



**Environmental
Planning
Commission**

**Agenda Number: 05
Project Number: 1010332
Case #: 15EPC-40001
February 12, 2015**

Staff Report

Agent	Myers, McCready & Myers
Applicant	98 th Street, LLC
Request	Site Development Plan for Subdivision
Legal Description	Tract 34D-1-A Bulk Land Plat, Tract 31A-1-A Lands of Salazar Family Trust, Salazar Quatro Trust, JSJ Investment Company & Falba Hannett, and Tracts 4-A-1 and 32H-1-A
Location	The SW corner of the intersection of Gibson Blvd. SW and 98 th St. SW
Size	Approximately 25.5 acres
Existing Zoning	SU-1 for Mixed Use
Proposed Zoning	No Change

Staff Recommendation

DENIAL of 15EPC-40001, based on the findings beginning on Page 22.

***Staff Planner
Catalina Lehner-AICP, Senior Planner***

Summary of Analysis

The request is for a site development plan for subdivision (SPS) for an ≈25.5 acre, vacant site zoned SU-1 Mixed Use. Single-family homes are proposed on ≈20 acres and future commercial uses are envisioned for the remaining, ≈5 acres. Residential and commercial design standards are proposed. The SPS shows creation of 80 residential lots but no commercial lots at this time.

The subject site is in the Developing Urban area of the Comprehensive Plan and in a designated Community Activity Center. The Westside Strategic Plan, the SW Abq. Strategic Action Plan and the Rio Bravo Sector Development Plan also apply. Overall, Staff finds that the request does not further most applicable Goals and policies.

Neighbors and property owners were notified as required. Staff has not received any inquiries or comments as of this writing.

Though not prohibited by the site's zoning, the request conflicts significantly with adopted Goals and policies. Therefore, Staff recommends denial.

City Departments and other interested agencies reviewed this application from 1/5/'15 to 1/10/'15.
Agency comments used in the preparation of this report begin on Page 29.

I. AREA CHARACTERISTICS AND ZONING HISTORY

Surrounding zoning, plan designations, and land uses:

	<i>Zoning</i>	<i>Comprehensive Plan Area; Applicable Rank II & III Plans</i>	<i>Land Use</i>
<i>Site</i>	SU-1 for Mixed Use	Developing Urban West Side Strategic Plan (including the SW Abq. Strategic Action Plan) Rio Bravo Sector Development Plan	Vacant
<i>North</i>	C-2	Developing Urban West Side Strategic Plan (including the SW Abq. Strategic Action Plan) Rio Bravo Sector Development Plan	Vacant, pharmacy/retail
<i>South</i>	R-LT, R-2	Developing Urban West Side Strategic Plan (including the SW Abq. Strategic Action Plan) Rio Bravo Sector Development Plan	Single-family homes
<i>East</i>	SU-1 for R-2 & R-T	Developing Urban West Side Strategic Plan (including the SW Abq. Strategic Action Plan) Rio Bravo Sector Development Plan	Townhomes & detached Homes
<i>West</i>	R-LT	Developing Urban West Side Strategic Plan (including the SW Abq. Strategic Action Plan) Rio Bravo Sector Development Plan	Single-family homes

II. INTRODUCTION

Request

The request is for a site development plan for subdivision, with design standards, for Tract 34D-1-A Bulk Land Plat, Tract 31A-1-A Lands of Salazar Family Trust et. al, and Tracts 4-A-1 and 32H-1-A, approximately 25.5 acres (the “subject site”). The subject site, which is vacant and has a large drainage pond in its NW corner, comprises the SW corner of the intersection of 98th Street and Gibson Blvd. and is about 25.5 acres in size.

The applicant proposes to develop single-family homes on approximately 20 acres and envisions future commercial uses on the remaining, approximately 5.5 acres. The proposed site development plan for subdivision would subdivide the subject site into 80 residential lots. Residential design standards and commercial design standards are proposed, though no subdivision of commercial lots is proposed at this time. The subject site is zoned SU-1 for Mixed Use pursuant to the Rio Bravo Sector Development Plan (RBSDP).

The applicant is requesting ddelegation of review authority for future development to the Development Review Board (DRB) for the residential portion, which means that the DRB would review the site development plan for building permit. The future commercial development, for which there are currently no defined plans, would return to the EPC for review. No site development plans for building permit are proposed at this time.

Environmental Planning Commission (EPC) Role

The EPC is hearing this case because the EPC is required to hear site development plans for subdivision cases for sites that are zoned SU-1 and/or 5 acres or larger in size. The EPC is the final decision-making body unless the EPC decision is appealed [Ref: §14-16-2-22(A)(1)]. If so, an appeal would be heard by the Land Use Hearing Officer (LUHO), though the City Council would make the final decision. The request is a quasi-judicial matter.

Context

The subject site, which is vacant, is located on Albuquerque's SW mesa. The area is characterized by predominantly single-family homes on small lots, with a large apartment complex to the east and one commercial use (pharmacy/retail) to the north. To the west and to the south are subdivisions of single-family homes. Also to the north is a large, vacant tract. Further north are more single-family homes. Just east of the apartment complex is the Amole Arroyo.

History

In May 1960, the City Planning Commission (CPC) approved a request for a master plan for "Hoffman City" (S-1082-MP-1), which included a lot of SW mesa land that was originally part of the Atrisco land grant. The original request was for 3,800 acres, but the acreage was reduced to 2,500. The applicant was Hoffman Homes. The master plan included homes, churches and schools and created the "donut" platting configuration that still exists today. At that time, a high school was envisioned on the subject site. It appears that the master plan approval occurred prior to annexation of the portion of the area that includes the subject site, though records aren't entirely clear (there is a reference to Hoffman City from 1959).

The subject site was annexed in 1960 as part of a larger, approx. 75 acre annexation (AX-29/Z-986, see attachments). The CPC heard the request in September and the City Council subsequently approved it. A variety of zoning was established: R-1, O-1, C-1, C-2 and M-2. The 75 acre area was referred to as the "Snow Vista Master Plan". The Snow Construction Company had purchased the land and intended to develop a variety of uses and a street network to serve the area. Interestingly, the case planner noted that the Snow Vista Master Plan showed more commercial uses than suggested by 1950s land use practice.

Since then, the SW mesa area has continued to develop and has become one of the fastest growing parts of the City. The majority of development consists of subdivisions of single-family homes on small lots and of the same type. A few commercial uses have developed to the north: two supermarkets, large-box retail and small food markets, at the intersection of 98th St./DeVargas-Sage Rds. SW. A pharmacy/retail use developed across Gibson Blvd. from the subject site, and went to building permit since the NW corner of the 98th St./Gibson Blvd. intersection is zoned C-2.

In 2001, the EPC approved a site development plan for subdivision with design standards (Project #1001450) for an 81-lot development on the NE portion of the circular-shaped area around 98th St./Gibson Blvd. that includes the subject site. The area was not a designated Community Activity Center at that time. The Comprehensive Plan map (Figure 30, January 2002) shows a proposed Community Activity Center. A map in the Westside Strategic Plan shows a designated Activity Center in this location (map p. 112, January 2003).

Long Range Roadway System

The Long Range Roadway System (LRRS) map, produced by the Mid-Region Council of Governments (MRCOG), identifies the functional classifications of roadways. 98th St. is designated as an Urban Principal Arterial. Gibson Blvd. and Blake Rd. are Urban Collectors.

A bicycle lane exists along both Gibson Blvd. and 98th St. There is a multi-purpose trail along the Amole Arroyo. ABQ Ride Route 198, 98th/Dennis Chavez, runs from Central Ave., down 98th St. and along Dennis Chavez Blvd. It offers service from the morning into the night on weekdays and on Saturdays and Sundays.

Public Facilities/Community Services

Public facilities, such as a library and community center, are located within a mile of the subject site. There are also parks and schools (middle and elementary).

» For more information, please refer to the Public Facilities Map (see attachment).

Design Standards

The purpose of design standards, which are associated with a site development plan for subdivision, is to create a framework to ensure that a development will further applicable City Plans and policies and contribute to making planning goals a reality. To achieve this, a proposed site development plan for subdivision needs to be an overarching guide for creating a high-quality development (see also Section VI of this report).

Typically, the EPC considers the specificity and completeness of design standards when contemplating whether or not to delegate its approval authority for future development to the Development Review Board (DRB).

III. ANALYSIS - Albuquerque Comprehensive Zoning Code

Definitions (Zoning Code §14-16-1-5)

Shopping Center Site. A premises containing five or more acres; zoned P, C-1, C-2, C-3, M-1, M-2, or a combination thereof; or a large retail facility; but excluding premises used and proposed to be used only for manufacturing, assembling, treating, repairing, rebuilding, wholesaling, and warehousing. Shopping center sites are subject to the shopping center regulations of the Zoning Code, § 14-16-3-2.

Site Development Plan for Subdivision. An accurate plan at a scale of at least 1 inch to 100 feet which covers at least one lot and specifies the site, proposed use, pedestrian and vehicular ingress and egress, any internal circulation requirements and, for each lot, maximum building height, minimum building setback, and maximum total dwelling units and/or nonresidential uses' maximum floor area ratio.

Townhouse or Town House. One of a group of two to eight attached dwelling units divided from each other by common walls, each having a separate entrance leading directly to the outdoors at ground level, and each having at least one-fourth of its heated and unheated floor area approximately at grade. A townhouse building is one type of an apartment.

