## Staff Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agent</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Site Development Plan for Building Permit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nathan Bisch - One Architecture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Legal Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Development Plan for Building Permit</td>
<td>Tract A-2, Heritage Marketplace</td>
<td>SW corner of Ladera Drive and Market Street</td>
<td>.94 acres</td>
<td>SU-2/SU-1 Planned Office Park and Commercial Development to Include Full Service Alcohol Sales with a Sit Down Restaurant</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary of Analysis

This is request for Site Development Plan for Building Permit for a 3,237 square foot restaurant with drive up service window on a .94 acre site located on the SW corner of Ladera Dr. and Market St. and zoned SU-2/SU-1 for Planned Office Park and Commercial Development to Include Full Service Alcohol Sales with a Sit Down Restaurant. The site is within the Heritage Marketplace Site Development Plan for Subdivision boundary.

A facilitated meeting occurred on January 25, 2017. Neighbors expressed concern about existing traffic in the area, additional traffic from the proposed use, the function of the intersections, delivery trucks, pedestrian safety, and the lack of a signal at Market Street because of the distance to Unser Boulevard. Attendees opposed the drive-thru use because a sit down restaurant would be preferable in the neighborhood center.

Staff recommends approval with conditions.

City Departments and other interested agencies reviewed this application from 01/03/2017 to 01/19/2017

Agency comments used in the preparation of this report begin on Page 16.
I. AREA CHARACTERISTICS AND ZONING HISTORY

Surrounding zoning, plan designations, and land uses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Comprehensive Plan Area; Applicable Rank II &amp; III Plans</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>R-D</td>
<td>Developing Urban, WSSP, El Rancho Atrisco Phase III SDP</td>
<td>Vacant, Multi-Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>SU-2/ SU-1 Planned Office Park and Commercial Development to include sales of package Liquor in Association with a Grocery Store</td>
<td>Developing Urban, WSSP, El Rancho Atrisco Phase III SDP</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>R-D</td>
<td>Developing Urban, WSSP, El Rancho Atrisco Phase III SDP</td>
<td>Multi-Family/ Single Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>SU-2 SU-1 Planned Office Park and Commercial Development, R-D</td>
<td>Developing Urban, WSSP</td>
<td>Commercial, Single Family</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. INTRODUCTION

Proposal

This is a request for a Site Development Plan for Building Permit for .94 acre site located on the south west corner of Ladera Drive and Market Street. The subject site is zoned SU-2/SU-1 for Planned Office Park and Commercial Development to Include Full Service Alcohol Sales with a Sit Down Restaurant. The applicant proposes to construct a 3,237 square foot restaurant with drive up service window. The subject site is located within the boundaries of the Heritage Marketplace Site Development Plan for Subdivision; therefore the requested Site Development Plan for Building Permit must conform to the EPC approved Heritage Marketplace Site Development Plan for Subdivision design standards. (13EPC-40148)

EPC Role

The EPC is hearing this case because of the SU-1 zone designation which requires the site plan review and approval. The EPC is the final decision-making body unless the EPC decision is appealed (Ref: §14-16-2-22(A)(1), the SU-1 zone. If so, an appeal would go to the Land Use
Hearing Officer (LUHO) then City Council 14-16-4-4-(A)(2). The request is considered a quasi-judicial matter.

**History/Background**

The El Rancho Atrisco Phase III Sector Plan, adopted in 1981, zoned the subject site SU-1 Planned Office Park and Commercial Development. Per the plan, commercial development is capped at no more than 50% of the original 25 acres of which the subject site is part.

The site is part of a larger 20 acre Site Development Plan for Subdivision.

In October 2012 the City Code Compliance Manager confirmed that activities allowed on the site must correspond to those enumerated in the C-1 Neighborhood Commercial zone uses, and that the area within which the subject site is located may be developed with commercial uses pursuant to the C-1 zone.

A construction project on Unser Blvd. north of I-40 widened the roadway from four to six lanes for through traffic and separate left-turn lanes at major intersections including the Ladera Rd. and Unser Blvd. intersection. The construction project was completed mid-2013.

The Transportation Coordinating Committee of the Mid-Region Council of Governments approved the additional access from Unser Boulevard in 2014, resolution TCC R-14-1.

In February of 2014, the Heritage Marketplace Site Development Plan for Subdivision (13EPC-40148, see attached) was approved by the EPC for the platted 20 acre site. This Site Plan for Subdivision states that a “A maximum of 50 percent (12.5 acres) of the original 25-acre site as referenced on Sheet 5 of the El Rancho Atrisco Phase III Sector Development Plan is eligible for development with retail and service-type uses consistent with those of the C-1 zone.” (see attached). Since the existing gas station consists of .85 acres, an additional 11.65 acres may be developed with commercial uses pursuant to the C-1 zone. The Heritage Marketplace Site Development Plan for Subdivision was signed off on by the DRB in November of 2014. Although the applicant had originally asked for delegation of the Site Development Plan for Building Permit to the DRB, the EPC chose to have the Site Development Plan for Building Permit return to the EPC for review.

In December of 2014, the EPC approved a Zone Map Amendment to add to the language “to Include Full Service Alcohol Sales with a Sit Down Restaurant” on the subject site and the three parcels along Unser Boulevard and add “to include the Sales of Package Liquor in Association with a Grocery Store” the site that now contains the Wal-Mart grocery store. A Site Development Plan for Building Permit for the parcels to the south of the subject site (14-EPC 40076, 77, 78 and 79) for the grocery store and a retail building were also approved.

The EPC recently approved two restaurants with drive up service windows for the two southern most parcels along Unser Boulevard (16 EPC 40055 and 16 EPC 40073).

**Context**

The subject site is vacant land located at the southwest corner of Ladera Drive and Market Street. The adjacent pads to the north and south contain, a grocery store (Walmart) with an adjacent
fueling station was constructed in 2015 as part of the Heritage Marketplace. The pad sites along Unser Boulevard will be developed with a retail building, a drive thru restaurant and drive thru restaurant with attached retail building. The corner of Unser Boulevard and Ladera Drive is occupied by an additional convenience store with gasoline pumps, constructed in 1996 prior to the Heritage Marketplace Site Development Plan for Subdivision.

To the east of the vacant parcels across Market Street is a multi-family apartment complex and farther to the east and south are single family neighborhoods, both part of the Laurelwood Neighborhood Association. Farther to the west across Unser Boulevard is a single family residential development, part of the Parkway Neighborhood Association.

Transportation System

The Long Range Roadway System (LRRS) map, produced by the Mid-Region Council of Governments (MRCOG), identifies the functional classifications of roadways.

The LRRS designates Unser Blvd. as a Principal Arterial.

The LRRS designates Ladera Dr. as a Minor Arterial.

The LRRS designates Market Street as a Local Street.

Comprehensive Plan Corridor Designation

Unser Blvd. is currently designated as an Express Transit Corridor, which, as stated in the Comprehensive Plan Corridor Policies, is “dedicated to developing higher speeds with fewer interruptions to travel for the car and transit vehicles.”

Trails/Bikeways

A paved multi-use trail is developed along Unser Blvd, with connections to a trail along I-40.

Public Facilities/Community Services

Please refer to the Public Facilities Map in the packet for a complete listing of public facilities and community services located within one mile of the subject site.

III. ANALYSIS

APPLICABLE ORDINANCES, PLANS AND POLICIES

Albuquerque Comprehensive Zoning Code

The El Rancho Atrisco Phase III Sector Plan, adopted in 1981, zoned the subject site SU-1 Planned Office Park and Commercial Development. Per the plan, commercial development is capped at no more than 50% of the original 25 acres of which the subject site is part.

In a letter dated October 18, 2012 (see attached), the City Code Compliance Manager confirmed the existing SU-1 zoning, regulated by the C-1 standards of the Zoning Code (§14-16-2-16(A)(7). Thus the northern half of the property can be developed with retail and service-type
uses consistent with the uses of the C-1 Zone and the additions approved by the EPC in 2014. The southern half of the property with residential and/or office uses per C-1 Zone standards. The Heritage Marketplace Site Development Plan for Subdivision references the C-2, O-1 and R-3 zones for development standards. Site development must also meet the requirements of Zoning Code §14-16-3-18(C) and §14-16-3-18(D), General Building and Site Design Regulations for Non-Residential Development.

The subject site may be developed with commercial uses, permissive and conditional, pursuant to the C-1 zone. The proposed restaurant with a drive-up service window use on the subject site is permitted under the existing zoning.

Definitions

**SU-1 Special Use Zone (§14-16-2-22):** This 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.

**Site Development Plan for Subdivision (§14-16-1-5):** 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.

**Site Development Plan for Building Permits (§14-16-1-5):** In addition to information required for Subdivision, exact structure locations, structure (including sign) elevations and dimensions, parking facilities, loading facilities, any energy conservation features of the plan (e.g., appropriate landscaping, building heights and siting for solar access, provision for non-auto transportation, or energy conservational building construction), and proposed schedule for development.

**Albuquerque / Bernalillo County Comprehensive Plan**

Policy Citations are in Regular Text; Staff Analysis is in **Bold Italics**

The subject site is located in the area designated (text) by the Comprehensive Plan with a Goal to “(text).” Applicable policies include:

Policy II.B.5.d: 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 request generally furthers Policy II.B.5.d. The proposed development would be suitable in terms of its location and intensity as it is appropriately located within an existing area zoned for commercial uses. The subject site is not considered a scenic or natural environment, and is subject to the Heritage Marketplace design standards, which were established to respect neighborhood values and conditions of the area. However, there is concern about the impact
of the traffic from the proposed development and the impact of the drive-use on the pedestrian safety.

Policy II.B.5.e: 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 can be ensured.

The request furthers Policy II.B.5.e because the site has access to a full range of existing urban services, including roads, electricity, transit and water and sewer. The proposed Site Development Plan for Building Permit is required to adhere to the Heritage Marketplace Site Development Plan for Subdivision design standards as approved by the Environmental Planning Commission. These standards help to ensure quality development on the site.

Policy II.B.5.i: Employment and service uses shall be located to complement residential areas and shall be sited to minimize adverse effects of noise, lighting, pollution, and traffic on residential environments.

The request furthers Policy II.B.5.i. New development will add to the services available to area residents and provide job opportunities. The Heritage Marketplace Site Development Plan for Subdivision provides design standards that limit lighting near residential development and includes other standards to increase the design quality for the adjacent neighborhoods.

West Side Strategic Plan (Rank II)

The West Side Strategic Plan (WSSP) was first adopted in 1997 and recently amended in 2011 to help promote development of Neighborhood and Community Activity Centers. The WSSP identifies 13 communities, each with a unique identity and comprised of smaller neighborhoods. The subject site is within the Ladera Community. The Ladera Community includes the area between the river on the east, roughly aligned with Western Trails on the north, with Unser Boulevard and the National Monument on the west, and with the I-40 corridor on the south. Relevant goals/policies include the following:

Policy 3.23: Location of commercial services, multifamily development, and public facilities shall be encouraged on the western side of the Ladera Community or in its central area to reduce trips to Coors Boulevard and provide easier access to services for neighborhoods west of the Ladera Golf Course. This development would occur in Neighborhood Centers designed to relate to the surrounding neighborhoods and be consistent with design guidelines for the area near the escarpment. Strip commercial development will not be allowed in this area.

The request furthers policy 3.23 because the proposed development adds commercial services on the western side of the Ladera Community within a neighborhood center. The site plan is generally consistent with the design standards in the Heritage Marketplace Site Development Plan for Subdivision. Extensive landscaping is provided along the northeast corner that will help the site relate to the neighborhood.

Policy 3.24: The area just west of Coors and north of I-40 up to a point of about 1000 feet south of Ladera Drive should be designated and developed as the Community Activity Center for Ladera.
The request furthers Policy 3.24 because the proposed commercial development will be located within the Unser/Ladera Neighborhood Center as shown on page 30 of the West Side Strategic Plan.

Policy 4.6.g: Create commercial developments that are or will be accessible by transit. Locate buildings adjacent to street frontages and place parking areas to the rear or sides of properties and/or on adjacent streets. Locate landscaping, walls, or fences so they do not create barriers for pedestrians. Parking shall not take precedence over pedestrian circulation.

The request partially furthers policy 4.6.g because the site is accessible by transit and the landscaping and walls do not create barriers for pedestrians. However, the building is close to the street, but has a drive up lane between the building and the street.

El Rancho Atrisco Phase III Sector Plan (Rank III)

The subject site for the request is within the boundaries of the adopted El Rancho Atrisco Phase III Sector Plan, first adopted in 1981. The Plan generally encompasses properties between Unser Boulevard on the west, Atrisco Road on the east, Hanover Road on the south, and the Ladera Channel on the north. The Rank III Plan does not provide goals or policies but rather a land use plan adopted that includes the subject site and other properties within the Sector Plan boundaries.

The request furthers the intent of El Rancho Atrisco Phase III Sector Plan because the proposed development complies with the intent of the land use plan contained within the El Rancho Atrisco Phase III Sector Plan.

Other Analysis

A Traffic Impact Analysis was done for the entire 20 acre site in 2013. This study looked at fast food restaurants up service windows (drive-thrus), two high turnover sit down restaurants, a grocery store and shopping center. The applicant updated the trip generation study to account for the additional drive up service window. The updated trip generation shows that the third drive up use will add 291 more trips than originally anticipated in the 2013 traffic study, an increase of about 2% for the entire site. Although the Trip Generation study states that use on Pad A has yet to determined, a 1,944 square foot fast food restaurant with drive up window was approved by the EPC in November. The original Trip Generation study looked at 4,000 square foot fast food restaurant with drive up service window, so smaller the square footage building would not add trips over what was originally studied.

The request does not add to the jobs to housing imbalance between the east and west sides of the city.

SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR BUILDING PERMIT

Request

This is a request for a Site Development Plan for Building Permit. The applicant proposes to construct a 3,237 square foot restaurant with drive up service window.

