include higher density living options. Although adding housing could enhance the neighborhood character, maintain compatibility with surrounding land uses; and respond to its development context with appropriate densities, site design, and relationship to the street, a site plan is not a part of this request, and therefore, compatibility cannot be analyzed. Also, the proposed zone change could result in the construction of community-focused amenities and not housing.

15. 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 applicant's policy-based response justifies how the proposed zone district furthers a preponderance of applicable goals and policies. The application demonstrates that the proposed R-1 zone district (1) could add needed dwelling units or community-focused amenities; (2) would be consistent in scale and density with surrounding single-family subdivisions within city limits; (3) has access to existing infrastructure, services, and amenities; (4) would not add harmful uses to the area; and (5) generally aligns with the objectives for designated Developing Urban Areas of the neighboring unincorporated Bernalillo County. As such, the proposed zone change is consistent with the health, safety, and general welfare of the City and does not present any conflicts with the Comprehensive Plan, as amended.

Applicable citations: Goal 4.1-Character; Policy 5.3.2-Leapfrog Development, Goal 5.6-City Development Areas, Policy 5.6.3-Areas of Consistency; Goal 9.3-Density.

Partially-Applicable citations: Policy 4.1.2-Identity and Design; Goal 5.3-Efficient Development Pattern; Goal 9.1-Supply, Policy 9.2.1-Compatibility.

Inapplicable citations: Goal 7.6-Context-Sensitive Infrastructure, Policy 7.6.2-Transportation Infrastructure; Goal 9.2-Sustainable Design.

B. 6-7(G)(3)(b): If the subject property is located partially or completely in an Area of Consistency (as shown in the ABC Comp Plan, as amended), the applicant has demonstrated that the new zone would clearly reinforce or strengthen the established character of the surrounding Area of Consistency and would not permit development that is significantly different from that character. The applicant must also demonstrate that the existing zoning is inappropriate because it meets any of the following criteria:

1. There was typographical or clerical error when the existing zone district was applied to the property.
2. There has been a significant change in neighborhood or community conditions affecting the site.
3. A different zone district is more advantageous to the community as articulated by the ABC Comp Plan, as amended (including implementation of patterns of land use, development density and intensity, and connectivity), and other applicable adopted City plan(s).

The applicant has demonstrated through their justification letter and analysis of Comp Plan goals and policies that the new zone would clearly reinforce and strengthen the established character of the surrounding Area of Consistency within the city limits, and would not permit development that is significantly different from that character.

The existing zoning could be inappropriate because there have been significant changes in neighborhood and community conditions that affect the site per Criterion 2. Namely, in 2005, the subject site was annexed by the City, and then as recently as 2017 with the adoption of the IDO, the subject site was designated as an Area of Consistency. Areas of Consistency are established as stable, fully developed parts of the city where new development must respect the existing scale, character, and intensity of the existing built environment, which in this case, the surrounding development within the city limits consist largely of single-family suburban development in R-1 zoning. However, if surrounding county lands are included in the analysis, less than approximately 50% of the adjacent lots are developed with primary buildings. Additionally, the Southwest Mesa CPA Assessment Report Policy recommendations encourage zone changes that allow intense mixed-use, commercial, or light industrial land uses on vacant land.

The proposed R-1 zone district could be more advantageous to the community with thoughtful, context-driven development (Criterion 3). Also, future R-1 development would align with current patterns of land use, development density, and intensity within the city limits.

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.
3. A different zone district is more advantageous to the community as articulated by the ABC Comp Plan, as amended (including implementation of patterns of land use, development density and intensity, and connectivity), and other applicable adopted City plan(s).

The subject site is not located in an Area of Change, but is completely located in an Area of Consistency, as designated by the Comp Plan.

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

The subject site is surrounded by R-1 and MX-T zone districts, as well as agricultural and residential uses within unincorporated Bernalillo County. This request does not include permissive uses that would be harmful to adjacent property, and instead focuses strictly on residential development and associated community uses. Conversely, allowable uses and development standards for the PD zone district can be negotiated from any of those listed in Table 4-2-1: Allowable Uses, and are applied on a case-by-case basis.