Zoning

The subject site is zoned SU-1 for Mixed Use pursuant to the Rio Bravo Sector Development Plan (RBSDP). The SU-1 Special Use Zone "provides suitable sites for uses which are special because of infrequent occurrence, effect on surrounding property, safety, hazard, or other reasons, and in which the appropriateness of the use to a specific location is partly or entirely dependent on the character of the site design" (emphasis mine). An associated site development plan is required in the SU-1 zone. The "Mixed Use" is pursuant to the RBSDP, which states:

"Within the SU-1 zone, properties will have allowances for C-1, C-2, O-1, O-2 and IP zoning subject to individual review procedures. The mixed-use can be applied to include R-LT zoning and other high-density residential uses. Community Activity Center (CAC) and Neighborhood Activity Center (NAC) mixed-use zoning should be applied to the designated activity centers within the RBSDP boundaries. These zoning districts will create development mixtures that include retail shops, public, service and institutions, residential units, and other community uses in a pedestrian-oriented format."

The residential development is proposed to reference the R-LT zone (§14-16-2-8). The R-LT zone allows uses permissive in the R-1 zone and townhomes- one dwelling per lot. Some of the proposed lots are too small to meet the R-1 minimum requirement of 5,000 sf and/or are less than the minimum 50 feet wide.

Regarding residential uses, the "mixed use can be applied to include R-LT zoning" as proposed. However, R-LT (in itself or as it refers to the R-1 zone) results in relatively low densities, such as the 4 DU/ac proposed. However, the mixed use also "can be applied to include...other high-density residential uses." According to the RBSDP, R-LT zoning is considered lower density and is associated with 6 DU/ac. R-2 density (up to 20 DU/ac), apartment density, is the highest allowed in the Plan area. The "mixed use" designation can also include R-2 zoning, which is more common to see mixed with commercial, office and IP uses. It's common practice to consider non-residential uses to be more compatible with higher-density residential uses (ex. apartments) than with single-family homes.

The future commercial development is intended to correspond to the C-2 zone (§14-16-2-17), which "provides suitable sites for offices, for most service and commercial activities, and for certain specified institutional uses." A wide variety of non-residential uses is possible in the C-2 zone.

IV. ANALYSIS –APPLICABLE PLANS, GOALS, POLICIES & REGULATIONS

A) Albuquerque / Bernalillo County Comprehensive Plan

The subject site is located in an area that the Albuquerque/Bernalillo County Comprehensive Plan has designated Developing Urban. The Goal of Developing and Established Urban Areas is “to create a quality urban environment which perpetuates the tradition of identifiable, individual but integrated communities within the metropolitan area and which offers variety and maximum choice in housing, transportation, work areas and life styles, while creating a visually pleasing built environment.”

The request would result in a use, a single-family subdivision, platted to be identical to the other single-family subdivisions surrounding it. There is an opportunity to create a different type of housing option to offer variety and maximum choice, especially since the subject site is in a designated Activity Center, but this is not proposed. The proposed subdivision is laid out to not provide choice in transportation modes and would not facilitate use of transit, walking or biking. Walled-off subdivisions do not contribute to integrated communities. There are few details about the potential, future commercial uses. The request generally does not further the Established Urban Goal.

Applicable policies include:

Land Use Policies-

Policy II.B.5a: The Developing Urban and Established Urban areas as shown by the Plan map shall allow a full range of urban land uses, resulting in an overall gross density up to 5 dwelling units per acre.

The request would allow for development of the same type of single-family homes that already characterize the area, which would not increase variety. It would also preclude other types of uses, such as more commercial, services, institutional and entertainment, in an area where there is little land use variety. The effect of the request upon overall gross density in the entire area, however, is not possible to measure. The request generally does not further Policy II.B.5a-full range of urban land uses.

Policy II.B.5d: The location, intensity and design of new development shall respect existing neighborhood values, natural environmental conditions and carrying capacities, scenic resources, and resources of other social, cultural, recreational concern.

The proposed subdivision is like the ones around it and Staff has received no comments as of this writing. However, the proposed subdivision’s design, walled-in and gated, would not help facilitate use of alternative transportation modes (walking, biking) that are related to recreational and social concerns. No pathways or parks are proposed. The request partially furthers Policy II.B.5d-neighborhood values/natural environmental conditions.

Policy II.B.5e: New growth shall be accommodated through development in areas where vacant land is contiguous to existing or programmed urban facilities and services and where the integrity of existing neighborhoods and can be ensured.

The subject site is vacant and contiguous to a developed area that has existing urban facilities. However, it's unclear at this time how drainage would be handled and the 2014 aerial photo shows the subdivision to the south draining onto the subject site. Drainage improvements may be needed. The request partially furthers Policy II.B.5e-new growth/urban facilities.

Policy II.B.5f: Clustering of homes to provide larger shared open areas and houses oriented towards pedestrian or bikeways shall be encouraged.

The subject site offers an opportunity to provide a different type of product, such as higher density, clustered housing, with open areas as amenities for the residents. While the townhomes to the east across 98th St. are higher density, they offer very little open space (a small area by the pool in the middle of the complex). The request does not meet the intent of Policy II.B.5f- clustering homes/open areas.

Policy II.B.5h: Higher density housing is most appropriate in the following situations:

- In designated Activity Centers.
- In areas with excellent access to the major street network.
- In areas where a mixed density pattern is already established by zoning or use, where it is compatible with existing area land uses and where adequate infrastructure is or will be available.
- In areas now predominantly zoned single-family only where it comprises a complete block face and faces onto similar or higher density development; up to 10 dwelling units per net acre.
- In areas where a transition is needed between single-family homes and much more intensive development: densities will vary up to 30 dwelling units per net acre according to the intensity of development in adjacent areas.

The subject site is an appropriate location for higher density housing because it is located in a designated Activity Center, the 98th/Gibson Community Activity Center. However, low density (4 DU/ac) housing is proposed in an Activity Center, on the side of 98th St. where there is no mixed density pattern. The proposed residential development would not function as a transition, either. The request does not further Policy II.B.5h- higher density housing location.

Policy II.B.5j: Where new commercial development occurs, it should generally be located in existing commercially zoned areas as follows:

- In small neighborhood-oriented centers provided with pedestrian and bicycle access within reasonable distance of residential areas for walking or bicycling.
- In larger area-wide shopping centers located at intersections of arterial streets and provided with access via mass transit; more than one shopping center should be allowed at an intersection only when transportation problems do not result.
- In freestanding retailing and contiguous storefronts along streets in older neighborhoods.

The potential, future commercial development would be located on land already zoned for commercial uses and within reasonable distance from residential uses. The subject site could be considered a larger area-wide shopping center site by definition and is located at the intersection of arterial streets, though using 4/5 of the site for low-density residential precludes development of an area-wide shopping center. Though the remaining ≈5 acre commercial portion could be a smaller neighborhood center, walking and bicycling distances would be longer than need be for most because no pedestrian access is proposed and there are only two ways to get in and out of the proposed subdivision. The request partially furthers Policy II.B.5j-location of new commercial development.

Policy II.B.5k: Land adjacent to arterial streets shall be planned to minimize harmful effects of traffic; livability and safety of established residential neighborhoods shall be protected in transportation planning and operations.

The subject site is adjacent to two arterial streets: 98th St. and Gibson Blvd. Transportation Staff provided comments that, when addressed, would help minimize harmful effects of traffic. An access point is shown on 98th St. for the residential portion; no access is indicated for the future commercial. The access on Blake Rd. aligns with that of the existing subdivision. Additional traffic would have some impact on the existing neighborhood, but it's not quantified since a TIS wasn't required at this time. The request partially furthers Policy II.B.5k-land/arterial streets/traffic effects.

Policy II.B.5l: Quality and innovation in design shall be encouraged in all new development; design shall be encouraged which is appropriate to the plan area.

The proposed architectural standards are specific for the commercial portion and require quality features. The residential standards would benefit from clarification. Also, they would result in the same kind of subdivision, in terms of layout and design, which characterizes the area. The request partially furthers Policy II.B.5l-quality design/new development.

Activity Centers

The Goal is to “expand and strengthen concentrations of moderate and high-density mixed land use and social/economic activities which reduce urban sprawl, auto travel needs, and service costs, and which enhance the identity of Albuquerque and its community.”

Policy II.B.7a: Existing and proposed Activity Centers are designated by a Comprehensive Plan map where appropriate to help shape urban form in a sustainable development pattern, create mixed-use concentrations of interrelated activities that promote transit and pedestrian access both to and within the center, and maximize cost-effectiveness of City services.

The subject site is located in a designated Activity Center, the 98th/Gibson Community Activity Center (CAC). It is shown as a proposed Activity Center in the January 2002 map in the Comprehensive Plan. In January 2003, the West Side Strategic Plan designed the 98th/Gibson CAC to serve the Bridge/Westgate and Gun Club Communities. Note that the existing

subdivision in the NE corner of the Activity Center was approved in 2001, prior to the CAC designation (see also History section of this report).

The request would not promote transit usage or pedestrianism because the subdivision would be walled in and no pathways or pedestrian gates are shown. Due to its relatively low density (4 DU/ac), the request would not maximize cost-effectiveness of services. For these reasons, it does not further Activity Center Policy II.B.7a.

Policy II.B.7i: Multi-unit housing is an appropriate use in Neighborhood, Community and Major Activity Centers.