Section 14-16-3-11(B) of the Zoning Code states, “…Site Development Plans are expected to meet the requirements of adopted city policies and procedures.” As such, staff has reviewed the attached site development plan for conformance with applicable goals and policies in the Comprehensive Plan,
the Comprehensive Zoning Code, Heritage Marketplace Site Development Plan for Subdivision (SPS) and all other applicable City planning documents.

**Site Plan Layout / Configuration**

The subject site is part of a larger shopping area that is developed with a grocery store, gas station, mixed retail building and has two additional drive-thru restaurants under development.

The building is oriented towards the northeast corner of the site, with the drive up lanes along the north and east sides of building. The entrance faces the parking area to the south. The proposed building will be 23 feet in height and have an FAR of .07. The SPS allows an FAR of up to .3, the proposed building complies.

The required building setbacks are as stated in the O-1 zone (§14-16-2-15), front and corner set back of not less than 10 feet when a lot is across the street from a residential zone. The building is setback approximately 30 feet from Ladera Drive and 85 feet from Market Street.

**Public Outdoor Space**

The approved SPS, Section D, requires a 200 square foot patio shaded by trees and or a shade structure. The site plan shows an approximately 255 square foot patio area at the entrance to the building; a tree is shown on the east side of the patio. Staff recommends an additional tree on the west side of the patio to provide shade. A bench into the patio area would also be a reasonable addition.

**Vehicular Access, Circulation and Parking**

The site takes access from Market Street via a 24 foot wide shared access drive located on the Wal-Mart site to the south. The site has access to Ladera Drive via a 43 foot wide shared access drive.

The zoning code (§14-16-3-1(A)(26), Off Street Parking Regulations, requires one parking space for each four seats within the restaurant; the parking calculations show 54 seats and would require 13 parking spaces; 28 spaces will be provided.

**Pedestrian and Bicycle Access and Circulation, Transit Access**

Access to the sidewalks along Market Street and Ladera Drive will be provided via a pedestrian connection from the building to Ladera near the northwest corner of the building. The SPS Section B, requires pedestrian connections to the public sidewalks; an additional connection should be added to Market Street, if it can be designed to provide safe access.

A six space bicycle rack will be provided near the entrance to the building. The zoning code, (§14-16-3-1 (B)(3)) requires 1 bicycle space for each 20 required auto spaces, but not less than two spaces. The proposed bicycle parking exceeds the requirement.

The nearest bus stop is located on Ladera drive approximately 650 feet from the site. There is an additional bus stop on Unser Blvd, approximately 800 feet from the site.
Walls/Fences
A screen wall is provided along the north side of the site to screen the drive up service lane, the wall is shown at 40 inches in height and will need to be reduced to 36 inches to comply with the SPS. An additional screen wall is shown along Market Street to screen the parking area in addition to the landscaping.

Lighting and Security
The lighting plan shows parking lot lights at 25 feet in height. This is allowed by the SPS. The light pole shown on the east side of the site, close to the dumpster area may need to be moved or lowered to 16 feet in height, it appears to be within 100 feet of the residential zoned site to the east. The applicant will need to verify this prior to DRB final sign off.

Landscaping
The site is subject to the requirements of §14-16-3-10, Landscaping Regulations and the landscaping standards in the SPS. The subject site is 41,137 square feet with a 3,237 square foot building for a net lot area of approximately 37,900 square feet. Pursuant to the Zoning Code, 15% of the net lot area must be landscaped; approximately 5,685 square feet of landscaping would be required. The applicant is providing 9,848 square feet of landscaping with a mixture of low to medium water plants that are generally successful in the area. The landscape plan will need to be updated prior to DRB to show the correct required square footage. The plan currently shows 13,131 square feet of landscaped area and a required landscape area of 9,848 square feet. Staff would also recommend lowering the grade of the landscape areas and adding inlets to allow storm water into the landscaping areas where possible.

Grading, Drainage, Utility Plans
The site slopes from west to east, with a change in grade of two to three feet. A small ponding area will be developed on the east side of the site to capture the first flush, additional flows will be accommodated in the existing infrastructure on the adjacent site.

Architecture
The SPS does not require a particular style of building. The proposed building is articulated on all sides with changes in color, plane and material. The building will have stucco finishes and stacked stone accents.

The SPS Section 4, contains a prohibition against generic franchise architecture. The choice of material is similar to existing development in the area and makes the building fit in with the existing development.

Signage
The Heritage Marketplace Site Development Plan for Subdivision design standards permit up to three wall mounted signs per commercial building façade per business, not to exceed 6% of each facade.
The applicant proposes to add the signage under a separate permit. The signage shown on the building elevations appears to be compliant with the signage standards, but is not dimensioned. There is an existing freestanding sign, approved as part of the grocery store, on the west side of the site. No changes are proposed to this sign.

Future signage will be required to comply with SPS standards and a note shall be added to the site stating that future signage can approved administratively if it complies with the required standards.

IV. AGENCY & NEIGHBORHOOD CONCERNS

Reviewing Agencies

The applicant moved the dumpster location in response to comments from Solid Waste. Comments from Transportation will be addressed prior to DRB sign off.

Neighborhood/Public

The Laurelwood Neighborhood Association, Parkway Neighborhood Association and the Westside Coalition of Neighborhoods were notified.

A facilitated meeting occurred on January 25, 2017. Neighbors expressed concern about the existing traffic in the area and additional traffic from the proposed use, including the volume of traffic, the function of the intersections, delivery trucks and the lack of a signal at Market Street because of the distance to Unser Boulevard.

There is opposition to the drive-thru use. The attendees stated that the drive-thru use is not pedestrian friendly and attendees would prefer a sit down restaurant, rather than the drive-thru. They feel the sit down restaurant would be a better fit for the neighborhood center.

Additional concerns raised were that there already burger places, including Burger King nearby and that the drive-thru poses safety issues for kids crossing the site.

There were questions about the traffic study and the updated trip generation numbers. The traffic engineer sent out a table including the original and updated trip generation number to allow for a side by side comparison. The updated trip generation shows that the third drive up use will add 291 more trips than originally anticipated in the 2013 traffic study, an increase of about 2% for the entire site.

The City Traffic Engineer with Transportation Development reviewed the updated Trip Generation and agreed with the analysis. The exhibits show the change in trips for the proposed development is very small and would not warrant any further traffic mitigation or infrastructure.

The applicant is looking at making changes to the site plan to address the neighborhood concerns; there may be changes to the site plan prior to the hearing based on this. The changes can be added as conditions of approval if approved by the EPC.

Staff received questions regarding the Neighborhood Activity Center designation in the W SSP. The WSSP was updated in 2009 to add the Southwest Strategic Action Plan. This plan added a
Neighborhood Activity Center Zone to the Tower/Unser, Rio Bravo and Route 66 Sector Development Plans as an option "to create a mixed-use zoning district that can be applied voluntarily to designated Neighborhood Activity Centers in these plans. The new, voluntary zoning applied to these specific plans and did not add zoning to the WSSP.

V. CONCLUSION

This is a request for a Site Development Plan for Building Permit to allow the development of a restaurant with drive-up service window on a .94 acre site at the southwest corner of Ladera Drive and Market Street.

The request is generally consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, Westside Strategic Plan and the El Rancho Atrisco Phase III Sector Development Plan. The request generally meets the standards of the approved Site Development Plan for Subdivision and the Zoning Code. The conditions of approval address areas of non-compliance.
FINDINGS – 16 EPC-40088, February 9, 2017- Site Development Plan for Building Permit

1. This is a request for a Site Development Plan for Building Permit for Tract A-2, Heritage Marketplace located on Ladera Drive NW, between Unser Boulevard and Market Street and containing approximately .94 acres.

2. The request will allow the development of 3,237 square foot restaurant with drive up service window and associated landscaping and parking areas.

3. In October of 2012, the City Code Compliance Manager confirmed that uses allowed on the site must correspond to those enumerated in the C-1 Neighborhood Commercial Zone, and that the area within which the subject site is located may be developed with commercial uses pursuant to the C-1 zone. Therefore, the proposed restaurant with a drive-up service window and retail building on the subject site is permissive.

4. The subject site is located within the Heritage Marketplace Site Development Plan for Subdivision (13EPC-40148), and is subject to the approved design standards. The request is consistent with those standards.

5. The site is within the boundaries of the Developing Urban area of the Comprehensive Plan, the Ladera Community of the West Side Strategic Plan and the El Rancho Atrisco III Sector Development Plan. The Heritage Marketplace Site Development Plan for Subdivision applies to the site and contains design requirements that development must comply with.

6. The Albuquerque/Bernalillo County Comprehensive Plan, Westside Strategic Plan, El Rancho Atrisco Phase III Sector Development Plan and the City of Albuquerque Zoning Code are incorporated herein by reference and made part of the record for all purposes.

7. Section 14-16-3-11 of the Zoning Code states, “...Site Development Plans are expected to meet the requirements of adopted city policies and procedures.” The attached site development plan has been evaluated for conformance with applicable goals and policies in the Comprehensive Plan, and other applicable Plans.

8. The proposed Site Development Plan for Building Permit furthers the following Comprehensive Plan policies:
A. Policy II.B.5.d: 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 request generally furthers Policy II.B.5.d. The proposed development would be suitable in terms of its location and intensity as it is appropriately located within an existing area zoned for commercial uses. The subject site is not considered a scenic or natural environment, and is subject to the Heritage Marketplace design standards, which were established to respect neighborhood values and conditions of the area. However, there is concern about the impact of the traffic from the proposed development and the impact of the drive-use on the pedestrian safety.

B. Policy II.B.5.e: 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 can be ensured.

The request furthers Policy II.B.5.e because the site has access to a full range of existing urban services, including roads, electricity, transit and water and sewer. The proposed Site Development Plan for Building Permit is required to adhere to the Heritage Marketplace Site Development Plan for Subdivision design standards as approved by the Environmental Planning Commission. These standards help to ensure quality development on the site.

C. Policy II.B.5.i: Employment and service uses shall be located to complement residential areas and shall be sited to minimize adverse effects of noise, lighting, pollution, and traffic on residential environments.

The request furthers Policy II.B.5.i. New development will add to the services available to area residents and provide job opportunities. The Heritage Marketplace Site Development Plan for Subdivision provides design standards that limit lighting near residential development and includes other standards to increase the design quality for the adjacent neighborhoods.

9. The proposed Site Development Plan for Building Permit furthers the following West Side Strategic Plan policies:

A. Policy 3.23: Location of commercial services, multifamily development, and public facilities shall be encouraged on the western side of the Ladera Community or in its central area to reduce trips to Coors Boulevard and provide easier access to services for neighborhoods west of the Ladera Golf Course. This development would occur in Neighborhood Centers designed to relate to the surrounding neighborhoods and be consistent with design guidelines for the area near the escarpment. Strip commercial development will not be allowed in this area.

The request furthers policy 3.23 because the proposed development adds commercial services on the western side of the Ladera Community within a neighborhood center. The site plan is generally consistent with the design standards in the Heritage Marketplace Site
Development Plan for Subdivision. Extensive landscaping is provided along the northeast corner that will help the site relate to the neighborhood.

B. Policy 3.24: The area just west of Coors and north of I-40 up to a point of about 1000 feet south of Ladera Drive should be designated and developed as the Community Activity Center for Ladera.

The request furthers Policy 3.24 because the proposed commercial development will be located within the Unser / Ladera Neighborhood Center as shown on page 30 of the West Side Strategic Plan.

C. Policy 4.6.g: Create commercial developments that are or will be accessible by transit. Locate buildings adjacent to street frontages and place parking areas to the rear or sides of properties and/or on adjacent streets. Locate landscaping, walls, or fences so they do not create barriers for pedestrians. Parking shall not take precedence over pedestrian circulation.

The request partially furthers policy 4.6.g because the site is accessible by transit and the landscaping and walls do not create barriers for pedestrians. The building is close to the street, but has a drive up lane between the building and the street.

10. The request furthers the intent of El Rancho Atrisco Phase III Sector Plan because the proposed development complies with the intent of the land use plan contained within the El Rancho Atrisco Phase III Sector Plan.

11. The Laurelwood Neighborhood Association, Parkway Neighborhood Association and the Westside Coalition of Neighborhoods were notified.

12. A facilitated meeting occurred on January 25, 2017. Neighbors expressed concern about the existing traffic in the area and additional traffic from the proposed use, including the volume of traffic, the function of the intersections, delivery trucks and the lack of a signal at Market Street because of the distance to Unser Boulevard. Attendees expressed opposition the drive-thru because it is not pedestrian friendly and they would prefer a sit down restaurant.

RECOMMENDATION - 16 EPC 40088- February 9, 2017-Site Development Plan for Building Permit

APPROVAL of 16EPC-40088, a request for Site Development Plan for Building Permit, for Tract A-2, Heritage Marketplace, based on the preceding Findings and subject to the following Conditions of Approval.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL – 16 EPC 40088- February 9, 2017-Site Development Plan for Building Permit

1. The EPC delegates final sign-off authority of this Site Development Plan for Building Permit to the Development Review Board (DRB). The DRB is responsible for ensuring that all EPC
Conditions have been satisfied and that other applicable City requirements have been met. A letter shall accompany the submittal, specifying all modifications that have been made to the site plan since the EPC hearing, including how the site plan has been modified to meet each of the EPC conditions. Unauthorized changes to this site plan, including before or after DRB final sign-off, may result in forfeiture of approvals.

2. Prior to application submittal to the DRB, the applicant shall meet with the staff planner to ensure that all conditions of approval are met.

3. Provide a pedestrian connection from the building to Market Street if it can be designed to provide safe access, as determined by Planning and Transportation Development with input from the applicant and neighborhoods.

4. Update sheet L.a.01 to show corrected site square footage and required landscape.

5. Reduce screen wall height to 36 inches to comply with the approved Site Development Plan for Subdivision.

6. Add an additional shade tree on the west side of the patio.

7. Future signage will be required to comply with SPS standards and a note shall be added to the site stating that future signage can be approved administratively if it complies with the required standards.

