

Bolivar, Silvia A.

From: Alison Osborn <aliki3201@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, August 16, 2021 3:24 PM
To: Bolivar, Silvia A.
Cc: devhelp@canq.gov
Subject: Apartment Development on Eagle Ranch

Hello, I'm writing because I oppose the building of more apartments on Eagle Ranch, next to CHUZE fitness.

This seems like such a bad idea to put these apartments in this location!

-It's a habitat for coyotes and will destroy their homes.

- People around the area paid extra money for homes that face the mountain because of the amazing views. Apartments will block these great Mountain Views.

- Traffic is already a big issue around this area and will be even worse adding hundreds of additional people to this location. It will be almost impossible to make a left turn onto Eagle Ranch from Agate Hills and be dangerous for those living on both sides of the street.

- There are already so many apartments on Eagle Ranch. Hundreds right next door and even more hundreds a few blocks away.

- Where will hundreds of people park? Will they spill into other neighborhoods just to park?

I feel this is a very bad use of this land and they should not be allowed to proceed with apartments at this location.

Thank you,

Alison Osborn
Cactus Hills PI NW

Bolivar, Silvia A.

From: Bernadette Yazzie <bmyfire@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 12, 2021 8:27 PM
To: Bolivar, Silvia A.; Planning Dev Help
Subject: PR-2021-005442 Major Amendment for Plaza at Paseo Del Norte/Sedona west apartments

I would like to express my opposition to this proposed development. I have so many concerns with this proposal. From compromising landscape/views, traffic, the amount of people and buildings etc. I moved here because of the great neighborhood feel and I feel it slipping away. We have so many apartments surrounding this area. I would love to see a market, coffee shop, anything like that to benefit the neighborhood. I actually welcome development, this is just not the right fit for the area. Please consider this as if it was your home. Thank you

Sent from my iPhone

Bolivar, Silvia A.

From: Carolyn Trueba <TRUEBA8159@msn.com>
Sent: Monday, August 16, 2021 4:31 PM
To: Bolivar, Silvia A.; Planning Dev Help
Cc: Borrego, Cynthia D.; Vigil, Susan P.
Subject: EPC August 19th hearing

I have recently been made aware that there is an EPC hearing scheduled for August 19th where city officials will make their decision to approve or deny the request to amend the existing office/commercial space site plan for the vacant lot directly south of Chuze Fitness gym on Eagle Ranch Road in order to build a 218 unit apartment complex. I live in the Cactus Hills subdivision across the street from the Chuze Fitness center and this site, and I am expressing my alarm and concern that this high-density development will increase traffic on an already overburdened Eagle Ranch Road .

I have lived in this location for only two years, but have seen increasing traffic and congestion. Every week I see either an accident on this span of road or a near miss; both the intersections at Irving and Eagle Ranch, and also Paradise and Eagle Ranch, are known for people continuing through the light after the light has turned red. In the past week I have seen two bad accidents, one being an overturned car in the street. We travel very carefully now through these two intersections with the realization that we could be next. The thought of increased traffic would be a further nightmare, and the lives injured or lost would undoubtedly increase.

I understand that there has been no traffic study to date and no plan to mitigate the increased traffic and congestion. This section of Eagle Ranch Road is approximately half a mile south of Costco and Cottonwood Mall. The Chuze Fitness gym area also backs up to a large retail mall with a Target and many stores. It is a popular route for many families traveling to these retail areas and will always have more congestion than most streets. It also currently hosts two large apartment complexes between Irving and Paradise, not to mention the constant traffic in and out of the Chuze Fitness gym. The traffic is high volume at all times of day and evening.

I believe the acreage in question should be developed for a purpose that does not greatly increase the likelihood of more traffic accidents and should not be allowed to proceed. Please vote no on this amendment.

Thank you,
Carolyn A. Trueba

Bolivar, Silvia A.

From: Jeanette Antoine <dirtracknm@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 16, 2021 9:30 AM
To: Planning Dev Help; Bolivar, Silvia A.
Subject: Sedona West Apartment Development

To whom it may concern,

I am writing in regards to the proposed development of the Sedona West Apartment Complex off Eagle Ranch Road. I do not live in the neighborhood, but I do have relatives that live off Agate Hills and I am there approximately 3 to 4 times a week. After reading flyers/letters that were left on my family's door and becoming involved with the group of neighbors that were taking part in the negotiations with the developer, I was able to attend the 2nd meeting that took place on Thursday July 8th. My first thought after seeing the diagram Jay Hill shared at this meeting was "the beautiful views of the Sandias and City skyline would be lost." I talked about the amazing fireworks show that we were able to watch on the 4th that was taking place all along the NE side of Albuquerque, and how that would no longer be possible. Looking at the initial drawings and revisions reminds me of the motels that littered the streets surrounding Disneyland where I grew up. I have yet to see anything showing any creativity or willingness to design the complex to fit into the surrounding environment. I have not seen anything showing landscaping, just buildings that look like cement blocks. To read that the first proposal for the site was an office complex makes sense to me now.