The idea behind Activity Centers is to concentrate residential density, commercial and service uses so that there are enough people to make transit feasible, support commercial uses and use existing infrastructure in an efficient manner. Single-family homes at a relatively low density (4DU/ac) are intended to be located outside of Activity Center rather than in them. The request does not further Activity Center Policy II.B.7i.

Community Identity & Urban Design

Policy II.B.9d: Development projects within Community Activity Centers should contribute the following:

1. Related land uses that effectively encourage walking trips from one destination to another within the center, including shopping, schools, parks or plazas, employment, entertainment, and civic uses such as public libraries, recreation or senior centers, post office or fire station.
2. Pedestrian linkages among uses in the Activity Center and connecting to surrounding neighborhoods.
3. Buildings designed and arranged to reflect local architectural traditions, scale, height, massing and setbacks appropriate to the community served by the Activity Center and that support public transit and pedestrian activity.
4. Landscaping, street furniture, public art, colored or textured paving and other improvements to the public realm that reinforce the cultural, social and design traditions of the community served by the Activity Center.

The request would result in a walled subdivision and potential, future commercial uses. These would be separated by a wall with no pedestrian linkages between them (2), which would discourage walking trips from the neighborhood to the non-residential uses. Connectivity between uses would not be provided (1). Though the buildings may reflect some local architectural traditions, the site layout would generally not support public transit and pedestrian activity (3). Landscaping (residential and commercial design standards) and colored, textured paving and architecture (commercial design standards) would help improve the public realm, though the result would be a divided activity center with no interconnection between residential and non-residential uses (4). The request does not further Policy II.B.9d-development projects within Community Activity Centers.

Community Resource Management-Transportation and Transit

Goal: To develop corridors, both streets and adjacent land uses, that provide a balanced circulation system through efficient placement of employment and services, and encouragement of bicycling, walking, and use of transit/paratransit as alternatives to automobile travel, while providing sufficient roadway capacity to meet mobility and access needs.

There have been efforts to develop 98th St. as a transportation corridor; there are bus shelters in close proximity and some density is developing (ex. townhomes/apartments in the SE portion of the Activity Center). The request would not encourage bicycling, walking or other alternatives to automobile travel because the residential uses would be walled in (with only two access points) and the residential and non-residential uses would be not connected at all. Both complicate non-vehicle circulation. Walls, gates and relatively low- density development do not support efforts to develop 98th St. as a transit corridor. Therefore, the Transportation and Transit Goal is not furthered.

Policy II.D.4g: Pedestrian opportunities shall be promoted and integrated into development to create safe and pleasant non-motorized travel conditions.

Walls, gates, limited access points and long expanses of perimeter walls preclude pedestrian opportunities and make it difficult for people who want to (or have to) use alternative modes of transportation. Transit Policy 4g is not furthered.

Community Resource Management-Economic Development

Goal: To achieve steady and diversified economic development balanced with other important social, cultural, and environmental goals.

Any development can be considered economic development, which is generally desirable. The request would result in mostly single-family residential, which does not generate jobs, with some commercial. The commercial portion is likely to provide mostly service jobs. However, more jobs would result if the subject site were to be developed as an activity center, which higher-density residential development would support. Jobs are needed on the Westside and, as this area develops with more low-density residential, opportunities to provide jobs become more and more limited. The request partially furthers the Economic Development Goal.

Policy II.C.6g: Concentrations of employment in Activity Centers should be promoted in an effort to balance jobs with housing and population and reduce the need to travel.

One of the main ideas behind Activity Centers is to concentrate employment and non-residential uses in designated locations, so that the surrounding single-family residential areas have services in close proximity and don't have to travel so far. Also, the jobs-housing balance on the Westside remains heavily skewed toward housing; developing activity centers as stated in the Plans would help provide much-needed jobs. The request does not further Policy II.C.6g.

B) WEST SIDE STRATEGIC PLAN (WSSP) (RANK II)

The West Side Strategic Plan (WSSP) was first adopted in 1997 and amended several times since then (2002, 2005, 2008, 2009 and 2011). The WSSP area encompasses over 96,000 acres of land, or approximately 150 square miles. Specific boundaries are shown on p.2 of the Plan.

The first amendments, in 2002, included changes to policies and activity center boundaries. The 98th/Gibson Community Activity Center is shown on p. 112 (map printed in 2003). The *Southwest Albuquerque Strategic Action Plan (SWASAP)*, revised from the 1999 version, became part of the WSSP in 2009 (Enactment R-2009-035).

The WSSP identifies 13 communities in established areas of the West Side, each with a unique identity and comprised of smaller neighborhood clusters. The subject site is located in the Bridge/Westgate community, which lies within the following boundaries: Central Ave. on the north, Coors Blvd. on the east, the 118th St. corridor on the west, and Blake Rd. on the south (see p. 70).

Community Concept Policies

WSSP Policy 1.1: Thirteen distinct communities, as shown on the Community Plan Map and described individually in this Plan, shall constitute the existing and future urban form of the West Side. Communities shall develop with areas of higher density (in Community and Neighborhood Centers), surrounded by areas of lower density. Bernalillo County and the City of Albuquerque Planning Commissions shall require that high density and non-residential development occur within Community and Neighborhood Centers. Low density residential development (typical 3-5 du/acre subdivisions, or large lot rural subdivisions) shall not be approved within the Centers.

The subject site is located in the 98th/Gibson Community Activity Center (WSSP, page 112). The proposed residential development is 4 DU/ac, and the WSSP states that “low density residential development (typical 3-5 du/acre subdivisions) shall not be approved within the Centers.” The request does not further WSSP Policy 1.1.

WSSP Policy 2.5: When considering approval of subdivisions or site development plans for residential development or zone changes to residential or higher density residential, the City Planning Department shall consider whether local public schools have sufficient capacity to support the increased number of homes. If area schools are at or over their designed capacity, then the requested action should be denied unless the applicant demonstrates that the proposed action will create no net increase in enrollment for area schools (e.g. senior housing.)

The Planning Department is considering school capacity. The request would result in 80 new households. APS comments that any residential development in this area will impact Rudolfo Anaya Elementary School, Truman Middle School, and Atrisco Heritage Academy High School. Currently, all three schools are over capacity. The applicant has not demonstrated that the request would not create a net increase in school enrollment, so the request should be denied and does not further WSSP Policy 2.5-school capacity/residential development.

WSSP Policy 3.42: Support the location of mixed-use higher density development within this Community in the Activity Centers internal to the Community.

The subject site is located in the 98th/Gibson Community Activity Center (see map p. 112), which is internal to the Bridge/Westgate Community. The intent of the WSSP is to support mixed-use higher density development in this location. The request, however, would result in a subdivision with a density of 4 DU/ac, which is relatively low and therefore does not further WSSP Policy 3.42.

WSSP Policy 3.46: Promote densities consistent with those found in the Sector Development Plans for the Bridge/Westgate Community, with densities as high as 30 DU/ac within the designated Community Activity Centers and adjacent areas.

The Rio Bravo Sector Development Plan (RBSDP) specifies a residential density of up to 20 DU/ac (which used to be 30 DU/ac, but that was changed with the 2009 amendments). The subject site is in a designated Community Activity Center, but has a density of 4 DU/ac. This is inconsistent with the intent of the WSSP and does not further WSSP Policy 3.46.

WSSP Policy 4.6.a: Design subdivisions to provide an efficient circulation pattern for transit service.

WSSP Policy 4.6.b: Design subdivisions to provide safe, attractive and efficient patterns for pedestrians. Walking distances from residences within subdivisions to arterials, collectors, or streets with existing or proposed transit service should be kept to ¼ mile or less whenever possible.

Neither do the proposed design standards address, nor does the site development plan show, any connectivity between commercial and residential tracts. The proposed subdivision would be gated and separated from the roadway by long expanses of walls, which would not provide efficient patterns for pedestrians, make walking distances too long for many people and would make it difficult overall to access transit service (a & b). Most future residents would be over ¼ mile from Transit service (b). The request does not further WSSP Policies 4.6.a and b.

WSSP Policy 4.6.c: Gated and/or walled communities and cul-de-sacs are strongly discouraged on the West Side. In rare instances when these design features are permitted, openings through perimeter walls and cul-de-sacs shall be provided every 600 feet so that pedestrians and bicyclists are provided direct access to transit service and other destinations.

The proposed subdivision would be both gated and walled, and would not provide openings through perimeter walls every 600 feet. The request does not further WSSP Policy 4.6.c.

WSSP Policy 4.6.d: Subdivisions shall be designed to avoid rear yard walls facing public streets.

The proposed subdivision has lots with rear yards facing Blake Rd., Gibson Blvd. and 98th St. and therefore does not further WSSP Policy 4.6.d.

WSSP Policy 4.6.e: Subdivisions shall be designed to provide multiple vehicular and pedestrian access points.

The proposed subdivision would be gated and have two access points. Openings through perimeter walls are neither shown on the site development plan nor addressed in the design standards. The lack of convenient access to 98th St. could make transit less desirable for most residents. The commercial design standards do not address connectivity with the residential use. The request does not further WSSP Policy 4.6.e.

WSSP Policy 4.10: It is important to promote and establish land uses and urban patterns whose design support bicycle and pedestrian travel, and public transportation, encourage ridership, enhance public mobility and promote alternatives to single occupant vehicle use.

As proposed, the request would not create land use patterns that support bicycle and pedestrian travel and promote alternatives to single occupancy vehicle usage. The design standards do not address openings through perimeter walls and would preclude direct access to transit service for pedestrians and bicyclists. The request does not further WSSP Policy 4.10.