8. Conditions from Transportation Development:
   
   1. 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).
   
   2. Site plan shall comply and be in accordance with all applicable City of Albuquerque requirements, including the Development Process Manual and current ADA criteria.
   
   3. The applicant will address transportation comments prior to DRB sign off.

9. Conditions of Approval from PNM:
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. 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.

10. The Site Development Plan shall comply with the General Regulations of the Zoning Code, the Subdivision Ordinance, and all other applicable design regulations, except as specifically approved by the EPC.

Notice of Decision cc list:
Nathan Bisch, One Architecture
Laurelwood Neighborhood Association
Parkway Neighborhood Association
Westside Coalition of Neighborhoods

Maggie Gould
Planner
CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE AGENCY COMMENTS

PLANNING DEPARTMENT
Zoning Enforcement
No adverse comments.

Office of Neighborhood Coordination
NA's and Coalitions Contacted: Laurelwood Heights NA, Parkway NA, Westside Coalition of NA's
Forwarded to Tyson Hummell for facilitation from ONC on 1/9/17 - VQ
Assigned to Kathy Oweegon – 1/10/17

Long Range Planning
Reviewed, No Comment

Metropolitan Redevelopment Agency

CITY ENGINEER
Transportation Development
Transportation Development Conditions:

1. 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).

2. Site plan shall comply and be in accordance with all applicable City of Albuquerque requirements, including the Development Process Manual and current ADA criteria.

The following comments need to be addressed prior to DRB:

1. For drive through facilities the minimum drive through lane width is 12 feet with a 25 foot minimum radius (inside edge) for all turns. (A 15 foot radius can be used with an increase in lane width to 14 feet).

2. The ADA access aisles shall have the words "NO PARKING" in capital letters, each of which shall be at least one foot high and at least two inches wide, placed at the rear of the parking space so as to be close to where an adjacent vehicle's rear tire would be placed. (66-1-4.1.B NMSA 1978)
3. The ADA accessible parking sign must have the required language per 66-7-352.4C NMSA 1978 "Violators Are Subject to a Fine and/or Towing." Please call out detail and location of HC signs.

4. One-way vehicular paths require pavement directional signage and a posted "Do Not Enter" sign at the point of egress. Please show detail and location of posted signs.

5. List radii for all curves shown; for passenger vehicles, the minimum end island radius for passenger vehicles is 15 ft. Radius for delivery trucks, fire trucks, etc. is 25 ft. or larger.

6. Per the zoning code, a 6 ft. wide ADA accessible pedestrian pathway is required from the public sidewalk to the building entrances. Please clearly show this pathway and provide details.

7. The handicap accessible spaces must include an access aisle. Van accessible aisles should be 8 ft wide; all others should be 5 ft wide.

Additional comments regarding the updated Trip Generation Study

I have reviewed the updated Trip Generation and agree with the analysis. As the exhibits show the change in trips for the proposed development is very small and would not warrant any further traffic mitigation or infrastructure.

Please let me know if you have additional questions.

Hydrology Development

DEPARTMENT of MUNICIPAL DEVELOPMENT
Transportation Planning
Traffic Engineering Operations

WATER UTILITY AUTHORITY
Utility Services

1. 16EPC-40088 Site Development Plan for Building Permit
   a. Submit a request for an availability statement at the link below. The submittal shall include an approved Fire I Plan from the City fire marshal’s office. Availability statement required prior to approval.
   b. All onsite water and sewer is to be considered private.
   c. Work can be done with a Water Authority mini work order.
ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH DEPARTMENT

PARKS AND RECREATION

Planning and Design
Reviewed, no comments.

Open Space Division

City Forester

POLICE DEPARTMENT/Planning

SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT DEPARTMENT

Refuse Division

1) Place enclosure at a straight shot for refuse driver. Move north.

2) Do not plant anything next to enclosure that will create an overhang. Pg. LA.01

3) All new /proposed refuse enclosures must be built to C.O.A min spec requirements, including sanitary drain for food services.

FIRE DEPARTMENT/Planning

This project was reviewed and more information is needed. 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 prior to submitting for building permit. This shall be a deferred submittal.

TRANSIT DEPARTMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Number</th>
<th>Brief Description of Request</th>
<th>Transit Corridor?</th>
<th>Transit Route?</th>
<th>Current Service/Stops</th>
<th>Comments/Support/Requests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1003275 16-EPC-40088</td>
<td>SPBP Heritage Market Place for a Burger King</td>
<td>Proximate to the Unser Boulevard Enhanced Transit Corridor</td>
<td>Directly on Commuter Route 92; within walking distance of Commuter Route 94</td>
<td>Routes 92 and 94 both stop at a stop pair south of Ladera on Unser; a Route 92 stop pair is approximately 600 feet east of the site on Ladera. None of these stops are affected.</td>
<td>No comment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMMENTS FROM OTHER AGENCIES

BERNALILLO COUNTY

ALBUQUERQUE METROPOLITAN ARROYO FLOOD CONTROL AUTHORITY
Reviewed. No comment.

ALBUQUERQUE PUBLIC SCHOOLS
APS Case Comments: This will have no adverse impact to the APS district.

MID-REGION COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
MRMPO has no adverse comments.
For informational purposes:
- Ladera Dr NW is functionally classified as an Existing Minor Arterial.
- According to the Long Range Bikeway System, there is a proposed bicycle lane on Ladera Dr NW.

MIDDLE RIO GRANDE CONSERVANCY DISTRICT

PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF NEW MEXICO
Conditions for Approval for Project #1003275 Site Development Plan for Building Permit (proposed Burger King restaurant at Heritage Marketplace) 16EPC-40088

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. 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.
View of the subject site looking southeast, including the monument sign, and sidewalk along Ladera Drive.

Looking northwest from Market Street to the subject site.
View of the subject site looking north.

View of the subject site looking west.
HISTORY
RESOLUTION

ADOPTING THE SECTOR DEVELOPMENT PLAN (SD-81-1) FOR THE LAND
DESCRIBED IN THE SUMMARY PLAT OF EL RANCHO ATRISCO, PHASE III,
CONTAINING APPROXIMATELY 348 ACRES.

WHEREAS, the Council, the Governing Body of the City of
Albuquerque has the authority to adopt master plans for physical
development or areas within the planning and platting jurisdiction
of the City as authorized by New Mexico Statutes, Section 3-19-5,
and by the City Charter as allowed under home rule provisions of the
Constitution of New Mexico; and

WHEREAS, a Sector Development Plan has been prepared for the
land described in the Summary Plat of El Rancho Atrisco, Phase III;
and

WHEREAS, the Environmental Planning Commission in its
advisory role on all matters related to planning, zoning, and
environmental protection, conducted public hearings on April 16,
1981 and June 18, 1981, recommended the adoption of the El Rancho
Atrisco, Phase III, Sector Development Plan subject to certain
findings; and

WHEREAS, the City Council has the sole authority to adopt
Sector Development Plans containing zone changes other than R-D.

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE COUNCIL, THE GOVERNING BODY OF THE CITY OF
ALBUQUERQUE:

Section 1. The El Rancho Atrisco, Phase III, Sector
Development Plan, as amended by the Council, is hereby adopted as a
guide to the partial implementation of the Albuquerque/Bernalillo
County Comprehensive Plan subject to the findings of the Environmental Planning Commission which are incorporated by reference herein and amended as follows:

1. Delete finding number two.

2. Amend finding number 3g to read as follows:

   "Ladera Drive between 72nd and Ouray should be in a paving district and the developer will improve the paving to Ladera Drive between 72nd and Unser pursuant to standard City policies."

3. Delete finding number 3i."

Section 2. All development and improvement activities in the area shall be guided by the Sector Development Plan.

Section 3. The Official Zone Map, adopted by 7-14-66.C.R.O. 1974 is hereby amended to reflect the zoning as shown on Sheet 5, Land Use and Transportation Map, El Rancho Atrisco, Phase III.

PASSED AND ADOPTED THIS 3rd day of August, 1981.

BY A VOTE OF 7 FOR AND 0 AGAINST

Yes: 7

Excused: Hill, Hoover

[Signature]
Marion M. Cottrell, President
City Council

APPROVED this 11th day of August, 1981.

[Signature]
David Rusk, Mayor
City of Albuquerque

ATTEST:

[Signature]
City Clerk
October 18, 2012

James K. Strozier, AICP
Consensus Planning
302 Eighth St. NW
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87102

Re: Lot 1A1, El Rancho Atrisco Phase 3

Dear Mr. Strozier:

This letter will verify that according to the map on file in this office on this date, the referenced property, legally described as Lot 1A1, El Rancho Atrisco Phase 3, Albuquerque, Bernalillo County, New Mexico is zoned SU-1 for Planned Office Park and Commercial Development with not more than 50% to be developed commercially.

Development of the property can only occur through an approved site development plan as regulated by Section 14-16-2-22 of the Comprehensive City Zoning Code. Activities allowed on the site must correspond to those enumerated in the C-1 Neighborhood Commercial zone and office uses.

The maximum percentage of the original 25-acre site as referenced on Sheet 5 of the El Rancho Atrisco Phase III Sector Development Plan that is eligible for development with retail and service-type uses consistent with those of the C-1 zone is 50 percent (12.5 acres). The existing gas station and convenience store located on Lot 1C toward the northwest corner of the original 25-acre site is considered "commercial development". Because this lot encompasses approximately .85 acres, the outstanding area – roughly 11.65 acres – may be developed with commercial uses pursuant to the C-1 zone.

The remaining area of the property can be developed with office or residential uses, or a combination thereof. Residential development on this portion would be regulated by Section 14-16-2-16(A)(7) of the Comprehensive City Zoning Code.
If you have additional questions regarding this matter, please feel free to contact me at (505) 924-3454 or bwilliams@cabq.gov.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Brennon Williams
Code Compliance Manager
Code Enforcement Division
Planning Department
OFFICIAL NOTIFICATION OF DECISION
February 18, 2014

Western Albuquerque Land Holdings
1130 Lanes End NW
Albuquerque, NM 87114

Project# 1003275
13EPC-40148 Site Development Plan for
Subdivision

LEGAL DESCRIPTION:
For all or a portion of lot 1-A-1, El Rancho Atrisco
Phase III, located on Unser Blvd NW between
Hanover Rd NW and Ladera Dr NW containing
approximately 19.98 acres.
Staff Planner: Chris Glore

On February 13, 2014, the Environmental Planning Commission (EPC), voted to APPROVE
Project 1003275, 13EPC-40148, a request for a Site Development Plan for Subdivision, based on
the following Findings and Conditions:

FINDINGS:

1. This is a request for a Site Development Plan for Subdivision for Tract 1-A-1, Plat of Tracts
1-A-1 and 1-B-1, El Rancho Atrisco Phase 3, containing approximately 19.98 acres located at
the SE Corner of Unser Blvd. NW and Ladera Dr. NW.

2. The request involves design and development standards for Heritage Marketplace
development, a mixed commercial, office and residential project. The applicant proposes to
re-subdivide the property into two tracts, of which Tract A would be developed with office
and/or multi-family residential uses and Tract B with commercial uses.

3. The subject site is located in the Developing Urban Area of the Comprehensive Plan, the
Unser/Ladera Neighborhood Center of the West Side Strategic Plan, and the El Rancho
Atrisco Phase III Sector Plan. The proposal must comply with the Zoning Regulations and
General Regulations of the Zoning Code.
4. The Albuquerque/Bernalillo County Comprehensive Plan, the West Side Strategic Plan, and the El Rancho Atrisco Phase III Sector Plan and the City of Albuquerque Zoning Code are incorporated herein by reference and made part of the record for all purposes.

5. The Site Development Plan for Subdivision request further the following Comprehensive Plan policies:

Policy II.B.5.a: Full range of urban land uses. The request would provide urban-scale commercial and office/residential uses within an area with a range of residential density and few commercial uses. The subject property is adjacent to two arterial streets and has good access to the multi-modal transportation system.

Policy II.B.5.d: Development respects neighborhood values, environmental conditions, and scenic resources. The area is currently under-served by neighborhood commercial and service businesses. The SPS design standards would reflect design theme consistent and complimentary to the surrounding development.

Policy II.B.5.e: New growth shall be in areas contiguous to existing or programmed urban facilities and services and neighborhood integrity assured. Urban facilities and services consist of fully developed arterial roadways on two sides of the property, and the full range of utilities within surrounding streets. Project traffic would not need to travel through surrounding neighborhoods.

Policy II.B.5.h: Higher density housing is most appropriate with excellent access to major streets; mixed density pattern; similar or higher density development; and transition. The subject site is within the designated Unser/Lader Neighborhood Center of the WSSP. The site is surrounded by residential land uses and existing infrastructure is in place. A mixed residential density exists in the surrounding area.

Policy II.B.5.i: Commercial development in centers with pedestrian and bicycle access; intersections of arterial streets and transit. The SPS commercial development would be at the intersection of two arterial streets and within an area of residential development.

Policy II.B.5.l: Quality and innovation in design. The SPS design requirements include the Zoning Code General Building and Site Design Regulations for Non-Residential Uses.

Policy II.B.5.m: Design improves the quality of the visual environment. The SPS would regulate building architecture, lighting, landscaping and signage in compliance with the Zoning Code.

Policy II.B.7.b: Net densities above 30 dwelling units per acre within Major Activity Centers. The site is designated Unser/Lader Neighborhood Center per the WSSP. The SPS proposes maximum residential density of 30 dwelling units per acre.

Policy II.B.7.f: Intense uses in Activity Centers located away from low-density residential and buffered by a transition area. The subject site is bordered by two arterial roads, and multi-family residential and/or office uses would buffer adjacent lower intensity uses.
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Policy II.B.7.i: Multi-unit housing appropriate in Neighborhood, Community and Major Activity Centers. The SPS would allow multi-family residential development in a designated Neighborhood Center.