I also asked about a traffic study and was quite surprised one had not been conducted. After several requests and promises made, no traffic study has been produced. When I am exiting from Agate Hills onto Eagle Ranch, it is close to impossible to make a left (northbound) onto Eagle Ranch and I need to make a right and make a u-turn at the next turnout. I live in a complex off Montgomery that has the exact set up. A turnout for those making a left from Eagle Ranch onto Agate Hills and NO MIDDLE LANE for the cars making a left onto Eagle Ranch from Agate Hills. This will be compounded by the increase in cars trying to make that left from the proposed apartment complex. The fact that we have no traffic study leads me to believe the developers know what a study will show.

Several of the neighbors have mentioned the desire to put a Trader Joe's or something similar in that spot. A few commercial businesses would be welcome. The impact on the schools that are already at/over capacity is also a concern.

I hope the Board members will hear the valid concerns of the neighbors in this community and those of us who may not live there, but can see the negative impact this project will have on the surrounding neighborhood(s).

Sincerely,
Jeanette Antoine

Sent from [Outlook](#)

Bolivar, Silvia A.

From: Jeanne Ronquillo <jmmkron@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, August 15, 2021 1:13 PM
To: Bolivar, Silvia A.
Subject: Eagle Ranch apartments

> Good afternoon,

>

> As a 25 year resident of Congress Heights, address: 4515 Yucca Hills Ct 87114, I am vehemently opposed to the apartment complex on Eagle Ranch. There is already too much traffic on Benton road and limited parking for the apartment complex that is already on Eagle Ranch. As I understand it, there has been no traffic study or consideration of where the overflow parking will take place.

>

> Also, it concerns me about the crime increase that will occur with rental properties such as apartment complexes. We have had 2 drive by shootings in my neighborhood since October of 2020. We do not need anymore transient residents with the uptake of potential violent crime.

>

> Thank you for your consideration and please, do not built the
> apartments, Jeanne L Ronquillo

Bolivar, Silvia A.

From: Karla Coronel <kcoronel09@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, August 13, 2021 1:54 PM
To: Bolivar, Silvia A.; Planning Dev Help
Subject: PR-2021-005442 Major Amendment for Plaza at Paseo Del Norte/Sedona West Apartment

Good afternoon Silvia,

I am writing to you today to voice my objection and concerns for the Sedona West Apartments on Eagle Ranch Road.

The location is next to two major intersections, Coors and Paseo which brings a lot of thru traffic to the area, especially around rush hour traffic in the mornings and the late afternoon. Apart from the thru traffic, there are already three apartment complexes along Eagle Ranch Rd. Eagle Ranch Apartments has a total of 432 units, West Park Apartments has 217 units and The Aspens has 548 units. Sedona West Apartments is adding an additional 218 units, which is a ridiculous number of units for such a small space and especially considering that it will only have 10 buildings meaning each building will have about 20 units. The increase in car traffic will bring HUGE traffic problems for the city. There have been no proposed options to help mitigate the traffic from the developers.

Following up on the traffic, Albuquerque Public Schools has a bus stop right on Eagle Ranch across the street from where the entrance to these apartments is going to be located. This is very dangerous for the kids in our community. We work very hard to make this community family friendly and kid safe.

Also, our school systems in the area are already overcrowded. We cannot continue to build more housing in the area when our schools are overcrowded.

As previously mentioned, there are already a total of 1,197 apartment units on Eagle Ranch. Parking is a problem in these apartments, especially Eagle Ranch Apartments which floods over to the empty lot and to the other side of the complex on Irving Blvd. By taking away the road residents use to park, they will flood into our neighborhoods and that is a safety concern for the residents. In addition, the buildings overlooking our backyards is an even bigger threat to our security. Apartments have high turnover rates and I don't appreciate the fact that strangers will be looking into my backyard.

Please let me know if there's any further information you need from me.

Thank you,

Karla Coronel

Bolivar, Silvia A.