C) SOUTHWEST ALBUQUERQUE STRATEGIC ACTION PLAN (SWASAP) (RANK II)

In March 2009, the City Council adopted the Southwest Albuquerque Strategic Action Plan (SWASAP) and made it a new chapter of the West Side Strategic Plan (WSSP), which was correspondingly amended (Bill No. R-08-169). The WSSP, which contains the SWASAP, applies to land within municipal boundaries. Bernalillo County did not adopt the SWASAP, so it does not apply to unincorporated lands.

The SWASAP replaced the Southwest Area Plan (SAP), first adopted in 1988 and subsequently amended in 1999, 2002 and 2009. Boundaries of the SWASAP are Paseo del Volcan on the west, Coors Blvd. on the east, Central Ave. on the north, and Dennis Chavez (Rio Bravo) Blvd. on the south.

The primary Goal of the SWASAP is for SW Albuquerque to become a complete community. The SWASAP contains projects and programs to help achieve this based on five interconnected goals (see below); each goal contains a subset of strategies to support and implement it. For example, the strategy of designating activity centers in key locations will help implement the goal of complete communities by providing convenient commercial and retail services to residents, who would then have the option to use alternative modes of transportation.

Community Activity Center

The SWASAP added a description of the 98th/Gibson Blvd. Community Activity Center, in which the subject site is located, to the WSSP (see SWASAP, p. 367). The Community Activity Center is envisioned to contain a circulation network of streets and trails, non-retail uses such as office and multi-family housing in or nearby, possible collocation of City services with commercial and residential uses.

Residential Subdivisions

The SWASAP states that, since 2000, development in SW Albuquerque has created “a patchwork of walled-in subdivisions, incomplete streets that are overloaded at commuting times, and limited parks,

trails, public buildings and shopping areas” (WSSP, p. 314). The SWASAP further states that “This monotonous SW Albuquerque development pattern is not prohibited by current development regulations” (p. 325), and that “continuing the existing, dominant SW Albuquerque development pattern will not result in a sustainable community...” (p. 325). “A mixture of uses is required to transform this area of isolated residential subdivisions into a well-rounded community” (p. 326).

The five SWASAP goals are:

- Goal 1: Build complete neighborhoods and a network of activity centers to serve them
- Goal 2: Provide convenient public services
- Goal 3: Plan and build a complete interconnected system of public parks, trails and major public open space
- Goal 4: Increase and improve retail and commercial services, and
- Goal 5: Develop a complete multi-modal transportation network.

Goals 1, 4 and 5 apply to the request. Staff finds the following:

Goal 1: Build complete neighborhoods and a network of activity centers to serve them (p. 321).

The idea is that the Community Activity Center include clusters of stores, offices, medical services, day care, entertainment, multi-family residences and/or public facilities such schools, libraries, etc. Neighborhood and Community Activity Centers are intended to be pedestrian-friendly, accessible but not dominated by vehicles, and contain a mixture of uses and housing opportunities different from those in the interior of neighborhoods (i.e.- different than the typical single-family residential).

The request would help preclude this part of SW Albuquerque from becoming a complete neighborhood. Approx. 1/5 of the subject site would be left for non-residential uses; non-residential uses can provide jobs, which are needed on the Westside. More jobs would result if the subject site were to be developed with a mix of commercial and retail uses. Adding low-density residential in this location means that residents of this area would continue to live far from their jobs and most shopping opportunities. The request generally does not further Goal 1.

Goal 4: Increase and improve retail and commercial services (p. 347).

Although commercial design standards are proposed, there are no concrete plans for commercial development at this time. 4/5 of the subject site is proposed to be developed as single-family homes, which remove the possibility of providing more non-residential uses in the Activity Center. 5 acres would remain for future retail and commercial services, which is less than the size of a Neighborhood Center as mentioned in the SWAAP- approx. 10-15 acres (p. 322). The request does not further Goal 4.

Goal 5: Develop a complete multi-modal transportation network (p. 353).

One applicable objective is to have a well-connected network that allows people to easily walk, bicycle, drive or take a bus. The proposed subdivision layout would not help facilitate creation

of a complete transportation network because it would be gated, have long expanses of walls, long block lengths, and dead-end streets. Connectivity would be limited and access to transit complicated by few access points. The request does not further Goal 5.

D) RIO BRAVO SECTOR DEVELOPMENT PLAN (RB SDP) (RANK III)

The Rio Bravo Sector Development Plan (RBSDP) was first adopted in 1989 (Enactment No. 215-1988) and consisted of approximately 1,289 acres of land owned by the Bellamah Community Development Corporation, which went bankrupt. Boundaries of the RBSDP are Paseo del Volcan on the west, Coors Blvd. on the east, Central Ave. on the north, and Dennis Chavez (Rio Bravo) Blvd. on the south. The subject site is in the Gun Club Community Service area (see Illustration 6, p. 20).

In 1999, RBSDP Amendment No. 1 was adopted and became effective in 2000 (Bill No. R-280). The purpose of the amendment was to recognize major changes such as land ownership and revise related plans. A comparison of the original and amended RBSDP begins on p. 43. Illustration 4 shows that the majority of the Plan area is intended for single-family homes (R-LT). The only areas envisioned for commercial development are the Community Activity Center at the intersection of 98th St./Gibson Blvd. and two small pocket commercial centers in the far southern portion of the Plan area. Illustration 7 shows that the subject site, part of the Community Activity Center, was originally zoned O-1 and C-2 and SU-3 O-1 and C-2. The zoning was changed to SU-1 Mixed Use upon adoption of the RBSDP.

In March 2009, the City Council adopted revisions to the RBSDP to “bring it into conformance with the SWASAP and the WSSP policies, priorities, and suggestions” (Bill No. R-08-170). The revisions consisted of adding activity center zoning designations, allowing cross-streets in Activity Centers, limiting the geographic coverage of repetitions of one housing type, and improving pedestrian and bicyclist safety. The intent of these revisions was to:

“help concentrate moderate-density mixed land use and social and economic activities to reduce urban sprawl, auto travel needs, and service costs and enhance the identity of Albuquerque and the SW Albuquerque community and support Albuquerque/Bernalillo County Comprehensive Plan policies in Section II.B.7 concerning Activity Centers.”

The intent of the RBSDP is to concentrate a mixture of land uses in activity centers. Residential uses can be included, but they are intended to be at least “moderate-density” and not the low-density (4 DU/ac) development proposed. Policies in the Comprehensive Plan, WSSP and SWASAP support higher density residential (ex. apartments) in activity centers along with non-residential uses; pretty much any land use except single-family homes (and usually manufacturing). The intent of the 2009 amendments is to be consistent with the higher-ranking plans.

However, language in the 2009 amendments is written with internal contradictions, such as “the mixed use can be applied to include R-LT zoning and other high-density residential uses.” The use of “other” makes it sound like the R-LT zone produces high-density residential; it does not. The plan states that the typical R-LT density is 6 DU/ac. The request proposes a density of 4 DU/ac, which is lower.

Although the 2009 amendments state that they intend to support Activity Center concepts, a phrase was added that states that activity center zoning designations and mixed use zoning “may be applied voluntarily to designated community and neighborhood activity centers”. Therefore, though the subject site’s zoning is SU-1 Mixed Use, and mixed use is not defined in the RBSDP, there is no prohibition on single-family homes in activity centers. However, the 2009 amendments intend to “limit the geographic coverage of repetitions of one housing type” (single-family or multi-family).

This lack of specificity does not negate applicable Goals and policies in the Comprehensive Plan, the WSSP and the SWASAP, which are mutually reinforcing and support the key concept of multi-family residential, commercial, office and service uses inside of Activity Centers and single-family homes outside of them. This development pattern would result in less travel time to services, improved access to transit, better conditions for pedestrians and bicyclists and jobs.

IV. ADDITIONAL ISSUES

Traffic Impact Study (TIS)

A TIS was not required at this time because the 80 proposed homes do not meet the threshold. However, a TIS will be required for the future commercial development.

Archaeology

The City Archaeologist issued a provisional certificate of no effect to allow the platting process to continue. However, an archaeological survey is required prior to issuance of a building permit. The acreage listed is 19.87, so perhaps the entire subject site was not considered. Additional coordination with the City Archaeologist is needed.

V. SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR SUBDIVISION (Sheet 1)

The site development plan for subdivision (Sheet 1) is confusing regarding the number of lots and tracts proposed. It states that 3 tracts and 80 lots would be created. Tracts A, B and C need to be clearly labeled and their acreage indicated in the narrative. Tract C is listed as 0.023 acre; this is too small to contain the individual lots. Tract C (or an unlabeled Tract D?) is supposed to be approx. 20 ac. It needs to be clear that the 80 lots would be individually platted if they’re intended for individual ownership. The proposed residential design standards (See Section VI of this report) would apply to all but Tract A, the commercial tract.

The proposed commercial tract (Tract A) is greater than 5 acres and commercially zoned, so it’s a shopping center (SC) site by definition. No platting is proposed at this time. The proposed commercial design standards (See Section VI of this report) would apply to only Tract A.

Zoning Code §14-16-1-5 defines a site development plan for subdivision as follows:

“An accurate plan at a scale of at least 1 inch to 100 feet which covers at least one lot and specifies the site, proposed use, pedestrian and vehicular ingress and egress, any internal

circulation requirements and, for each lot, maximum building height, minimum building setback, and maximum total dwelling units and/or nonresidential uses' maximum floor area ratio.”