Policy II.C.1.b: Balanced land use/transportation system of housing, employment and services. The request would add commercial, services and housing within an area under-served by commercial and service uses.

Noise Goal: Protect the public health and welfare and quality of life. The multi-family residential and neighborhood-serving commercial uses would not operate at a level of intensity disturbing to surrounding residents.

Policy II.D.4.c: Dwelling units close to Major Transit and Enhanced Transit streets. Unser Blvd. is a designated Express Transit Corridor. The request would allow additional dwelling units along the Transit Corridor.

Policy II.D.6.a: New jobs created convenient to areas of need. The City’s west side is deficient in jobs relative to housing. The proposed commercial and office uses would provide jobs on the west side.

6. The Site Development Plan for Subdivision request partially furthers the following Comprehensive Plan policies:

Policy II.B.5.i: Employment and service uses located to complement residential areas and minimize adverse effects of noise, lighting, pollution, and traffic. The SPS would be consistent with the intended land uses of a Neighborhood Center. Commercial and office development would be convenient to surrounding residents. A Traffic Impact Study is under review by the NMDOT. Traffic generated by the developments would potentially impact single-family residential from vehicular access at Hanover Rd.

Policy II.B.5.k: Minimize harmful effects of traffic; livability and safety of residential neighborhoods. Unser Blvd. is a Principal Urban Arterial. The SPS proposes multi-direction access to Unser Blvd. which is under State jurisdiction. The proposed access is a concern of City staff, MRCOG and the NMDOT and a concern of the neighborhood.

Policy II.D.4.a: Street design, transit service, and development form consistent with Corridors and Activity Centers. The site is within a Neighborhood Center. Unser Blvd. is a designated Express Transit Corridor. The SPS design standards would be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan Development Form details. The SPS does not propose internal connecting sidewalks leading to public gathering spaces.

7. The Site Development Plan for Subdivision request furthers the following goals and policies of the West Side Strategic Plan:

Policy I.1: Develop higher density in Community and Neighborhood Centers, surrounded by lower density.
OFFICIAL NOTICE OF DECISION
Project #1003275
February 13, 2014
Page 4 of 8

Policy 3.8: The highest density in the Community and Neighborhood Centers. Multifamily housing and employment facilities are appropriate with commercial services.

Policy 3.16: Multifamily development and commercial or employment uses are appropriate in the Community or Neighborhood Centers. Mixed-use and multi-modal access shall be incorporated.

Policy 4.6.f: Locate multiple-family residential within Community and Neighborhood Centers and allow higher density so they serve as transit hubs.

Policy 4.10: Promote and establish land uses and urban patterns whose design support bicycle and pedestrian travel, and public transportation.

Higher density residential and commercial development on the site would be within a designated Neighborhood Center. The SPS proposes a mix of commercial, office and multi-family residential development up to 30 dwelling units per acre. The development would be adjacent to Arterial roadways (Unser Blvd. and Ladera Dr.), a regional trail and two ABQ Ride express transit lines.

Policy 1.9: In the Established and Developing Urban areas neighborhood and community centers may be developed at appropriate locations.

Policy 1.16: Neighborhood Centers on collector and arterial streets. Primary access by auto, with pedestrian and bicycle connections to adjacent neighborhoods.

The site is within a Neighborhood Center and would be accessed from a Collector street (Market St.) and Arterial streets (Unser Blvd. and Ladera Dr.) The development would provide sidewalk connections to the Unser Blvd. trail and to surrounding single family residential neighborhoods.

Policy 1.17: Encourage public services, parks, retail and commercial services in Activity Centers. There are no public facilities proposed. Retail and service uses and offices would be on a site within a Neighborhood Center.

Policy 3.23: Location of commercial services, multifamily development, and public facilities to reduce trips to Coors Boulevard and provide easier access. The development would increase retail and service businesses and would allow multi-family residential development on property in a Neighborhood Center west of Coors Blvd.

Policy 6.23: Require trail access to the regional trail network, through the Community Centers, Employment Centers, Neighborhood Centers, and parks and open space. The SPS would require buildings to be linked via sidewalk to the Unser Blvd. trail and to existing sidewalks.

8. The Site Development Plan for Subdivision request partially furthers the following goals and policies of the West Side Strategic Plan:

Policy 1.15: Neighborhood Centers shall contain scale accommodating to pedestrians and bicyclists, including outdoor seating. Shared parking is proposed. The SPS does not commit to outdoor spaces for gathering aside from restaurant outdoor space.
Policy 1.5: Community and Neighborhood Centers shall provide pedestrian/bicycle access to key activity areas. The SPS design standards require linking building entrances to the Unser Blvd. trail, however, there is not sufficient detail regarding access within parking lots and between buildings.

Policy 4.6.g: Commercial developments accessible by transit locate buildings adjacent to street frontages and parking to the rear or sides. The development would provide shopping and housing options for potential transit users. The location of buildings relative to street frontage and parking lots is not addressed by the SPS.

Policy 4.6.h: Limit parking spaces to 10% above Code requirements and provide safe, attractive, and efficient routes to streets and transit. The SPS references the Zoning Code for parking minimums and does not impose maximum parking. Through-site access is not addressed in the SPS.

Policy 6.25: Internal bicycle/pedestrian trails link to the primary trails network. Demonstrate connectivity of trails. The SPS design standards do not provide detail as to how internal pedestrian access would be accomplished.

9. The SPS proposed land uses are consistent with the El Rancho Atrisco Phase III Sector Plan designation for the subject site of Planned Office Park and Commercial Development – Not More Than 50% To Be Developed Commercially. Proposed uses including residential are consistent with the C-1 Zone.

10. At the Facilitated Meeting on January 28, 2014 Neighborhood Association members expressed concerns regarding the proposed vehicle access on Unser Blvd., potential multi-family residential development, and pedestrian and bicycle access.

11. The applicant requests delegation of approval authority Site Development Plan for Building Permit applications to the DRB.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

1. The EPC delegates final sign-off authority of this site development plan to the Development Review Board (DRB). The DRB is responsible for ensuring that all EPC Conditions have been satisfied and that other applicable City requirements have been met. A letter shall accompany the submittal, specifying all modifications that have been made to the site plan since the EPC hearing, including how the site plan has been modified to meet each of the EPC conditions. Unauthorized changes to this site plan, including before or after DRB final sign-off, may result in forfeiture of approvals.

2. Prior to application submittal to the DRB, the applicant shall meet with the staff planner to ensure that all conditions of approval are met.

3. The Site Development Plan shall comply with the General Regulations of the Zoning Code and all other applicable design regulations, except as specifically approved by the EPC.
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4. Future development on the site will require EPC review of a Site Development Plan for Building Permit.

5. The Developer is responsible for permanent improvements to the transportation facilities adjacent to the proposed site development plan, as required by the Development Review Board (DRB).

6. The section of Unser Blvd referenced in the SPS is under the jurisdiction of the New Mexico Department of Transportation (NMDOT). Prior to DRB approval of any Site Development Plan for Building Permit, NMDOT shall have determined whether or not the requested access points on Unser Blvd. will be allowed, and if allowed the access request shall have been approved through the MRCOG Transportation Coordinating Committee process.

7. Site plan shall comply and be in accordance with all applicable City of Albuquerque requirements, including the Development Process Manual and current ADA criteria.

8. New median cuts must be requested in writing to the Traffic Engineer, Development & Review Services. The construction of appropriate left turn lanes must be included with any new median cuts.

9. Access points must meet DPM’s minimum distances from intersections. Proposed access ‘H’ must provide minimum of 100 ft. setback and proposed access ‘G’ must be a minimum of 200 ft. setback from projected intersecting flow lines.


11. A cross access easement and shared parking agreement shall be part of the platting process.

12. The text “Landscaping and signing will not interfere with clear sight requirements. Therefore, signs, walls, trees, and shrubbery between 3 and 8 feet tall (as measured from the gutter pan) will not be acceptable in this area” shall be added to Design Standards, Section 3 Landscape and Section 5 Signage, to demonstrate that the signs and landscaping will not interfere with the sight distance of the entrances.

13. Revise Site Plan sheet 1, under Building Heights and Setbacks, to delete the first two sentences and replace with the following: “Maximum building heights for all buildings shall be per the SU-1 zone.”

14. Revise Design Standards sheet 2, under Architecture, to delete 4.C.2 in its entirety and replace the first sentence of 4.C.1 with the following: “Maximum building heights for all buildings shall be per the SU-1 zone.”

15. The design of access to Unser Blvd. shall demonstrate consistency with AASHTO guidelines for bicycle safety.
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APPEAL: If you wish to appeal this decision, you must do so within 15 days of the EPC’s decision or by FEBRUARY 28, 2014. The date of the EPC’s decision is not included in the 15-day period for filing an appeal, and if the 15th day falls on a Saturday, Sunday or Holiday, the next working day is considered as the deadline for filing the appeal.

For more information regarding the appeal process, please refer to Section 14-16-4-4 of the Zoning Code. A Non-Refundable filing fee will be calculated at the Land Development Coordination Counter and is required at the time the appeal is filed. It is not possible to appeal EPC Recommendations to City Council; rather a formal protest of the EPC’s Recommendation can be filed within the 15 day period following the EPC’s decision.

You will receive notification if any person files an appeal. If there is no appeal, you can receive Building Permits at any time after the appeal deadline quoted above, provided all conditions imposed at the time of approval have been met. Successful applicants are reminded that other regulations of the City Zoning Code must be complied with, even after approval of the referenced application(s).

ZONE MAP AMENDMENTS: Pursuant to Zoning Code Section 14-16-4-1(C)(16), a change to the zone map does not become official until the Certification of Zoning (CZ) is sent to the applicant and any other person who requests it. Such certification shall be signed by the Planning Director after appeal possibilities have been concluded and after all requirements prerequisite to this certification are met. If such requirements are not met within six months after the date of final City approval, the approval is void. The Planning Director may extend this time limit up to an additional six months.

SITE DEVELOPMENT PLANS: Pursuant to Zoning Code Section 14-16-3-11(C)(1), if less than one-half of the approved square footage of a site development plan has been built or less than one-half of the site has been developed, the plan for the undeveloped areas shall terminate automatically seven years after adoption or major amendment of the plan; within six months prior to the seven-year deadline, the property owners shall request in writing through the Planning Director that the Planning Commission extend the plan’s life an additional five years. Additional design details will be required as a project proceeds through the Development Review Board and through the plan check of Building Permit submittals for construction. Planning staff may consider minor, reasonable changes that are consistent with an approved Site Development Plan so long as they can be shown to be in conformance with the original, approved intent.

DEFERRAL FEES: Pursuant to Zoning Code Section 14-16-4-1(B), deferral at the request of the applicant is subject to a $110.00 fee per case.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Suzanne Luban
Planning Director
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SL/CG/mc

cc:  Steve Collins, 7517 Vista Alegre NW, Albuquerque NM 87120
     Sharise McCannon, 2808 El Tesoro Escondido NW, Albuquerque NM 87120
     Mary Loughran, 8015 Fallbrook NW, Albuquerque NM 87120
     James Larkin, 7304 Inwood NW, Albuquerque NM 87120
     John Vrabec, 7721 Pinewood Dr. NW, Albuquerque NM 87120
     Thomas Borst, 1908 Selway Pl. NW, Albuquerque NM 87120
     Jason Stone, 1136 Makian Pl. NW, Albuquerque NM 87120
     Candelaria Patterson, 7608 Elderwood NW, Albuquerque NM 87120
     Harry Hendrickson, 10592 Rio del Sol Ct. NW, Albuquerque NM 87120
     Jerry Worrall, 1039 Pinatubo Pl. NW, Albuquerque, NM 87120
ZONING

Please refer to the Zoning Code for specifics of the SU-2 zone, the SU-1 zone, and the C-1 zone.
APPLICATION INFORMATION
City of Albuquerque

DEVELOPMENT/ PLAN REVIEW APPLICATION
Updated 4/16/15

Supplemental Form (SF)

SUBDIVISION
— Major subdivision action
— Minor subdivision action
— Vacant
— Variance (Non-Zoning)

SZ ZONING & PLANNING
— Annexation
— Zone Map Amendment (Establish or Change Zoning, includes Zoning within Sector Development Plans)
— Adoption of Rank 2 or 3 Plan or similar Text Amendment to Adopted Rank 1, 2 or 3 Plan(s), Zoning Code, or Subd. Regulations
— Street Name Change (Local & Collector)

SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN
— for Subdivision
— for Building Permit
— Administrative Amendment (AA)
— Administrative Approval (DRT, URT, etc.)
— IP Master Development Plan
— Cert. of Appropriateness (LUC/C)

STORM DRAINAGE (Form D)
— Storm Drainage Cost Allocation Plan

PRINT OR TYPE IN BLACK INK ONLY. The applicant or agent must submit the completed application in person to the Planning Department Development Services Center, 600 2nd Street NW, Albuquerque, NM 87102. Fees must be paid at the time of application. Refer to supplemental forms for submittal requirements.

APPLICATION INFORMATION:

Professional/Agent (if any): ____________________

PHONE: ____________________

ADDRESS: ____________________

FAX: ____________________

CITY: ____________________ STATE: __________ ZIP: ______ E-MAIL: ____________________

APPLICANT: Nathan Bisch - One Architecture

PHONE: 314-324-6126

ADDRESS: 8001 N. Central Ave., Suite 101

CITY: Phoenix STATE: AZ ZIP: 85020 E-MAIL: nathan.bisch@onearchitecture.com

Proprietary interest in site:

List all owners:

DESCRIPTION OF REQUEST: Proposal to build a new Burger King restaurant.

Is the applicant seeking incentives pursuant to the Family Housing Development Program? Yes (X) No

SITE INFORMATION: ACCURACY OF THE EXISTING LEGAL DESCRIPTION IS CRUCIAL! ATTACH A SEPARATE SHEET IF NECESSARY.