From: Mindy Allison <mindy.allison@hotmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, August 14, 2021 12:49 PM
To: That Girl
Cc: Sharon Munson; Bluejay9393@gmail.com; Hiba.alkhafaji@gmail.com; R E; RunRachael1275@aol.com; SamASandoval@comcast.net; aboard111@gmail.com; aubrey.eber@icloud.com; bmyfire@gmail.com; cgriego24@gmail.com; dianexline@gmail.com; dirttracknm@hotmail.com; ekhaley@comcast.net; halfayyadh@gmail.com; jagreene586@gmail.com; jantoin@arcaspirit.org; kcoronel09@gmail.com; maxlovestater@gmail.com; muhanned_eng76@yahoo.com; mwells4519@gmail.com; nelsoncarol7654@gmail.com; nmpexus@yahoo.com; Bolivar, Silvia A.; samralphroxy@yahoo.com; ta_a@msn.com
Subject: Re: Project: EPC PR-2021-005442 Major Amendment to Site Plan

Thank u Sharon - amen!!! I am going to try my best to attend this hearing, however I work during the day as well. I agree, this needs to be held when the working people can attend. I find that concerning as well. Hopefully written feedback will count towards the verbal objections. Please neighbors DO NOT hesitate to email ur concerns even if attending the meeting. Thank you everyone who has done so! This is our chance to save the neighborhood. After that, it is out of our hands!

Sent from my iPhone

On Aug 14, 2021, at 12:13 PM, That Girl <tinathtgrl@gmail.com> wrote:

I also did not get an invitation to the meeting this Thursday. Seems they weed people out randomly. Very concerning!

I will be on the call this week and will be voicing some of the same concerns you have Sharon.

Thanks for your input

Tina Ritt
Benton St

On Sat, Aug 14, 2021 at 12:02 PM Sharon Munson <munsoncs@aol.com> wrote:

I am a neighbor living right across the street from this proposed high-density apartment complex and have negotiated in good faith in 4 different meetings, along with many many other concerned neighbors over the last two months. I was concerned that I DID NOT receive an official invitation to the meeting on Thursday August 19, 2021, which is the deciding meeting as to whether this change in the existing zoning will or will not be permitted. I am also more than concerned that this meeting is happening on a work day . . . Thursday, August 19th at 8:40 in the morning. I am back at school because I am a teacher, and I know from previous meetings that this one is liable to start late and run long.

My issue with this plan change is that the obvious concerns of the many many neighbors who have attended over the summer and expressed worry over the 218 unit (higher density than ANY of the FIVE apartment complexes in the neighborhood already) Complex and the impact it will have on the traffic and off-site parking will NOT be able to attend and express their opposition to requested changes to

the existing plan for that 7 acre lot. We are doing the math, 300 to 500 people on a 7 acre lot with 300 parking spaces . . . that will not be enough and we are the closest neighborhood likely to see overflow parking on our streets. We were told the developer hired a traffic engineer but no change to the density or parking space allotment was made in the plans to present to neighbors to mitigate this problem. We were told that there would be a traffic study done because our neighborhood empties directly onto Eagle Ranch Road in the exact same place one of the two Eagle Ranch exits to the new complex would also exit. That would equate to approximately 300 to 500 people exiting from across Eagle Ranch at the same times in the mornings and evenings and throughout the day. We expressed concerns over the bus stops, walking traffic, and already crowded and unsafe dangers/accidents already happening at the busy intersections all around us (check the city data on this!!!)

Neighbors were "tasked" to come up with solutions to our own concerns, and we rose to that occasion. Neighbors did their homework and provided visuals and data to support our possible solutions to the some of the privacy and view issues that were very concerning to us. I personally felt that the solutions to these problems should have been the responsibility of the developer, since he is the one requesting the changes to the original site plan. Even given this approach, the neighbors who attended expressed over and over their appreciation for the changes in the plans to protect privacy, views, and walkability in our neighborhood BUT the density, parking spaces, and impact on a neighborhood already inundated with apartment complexes of considerably LOWER densities were NOT addressed. This says nothing about the impact to neighborhood schools already designated as Title 1 due to poverty levels in the school zone, a change that has occurred over the last 10 years because of the influx of apartment complexes. Our neighborhood school dropped from a Grade A to a D in the last 10 years. This does not make it attractive to buyers we hope to attract to our neighborhoods as we, for whatever reason, need to sell our homes. We are also very concerned about overcrowding in our schools because this has a direct impact on the quality of the education of our children at all levels. Speaking of traffic safety, we have three schools buses (separate stops and times for Elementary, Middle, and High school--some handicap equipped buses as well) minimum picking up children at four apartment complexes on Eagle Ranch Road alone.