The proposed site development plan for subdivision complies with this definition, though clarification is needed in places. The proposed uses need to be a category and off-street parking, as a category, can be removed. The building setback and open space categories refer to the R-LT zone. To eliminate cross-referencing and meet the definition, the setbacks and the open space requirements of the R-LT zone need to be stated.

Grading & Drainage Plan

The subject site's topography varies. It slopes generally downward from 98th St. toward the middle of the site. From Blake Rd., the site slopes upward and then downward again. There is a large drainage pond in the site's NW corner. It's unclear if that is proposed to remain. A new drainage pond (Tract B) is proposed in the site's SE corner. Retaining walls are proposed at various locations throughout and around the subdivision. Staff suggests labeling the easements that were keynoted.

Utility Plan

Sewer lines run along 98th St. and Blake Rd. There are water lines along these streets and Gibson Blvd. The proposed development would connect to the water lines on all three streets, and would connect to the sewer line along 98th St.

VI. SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR SUBDIVISION, DESIGN STANDARDS

Design standards create a framework to ensure that a development will further applicable City policies and contribute to making planning goals a reality. Design standards establish parameters used to review future site development plan(s) for building permit. It is important to ensure that the design standards are clear, well-defined and free of internal inconsistencies. They typically contain the following sections: Overall Goal/Theme, Site Elements, Pedestrianism, Parking, Setbacks, Landscape, Lighting, Walls/Fences, Utilities, Signage, Architecture and Process.

Two types of design standards are proposed, residential and commercial, and they are handled separately. There are a few organizational issues. The proposed, commercial design standards must comply with Zoning Code §14-16-3-2, the shopping center (SC) regulations. The proposed design standards (see Sheets 3 - 5) are discussed below in the order presented, except for Sheet 2. Staff will not discuss them in detail, but rather will point out opportunities for improvement.

RESIDENTIAL DESIGN STANDARDS (Sheet 3)

Introduction:

The primary goal is to achieve a mixed use. The design standards are intended to help facilitate design of buildings that respect the site's natural conditions. Staff suggests removal of both phrases, because the design standards would not achieve these things unless the site layout was significantly altered. Paragraph 3 should be moved to the Process section.

I. Pedestrian Amenities:

The phrase about pedestrian-friendly environment being a “primary design objective” either needs to be removed or pedestrian access and amenities need to be added. The subdivision is proposed to be gated and there are no wall openings. Staff suggests adding a pedestrian connection, which can be gated, to Gibson Blvd. so that the future commercial uses can be accessed from both sides of the subdivision. Drive-aisle crossings internal to the subdivision need to be clearly demarcated.

II. Building Standards:

Information about colors, materials, finishes and building styles belongs in the Architecture section, alongside the typical elevation photos. Subsequent renumbering of sections will be needed. The statement about asphalt shingles being prohibited should be re-instated.

III. Setbacks:

The project would use setbacks from the R-LT zone, as indicated on Sheet 1. The R-LT zone needs to be mentioned here and the setbacks listed consistently. The diagram can be made smaller.

IV. Landscape:

Sheet 2 is a proposed landscaping plan that shows street trees and some landscaping near the entrances. Street trees are required along all Major Streets. The Street Tree Ordinance defines major streets as principal arterial, minor arterial or collector. Therefore, street trees are required along all three streets, including Gibson Blvd. where none are proposed, and extending from the subdivision to the intersection. Shorter species can be used under the electric lines.

Street tree calculations need to be provided and sidewalk shown. Street trees “shall be placed between the curb and the public sidewalk.” The public sidewalk, curb and walls need to be shown. Staff suggests that the ash species be replaced (see the City Forester’s article at <http://www.cabq.gov/council/councilors/district-2/news/feet-firmly-on-the-ground-looking-up>). The legend can remain on Sheet 2, these plants should also be included on the landscape palette in the design standards.

The landscape section of the design standards (Sheet 3) needs to include a landscape palette and mention at least one tree per lot. It’s unclear what private commons area refers to since no park or outdoor space is provided.

V. Lighting:

Light poles should be referred to as “fully-shielded” in Standard B, which is about dark skies.

VI. Signage:

The signage detail needs to be on Sheet 3. Standard 3, regarding free-standing signage and bracing, can be removed.

VII. Architecture:

The building standards (see above) need to be re-incorporated into the architectural standards.

VIII. Utilities: ok. No changes recommended at this time.

IX. Off-Street Parking:

Explain how the parking would be calculated and provided, rather than reference the Zoning Code (design standards should be a self-contained document). Correct the reference to (24)(d) by adding an (A) in front of it.

X. Open Space:

An explanation of how the Open Space requirement would be met is needed, rather than a cross reference.

XI. Walls & Screening:

The language “for height and setbacks” needs to be removed. Compliance with the Regulations for Walls and Fences (14-16-3-18) is required, and not just with respect to height and setbacks. Regarding the Zoning Code’s minimum design regulations for walls, (a)-Layout, must be met. The proposed design standards would comply with just (b)-Façade, and both (a) and (b) are required.

To re-inforce the statements regarding pedestrian amenities, language should be added to this section to provide for wall openings, which can be keyed, so residents have better access to walking, biking, transit and the future commercial development nearby.

XII. Process:

Staff recommends strengthening and clarifying the design standards to give the DRB clear parameters to work with when reviewing the site development plan for building permit. Otherwise, delegation to the DRB is not warranted.

COMMERCIAL DESIGN STANDARDS (Sheets 4 & 5)

Introduction:

The objective is to create a high-quality neighborhood commercial tract. The standards are a supplement to the Zoning Code and other City ordinances.

I. Parking & Circulation Standards:

These provide for demarcated pedestrian connections, 8 foot sidewalks and breaking-up parking areas with landscaping and/or non-vehicular connections. Standard C, regarding pedestrian connections, needs to be moved into a new section called, for example, Pedestrian and Site Amenities.

This new section can address pedestrian (and bicycle) circulation, pedestrian connections and site amenities such as seating, plaza areas, and other amenities that would help define the site and re-

inforce the quality provided by the landscaping and architectural standards. Another way to do it would be to add just a Site Amenities section. Either way, the topics are standard in design standards so they need to be called-out and addressed.

II. Building Heights & Setbacks:

The standard says “per the C-2 zone”. The height and setback requirements need to be stated so the design standards can be a functional, stand-alone document.

III. Landscaping Standards:

The proposed landscaping standards are detailed and would provide a varied palette, more than minimum ground coverage, and meet Zoning Code requirements. Water conserving turf is allowed.

IV. Architectural Standards:

The objective is to create a visually integrated site. A variety of architectural styles, such as Pueblo, Territorial, or NM Traditional (Northern NM?) and Southwestern Contemporary, are permitted. Quality on all buildings sides (common in design standards) is required. Values for the “middle range of reflectance” need to be specified and/or the objective of avoiding very light or very dark colors needs to be stated. “Earth tone” colors include all colors on earth; specificity is needed. Staff suggests stating, for example, browns, tans, grey-greens.

V. Screening, Walls & Fencing Standards:

These would provide for sufficient screening of parking and refuse. Staff suggests clarifying “masonry” in Standard C (stucco-finish or split-face block) regarding the refuse enclosure. This would also further define Standard D regarding compatibility with the buildings.

VI. Lighting Standards: The section needs to be numbered.

VII. Signage Standards:

Building-mounted and wall signs are allowed and are required to be consistent with the architectural style of the buildings. Off-premise signs are prohibited, which is common in design standards. Some standards are Zoning Code requirements, such as not allowing signs to extend above rooflines, on natural features, or that have moving parts. Staff suggests at least 70% contrast between the lettering and the background; 50% contrast is proposed. This would improve readability, as would limiting colors and materials to 3 different types.

VIII. Utility Standards: ok. No proposed changes at this time.

Pedestrian & Bicycle Connections:

These topics are common in design standards and need to be addressed. Staff suggests a new section II, with renumbering of subsequent sections. The pedestrian standards listed under parking can be moved here for the sake of clarity. An explanation of the concept for pedestrian and bicycle (non-vehicular) circulation would be helpful.

Site Amenities:

This section can be added and/or combined with the Pedestrian section. Topics commonly addressed include outdoor space, seating and shading.

IX. Approval Process: ok

Future site development plans for building permit would return to the EPC for review, which is consistent with the practice that the EPC reviews shopping center sites.

VII. AGENCY & NEIGHBORHOOD CONCERNS

Reviewing Agencies/Pre-Hearing Discussion

City Departments and other agencies reviewed this application from 1/5/'15 to 1/10/'15. Long Range Planning Staff commented that, though the proposed development is allowed by the site's zoning, it is substantially inconsistent with the policies and goals cited in the application letter. All of the cited policies and goals would support a higher density, mixed-use development; a single family residential subdivision would have no direct connections to the future commercial development. Having a range of housing options (some townhouse, some single family detached, some range in sizes & products) would also help meet Plan goals/policies.

Transportation Staff's comments request additional details and clarification. Hydrology Staff note that the site plan will have to comply with the Drainage Ordinance, Subdivision Ordinance and DPM when submitted for DRB approval. Albuquerque Public Schools (APS) notes that all three area schools (elementary, junior high and senior high) are all over-capacity. Agency comments begin on p. 29.