Lot or Tract No. Pad Site E Block: __________

Subdiv/Addn/TVBA: Heritage Market Place

Existing Zoning: SU1 / SU2 Proposed zoning: SU1 / SU2 MRGCD Map No

Zone Atlas page(s): H-09-Z UPC Code: ____________________

CASE HISTORY:

List any current or prior case number that may be relevant to your application (Proj., App., DRB, AX, Z, V, S, etc.):

CASE INFORMATION:

Within city limits? Yes Within 1000FT of a landfill? __________

No. of existing lots: __________ No. of proposed lots: __________ Total site area (acres): __________

LOCATION OF PROPERTY BY STREETS: On or Near: Southwest corner of Ladera Drive and Market Street - Heritage Market Place Development Between: __________ and __________

Check if project was previously reviewed by: Sketch Plan/Plan □ or Pre-application Review Team (PRT) □. Review Date:

SIGNATURE: ____________________

(Print Name) Nathan Bisch DATE: 12/23/2016

Applicant: □ Agent: □

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

□ INTERNAL ROUTING □ All checklists are complete
□ All fees have been collected □ All case #s are assigned
□ AGIS copy has been sent □ Case history #s are listed
□ Site is within 1000ft of a landfill □ F.H.D.P. density bonus
□ F.H.D.P. need date

Application case numbers: 16.EPC 4003275 Action S.F. Fees

16.EPC 4003275 SBD $385.00
16.EPC 4003275 AUV $75.00
16.EPC 4003275 $50.00 Total $510.00

Hearing date: Feb. 9, 2017

12-29-16 Project #1003275 1003275

Staff signature & Date
SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR SUBDIVISION (EPC16) Maximum Size: 24” x 36”

- 5 Acres or more & zoned SU-1, IP, SU-2, PC, or Shopping Center: Certificate of No Effect or Approval
- Site Plan and related drawings (folded to fit into an 8.5” by 14” pocket) 20 copies.
- Site plans and related drawings reduced to 8.5” x 11” format (1 copy)
- Zone Atlas map with the entire property(ies) clearly outlined
- Letter briefly describing, explaining, and justifying the request
- Letter of authorization from the property owner if application is submitted by an agent
- Office of Community & Neighborhood Coordination inquiry response, notifying letter, certified mail receipts
- Completed Site Plan for Subdivision and/or Building Permit Checklist
- Sign Posting Agreement
- Traffic Impact Study (TIS) form with required signature
- Fee (see schedule)
- List any original and/or related file numbers on the cover application

EPC hearings are approximately 7 weeks after the filing deadline. Your attendance is required.

SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR BUILDING PERMIT (EPC15) Maximum Size: 24” x 36”

- Site Plan and related drawings (folded to fit into an 8.5” by 14” pocket) 20 copies.
- Site Plan for Subdivision, if applicable, previously approved or simultaneously submitted.
- Site plans and related drawings reduced to 8.5” x 11” format (1 copy)
- Zone Atlas map with the entire property(ies) clearly outlined and crosshatched (to be photocopied)
- Letter briefly describing, explaining, and justifying the request
- Letter of authorization from the property owner if application is submitted by an agent
- Office of Community & Neighborhood Coordination inquiry response, notifying letter, certified mail receipts
- Sign Posting Agreement
- Completed Site Plan for Subdivision and/or Building Permit Checklist
- Traffic Impact Study (TIS) form with required signature
- Fee (see schedule)
- List any original and/or related file numbers on the cover application

NOTE: For wireless telecom facilities, requests for waivers of requirements, the following materials are required in addition to those listed above for application submittal:

- Collocation evidence as required by Zoning Code §114-16-3-17(A)(6)
- Notarized statement declaring number of antennas accommodated. Refer to §114-16-3-17(A)(13)(d)(2)
- Letter of intent regarding shared use. Refer to §114-16-3-17(A)(13)(e)
- Affidavit explaining factual basis of engineering requirements. Refer to §114-16-3-17(A)(13)(d)(3)
- Distance to nearest existing free standing tower and its owner’s name if the proposed facility is also a free standing tower §114-16-3-17(A)(17)
- Registered engineer or architect’s stamp on the Site Development Plans
- Office of Community & Neighborhood Coordination inquiry response as above based on ¼ mile radius

EPC hearings are approximately 7 weeks after the filing deadline. Your attendance is required.

AMENDED SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR BUILDING PERMIT (EPC01) Maximum Size: 24” x 36”

- DRB signed amended Site Plan (folded to fit into an 8.5” by 14” pocket) 20 copies
- DRB signed Site Plan for Subdivision, if applicable (required when amending SDP for Building Permit) 20 copies
- Site plans and related drawings reduced to 8.5” x 11” format (1 copy)
- Zone Atlas map with the entire property(ies) clearly outlined
- Letter briefly describing, explaining, and justifying the request
- Letter of authorization from the property owner if application is submitted by an agent
- Office of Community & Neighborhood Coordination inquiry response, notifying letter, certified mail receipts
- Sign Posting Agreement
- Completed Site Plan for Building Permit Checklist (not required for amendment of SDP for Subdivision)
- Traffic Impact Study (TIS) form with required signature
- Fee (see schedule)
- List any original and/or related file numbers on the cover application

EPC hearings are approximately 7 weeks after the filing deadline. Your attendance is required.

I, the applicant, acknowledge that any information required but not submitted with this application will likely result in deferral of actions.

[Signatures and dates]

Checklists complete: ☐ Fees collected: ☐ Case # assigned: ☐ Related # listed: ☐

Application case numbers: 16-EP-50888

Form revised November 2010

Planner signature / date: 12-30-16

Project #: 1003216
CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE
TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDY (TIS) FORM

APPLICANT: Nathan Bisch
DATE OF REQUEST: 11/23/16
ZONE ATLAS PAGE(S): 4-9

CURRENT:
ZONING
PARCEL SIZE (AC/SQ. FT.) .94 Acre

LEGAL DESCRIPTION:
LOT OR TRACT # PAD E BLOCK #
SUBDIVISION NAME Heritage Marketplace

REQUESTED CITY ACTION(S):
ANNEXATION [ ]
ZONE CHANGE [ ]: From_______ To_______
SECTOR, AREA, FAC, COMP PLAN [ ]
AMENDMENT (Map/Text) [ ]

SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN:
SUBDIVISION* [ ] AMENDMENT [ ]
BUILDING PERMIT [x] ACCESS PERMIT [ ]
BUILDING PURPOSES [ ] OTHER [ ]
*includes platting actions

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF ACTION:
# OF UNITS: 1
BUILDING SIZE: 3237 (sq. ft.)

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:
NO CONSTRUCTION/DEVELOPMENT [ ]
NEW CONSTRUCTION [x]
EXPANSION OF EXISTING DEVELOPMENT [ ]

Note: changes made to development proposals / assumptions, from the information provided above, will result in a new TIS determination.

APPLICANT OR REPRESENTATIVE ___________________________ DATE 11/23/16
(To be signed upon completion of processing by the Traffic Engineer)

Planning Department, Development & Building Services Division, Transportation Development Section - 2nd Floor West, 500 2nd St. NW, Plaza del Sol Building, City, 87102, phone 924-3994

TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDY (TIS) REQUIRED: YES [x] NO [ ] BORDERLINE [ ]

THRESHOLDS MET? YES [ ] NO [ ] MITIGATING REASONS FOR NOT REQUIRING TIS: PREVIOUSLY STUDIED: [x]
Notes: HERITAGE NEIGHBORHOOD MARKETPLACE (12/14)

If a TIS is required: a scoping meeting (as outlined in the development process manual) must be held to define the level of analysis needed and the parameters of the study. Any subsequent changes to the development proposal identified above may require an update or new TIS.

TRAFFIC ENGINEER ___________________________ DATE 12-15-16

Required TIS must be completed prior to applying to the EPC and/or the DRB. Arrangements must be made prior to submittal if a variance to this procedure is requested and noted on this form, otherwise the application may not be accepted or deferred if the arrangements are not complied with.

TIS -SUBMITTED / / -FINALIZED / / TRAFFIC ENGINEER DATE

Revised January 20, 2011
December 20, 2016

To Whom it May Concern:

This letter is to certify that One! Architecture, PLC has permission to act as agent and applicant for the purpose of submitting applications for site development plans for a building permit for the property at the SWC of Ladera Dr & Market St. The legal description of that property is as follows:

"Tract A-2," as shown on the Plat of Tracts A-1 thru A-3 and C-1 thru C-3, Heritage Marketplace, recorded in the Official Records of Bernalillo County, New Mexico on April 7, 2015 in Plat Book 2015C, Page 35, as Document No. 2015028498 (being a replat of Tracts A and C, as shown on the Bulk Land Plat of Tracts A, B and C, Heritage Marketplace, recorded in the Official Records of Bernalillo County, New Mexico on February 19, 2015 in Plat Book 2015C, Page 14, as Document No. 2015013421).

Sincerely,

ABQ HERITAGE MARKETPLACE, LLC, an Arizona Limited Liability Company

By: FD Heritage Marketplace, LLC, an Arizona Limited Liability Company
Its: Manager

By: [Signature]
Jay Schneider
Manager

{00852344-2}
December 19, 2016

RE: Heritage Market Place Development – Proposed Burger King Project Narrative

To Whom It May Concern:

It is our intention to build a new Burger King restaurant in the Heritage Market Place development in Albuquerque, New Mexico. The site is identified as Pad Site E at the Southwest corner of Market Street and Ladera Drive and is noted as 0.94 Acres in size. For reference, the site can be found on page H-09 of the Zone Atlas map.

The building in question is 3,237 square feet and is one-story and is situated at the corner of Ladera Drive and Market Street. It consists of a two-lane drive though that wraps the building starting on the Market Street side and exits on the Ladera Drive side of the building. The drive through window is located along the Ladera Drive side. The remaining portion of the site consists of parking, landscaping and site lighting. All new landscaping and site lighting will be in accordance with the development standards and requirements and is subject to developer approval.

The exterior façade of the building is a combination of stone, brick and EIFS. At the base of the building we propose a harvest brown CMU split-faced brick. Above the base we propose an EIFS field stucco with sand finish and reveals at approximately every three feet. The EIFS color is proposed to be nomadic desert. We have designed a 23'-0" accent tower on all sides of the building. We propose that the material on this tower be a cultured stone veneer color aspen. Just above the 18'-5" parapet on all four sides of the building we are planning to install a prefabricated red light band that is topped with a silver metal top cap.

We propose windows on three sides of the building in a dark bronze aluminum storefront. Above each window we are planning to install a suspended aluminum canopy with accent lighting under each one. Over the main side entry doors we proposal an aluminum canopy to match the others over the windows. Above the canopy we will have a sign that reads “Home of the Wopper” and above that sign we propose a Burger King button sign on the tower. In addition to the button sign at the main entry tower, we also propose a button sign on the tower on the secondary entrance and two on the drive-through side of the building. Finally, one last button sign on the rear of the building.

The building is designed per Burger King Corporate standards for image requirements however may be adjusted to meet development standards and materials if agreed to by the Developer and Burger King Franchisee. For additional questions about the project, please contact me at nathan.bisch@onearchitecture.us or 314-324-6126.

Thank you,

Nathan Bisch
Director of Operations
One Architecture
Tuesday, January 24, 2017

Racquel Michel, P.E.  
City of Albuquerque Transportation Development Section  
Planning Department  
600 2nd St. NE  
Albuquerque, NM 87102

Re: Proposed Burger King Restaurant (Ladera / Market St.)

Dear Racquel:

Attached for your consideration are the following items related to the Referenced project:

- Vicinity Map showing project location
- Preliminary site plan for proposed Burger King restaurant
- Conceptual Site Plan for Heritage Plaza development
- Trip Generation Rate Worksheet (based on the ITE Trip Generation Manual, current edition) showing comparative trip generation rates for project to date

Currently, the following uses have been implemented on the Heritage Plaza development:
1) Pad D - 41,120 S.F. Walmart Marketplace Neighborhood Center  
2) Pad D - Associated gasoline center with 12 fueling positions  
3) Pad C - Approximately 12,100 S.F. retail commercial pad site (recently completed / partly vacant) NOTE: Square footage of building approximated based on field observation.  
4) Pad B – Approximately 2,160 S.F. of Fast Food Restaurant with Drive-Thru Window use plus 1,800 S.F. of retail commercial building use that were recently approved by the City of Albuquerque Environmental Planning Commission.

This proposal is for a 3,250 S.F. Burger King Fast Food Restaurant at the northeast corner of the Heritage Plaza development.

Still pending are the implementation of uses on Pad A and the multi-family site.

The attached trip generation worksheet for Heritage Center Development (January, 2017 Plan – Burger King) calculates the trip generation rates for each of the existing implemented uses plus the proposed Burger King. To date, it appears that the project (including Burger King Trips) will generate 10,996 trips per day, 308 entering trips per hour and 255 exiting trips per hour during the AM Peak Hour, and 468 entering trips per hour and 461 exiting trips per hour during the PM Peak Hour. These trip generation rates are well below the anticipated rates for the project in the approved Traffic Impact Study for the project dated 12/18/2014.
Re: Proposed Burger King Restaurant (Ladera / Market St.)

Future uses as forecast in the 2014 Traffic Impact Study would generate an additional 3,370 trips per day, 102 entering and 181 exiting trips per hour during the AM Peak Hour, and 163 entering and 109 exiting trips per hour during the PM Peak Hour. If the project continues to develop as anticipated in the 2014 Traffic Impact Study, there will be a 2.1% increase in daily traffic generated, a 0.5% reduction in the AM traffic generated, and a 1.8% increase in the PM traffic generated (or about 21 trips per hour) by this development.