I appreciate that the facilitators worked to manage a negotiation/discussion and address neighborhood concerns. But the fact remains that the major objections to this project were NOT addressed. And the overall feeling was that the intention was to pass this along to the NEXT STEP to solve the density and traffic problems we introduced. IF this change is approved, there is nothing in place to guarantee the neighbors that any of these concerns will be addressed in any real or serious way because the existing site plan/changes will have already been given a "yes." For that reason, good sense says that this is time and place to do the OBJECTING. I OBJECT to the changes requested.

As I said, I am a teacher . . . working very hard right now to educate our children (wearing masks and doing our best with it to keep children safe!) and will not be able to attend this meeting. Meetings of this magnitude and impact should be held when the working people of this neighborhood can actually attend and be heard. I am voicing my STRONG OBJECTION to this change being permitted/approved.

Sharon Munson

Bolivar, Silvia A.

From: Rachael Eberhardt <RunRachael1275@aol.com>
Sent: Sunday, August 15, 2021 3:06 PM
To: Bolivar, Silvia A.
Cc: Jay Hill
Subject: Eagle Ranch Development

Hello,

This is Rachael Eberhardt, a resident on Agate Hills Rd NW, across from the proposed Eagle Ranch apartment development. I will be at work on Thursday during the meeting, so I'd like to voice my feelings about the development now.

First, Eagle Ranch is a highly busy road. I work as an instructor at Chuze fitness across the street. I often walk to work, but it's sometimes dicey with the amount of traffic. If there was more, it would be difficult for families to commute by both car and foot. Accidents would likely increase, as would drive times for local residents.

Second, we just bought our home last February. A large factor in the decision to purchase this home was the view of the bosque and the mountains. If these apartments are built, even with the recently proposed adjustment, the bosque would be completely blocked, and there would only be a partial Mountain View. This would both decrease the value of our home and decrease the quality of life we enjoy as we spend time in our back yard.

Third, digging into the land in that empty lot would disrupt the rodents and other animals who live there, sending them into our neighborhood and likely requiring many residents to be forced to hire exterminators.

Fourth, we only have one small park in our neighborhood; we enjoy taking our dogs there regularly. However, increased numbers of residents nearby would mean overcrowding in the park and potential unlawful behavior at night, as it's the only outside gathering spot nearby.

Finally, that spot would be much better suited for retail space. The economic impact of Covid is slowly dissipating and businesses are beginning to grow. Restaurants and smaller shops would draw the local residents who would enjoy the opportunity to walk to local restaurants and shops.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak about this topic.

- Rachael Eberhardt

Bolivar, Silvia A.

From: R E <eklerr@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, August 15, 2021 11:22 AM
To: Bolivar, Silvia A.; Planning Dev Help
Subject: PR-2021-005442 Amendment for Plaza at Paseo Del Norte - Sedona West Apartments

Aug 15, 2021

Honorable Commissioners

I am a resident in the close vicinity of this proposed development of an apartment complex.

I am writing to express my opposition to the amendment which revises the site plan to accommodate the construction of a complex consisting of 218 densely packed units.

My objection considers that such unit density is far and away greater than the density of apartment complexes in the vicinity. Also considered is that the vicinity already has a large number of multi unit apartments. The proposed project would surge multi unit apartment concentration to an even higher level of saturation.

From my perspective, the immediate detriment would appear as the insertion of hundreds of motor vehicles into the intersection of Eagle Ranch and Agate hills. That intersection is already difficult and hazardous. It has been proposed that the traffic concern could be mitigated by traffic control device such as four way stop. That idea causes the imposition or intrusion into the larger community of Eagle Ranch motorists who reasonably expect a boulevard sort of flow rather than the frustration (and pollution) of stop and go traffic.

Also of consideration is that there currently exists a nice viewscape from houses bounded by Eagle Ranch as well as from the intersection of Agate Hills and Eagle Ranch. The viewscape at the intersection is something that is enjoyed by neighborhood residents regardless of having a view lot bounded by Eagle Ranch. The developer has proposed a mitigation to the viewscape issue but it falls short.

The adjacent complex, Eagle Ranch Apartments, is a bona fide upscale development. Its buildings surround grassy courtyards. It is nice there.

Sedona West, as portrayed by its site plan, does not compare favorably to that. The Sedona West site plan portrays an optimization for unit density hence revenue rather than any concern for an aesthetic contribution to a sense of comfort. Sedona West is going to be a reduced quality for living at a higher price than their immediate neighboring apartment complex.

That is not a positive influence.

I reiterate my objection to the proposed amending of the site plan.

Sincerely

Bob Ekler
9509 Benton st NW
Albuquerque -- 87114

Bolivar, Silvia A.