Neighborhood/Public

Four neighborhood organizations were required to be notified: the Sungate Estates Homeowners Association (HOA), the South Valley Coalition of Neighborhood Associations (NAs), the SW Alliance of Neighbors (SWAN), and the Westside Coalition. The applicant notified them as required (see attachments). As of this writing, Staff has not received any comments or inquiries.

VIII. CONCLUSION

This request is for a site development plan for subdivision, with design standards, for an approx. 25.5 acre site that comprises the SW corner of the intersection of Gibson Blvd. and 98th St. SW. The subject site is vacant.

The applicant proposes to create three tracts and 80 individual lots in order to develop a residential subdivision. Residential design standards are proposed and delegation of approval authority to the DRB is requested. Commercial design standards are also proposed, though currently no development is planned. The approximately 5 acre commercial tract would return to the EPC for review.

The subject site is in the Developing Urban area of the Comprehensive Plan. The West Side Strategic Plan (WSSP), the Southwest Area Action Plan (SWAAP, contained in the WSSP) and

the Rio Bravo sector Development Plan (RBSDP) apply. Overall, Staff finds that the request mostly does not further applicable Goals and policies.

Although it has been determined that the site's SU-1 Mixed Use zoning does not prohibit single-family homes, the request is in conflict with a preponderance of Goals and policies that apply to the subject site and is contrary to the overarching intent of Activity Centers as stated in the Comprehensive Plan, the WSSP and the SWAAP. For these reasons, Staff recommends denial of the request. Should the EPC disagree, Staff recommends conditions to bring the request closer to meeting applicable policy objectives and clarification of the proposed design standards to provide the DRB with clear parameters. Otherwise, delegation to the DRB is not warranted at this time.

FINDINGS -15EPC-40001, February 12, 2015-Site Development Plan for Subdivision

1. The subject request is for a site development plan for subdivision for Tract 34D-1-A Bulk Land Plat, Tract 31A-1-A Lands of Salazar Family Trust, Salazar Quatro Trust, JSJ Investment Company & Falba Hannett, and Tracts 4-A-1 and 32H-1-A, an approximately 25.5 acre site consisting of the SW corner of the intersection of Gibson Blvd. SW and 98th St. SW, zoned SU-1 for Mixed Use.
2. The applicant proposes to create three tracts and to subdivide an approximately 20 acre portion of the subject site into 80 individual lots. Design standards are proposed for the residential portion and for the future, approximately 5 acre commercial portion. Delegation of approval authority to the Development Review Board (DRB) is requested for the residential portion. The commercial portion would return to the EPC.
3. The subject site is within the boundaries of the Developing Urban Area of the Comprehensive Plan. The West Side Strategic Plan (WSSP), the Southwest Area Action Plan (SWAAP, contained in the WSSP) and the Rio Bravo sector Development Plan (RBSDP) apply.
4. The Albuquerque/Bernalillo County Comprehensive Plan, the WSSP, the SWAAP and the RBSDP and the City of Albuquerque Zoning Code are incorporated herein by reference and made part of the record for all purposes.
5. Because the commercial portion of the subject site is greater than 5 acres in size, it is a Shopping Center (SC) site by definition and is subject to the regulations of Zoning Code §14-16-3-2.
6. The request does not further the following Comprehensive Plan Goals:
 - A. Established Urban Goal. The request would result in a use, a single-family subdivision, platted to be identical to the other single-family subdivisions surrounding it. There is an opportunity to create a different type of housing option to offer variety and maximum choice, especially since the subject site is in a designated Activity Center, but this is not proposed. The proposed subdivision is laid out to not provide choice in transportation modes and would not facilitate use of transit, walking or biking. Walled-off subdivisions do not contribute to integrated communities. There are few details about the potential, future commercial uses.
 - B. Transportation and Transit Goal. There have been efforts to develop 98th St. as a transportation corridor; there are bus shelters in close proximity and some density is developing (ex. townhomes/apartments in the SE portion of the Activity Center). The request would not encourage bicycling, walking or other alternatives to automobile travel because the residential uses would be walled in (with only two access points) and the residential and non-residential uses would be not connected at all. Both complicate non-vehicle circulation. Walls, gates and

relatively low- density development do not support efforts to develop 98th St. as a transit corridor.

7. The request does not further the following Comprehensive Plan policies:

- A. Policy II.B.5a-full range of urban land uses. Office and retail uses would bring more variety to the area's land use mix. The request would allow for development of the same type of single-family homes that already characterize the area, which would not increase variety. It would also preclude other types of uses, such as more commercial, services, institutional and entertainment, in an area where there is little land use variety.
- B. Policy II.B.5f- clustering homes/open areas. The subject site offers an opportunity to provide a different type of product, such as higher density, clustered housing, with open areas as amenities for the residents. The townhomes to the east are higher density, but they offer very little open space.
- C. Policy II.B.5h- higher density housing location. The subject site is an appropriate location for higher density housing because it is located in a designated Activity Center, the 98th/Gibson Community Activity Center. However, low density (4 DU/ac) housing is proposed in an Activity Center, on the side of 98th St. where there is no mixed density pattern. The proposed residential development would not function as a transition, either.
- E. Policy II.D.4g- Pedestrian opportunities/safe, pleasant non-motorized travel. Walls, gates, limited access points and long expanses of perimeter walls preclude pedestrian opportunities and make it difficult for people who want to (or have to) use alternative modes of transportation.

8. The request does not further the following Comprehensive Plan Goal and policies regarding Activity Centers:

- A. Goal- The subject site is located in a designated Activity Center, the 98th/Gibson Community Activity Center (CAC). It is shown as a proposed Activity Center in the January 2002 map in the Comprehensive Plan. In January 2003, the West Side Strategic Plan designed the 98th/Gibson CAC to serve the Bridge/Westgate and Gun Club Communities. Note that the existing subdivision in the NE corner of the Activity Center was approved in 2001, prior to the CAC designation (see also History section of this report). expand and strengthen concentrations of moderate and high-density mixed land use and social/economic activities which reduce urban sprawl, auto travel needs, and service costs
- B. Policy II.B.7a- mixed-use concentrations/promote transit and pedestrian access/maximize cost-effectiveness of services. The request would not promote transit usage or pedestrianism because the subdivision would be walled in and no pathways or pedestrian gates are shown.

Due to its relatively low density (4 DU/ac), the request would not maximize cost-effectiveness of services.

- C. Policy II.B.7i- multi-unit housing/Activity Centers. The idea behind Activity Centers is to concentrate residential density, commercial and service uses so that there are enough people to make transit feasible, support commercial uses and use existing infrastructure in an efficient manner. Single-family homes at a relatively low density (4DU/ac) are intended to be located outside of Activity Center rather than in them.
- D. Policy II.B.9d- development projects in Community Activity Centers. The request would result in a walled subdivision and potential, future commercial uses. These would be separated by a wall with no pedestrian linkages between them (2), which would discourage walking trips from the neighborhood to the non-residential uses. Connectivity between uses would not be provided (1). Though the buildings may reflect some local architectural traditions, the site layout would generally not support public transit and pedestrian activity (3). Landscaping (residential and commercial design standards) and colored, textured paving and architecture (commercial design standards) would help improve the public realm, though the result would be a divided activity center with no interconnection between residential and non-residential uses (4).
- E. Policy II.C.6g-concentrations of employment in Activity Centers/balance jobs with housing. One of the main ideas behind Activity Centers is to concentrate employment and non-residential uses in designated locations, so that the surrounding single-family residential areas have services in close proximity and don't have to travel so far. Also, the jobs-housing balance on the Westside remains heavily skewed toward housing; developing activity centers as stated in the Plans would help provide much-needed jobs.

9. Regarding the WSSP, the request does not further the following, applicable policies:

- A. WSSP Policy 1.1- communities shall develop with areas of higher density (in Community and Neighborhood Centers) surrounded by areas of lower density. Low density residential development (typical 3-5 du/acre subdivisions) shall not be approved within the Centers. The subject site is located in the 98th/Gibson Community Activity Center (WSSP, page 112). The proposed residential development is 4 DU/ac, and the WSSP states that "low density residential development (typical 3-5 DU/acre subdivisions) shall not be approved within the Centers."
- B. WSSP Policy 2.5- Subdivisions/local public school capacity. If area schools are at or over capacity, then the requested action should be denied unless the applicant demonstrates that the proposed action will create no net increase in enrollment for area schools (e.g. senior housing.) The request would result in 80 new households. APS comments that any residential development in this area will impact Rudolfo Anaya Elementary School, Truman Middle School, and Atrisco Heritage Academy High School. Currently, all three schools are over

capacity. The applicant has not demonstrated that the request would not create a net increase in school enrollment, so the request should be denied.