In summary, this analysis demonstrates that the trip generation rate for the uses already implemented plus the newly proposed Burger King restaurant are reasonably close to the trip generation rates assumed in the 2014 Traffic Impact Study. Changes in the actual future uses on Pad A and/or the multi-family will change the results of this analysis somewhat, but that is yet to be determined. This letter of report assumes that the future implemented uses on those Pads will be exactly those defined in the 2014 Traffic Impact Study, which is a reasonable assumption at this time.

Please call me if you have questions.

Best Regards,

Terry O. Brown, P.E.

attachments as noted

cc: Nathan Bisch, One Architecture, PLC w/attachments
# Heritage Center Development (January, 2017 Plan - Burger King)


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>USE (ITE CODE)</th>
<th>24 HR VOL</th>
<th>A. M. PEAK HR.</th>
<th>P. M. PEAK HR.</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GROSS</td>
<td>ENTER</td>
<td>EXIT</td>
<td>ENTER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary Sheet</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pad D</td>
<td>Supermarket (850)</td>
<td>41.12</td>
<td>4,145</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pad D</td>
<td>Gasoline / Service Station w/ Convenience Market (945)</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>1,953</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pad C</td>
<td>Shopping Center (820)</td>
<td>12.10</td>
<td>1,721</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pad B (EPC)*</td>
<td>Fast Food Restaurant w/ Drive-Thru Window (934)</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>1,072</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pad B (EPC)*</td>
<td>Shopping Center (820)</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pad E - Burger King</td>
<td>Fast Food Restaurant w/ Drive-Thru Window (934)</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>1,606</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FUTURE TRIPS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pad A</td>
<td>Fast Food Restaurant w/ Drive-Thru Window (934)</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>1,610</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family</td>
<td>Apartment (220)</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>1,760</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal Trip Generated by Future Uses</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,370</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Anticipated Project Trips</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14,366</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trips Assumed in Approved Traffic Impact Study (12/18/2014)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>14,075</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Increase (Decrease) in Trips Generated above TIS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>291</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage Increase (-Decrease) in Trips Generated above TIS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>-0.5%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>-0.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* - Recently approved by the Environmental Planning Commission (EPC)
Response to Kathleen Owegon’s 01/26/2017 9:29 AM E-Mail Request:

It should first be noted that during the development of the Traffic Impact Study for a project such as Heritage Plaza, forecasts are based on assumed land uses as well as calculated trip generation rates based on the Institute of Transportation Engineers’ (ITE) Trip Generation Manual, current edition. Certain land uses were assumed on each Pad in the Traffic Impact Study. We try to assume uses, though, that reasonably approximate how the project will develop under the free market. In most cases, we get pretty close overall. If we underestimate the project trip generation rate by too much, the City can require an update to the Traffic Impact Study.

The following table demonstrates the land uses / square footage assumed in the approved 2014 Traffic Impact Study and compares it to the existing use / proposed use / future use as of January, 2017:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pad</th>
<th>2014 TIS</th>
<th>Current</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S.F.</td>
<td>Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>Fast Food Rest. w/Window</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>5,300</td>
<td>Sit-Down Restaurant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>Sit-Down Restaurant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>Fast Food Rest. w/Window</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>43,000</td>
<td>Supermarket*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>Retail Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi</td>
<td>270-Unit Apartments</td>
<td>Multi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Supermarket was not designated as being on Pad D in the approved 2014 Traffic Impact Study.

NOTE: Red text uses above designate existing or approved uses at present. Blue text use above designates the proposed use in question (i.e., a 3,237 S.F. Burger King. Black text uses above designate assumed future uses:

- The future uses on Pad A and the Multi tract are yet to be determined.
- The assumed 5,300 S.F. Sit-Down Restaurant on Pad B has recently been approved as a 2,160 S.F. Fast Food Restaurant w/Drive-Thru Window plus 1,800 S.F. of retail commercial floor space.
- The assumed 8,000 S.F. Sit-Down Restaurant on Pad C was recently constructed as 12,100 S.F. retail commercial floor space which currently includes a Verizon store.
- The originally assumed 43,000 S.F. Supermarket plus 4,000 S.F. Fast Food Restaurant w/Drive-Thru Window on Pad D was constructed as a 41,120 S.F. Supermarket plus a 12 fueling position gasoline center. (NOTE: The 43,000 S.F. Supermarket itself was not assumed to be on Pad D, although Pad D was later expanded to include an unnamed tract).
- The originally assumed 20,000 S.F. Retail Commercial on Pad E is now proposed as a 3,237 S.F. Burger King.
Overall, as demonstrate in the Trip Generation Analysis dated January 24, 2017, the project is on tract to generate within 1 or 2 percent of what was anticipated in the 2014 Traffic Impact Study assuming future uses on Pad A and Multi tract are reasonably close to those anticipated.

If the above text or portions of the above text are unreadable or in poor format, please see the attached pdf file.

Please call me if you have questions.

Best Regards,

Terry O. Brown, P.E.
P. O. Box 92051
Albuquerque, NM 87199-2051
(505) 883-8807 – Office
(505) 270-6981 – Cell
e-mail: tobe@swcp.com

From: Kathleen Oweegon [mailto:oweegon@bridgesofpeace.com]
Sent: Thursday, January 26, 2017 9:29 AM
To: tobe@swcp.com
Cc: Renee Horvath <aboard10@juno.com>; Candy Patterson <candypatt@aol.com>; Gregie and Deborah Duran <voyager4969@outlook.com>; flujan3@msn.com; avalon3a@yahoo.com; info@srmna.org; dealswithdebbie@gmail.com; Ruben Aleman <m_raleman@yahoo.com>; marykloughran@comcast.net; Harry <hlhen@comcast.net>; Brad Flahiff <brad@barnettmtg.com>; jon.totel@onearchitecture.us; Nathan Bisch <nathan.bisch@onearchitecture.us>; Maggie Gould <MGould@cabq.gov>; Quevedo, Vicente M. <vquevedo@cabq.gov>; Tyson Hummell <thummell@cabq.gov>; Shannon Triplett <striplett@cabq.gov>; Jessie Eaton Lawrence <jessie@lawrencemeetingresources.com>

Subject: Project #1003275 Burger King trip generation analysis question

Good morning Terry,

I am a contract facilitator for the City of ABQ Land Use Facilitation Program. Last evening, I facilitated a community meeting regarding the proposed Burger King on Ladera and Market Street (Project #1003275). I am writing to you on behalf of the participants in that meeting.

The trip generation analysis was reviewed and discussed in the meeting, and the participants were comparing the updated analysis with the previous version. To assist them better understand the TGA and its implications, they asked me to write you and ask:

What caused the differences in the trip generation data - line by line?

Our hope is that you will be kind enough, please, to send the answer(s) to this question at your earliest opportunity, via reply-all, so that the neighbors to this proposed project can make more informed decisions about their response before the Feb. 9 EPC Hearing.

Thank you, in advance, for any help you can provide with this.

Respectfully,

Kathleen

Kathleen Oweegon
Facilitator, Mediator, Trainer
Bridges of Peace
(505) 501-7000 Santa Fe
(505) 242-6141 Albuquerque
P.O. Box 21966
Albuquerque, NM 87154
NOTIFICATION &
NEIGHBORHOOD INFORMATION
December 15, 2016

Nathan Bisch
One Architecture
8801 North Central Ave., Suite 101
Phoenix, AZ 85020
Phone: 314-324-6126
E-mail: Nathan.bisch@onearchitecture.com

Dear Nathan:

Thank you for your inquiry of December 15, 2016 requesting the names of ALL Neighborhood and/or Homeowner Associations who would be affected under the provisions of §14-8-2-7 of the Neighborhood Association Recognition Ordinance by your proposed project at (EPC SUBMITTAL) TR A2 PLAT OF TRACTS A-1 THRU A-3 AND C-1 THRU C-3HERITAGE MARKETPLACE (BEING A REPLAT OF TRACTS A AND C,HERITAGE MARKETPLACE), LOCATED ON LADERA DR BETWEEN UNSER BLVD AND MARKET ST zone map H-09.

Our records indicate that the Neighborhood and/or Homeowner Associations affected by this submittal and the contact names are as follows:

LAURELWOOD N.A. (LWD) “R”
*Candelaria Patterson e-mail: candypatt@aol.com
7608 Elderwood Dr. NW/87120 321-1761 (c)
Gregie Duran e-mail: voyager4969@outlook.com
7525 Maplewood Dr. NW/87120 269-6233 (c)

PARKWAY N.A. (PKW) “R”
*Ruben Aleman e-mail: m_aleman@yahoo.com
8005 Fallbrook NW/87120 385-2189 (c)
Mary Loughran e-mail: marykloughran@comcast.net
8015 Fallbrook NW/87120 836-7841 (h)

WESTSIDE COALITION OF N.A.’S
Harry Hendriksen, 10592 Rio Del Sole Ct. NW/87114-2701 890-3481 (h) e-mail: hiben@comcast.net
Rene Horvath, 5515 Palomino Dr. NW/87120 898-2114 (h) e-mail: aboard10@juno.com

Please note that according to §14-8-2-7 of the Neighborhood Association Recognition Ordinance you are required to notify each of these contact persons by certified mail, return receipt requested, before the Planning Department will accept your application filing (PLEASE ATTACH: 1) Copy of this letter; 2) Copy of letters sent to NA/HOA’s and 3) Copy of White Receipts showing proof that you sent certified mail w/stamp from USPS showing date.) If you have any questions about the information provided please contact me at (505) 924-3902 or via e-mail message at vquezvedo@cabq.gov.
December 19, 2016

LAURELWOOD N.A. (LWD) “R”
Mr. Gregie Duran
7525 Maplewood Drive NW
Albuquerque, NM 87120

RE: Proposed New Burger King Restaurant

Mr. Duran,

This letter is to notify you of our intention to construct a new Burger King restaurant with a drive through in the Heritage Market Place development in Albuquerque, New Mexico. At this time we are applying for a Site Development Plan for Building Permit. The restaurant in question is to be built at Tract A-2 of Heritage Market Place, PAD site E at the Southwest corner of Ladera Drive and Market Street in the Heritage Market Place development. For your reference the site is located on zone map H-09 and the property address is 7900 Ladera Drive NW, Albuquerque, NM.

The Burger King will be a one-story building with a drive through. Customers will be able to access the Burger King off of both Market Street and Ladera Drive. The drive through will wrap the building starting at Market Street and drive through window will face Ladera Drive. The exterior of the building will be a mix of stone, brick and EIFS along with aluminum canopies above the windows. All colors and materials on the exterior of the building will be approved by the Heritage Market Place development in order to be certain that this building works with the development standards.

Finally, we are anticipating that our application will be heard at the February 9, 2017 EPC hearing beginning at 8:30 am in the basement hearing room of Plaza del Sol, located at 600 2nd Street NW, Albuquerque, NM 87102.

We would welcome the opportunity to respond to any comments or questions you have regarding the proposed Burger King. Feel free to contact me directly at 314-324-6126 or nathan.bisch@onearchitecture.us.

Sincerely,

Nathan Bisch
Director of Operations
One Architecture
U.S. Postal Service™
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FACILITATED MEETING REPORT
AMENDMENTS

Date Submitted: January 31, 2017
Original Submission: January 27, 2017
Submitted By: Kathleen Oweegon
Facilitator: Kathleen Oweegon
Co-facilitator: Jessie Lawrence
Project Number: #1003275-16EPC-40088
Meeting Date and Time: January 25, 2017 6:00 p.m.

Amendments:

Outcome (page 1)
- Unresolved Issues & Concerns
  o Location
    ▪ Add: “pedestrian safety (high density housing & heavy traffic)”

Neighbors’ Response
- Security (page 9) i)(1)
  o Delete: “cameras in bathroom”

Application Hearing Details: Resident Participation at Hearing: (page 11) 3.a.
- Change “Written comments must be received by Feb. 2, 2017” to
  “Comments received by 9 am on January 30th will be included in the staff report. Comments received by 9 am on February 7 will be forwarded to the EPC. All comments will be added to the project file.”
CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE
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Project #: 1003275-16EPC-40088
Property Description/Address: Proposed Burger King on Pad Site E, Heritage Market Place, located on the SW Corner of Ladera & Market Street, Heritage Market Place Development

Date Submitted: January 27, 2017
Submitted By: Kathleen Oweegon

Meeting Date/Time: January 25, 2017
Meeting Location: Southwest Mesa Clinic, 301 Unser Blvd NW
Facilitator: Kathleen Oweegon
Co-facilitator: Jessie Lawrence

- Applicant/Agent
  - Barnett Management Company, Burger King Franchisee
  - One Architecture
- Neighborhood Associations/Interested Parties
  - Westside Coalition of Neighborhoods
  - Laurelwood NA
  - Avalon NA
  - S.R. Marmon NA

Background/Meeting Summary:
This meeting was to discuss: Site Development Plan for Building Permit –
One Architecture, requests the above action for all or a portion of Pad Site E, Heritage Market Place, zoned SU-1/SU-2, located on Southwest Corner of Ladera and Market Street, Heritage Market Place Development, containing approximately .94 acre. (H-9)

This was a collaborative conversation. While the neighbors expressed concerns about:
  - the drive-thru
  - pedestrian safety (in relation to the drive-thru)
  - location
    - traffic
    - the overabundance of fast-food options in the area
    - the lack of a sit-down restaurant in Heritage Market Place and the vicinity,
they also made it clear that they had nothing against Burger King per se, and expressed appreciation for the Applicant’s approach to the conversation and to their concerns.
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Outcome:

- Areas of Agreement
  - The Applicant has agreed to do all that he can to address the neighbors’ concerns regarding pedestrian safety in relation to the Burger King and its drive-thru.

- Unresolved Issues & Concerns
  - Location
    - traffic
    - the overabundance of fast-food options in the area
    - the lack of a sit-down restaurant in Heritage Market Place and the vicinity

- Key Points
  - The Applicant expressed that he welcomes ongoing, long-term direct communication with the neighbors regarding their concerns and needs with regard to the Burger King, and provided them with his contact information [also included later in this report – page 9 xi(1)].