From: Robin E. James <rej@modrall.com>
Sent: Monday, August 16, 2021 4:34 PM
To: Bolivar, Silvia A.
Cc: Lehner, Catalina L.; Meg L. Meister
Subject: Objections to Project #PR-2021-005442 (Sedona West Apartments), Proposed Major Amendment to Site Plan

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Please do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and are expecting this message and know the content is safe.

Silvia,

Below are written objections with regard to the above referenced matter. Please confirm receipt of this email at your earliest convenience. Thank you.

We are submitting the following objections on behalf of Columbus Pacific (“Columbus”), owner of the parcel adjacent to the subject parcel located at Eagle Ranch Road NW, between Paradise Boulevard NW and Irving Boulevard NW (the “Subject Parcel”), and party to the original site plan to which amendment is being sought. Columbus’s objections are as follows:

1. Notice. Columbus did not receive proper notice of the initial hearing (or current hearing) on this matter as required by the Integrated Development Ordinance (IDO). Columbus also did not receive notice of the facilitated meetings or pre-neighborhood meetings on this matter. *Columbus objects to any changes made prior to receiving proper notice as required under the IDO and is hereby reserving the right to make such claim, despite the fact that Columbus is submitting additional objections at this time.*
2. Site Plan. Columbus is a party to the original site plan sought to be amended. Although Columbus’s specific tract is not being changed by this proposed amendment, the access road that runs through the site is being altered. Columbus relied on the original site plan as drafted in pursuing its development. Specifically, Columbus relied on the two-way access road running from Eagle Ranch Road to its parcel as shown on the current site plan (the “Access Road”) and has vested rights in this plan. Columbus also relied on the grading and drainage plan for the entire site plan area, along with the sewage and fire safety plans in place. Columbus has vested rights in all such prior approvals and agreements for the entire site plan area. *Columbus has not given consent to change the site plan and hereby objects to any changes without its prior consent.*
3. Vehicular Access. As stated in the Supplemental Staff Report on this matter, the original proposed new site plan for the Subject Parcel showed that the Access Road was to be closed. The report notes that the proposed site plan has been amended to leave the Access Road open, but notes that parking provided along the western boundary could still conflict with access. While the report references the western boundary of the Subject Parcel, Columbus is concerned with the parking now shown along the Access Road on the southern portion of the Subject Parcel. Columbus believes that this could affect access to its property. *Columbus objects to the amended site plan as currently drafted with parking along the Access Road and to any changes to the Access Road that would in any way affect or change the two-way vehicular access to its shopping center.*
4. Technical Objections (Infrastructure). *Columbus objects to any technical findings or recommendations by the EPC that would have any effect on Columbus’s parcel or change Columbus’s parcel in any way and further requests specific conditions to approval stating that that no changes to or approvals for the Subject Parcel are to affect or change Columbus’s parcel in any way.* Columbus also makes the following specific technical objections and requests for conditions to approval:

- a. Drainage. As noted in the Supplemental Staff Report, the new project on the Subject Parcel will result in an increase in developed storm water runoff generated due to the new impervious areas. The Supplemental Staff Report goes on to state the following: “Due to the general slope of the site from west to east, and coordination compromises to the site development with the neighboring property owners, the site as fully developed will not be able to include ponding improvements necessary to comply with the City of Albuquerque DPM and Current Stormwater Quality Ordinance Requirements to capture and treat the 0.42 inch storm event generated by the site. Calculations included in the Conceptual Grading Plan (CG-101) demonstrate that the required stormwater quality volume generated by the developed site to be 8,510 CF, as such, a Variance is requested for the developer to utilize the alternative ‘payment-in-lieu’ option noted in the City of Albuquerque DPM Section 6-12(C)(1), to be coordinated with the City Hydrology Engineer. The findings for the Grading and Drainage Plan [will] be discussed at DRB.” *Columbus objects to the amendment to the site plan to the extent that the drainage from the Subject Parcel will affect or change its parcel in any way. Columbus also objects to any variance granted for the Subject Parcel, any arrangement for the payment-in-lieu option noted above, and any other changes to or approvals for the Subject Parcel that would in any way affect or change Columbus’s parcel in any way. Columbus specifically requests that the EPC require as a condition to the DRB approval that any drainage, including any granted variance or other plan, not affect or change Columbus’s parcel in any way.*
 - b. Transportation. The Supplemental Staff Report states the following: “the DRB shall fully consider the transportation issues in the vicinity of the subject site including, but not limited to, traffic generated by the proposed development, pedestrian safety, vehicular circulation, and access, and that mitigation measures to improve safety and walkability be implemented in coordination with the City Engineer.” *Columbus objects to the amendment to the site plan to the extent that access to its parcel will be affected or changed in any way and requests that the EPC require as a condition to the DRB approval that Columbus’s access not be affected or changed.*
 - c. Paved Trail. As noted in the Supplemental Staff Report, there is a proposed paved trail that would border the Subject Parcel. This also borders Columbus’s property. The staff report states that “an improved asphalt multi-purpose trail with an access easement for City maintenance should be provided. Infrastructure requirements can be finalized by the DRB.” *Columbus supports this condition to approval and objects to any change that would eliminate this requirement.*
 - d. Fire Plan. The original Staff Report states that no information has been shown with regard to a fire plan. The amended site plan originally submitted in this matter cut off access to the fire hydrant located on the Access Road. *Columbus objects to the amendment to the site plan to the extent that fire access and safety for its parcel will be affected or changed in any way and requests that the EPC require as a condition to the DRB approval that fire access and safety for Columbus’s parcel not be affected or changed.*
 - e. Sewer System and Other Utilities. The current site plan did not contemplate a residential apartment complex. *Columbus objects to the amendment to the site plan to the extent that the current sewer system or other utilities will be affected or changed in any way and requests that the EPC require as a condition to the DRB approval that any changes cannot affect or change Columbus’s parcel in any way. Columbus also objects to the EPC approving the amendment to the site plan without any of the above requested conditions included.*
5. Findings. At this time, Columbus’s understanding is that the Access Road is going to remain open to two-way traffic. This is integral to the entire development and original goals of the larger development that makes up the current site plan to which amendment is being sought. Because the original amended site plan submitted for the Subject Parcel showed that the Access Road was to be closed, many of the findings in the original Staff Report conflict with the overall goals and policies stated therein. *Columbus hereby objects to the portions of the Supplemental Staff Report that indicate that certain goals and policies with regard to interconnectivity, access, and walkability will be met, unless it is made clear that the reason these goal and policies are being*

met is due to the Access Road being left open to two-way traffic. These goals and policies include, but are not limited to the following:

- a. Subpolicy 5.1.1(a): create walkable places that provide opportunities to live, work, learn, shop and play.
- b. Subpolicy 5.1.1(h): encourage all new development, especially in designated Centers and Corridors, to address transit connections, linkages, and opportunities within the proposed development.
- c. Policy 5.1.6 – Activity Centers: foster mixed-use centers of activity with a range of services and amenities that support healthy lifestyles and meet the needs of nearby residents and businesses.
- d. Subpolicy 5.1.6(a): incorporate a compatible mix of commercial and residential uses with a range of higher-density housing types.
- e. Goal 5.2 – Complete Communities: foster communities where residents can live, work, learn, shop and play together.
- f. Goal 5.2.1 – Land Uses: create healthy, sustainable, and distinct communities with a mix of uses that are conveniently accessible from surrounding neighborhoods.
- g. Goal 5.3 – Efficient Development Patterns: promote development patterns that maximize the utility of existing infrastructure and public facilities and the efficient use of land to support the public good.

Columbus also requests that as a condition to EPC approval, a specific finding be entered that the Access Road is an integral part of the Subject Parcel and surrounding areas, including the entire area that is subject to the original site plan, and that the Access Road must be left open. Columbus objects to the EPC approving the amendment to the site plan without this finding.



Robin James

Associate Attorney | Modrall Sperring | <https://ddec1-0-en-ctp.trendmicro.com:443/wis/clicktime/v1/query?url=www.modrall.com&umid=78c91b7b-2295-4f83-bf3f-0a342f451628&auth=307405480ca3e49a8b1deb4e49ca5cd244e7e096-3b46a370614b4b870ba07a05265e12b764362476>

P.O. Box 2168 | Albuquerque, NM 87103-2168

500 4th St. NW, Ste. 1000 | Albuquerque, NM 87102

D: 505.848.1864 | O: 505.848.1800 | C: 505.280.1405

Bolivar, Silvia A.