- C. WSSP Policy 3.42- support location of mixed-use higher density development in this Community in the Activity Centers internal to the Community. The subject site is located in the 98th/Gibson Community Activity Center (see map p. 112), which is internal to the Bridge/Westgate Community. The intent of the WSSP is to support mixed-use higher density development in this location. The request, however, would result in a subdivision with a density of 4 DU/ac, which is relatively low.
- D. WSSP Policy 3.46- promote densities consistent with those in Sector Development Plans for the Bridge/Westgate Community, with densities as high as 30 DU/ac within the designated Community Activity Centers and adjacent areas. The Rio Bravo Sector Development Plan (RBSDP) specifies a residential density of up to 20 DU/ac (which used to be 30 DU/ac, but that was changed with the 2009 amendments). The subject site is in a designated Community Activity Center, but has a density of 4 DU/ac. This is inconsistent with the intent of the WSSP.
- E. WSSP Policy 4.6.a- design subdivisions to provide an efficient circulation pattern for transit service, and WSSP Policy 4.6.b- design subdivisions to provide safe, attractive and efficient patterns for pedestrians. Walking distances from residences to transit service should be kept to ¼ mile or less. The proposed design standards provide no connectivity between commercial and residential tracts. The proposed subdivision would be gated and separated from the roadway by long expanses of walls, which would not provide efficient patterns for pedestrians, make walking distances too long for many people and would make it difficult overall to access transit service (a & b). Most future residents would be over ¼ mile from Transit service (b).
- F. WSSP Policy 4.6.c- gated and/or walled communities and cul-de-sacs are strongly discouraged on the West Side. The proposed subdivision would be both gated and walled, and would not provide openings through perimeter walls every 600 feet.
- G. WSSP Policy 4.6.d- subdivisions shall be designed to avoid rear yard walls facing public streets. The proposed subdivision has lots with rear yards facing Blake Rd., Gibson Blvd. and 98th St.
- H. WSSP Policy 4.6.e- subdivisions shall be designed to provide multiple vehicular and pedestrian access points. The proposed subdivision would be gated and have two access points. Openings through perimeter walls are neither shown on the site development plan nor addressed in the design standards. The lack of convenient access to 98th St. could make transit less desirable for most residents. The commercial design standards do not address connectivity with the residential use.

- I. WSSP Policy 4.10- promote and establish land uses and urban patterns whose design support bicycle and pedestrian travel, and public transportation, encourage ridership, enhance public mobility and promote alternatives to single occupant vehicle use. As proposed, the request would not create land use patterns that support bicycle and pedestrian travel and promote alternatives to single occupancy vehicle usage. The design standards do not address openings through perimeter walls and would preclude direct access to transit service for pedestrians and bicyclists.

10. The request is inconsistent with the following, applicable Goals of the SWASAP (a chapter of the WSSP):

- A. Goal 1- build complete neighborhoods and a network of activity centers to serve them. The idea is that the Community Activity Center include clusters of stores, offices, medical services, day care, entertainment, multi-family residences and/or public facilities such schools, libraries, etc. Neighborhood and Community Activity Centers are intended to be pedestrian-friendly, accessible but not dominated by vehicles, and contain a mixture of uses and housing opportunities different from those in the interior of neighborhoods (i.e.- different than the typical single-family residential).

The request would help preclude this part of SW Albuquerque from becoming a complete neighborhood. Approx. 1/5 of the subject site would be left for non-residential uses; non-residential uses can provide jobs, which are needed on the Westside. More jobs would result if the subject site were to be developed with a mix of commercial and retail uses. Adding low-density residential in this location means that residents of this area would continue to live far from their jobs and most shopping opportunities.

- B. Goal 4- increase and improve retail and commercial services. Although commercial design standards are proposed, there are no concrete plans for commercial development at this time. 4/5 of the subject site is proposed to be developed as single-family homes, which remove the possibility of providing more non-residential uses in the Activity Center. 5 acres would remain for future retail and commercial services, which is less than the size of a Neighborhood Center as mentioned in the SWAAP- approx. 10-15 acres.
- C. Goal 5- develop a complete multi-modal transportation network. One applicable objective is to have a well-connected network that allows people to easily walk, bicycle, drive or take a bus. The proposed subdivision layout would not help facilitate creation of a complete transportation network because it would be gated, have long expanses of walls, long block lengths, and dead-end streets. Connectivity would be limited and access to transit complicated by few access points.

11. Though single-family residential is not prohibited by the subject site's zoning, the request is inconsistent with the intent of the RBSDP in the following ways:

- A. The majority of the RBSDP area is intended for single-family homes (R-LT). The only areas envisioned for commercial development are the Community Activity Center at the intersection of 98th St./Gibson Blvd. and two small pocket commercial centers in the far southern portion of the Plan area. The request would remove the possibility of developing commercial, service, office, institutional and multi-family uses on approximately 20 acres in the 98th St./Gibson Blvd. Community Activity Center.
- B. The intent of the 2009 amendments to the RBSDP was to: “help concentrate moderate-density mixed land use and social and economic activities to reduce urban sprawl, auto travel needs, and service costs and enhance the identity of Albuquerque and the SW Albuquerque community and support Albuquerque/Bernalillo County Comprehensive Plan policies in Section II.B.7 concerning Activity Centers.”

The intent is to concentrate a mixture of land uses in activity centers. Residential uses can be included, but they are intended to be at least “moderate-density” and not the low-density (4 DU/ac) development proposed. Policies in the Comprehensive Plan, WSSP and SWASAP support higher density residential uses (ex. apartments) in activity centers along with non-residential uses. The intent of the 2009 amendments is to be consistent with the higher-ranking plans. Because low-density (4 DU/ac) single-family homes are proposed on 4/5 of the subject site, the request is inconsistent with the intent of the RBSDP.

- C. Although it has been determined that the subject site’s SU-1 Mixed Use zoning does not prohibit single-family homes, the request is in conflict with a preponderance of Goals and policies that apply to the subject site and is contrary to the overarching intent of Activity Centers as stated in the Comprehensive Plan, the WSSP and the SWAAP. The Goals and policies contained in these plans are mutually reinforcing and support the key concept of multi-family residential, commercial, office and service uses inside of Activity Centers and single-family homes outside of them. This development pattern would result in less travel time to services, improved access to transit, better conditions for pedestrians and bicyclists and improvement of the jobs/housing imbalance on the Westside.
- D. The 2009 amendments intend to “limit the geographic coverage of repetitions of one housing type” (single-family or multi-family). Though single-family homes are not prohibited on the subject site, development to the NW, SW and SE of the subject site consists of single-family homes with similar site layouts. The request would repeat the same, predominant housing type and layout, and would preclude opportunities to provide a variety of housing types.
12. The affected neighborhood organizations are the Sungate Estates Homeowners Association (HOA), the South Valley Coalition of Neighborhood Associations (NAs), the SW Alliance of Neighbors (SWAN), and the Westside Coalition. The applicant notified them as required. As of this writing, Staff has not received any comments or inquiries.

RECOMMENDATION - 15EPC-40001, February 12, 2015

DENIAL of 15EPC-40001, a Site Development Plan for Subdivision for Tract 34D-1-A Bulk Land Plat, Tract 31A-1-A Lands of Salazar Family Trust, Salazar Quatro Trust, JSJ Investment Company & Falba Hannett, and Tracts 4-A-1 and 32H-1-A, an approximately 25.5 acre site consisting of the SW corner of the intersection of Gibson Blvd. SW and 98th St. SW, zoned SU-1 for Mixed Use, based on the preceding Findings.

***Catalina Lehner, AICP
Senior Planner***

cc: Myers, McCready & Myers, Attn: Matt Myers, 1401 Central Ave. NW, Suite B, Albuquerque, NM 87104
Mike Smith, Sun Gate Estates HOA, 2612 Mountain Gate SW, Albuquerque, NM 87121
Robert Maldonado, Sun Gate Estates HOA, 2716 Mountain Gate SW, Albuquerque, NM 87121
Rod Mahoney, South Valley Coalition of NAs, 1838 Sadora Rd. SW, Albuquerque, NM 87105
Marcia Fernandez, South Valley Coalition of NAs, 2401 Violet SW, Albuquerque, NM 87105
Johnny Pena, SW Alliance of Neighbors (SWAN), 6525 Sunset Gardens SW, Albuquerque, NM 87121
Jerry Gallegos, SW Alliance of Neighbors (SWAN), 417 65th St. SW, Albuquerque, NM 87121
Jerry Worrall, Westside Coalition, 1039 Pinatubo Pl. NW, Albuquerque, NM 87120
Harry Hendriksen, Westside Coalition, 10592 Rio del Sol Ct. NW, Albuquerque, NM 87114-2701

CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE AGENCY COMMENTS

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Zoning Code Services

No adverse comments.

Office of Neighborhood Coordination

SunGate Estates HOA, South Valley Coalition of NAs, South West Alliance of Neighbors (SWAN)
Westside Coalition of NAs.

Long Range Planning

The request is for a Site Development Plan for Subdivision. The site is within the Rio Bravo Sector Development Plan boundaries. The site is zoned SU-1 for Mixed Uses. The request is for approval of 80 residential lots (at R-1 densities); 5.6 acres of the site remain for future commercial development. The requested development is allowed by the site's zoning, but it is substantially inconsistent with the policies and goals cited in the application letter. The zone is for mixed uses, "to include RLT zoning and other high-density residential uses." The West Side Strategic Plan policy states that development within Community Activity Centers "provides the primary focus for the entire community with a higher concentration and greater variety of commercial and entertainment uses...the most intense land uses within the community." All of the policies and goals cited in the letter would support a higher density, mixed-use development; a single family residential subdivision is proposed that would have no direct connections to the future commercial development parcel.

The Rio Bravo SDP amendment R-08-70 further limits repetition of one housing type (single-family detached house, single-family attached, or multiple-family) in II.D.1, Land Use, Parcelization and Development. The SU-1 for Mixed Use Zone description indicates that "R-LT zoning and other high-density residential uses" are allowed, which permits low-density single-family residential, even while the intent is clearly for R-LT and above densities. Having a range of housing options (some townhouse, some single family detached, some range in sizes & products) would also help meet Plan goals/policies.