Meeting Specifics:

1) Applicant Presentation – Brad Flahiff
   a) Burger King is almost all franchises – 7,500 Burger King stores and only 22 corporate stores. I work for one franchisee based in Phoenix – Barnett Mgmt Co. – for the past 31 years.
   b) This franchise is a family-owned business
   c) Signed a development agreement with Burger King in last year to open a franchise in ABQ.
      i) They have preferred corporations around the country they like to work with.
      ii) There are about 600 franchisees.
         (1) We were given honor of franchisee of year in 2014.
      iii) Burger King said they would like to have us in some other markets and saw possibility for some expansion here.
   d) We’ve done research about what the market looks like and toured facilities.
   e) We think we bring family-owned culture – bring nice facilities that we take care of well.
   f) We look at demographics, where we think a place can support a restaurant.
   g) We look at traffic counts, what else is in the area (residential/business), daytime business population, anchor, etc. This particular site came to us with a pad opportunity.
   h) Heard concerns about traffic, drive-thru. Don’t know that I can answer all of them.
      i) Burger King is permissible use.
      ii) We want to look at if we can alleviate concerns and if it’s a good match or not.
   i) Occasionally hear things at these meetings that make us second-guess decisions, and we end up pulling out of the contract.
   j) (Looking at colored proposed elevations diagrams). The City has seen these, and we’re still going to get feedback.
      i) The elevations are pretty standard, with a prototype 3,237 sq foot footprint.
k) We plan on a double drive-thru. Without second lane, would have 3-4 fewer cars in drive-thru, backed up beyond the drive-thru lanes. A double drive-thru helps alleviate backup.

l) We have a dining room with approximately 52 seats.
   i) Would be happy to email dining room plan.
   ii) Don’t know if that seat count includes 2 lounge chairs or the stools in front of games for kids.
   iii) Will confirm the exact number of seats, and which seats are and are not counted.

m) Regarding the Wal-Mart location – we’re in a few different types of Wal-Mart centers in Phoenix. Not infatuated with Wal-Mart, but don’t see it as a problem. See different results in different sites with Wal-Mart.

2) Neighbors’ Response
   a) Drive-thru & related pedestrian safety
      i) Q: Regarding stacking, saw something that said 11 cars?
         (1) A: 11 cars fit from entrance to pick-up window on the site plan.
         (a) Entrances to the site are at the SE and SW corners of the site.
      ii) Q: Is there an entrance from Market Street just south of Ladera?
         (1) A: Not an entrance there. This was on master site plan, but not part of our plan.
      iii) Q: What’s between the two entrances along the south side?
         (1) A: Open parking.
      iv) Q: Are there pedestrian sidewalks?
         (1) A: Yes, along the outside perimeter on Ladera. We don’t have one proposed on Market.
         (a) Pedestrian walkway would be whatever currently exists to get into shopping center. If one exists, we’re not pulling it out, but not proposing another one.
      v) Q: Internal to the site, are there any sidewalks?
         (1) A: Just immediately around building
      vi) Q: On south side of pad, any pedestrian traffic?
         (1) A: No, no pedestrian walkway planned there.
      vii) Q: So, open parking and designated entrance. How will pedestrians access site?
         (1) A: Pedestrian walkway from Ladera, western edge of site. No other pedestrian walkways on south side of site specific to pad.
      viii) Q: Is the parking delineated with white line on asphalt? Curb?
         (1) A: No curb between two islands. Open parking, striped.
         (a) City could propose that they want a curb.
      ix) Q: Drive-through to window, two lanes?
         (1) A: At point where the lanes turn around the side of the building, they merge to one lane.
      x) Q: How many cars are usual? Is 11 typical?
         (1) A: Hard to say what’s typical. Depends on time of day, e.g. peak hours.
         (a) Think we’re generally good at speed of service, average car 3 minutes from speaker to delivery as company average. But traffic patterns come in waves.
Q: Have you seen problems with drive-thrus in other stores?
   (1) A: One store with single drive-thru is busy very regularly. That’s why we started
two drive-thrus. Fortunately, in most cases, that seems to be overkill, but better to
have too much space than not enough.
   (a) If something isn’t what I say it is, feel free to call me. Also, sometimes
there’s a peak in traffic right after we open, and then it slows down.

Neighbor: I don’t like 2-lane drive-thrus. They screw up my order, or I have to take
more time to check it. I hate them, based on my experience.

Q: Do you anticipate traffic coming in off Market, then exiting the other entrance?
   (1) A: See lot more traffic on Ladera than Market, but hard to say. Don’t know.
Don’t think traffic study addresses where they’ll enter.

Q: Where do cars exit?
   (1) A: Can go out either exit. If we anticipate that cars leave from the SW exit, they
can leave to either street.

Q: Northbound exit from shopping center parking lot onto Ladera, is that striped?
   Two outgoing, one ingoing?
   (1) A: Sounds right.

Q: Where is the drive-thru window on the building?
   (1) A: Window is approximately central on north side of building. There are two
bump-outs on the building. The eastern one is just architectural.

Q: On the site plan, do the measurements indicate space for 11 cars?
   (1) A: Yes. A parking space is 9x18, we measure 10x20 for each car.

Q: What about pedestrian safety from moving cars? Is there a barrier on the north side?
   (1) A: On the north side, there will be 40" screen wall along most of northern
boundary. Not just for safety, but also headlights, protection for sidewalk.
   (a) There’s an issue with the idea of a pedestrian walkway from Market – it
would have to cross the drive-thru.
   (i) As an option, we could stripe across the parking lot to designate a
walkway, but that seemed less safe to us.

Q: Where is the entrance to the building?
   (1) A: On the south side.

Q: How will people walk to the building?
   (1) Using what’s existing. We’re not planning to add nothing new.

Neighbor: This is not pedestrian-friendly at all. Pedestrians will be dodging cars.
Facilitator to neighbors: What would pedestrian-friendly look like?
   (1) Neighbor: Cannot have to walk through cars.
   (2) Brad: Let’s assume no crosswalk from Market.
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(a) Do we want a sidewalk? If pedestrians wanted to cut in, if City allowed it, would we want to tie into sidewalk on east side of site and bring something across?

(b) Maybe put a stop sign before drive thru, and striped crossway? Does that alleviate concerns? I'm hearing more overarching concerns.

(3) Neighbor: This is a challenge because it's so congested on Market, and we can't have signalized light there because this is an F-rated intersection.

(a) We're going to have a lot of traffic backed up on Market, and Wal-Mart traffic relying on Market Street to make a left and head south on Unser. Intersection has long delays, and that's the challenge for the site, the access issues.

(4) Applicant: If this site were put to another use, would there be the same pedestrian issue? Is this specific to the Burger King use or poorly designed center?

(a) Neighbor: Specific to fast food – the difference with fast food is there are more kids walking through the parking area to get to the fast-food restaurants.

xxiii) Q: Is there a minimum space for drive-thrus? Acreage? Footage?

(1) A: 23,000 sf, ½ acre – we can get down that small in some cases. In one case in Phoenix, we're looking at a 2-acre site with 1.25 usable acres.

(2) There's a lot of variation in what we can build on.

(3) Think 35,000-45,000 sq. ft. is ideal, but that's very site-specific.

xxiv) Q: Will there be a trashcan at the end of the drive-thru, so trash can be deposited when driving out of the drive thru? It is important as a community member to have a place to get rid of my trash.

(1) A: Yes, there will be trashcan.

b) Location

i) Neighbor: We have concerns about whole development, not just Burger King.

(1) We're high-density residential, a lot of families.

(2) We've been down this path before. We were told that there would be a sit-down restaurant, services for the area. Then things started to change. Now, high density, more apartments, not friendly to pedestrians, drive-thrus, and we object to them.

(3) This is a residential area. This is a Neighborhood Activity Center, it's supposed to be pedestrian-friendly. It's not. We keep going around on this.

(4) Wal-Mart has a tremendous amount of traffic.

(5) We still want our sit-down restaurant, and it's clear it's not coming, and we're getting another drive-thru.

(6) We understand the business, but it's too intense for the area, and it's adding to the traffic.

ii) Q: There's a difference between the original TIS and the amended one that was handed out in this meeting.

(1) A: Jon: It has been updated.

iii) Q: Only one of the Traffic Impact Studies includes apartments; one includes supermarket, differing numbers. Differing information; I question that. Also, fast food restaurants, originally on pad A and pad D,
CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE
LAND USE FACILITATION PROGRAM
PROJECT MEETING REPORT

(1) Differing data, 1,984 vs. 1,606. [traffic numbers] Without actual traffic studies, I'm questioning validity of those numbers.

(2) A: Brad: I saw the original traffic study, and saw the 1,606, and thought it would be the busiest Burger King ever operated.

(a) On average, we will get approximately 500 customers per day.

(i) About 67% of business comes to drive thru. If we convert that to trips, coming and going, still only at 1000.

(ii) The explanation from the traffic engineer was that they use standard tables, and information from actual restaurants wouldn't be accepted by city. We want to be conservative, so we're prepared for worst-case scenario. The traffic engineer [Terry] would be the person to answer that.

(3) Facilitator: Seems we need more information?

(a) Neighbor: Yes, need to validate.

(b) Facilitator: I can make it an action item to follow up on as addendum to report. What are exact words of question I need to pose to Terry?

(i) "What caused the differences in the trip generation data tables, line by line?"

iv) Neighbor: Regarding pedestrian traffic and safety: On the way to this meeting, the road was blocked by police at 72nd and Ladera because of a car on the sidewalk.

(1) This is a problematic area, Ladera and Unser. If in right turn lane, cars don't have to stop, only yield.

(2) Concerns about pedestrian safety and driver safety. Also major trail along Unser, with suicide lane crossing multi-use trail.

v) Neighbor: This location is about 1.5 miles from our community. Because of Walmart, we go there; it's convenient.

(1) First, Avalon neighborhood and others in vicinity patronize the same nearby restaurants here on west side.

(a) On Central from 98th to Atrisco, 98th between 40 and Central, Coors from Central to Sequoia – within these boundaries, there are 7 various pizza places, only 2 with dine-in seating. We have at least 14 hamburger joints already (listed restaurants).

(b) Already have 2 Burger Kings – one that is 2.5 miles north of site, another 2.5 miles south.

(i) For Avalon NA, we'll have one less than .5 miles, another 2 miles away.

(ii) We're in desperate need of dine-in restaurants.

(2) Second, we have problems with congestion from Wal-Mart, Wal-Mart gas, and Valero gas, before we even get the shops in.

(a) Traffic Impact Study only had two drive-thrus for the Marketplace, and those have already been approved.

(b) Another fast food establishment, especially with drive-thru, would not be appropriate.

(c) Also, reviewing locations, noticed that most Burger Kings are in the north quadrant of ABQ, only one in SE, and 2 in SW, with one of those actually on the border.
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(i) Something else to consider, getting further from these two and getting something in the south.

vi) Q: When you decided to build here, what is it about this area?
   (1) A: This pad is within a shopping center; that's what was available for lease when we were looking. Two pads already under contract, another is open.
      (a) We look at traffic, demographics, who anchor is, where other Burger Kings are. Site selection is more of an art than a science.

vii) Q: Central is just south of where we are now. You wouldn't have to go far to put your Burger King in the south quadrant of ABQ, where it is more needed.
   (1) A: We're looking there, too. We have approximately 3 sites with offers and 7-8 that we're looking at, with a couple that might happen, and we're looking at different areas around ABQ.

viii) Q: Is the broker from here?
    (1) A: Based in Phoenix, but works the southwest region. ~3 main commercial brokers in ABQ, and they work very closely with them.

ix) Q: Did you consider the impact of the Taco Bell?
    (1) A: Looked at data from other places, in other situations, and a nearby Taco Bell hasn't affected us. Other types of fast food might affect us differently.

x) Q: Were you aware of the two Burger Kings 2.5 miles away and the other burger joints?
   (1) A: Yes. We map Burger Kings, then look at the gaps. We'd rather see 3 miles distance between them, but we also look at who anchor is, if other Burger Kings are in good spots, what condition they're in, what the competition is.

xi) Q: Do the other Burger Kings in the area know you want to come there?
   (1) A: Yes, notices sent to them. Could come up that it is disputed, and there will be a study on the impact to that restaurant. If over a certain threshold, may say we can't develop there, or we may need to pay for the impact.

xii) Q: It seems that we should be looking at sit-down restaurant rather than drive-thru. This doesn't really help our community. It's built for the people who drive through but don't live here.
   (1) A: For us, when there's a site opportunity, we ask if we are interested and if it will be a viable site.
      (a) The master planning is out of my area of expertise. I don't want to speak for developer, but I'm guessing they want to lease or sell the pad and make money. Don't know how it works if community says they want to limit the use.
      (b) If the City says this is not ok, we would say ok and gracefully bow out. For us, the consideration is do we think it's viable.

xiii) Q: Need to look at regulations within scope of site, what permissive use means here.
    (1) A: Want to try to alleviate concerns, because you're potentially our customer. Working with you matters to us.
    (2) Q2: So Burger King likes community feedback?
       (a) A: Barnett Management certainly does.
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c) Traffic

i) Q: With the Wal-Mart, we’re seeing traffic from delivery trucks.
   (1) The fire hydrant has been hit 3 times in last 8 months.
   (2) They make right turn and come into the neighborhood, because it’s easier to
       navigate. That road is not a service road. Using our roads as service roads can
       harm our homes, trees, and vegetation. Concern that trucks will continue to use
       our neighborhood to exit.
   (3) Worries me that you have drive thru there, and you don’t know if person is going
       in or driving through, and trucks will have difficulty navigating intersection.

ii) Neighbor: It’s an issue that they can’t signalize the intersection on Market right by
     this site, because it’s too close to the Ladera/Market intersection.
     (1) For people traveling south like the Avalon neighborhood, once we get in, going
         out is the problem.