From: Sharon Munson <munsoncs@aol.com>
Sent: Saturday, August 14, 2021 12:02 PM
To: Bolivar, Silvia A.
Cc: Bluejay9393@gmail.com; bmyfire@gmail.com; ekhaley@comcast.net; halfayyadh@gmail.com; jantoin@arcaspirit.org; jagreene586@gmail.com; kcoronel09@gmail.com; mindy.allison@hotmail.com; aboard111@gmail.com; Sharon Munson; cgriego24@gmail.com; muhanned_eng76@yahoo.com; dirttracknm@hotmail.com; nelsoncarol7654@gmail.com; dianexline@gmail.com; ta_a@msn.com; samralphroxy@yahoo.com; maxlovestater@gmail.com; RunRachael1275@aol.com; tinathtgrl@gmail.com; aubrey.eber@icloud.com; SamASandoval@comcast.net; nmplexus@yahoo.com; Hiba.alkhafaji@gmail.com; mwells4519@gmail.com
Subject: Project: EPC PR-2021-005442 Major Amendment to Site Plan

I am a neighbor living right across the street from this proposed high-density apartment complex and have negotiated in good faith in 4 different meetings, along with many many other concerned neighbors over the last two months. I was concerned that I DID NOT receive an official invitation to the meeting on Thursday August 19, 2021, which is the deciding meeting as to whether this change in the existing zoning will or will not be permitted. I am also more than concerned that this meeting is happening on a work day . . . Thursday, August 19th at 8:40 in the morning. I am back at school because I am a teacher, and I know from previous meetings that this one is liable to start late and run long.

My issue with this plan change is that the obvious concerns of the many many neighbors who have attended over the summer and expressed worry over the 218 unit (higher density than ANY of the FIVE apartment complexes in the neighborhood already) Complex and the impact it will have on the traffic and off-site parking will NOT be able to attend and express their opposition to requested changes to the existing plan for that 7 acre lot. We are doing the math, 300 to 500 people on a 7 acre lot with 300 parking spaces . . . that will not be enough and we are the closest neighborhood likely to see overflow parking on our streets. We were told the developer hired a traffic engineer but no change to the density or parking space allotment was made in the plans to present to neighbors to mitigate this problem. We were told that there would be a traffic study done because our neighborhood empties directly onto Eagle Ranch Road in the exact same place one of the two Eagle Ranch exits to the new complex would also exit. That would equate to approximately 300 to 500 people exiting from across Eagle Ranch at the same times in the mornings and evenings and throughout the day. We expressed concerns over the bus stops, walking traffic, and already crowded and unsafe dangers/accidents already happening at the busy intersections all around us (check the city data on this!!!)

Neighbors were "tasked" to come up with solutions to our own concerns, and we rose to that occasion. Neighbors did their homework and provided visuals and data to support our possible solutions to the some of the privacy and view issues that were very concerning to us. I personally felt that the solutions to these problems should have been the responsibility of the developer, since he is the one requesting the changes to the original site plan. Even given this approach, the neighbors who attended expressed over and over their appreciation for the changes in the plans to protect privacy, views, and walkability in our neighborhood BUT the density, parking spaces, and impact on a neighborhood already inundated with apartment complexes of considerably LOWER densities were NOT addressed. This says nothing about the impact to neighborhood schools already designated as Title 1 due to poverty levels in the school zone, a change that has occurred over the last 10 years because of the influx of apartment complexes. Our neighborhood school dropped from a Grade A to a D in the last 10 years. This does not make it attractive to buyers we hope to attract to our neighborhoods as we, for whatever reason, need to sell our homes. We are also very concerned about overcrowding in our schools because this has a direct impact on the quality of the education of our children at all levels. Speaking of traffic safety, we have three schools buses (separate stops and times for Elementary, Middle, and High school--some handicap equipped buses as well) minimum picking up children at four apartment complexes on Eagle Ranch Road alone.

I appreciate that the facilitators worked to manage a negotiation/discussion and address neighborhood concerns. But the fact remains that the major objections to this project were NOT addressed. And the overall feeling was that the intention was to pass this along to the NEXT STEP to solve the density and traffic problems we introduced. IF this change is approved, there is nothing in place to guarantee the neighbors that any of these concerns will be addressed in any real or serious way because the existing site plan/changes will have already been given a "yes." For that reason, good sense says that this is time and place to do the OBJECTING. I OBJECT to the changes requested.

As I said, I am a teacher . . . working very hard right now to educate our children (wearing masks and doing our best with it to keep children safe!) and will not be able to attend this meeting. Meetings of this magnitude and impact should be held when the working people of this neighborhood can actually attend and be heard. I am voicing my STRONG OBJECTION to this change being permitted/approved.

Sharon Munson

Bolivar, Silvia A.