Future development would be required to meet applicable IDO Use-specific standards (IDO § 14-16-4-3) as well as Development Standards (e.g., Dimensional Standards (IDO § 14-16-5-1), Landscape Buffering and Screening (IDO § 14-16-5-6), Neighborhood Edges (IDO § 14-16-5-9)], DPM standards, and any other applicable City regulation.

- 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 any of the following criteria:
1. Have adequate capacity to serve the development made possible by the change of zone.
 2. Will have adequate capacity based on improvements for which the City has already approved and budgeted capital funds during the next calendar year.
 3. Will have adequate capacity when the applicant fulfills its obligations under the IDO, the DPM, and/or an Infrastructure Improvements Agreement (IIA).
 4. Will have adequate capacity when the City and the applicant have fulfilled their respective obligations under a City approved Development Agreement between the City and the applicant.

This request meets Criterion 3. The subject site should have adequate capacity when the applicant fulfills its obligations under the IDO, the DPM, and/or an Infrastructure Improvements Agreement (IIA).

- 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.

Although the subject site is located along the Major Collector Sage Rd SW, the applicant's justification is not completely based on the subject site's location; rather, the applicant has adequately demonstrated that the request furthers and does not conflict with a preponderance of applicable Comp Plan goals. Furthermore, the applicant is proposing a zone change that is consistent with the adjacent properties within the city limits, which could support a future development of single-family housing.

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

While economic considerations factor in to a decision to develop, the applicant's justification is not completely or predominantly based upon the cost of land or economic considerations. Rather, the applicant's request furthers a preponderance of applicable Comprehensive Plan Goals and Policies and does not conflict with them, including the fact that the proposed R-1 zone district would restrict development to development that aligns with adjacent residential uses.

- H. 6-7(G)(3)(h): The Zoning Map Amendment 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 requested zoning will clearly facilitate implementation of the ABC Comp Plan, as amended, and at least 1 of the following applies:

1. The subject property is different from surrounding land because it can function as a transition between adjacent zone districts.
2. The subject property 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 subject property makes it unsuitable for the uses allowed in any adjacent zone district.

The Zoning Map Amendment does not apply a zone district different from surrounding zone districts. Namely, the subject site is adjacent to lots designated as R-1 zone districts. Furthermore, the existing MX-T zoning adjacent to the east support a subdivision of single-family homes. Therefore, R-1 land uses are already established in the nearby surroundings. The applicant has demonstrated that the request would further the implementation of applicable Comp Plan goals and policies.

16. A Zoning Map Amendment does not require a Traffic Scoping Form. Traffic will be reviewed during Site Plan for appropriate vehicle and pedestrian access, infrastructure improvements, and any necessary mitigations.
17. According to the Office of Neighborhood Coordination (ONC), the subject site is within 660-feet of the South West Alliance of Neighbors and Stinson Tower NA, which were notified as required.
18. Property owners within 100 feet of the subject site were notified as required.
19. Comments from 13 different agencies were received, and no agency opposes the request. Although no response requires further action at this time, many give direction for future development.
20. The applicant was not required to offer a tribal meeting as part of a pre-submittal requirement for a Site Plan-EPC. Staff referred the applications for Agency Comment to Indian Nations, Tribes, or Pueblos and Tribal Representatives, and no comment as an Agency was received.

APPEAL

If you wish to appeal, you must do so within 15 days of the EPC's decision or by **September 4, 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). A non-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 notice 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,



for Alan Varela
Planning Director

AV/MJ/CH

cc: Ron Hensley, Ron@THEgroup.cc
Jerry Gallegos, jgallegoswccd@gmail.com
Lorenzo Otero, housealbchrome@gmail.com
Stinson Tower NA, stnapres@outlook.com;
Bruce Rizzieri, rizzierinm@gmail.com
Emilio Chavez, epchavez49@gmail.com
Legal, dking@cabq.gov
Legal, acoon@cabq.gov
EPC file