CITY ENGINEER

Transportation Development Services

Transportation Development (City Engineer/Planning Department):

- A. Label all existing facilities within public right-of-way on site plan including the existing curb, sidewalk, and sidewalk widths immediately adjacent to the site. Also, show the existing wheelchair ramps and the existing transit stop.
- B. Show the existing medians within Gibson Blvd. and 98th Street. Also, show existing bike lanes and bike lane widths on surrounding streets.

- C. Label Orange Range Avenue and its roadway width at its intersection with Blake Road to show its proximity relative to the new intersection. It is preferable to align the new road with Orange Range Avenue.
- D. Internally, within the site, label all new curb and curb ramps, and provide curb ramp details. Label all new sidewalk and sidewalk widths within the subdivision, and provide a minimum sidewalk width of 4 feet. Show typical section for all internal roads.
- E. Label all internal curb radii for the private roads on-site. All internal curb radii at the intersections should be a minimum of 20 feet.
- F. Provide a separate plan showing the route for a garbage truck and emergency vehicle.
- G. Provide a detail of the curb radii configuration for the new access from 98th Street and Blake Road.
- H. Label length of stub street.
- I. Developer is responsible for permanent improvements to the transportation facilities adjacent to the proposed development site plan, as required by the Development Review Board (DRB).

Traffic Engineering Operations

Hydrology

The site plan will have to comply with the Drainage Ordinance, Subdivision Ordinance and DPM when submitted for DRB approval.

DEPARTMENT of MUNICIPAL DEVELOPMENT

Transportation Planning

Per the Interim Long Range Roadway System map, both Gibson Blvd. and 98th St. are both Principal Arterials. Gibson Blvd. is planned to contain 124 feet of R/W, whereas 98 St. is to be 156 feet wide. Both Gibson Blvd. and 98th St. currently contain bicycle lanes, which is consistent with the Long Range Bikeway System map.

Traffic Engineering Operations (Department of Municipal Development):

- No comments received.

Street Maintenance (Department of Municipal Development):

- No comments received.

New Mexico Department of Transportation (NMDOT):

- NM DOT has no comments.

RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS FROM CITY ENGINEER, MUNICIPAL DEVELOPMENT and NMDOT:

Conditions of approval for the proposed Site Development Plan for Subdivision shall include:

- A. Label all existing facilities within public right-of-way on site plan including the existing curb, sidewalk, and sidewalk widths immediately adjacent to the site. Also, show the existing wheelchair ramps and the existing transit stop.
- B. Show the existing medians within Gibson Blvd. and 98th Street. Also, show existing bike lanes and bike lane widths on surrounding streets.
- C. Label Orange Range Avenue and its roadway width at its intersection with Blake Road to show its proximity relative to the new intersection. It is preferable to align the new road with Orange Range Avenue.
- D. Internally, within the site, label all new curb and curb ramps, and provide curb ramp details. Label all new sidewalk and sidewalk widths within the subdivision, and provide a minimum sidewalk width of 4 feet. Show typical section for all internal roads.
- E. Label all internal curb radii for the private roads on-site. All internal curb radii at the intersections should be a minimum of 20 feet.
- F. Provide a separate plan showing the route for a garbage truck and emergency vehicle.
- G. Provide a detail of the curb radii configuration for the new access from 98th Street and Blake Road.
- H. Label length of stub street.
- I. Developer is responsible for permanent improvements to the transportation facilities adjacent to the proposed development site plan, as required by the Development Review Board (DRB).

WATER UTILITY AUTHORITY

Utility Services- No Comment

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH DEPARTMENT

Air Quality Division

Environmental Services Division

There is the potential for above-named project to be impacted by the presence of landfill gas generated by a former City owned/operated landfill (Coronado Landfill). The developers of this site are required to follow the most current version of the *City of Albuquerque Interim Guidelines for Development within City Designated Landfill Buffer Zones*. A landfill gas assessment must be completed for this development. A review and approval of the Site Plan(s), the proposed construction, design drawings, and a certification of construction will be required by the Environmental Health Department (EHD), Environmental Services Division.

PARKS AND RECREATION

Planning and Design

No comments.

Open Space Division

OSD has reviewed and has no comments.

City Forester

POLICE DEPARTMENT/Planning

This project is in the Southwest Area Command. No Crime Prevention or CPTED comments concerning the proposed Site Development Plan for Subdivision request at this time.

SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT DEPARTMENT

Refuse Division

Approved. Must follow SWMD ordinances for enclosure access and location.

FIRE DEPARTMENT/Planning

All site development plans for subdivisions and site development plans for building permit shall be submitted to the Fire Marshal’s Office Plans Checking Division for an official review and approval.

1) Required Hydrants (DPM Ch 25 Sec 8 and Sec 7): Fire Hydrants locations appear to meet standards. Please submit plans for an official approval.

2) Apparatus Access (IFC 503 and Appendix D): Fire Department access appears to meet standards. Please submit plans for an official approval.

TRANSIT DEPARTMENT

Project # 1010332 14EPC-70428 SITE DEVELOPMENT FOR SUBDIVISION TRACTS 34D-1-A, LANDS OF SALAZAR FAIMILY TRUST ET AL., LOCATED ON 98 TH STREEET SW BETWEEN GIBSON BLVD. SW AND BLAKE RD, SW, (APPROX 19.867 AC) INTO 80 SINGLE FAMILY DU AND ONE 5 ACRE COMMERCIAL TRACT. (N-9)	Adjacent and nearby routes	Route #198, 98 th Street route, passes the site on 98 th Street.
	Adjacent bus stops	There is an existing bus stop on 98 street adjacent to the property, serving the above-mentioned route on 98 street in southbound direction, approx..60’ north from the south east corner of the property.
	Site plan requirements	Transit requests the applicant to install a Type C bus shelter as per the COA Design standard COA 2355, and associated bench and trash can at the existing bus stop located adjacent to the property on 98 th Street. Please provide access to the bus stop from the property.
	Large site TDM suggestions	None.
	Other information	None

COMMENTS FROM OTHER AGENCIES

BERNALILLO COUNTY

ALBUQUERQUE METROPOLITAN ARROYO FLOOD CONTROL AUTHORITY

Reviewed, no comments.

ALBUQUERQUE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

**Project #1010332
 14EPC-70428 SITE
 DEVELOPMENT
 PLAN FOR
 SUBDIVISION**

Lands of Salazar Family Trust, Tract 34D-1-A, is located on 98th St SW between Gibson Blvd SW and Blake Rd SW. The owner of the above property requests approval of a Site Development Plan for Subdivision for a development that will consist of 80 single family units and a 5 acres commercial development. Any residential development in this area will impact Rudolfo Anaya Elementary School, Truman Middle School, and Atrisco Heritage Academy High School. Currently, all three schools are over capacity.

Loc No	School	2014-15 40th Day	Capacity	Space Available
392	Rudolfo Anaya ES	928	560	-368
475	Truman MS	1352	950	-402
576	Atrisco Heritage	2420	2300	-120

Residential Units: 80
Est. Elementary School Students: 21
Est. Middle School Students: 9
Est. High School Students: 9
Est. Total # of Students from Project: 39

*The estimated number of students from the proposed project is based on an average student generation rate for the entire APS district

To address overcrowding at schools, APS will explore various alternatives. A combination or all of the following options may be utilized to relieve overcrowded schools.

- Provide new capacity (long term solution)
 - Construct new schools or additions
 - Add portables
 - Use of non-classroom spaces for temporary classrooms
 - Lease facilities
 - Use other public facilities
- Improve facility efficiency (short term solution)
 - Schedule Changes
 - Double sessions
 - Multi-track year-round
 - Other

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Float teachers (flex schedule)• Shift students to Schools with Capacity (short term solution)<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Boundary Adjustments / Busing○ Grade reconfiguration• Combination of above strategies <p>All planned additions to existing educational facilities are contingent upon taxpayer approval.</p>
--	---

MID-REGION COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

MIDDLE RIO GRANDE CONSERVANCY DISTRICT

PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF NEW MEXICO

1. It is the applicant’s obligation to determine if existing utility easements or rights-of-way are located on or adjacent to the property and to abide by any conditions or terms of those easements.
2. An existing overhead electric distribution line is located along the northern boundary of the subject property along Gibson Boulevard SW and an underground distribution line is located along the eastern boundary of the site along 98th Street SW. It is necessary for the developer to contact PNM’s New Service Delivery Department to coordinate electric service for this project and for any modifications to the existing electric distribution facilities. Any relocation, changes or realignment regarding existing electric utilities will be the developer’s expense. In some cases, relocation or changes to existing facilities may not be feasible due to safety clearances or other physical constraints. The applicant is responsible to abide by any conditions or terms for those distribution easements. PNM will review all technical needs, issues and safety clearances for its electric power systems. Contact:
PNM – New Service Delivery, 4201 Edith Boulevard NE, Albuquerque, NM 87107
Phone: (505) 241-3425
3. Ground-mounted equipment screening will be designed to allow for access to utility facilities. All screening and vegetation surrounding ground-mounted transformers and utility pads are to allow 10 feet of clearance in front of the equipment door and 5-6 feet of clearance on the remaining three sides for safe operation, maintenance and repair purposes. Refer to the PNM Electric Service Guide at www.pnm.com for specifications.
4. Coordination with PNM will be necessary for this project regarding proposed tree species, the height at maturity and tree placement, sign location and height, and lighting height in order to ensure sufficient safety clearances to avoid interference with the existing electric distribution facilities along the eastern and northern boundaries of the subject site.