From: That Girl <tinathtgrl@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, August 14, 2021 12:13 PM
To: Sharon Munson
Cc: Bluejay9393@gmail.com; Hiba.alkhafaji@gmail.com; R E; RunRachael1275@aol.com; SamASandoval@comcast.net; aboard111@gmail.com; aubrey.eber@icloud.com; bmyfire@gmail.com; cgriego24@gmail.com; dianexline@gmail.com; dirttracknm@hotmail.com; ekhaley@comcast.net; halfayyadh@gmail.com; jagreene586@gmail.com; jantoin@arcaspirit.org; kcoronel09@gmail.com; maxlovestater@gmail.com; mindy.allison@hotmail.com; muhanned_eng76@yahoo.com; mwells4519@gmail.com; nelsoncarol7654@gmail.com; nmplexus@yahoo.com; Bolivar, Silvia A.; samralphroxy@yahoo.com; ta_a@msn.com
Subject: Re: Project: EPC PR-2021-005442 Major Amendment to Site Plan

I also did not get an invitation to the meeting this Thursday. Seems they weed people out randomly. Very concerning!

I will be on the call this week and will be voicing some of the same concerns you have Sharon.

Thanks for your input

Tina Ritt
Benton St

On Sat, Aug 14, 2021 at 12:02 PM Sharon Munson <munsoncs@aol.com> wrote:

I am a neighbor living right across the street from this proposed high-density apartment complex and have negotiated in good faith in 4 different meetings, along with many many other concerned neighbors over the last two months. I was concerned that I DID NOT receive an official invitation to the meeting on Thursday August 19, 2021, which is the deciding meeting as to whether this change in the existing zoning will or will not be permitted. I am also more than concerned that this meeting is happening on a work day . . . Thursday, August 19th at 8:40 in the morning. I am back at school because I am a teacher, and I know from previous meetings that this one is liable to start late and run long.

My issue with this plan change is that the obvious concerns of the many many neighbors who have attended over the summer and expressed worry over the 218 unit (higher density than ANY of the FIVE apartment complexes in the neighborhood already) Complex and the impact it will have on the traffic and off-site parking will NOT be able to attend and express their opposition to requested changes to the existing plan for that 7 acre lot. We are doing the math, 300 to 500 people on a 7 acre lot with 300 parking spaces . . . that will not be enough and we are the closest neighborhood likely to see overflow parking on our streets. We were told the developer hired a traffic engineer but no change to the density or parking space allotment was made in the plans to present to neighbors to mitigate this problem. We were told that there would be a traffic study done because our neighborhood empties directly onto Eagle Ranch Road in the exact same place one of the two Eagle Ranch exits to the new complex would also exit. That would equate to approximately 300 to 500 people exiting from across Eagle Ranch at the same times in the mornings and evenings and throughout the day. We expressed concerns over the bus stops, walking traffic, and already crowded and unsafe dangers/accidents already happening at the busy intersections all around us (check the city data on this!!!)

Neighbors were "tasked" to come up with solutions to our own concerns, and we rose to that occasion. Neighbors did their homework and provided visuals and data to support our possible solutions to the some of the privacy and view issues that were very concerning to us. I personally felt that the solutions to these problems should have been the responsibility of the developer, since he is the one requesting the changes to the original site plan. Even given this approach, the neighbors who attended expressed over and over their appreciation for the changes in the plans to protect privacy, views, and walkability in our neighborhood BUT the density, parking spaces, and impact on a

neighborhood already inundated with apartment complexes of considerably LOWER densities were NOT addressed. This says nothing about the impact to neighborhood schools already designated as Title 1 due to poverty levels in the school zone, a change that has occurred over the last 10 years because of the influx of apartment complexes. Our neighborhood school dropped from a Grade A to a D in the last 10 years. This does not make it attractive to buyers we hope to attract to our neighborhoods as we, for whatever reason, need to sell our homes. We are also very concerned about overcrowding in our schools because this has a direct impact on the quality of the education of our children at all levels. Speaking of traffic safety, we have three schools buses (separate stops and times for Elementary, Middle, and High school--some handicap equipped buses as well) minimum picking up children at four apartment complexes on Eagle Ranch Road alone.

I appreciate that the facilitators worked to manage a negotiation/discussion and address neighborhood concerns. But the fact remains that the major objections to this project were NOT addressed. And the overall feeling was that the intention was to pass this along to the NEXT STEP to solve the density and traffic problems we introduced. IF this change is approved, there is nothing in place to guarantee the neighbors that any of these concerns will be addressed in any real or serious way because the existing site plan/changes will have already been given a "yes." For that reason, good sense says that this is time and place to do the OBJECTING. I OBJECT to the changes requested.

As I said, I am a teacher . . . working very hard right now to educate our children (wearing masks and doing our best with it to keep children safe!) and will not be able to attend this meeting. Meetings of this magnitude and impact should be held when the working people of this neighborhood can actually attend and be heard. I am voicing my STRONG OBJECTION to this change being permitted/approved.

Sharon Munson