iii) Neighbor: Concerned about increased pollution, road noise. Drive-thrus add more
     congestion.
     (1) A: If we bow out, there will be another fast food user in 3 months. Would rather
         see what the city says, and if they say it’s an approved use, we will do everything
         for you that we can. If there are things we can do within reason, we’ll do them.

iv) Q: Zoning is C1?
    (1) A: Facilitator (reading from an email previously sent by Planner Maggie Gould):
        “SU2, SU1 for planned office park and commercial, to include full-service
        alcohol sales with sit-down restaurant.” Many of your zoning questions are
        answered in Maggie’s email, which I have handed out.

v) Q: Existing zoning is SU2. Have you proposed something different on the site plan?
    (1) A: Jon: Not changing the zoning. Sticking to existing zoning.

vi) Q: Did you have a pre-application meeting with Maggie?
    (1) A: No meetings yet.

vii) Neighbor: We didn’t mind a commercial area coming in, but now they’re throwing in
     a lot of high-traffic uses. Seems like every intensive use is on the site and it’s not
     balanced well.
     (1) Concerned about safety issues, especially with intersection.
         (a) Kids will be coming from apartments, darting between cars.
     (2) A: Assuming city says yes, the screen wall planned on Ladera could be extended
         to go around drive thru along Market as a deterrent. If that would help alleviate
         this concern, we’re not opposed to that.

viii) Q: No sidewalk, correct?
     (1) A: Understand sidewalks exist along the road. Our only sidewalk will be access
         into site along Ladera. ADA compliant with ramps, hatching, and grades.

ix) Q: What about pedestrian access on Market?
    (1) A: I’m open to tying into the existing sidewalk.
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(a) The SE corner of site is for water retention. If there is a walkway, it would need to come across entrance to drive thru. We could stripe or put up signs and tie into the parking island on east end of parking adjacent to building. Happy to put walkway in there.

x) Q: Would you consider not putting in drive thru?
   (1) A: Not in an area like this. Drive thru is 67% of the business.

xi) Neighbor: Burger King on 98th just off Central doesn’t have a drive thru.
   (1) A: I’m hearing the drive thru and traffic as big concerns. Will continue to look at ways to mitigate that. If you have ideas, let me know. Contact information: Brad Flahiff, Director of Development, Barnett Management Company, 11022 N 28th Dr, #170, Phoenix, AZ 85029 C: 602-577-9492

d) Signage
   i) Q: Signs? Any freestanding signs?
      (1) A: Think we’re not allowed any freestanding monument sign, because can have panel on pre-existing sign on NW corner of our pad. Assume a sign for the complex with a space for a Burger King sign is there already.

ii) Q: No other signs around building?
    (1) A: I understand that we’re not allowed other sign. We do not have any plan for a sign right now.

iii) Q: You said not you’re looking to add external sign?
     (1) A: Correct.

iv) Neighbor: I have a concern about reader boards
    (1) A: No reader boards. What’s typical for us is a Burger King logo that sits on street.
       (a) If electronic sign allowed, it would 6’ or 8’ with a static message.
       (b) I don’t think we’re allowed one. I’m happy to specifically answer in email when I have information about the type of monument sign, if any, that is allowed

e) Security
   i) Q: What’s planned for security?
      (1) A: Alarm system, motion sensors, door sensors, camera system, closed circuit TV, 12 cameras around the restaurant, a couple of exterior cameras, cameras in bathroom, dining room, kitchen.

    (1) A: We don’t use armed security guards anywhere.
       (a) We will have cameras pointing into parking lot. If we saw anything, we’d call the police. If anything happened, we would have it on camera and we would call it in, and we want as much light as allowed without interfering with the neighborhoods.
       (b) Think it will be better in terms of security to have a business here, rather than the empty pad.
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iii) Q: If you have cameras around and there’s an accident, e.g. on Ladera, would you offer that for police investigation?
   (1) A: When police ask us for something, we want to cooperate.

f) Hours of operation
   i) Q: What hours will the Burger King be open?
      (1) A: Not 24 hours. Typically 6 AM to midnight, but depends on area. Often hours are included in city use permit.

ghi) Lighting
   i) Q: All lights downcast? Light height? Any height variance?
      (1) A: We typically use LED.
      (2) We have to match rest of shopping center.
      (3) Lights at 22 feet; either center standard or city maximum.

h) Closing Thoughts
   i) Neighbor: Just opposed to drive-thru segments because West Side Strategic Plan description of Neighborhood Center says should be pedestrian oriented. Concerned that the City is not following their own rules.
   ii) Neighbor: Think someone from the city should be here to address concerns, generally at these meetings. More information would be great. Don’t think that they should stay away because of objectivity.
   iii) Neighbor: Thank you for being gentle about this. We appreciate your comments and your willingness to bow out gracefully if this is not a good fit.
      (1) Concerned about drive thru, kids, think we need to do better for our families.

Action Items:
1. Brad will confirm the exact number of seats, and which seats are and are not counted and will send that information via to the neighbors on the report send list.
2. Brad will email the group when he has information about the type of monument sign, if any, that is allowed

Application Hearing Details: Hearing scheduled for February 9, 2017
1. Hearing Time:
   a. The Commission will begin hearing applications at 8:30 a.m.
   b. The actual time this application will be heard by the Commission will depend on the applicant’s position on the Commission’s schedule
2. Hearing Process:
   a. Comments from facilitated meetings will go into a report, which goes to the City Planner.
   b. City Planner includes facilitator report in recommendations.
   c. The Commission will make a decision and parties have 15 days to appeal the decision.
3. Resident Participation at Hearing:
   a. Written comments must be received by Feb. 2, 2017 and may be sent to: Maggie Gould, (505) 924-3910, mgould@cabq.gov, 600 2nd St., 3rd floor, Albuquerque, NM, 87102 OR
   b. Peter Nichols, Chair, EPC, c/o Planning Department, 600 2nd St., 3rd floor, Albuquerque, NM, 87102

Names & Addresses of Attendees:
- Applicant/Agent
  o Barnett Management Company, Burger King Franchisee
    ▪ Brad Flahiff
  o One Architecture
    ▪ Jon Totel
- Neighborhood Associations/Interested Parties
  o Westside Coalition of Neighborhoods
    ▪ René Horvath
  o Laurelwood NA
    ▪ Frances Lujan, Board Member
    ▪ Frank Comfort
    ▪ Deborah Duran
    ▪ Candy Patterson, President
  o Avalon NA
    ▪ Lucy Anchondo
  o S.R. Marmon NA
    ▪ E. Ward
  o No Affiliation Noted
    ▪ Mari Ruiz
Hello,

The 2009 WSSP is on our website and also includes the table of amendments. The page number I referenced are from that document, in the Southwest Strategic Action Plan section of the WSSP.
https://www.cabq.gov/planning/urban-design-development/publications/publications

Thank you,

Maggie Gould, MCRP
Planner
City of Albuquerque, Planning Department
600 Second St. NW
Albuquerque, NM 87102
505-924-3910
mgould@cabq.gov

Ms. Gould,
Which WSSP is being currently used and is there a link to it?

Thank you,
Frank Comfort

Sent from my Verizon 4G LTE smartphone

-------- Original message --------
From: "Gould, Maggie S." <MGould@cabq.gov>
Date: 1/26/17 16:24 (GMT-07:00)
To: Candypatt@aol.com, oweegon@bridgesofpeace.com, Brad@barnettmgmt.com, fcomfort@aol.com
Cc: aboard10@juno.com, nathan.bisch@onearchitecture.us, voyager4969@outlook.com, m_raleman@yahoo.com, marykloughran@comcast.net, hlhen@comcast.net, Triplett, Shannon; Quevedo, Vicente M.; Hummell, Tyson; jessie@lawrencemeetingresources.com; Dicome, Kym
Subject: RE: REMINDER: RSVP for Facilitated Meeting - EPC Project 1003275, Burger King
Ms. Gould,

Thank you for the response.

Would you please clarify which West Side Strategic Plan (WSSP) is being used?
What is the definition of a Neighborhood Activity Center?

This is what I have: [+NAC Neighborhood Activity Center Zone
This zone is intended for application in designated Neighborhood Activity Centers. It provides for development of a mixture of two or more of the following uses in a pedestrian-oriented format: neighborhood serving retail, commercial and/or publicly provided services, institutions (schools, libraries, religious institutions), multi-family residences, and live/work spaces.
A. Permissive uses:
   (1) Uses listed as permissive in §14-16-2-16 C-1 Neighborhood Commercial Zone, except:
      (a) Signs: Only wall signs are permitted. No free-standing signs are permitted, except those exceptions listed in §14-16-2-17(A)(9)(f) of the Zoning Code. On live/work spaces, signs may be no more than eight square feet in area and shall be located on the building wall no higher than the first floor.
      (b) Drive-up and drive-in facilities are not allowed.
      (c) Gasoline, oil, or liquefied petroleum gas, or other vehicle fuel sales are not allowed.

Is that correct?

Thank You

Frank Comfort

LNA

fcomfort@aol.com

505-321-6886

In a message dated 1/24/2017 6:04:23 P.M. Mountain Standard Time, MGould@cabq.gov writes:

Hello All,

These are responses to Candy’s questions from earlier.

The site is zoned SU-2, SU-1 for Planned Office Park and Commercial Development to Include Full Service Alcohol Sales with a Sit Down Restaurant.

The El Rancho Atrisco Phase III Sector Plan, adopted in 1981, zoned the entire 20 acres of which the subject site is a part, SU-1 Planned Office Park and Commercial Development, but caps the commercial development at no more than 50% of the site. In October 2012 the City Code Compliance Manager confirmed that activities allowed on the site must correspond to those enumerated in the C-1 Neighborhood Commercial zone uses, and that the area within which the
subject site is located may be developed with commercial uses pursuant to the C-1 zone. The additional use to include Full Service Alcohol Sales with a Sit Down Restaurant was added in 2014.

The proposed food service / retail use with a drive thru on the subject site is permissive.

The original Traffic Impact Study looked at two drive-up fast food restaurants, a supermarket, two high turnover sit down restaurants, a shopping center and apartments. The study did not approve or deny any use, it looked at the traffic impact of possible uses that could be developed on the site.

There is no minimum lot size for drive up uses.

Are you asking about the number of cars that will be accommodated in the drive up lanes with regards to stacking? The Development Process Manual shows a 100 foot drive up lane for fast food as accommodating 5 vehicles, so based on that, the drive up lanes would accommodate about 11 vehicles. I will check that with transportation in the morning.

The Westside Strategic Plan designates the area as a neighborhood activity center.

Also, the trip generation should be updated to show the fast food drive up use on pad site b. Tony Loyd sent that information to the traffic engineer.

Let me know if I can answer any additional questions.

Thank you,

Maggie Gould, MCRP
Planner
City of Albuquerque, Planning Department
600 Second St. NW
Albuquerque, NM 87102
505-924-3910
mgould@cabq.gov

From: Kathleen Oweegon [mailto:oweegon@bridgesofpeace.com]
Sent: Tuesday, January 24, 2017 2:43 PM
To: Brad Flahiff
Cc: Renee Horvath; Nathan Bisch; Candy Patterson; voyager4969@outlook.com; Ruben Aleman; maryklooughran@comcast.net; Harry; Triplett, Shannon; Gould, Maggie S.; Quevedo, Vicente M.; Hummel, Tyson; Jessie Eaton Lawrence
Subject: Re: REMINDER: RSVP for Facilitated Meeting - EPC Project 1003275, Burger King
Thank you, Brad, for your responsiveness and for this information.

Sincerely,

Kathleen

Kathleen Oweegon
Facilitator, Mediator, Trainer
Bridges of Peace
(505) 501-7000 Santa Fe
(505) 242-6141 Albuquerque
P.O. Box 21966
Albuquerque, NM 87154
oweegon@bridgesofpeace.com
www.bridgesofpeace.com

On Jan 24, 2017, at 2:38 PM, Brad Flahiff <Brad@barnettmgt.com> wrote:

Hi Kathleen and Renee,

The only application submitted thus far that I'm aware of is the application Kathleen attached to her response. The site plan was included with that application. The updated trip generation report for the TIS was previously sent out, but maybe it didn't go to everyone. I've attached it for reference.

Let me know if I can be of any further help, and I look forward to meeting you all tomorrow evening.

Thanks,

Brad Flahiff
Director of Development
Barnett Management Company
Begin forwarded message:

From: Kathleen Oweegon [mailto:oweegon@bridgesofpeace.com]
Sent: Tuesday, January 24, 2017 2:17 PM
To: Brad Flahiff <Brad@barnettmgmt.com>
Subject: Fwd: REMINDER: RSVP for Facilitated Meeting - EPC Project 1003275, Burger King

From: aboard10@juno.com

Subject: Re: REMINDER: RSVP for Facilitated Meeting - EPC Project 1003275, Burger King

Date: January 23, 2017 at 11:50:54 AM MST

To: oweegon@bridgesofpeace.com

Cc: nathan.bisch@onearchitecture.us, candypatt@aol.com, voyager4969@outlook.com, m_raleyman@yahoo.com, marykloughran@comcast.net, hlhen@comcast.net, aboard10@juno.com, striplett@cabq.gov, MGould@cabq.gov, yquevedo@cabq.gov, thummell@cabq.gov, jessie@lawrencemeetingresources.com

Dear Kathleen,

I will be there. What information do you have on the Burger King building permit application, the site plan for subdivision, and the TIS / traffic report, that you can send to us before the meeting?

Rene' Horvath

From: Kathleen Oweegon [mailto:oweegon@bridgesofpeace.com]
Sent: Tuesday, January 24, 2017 1:49 PM
To: Renee Horvath <aboard10@juno.com>
Cc: Nathan Bisch <nathan.bisch@onearchitecture.us>; Candy Patterson
Dear Rene,

Thank you for your RSVP.

The only document I received with regard to this case is the application, which I sent out yesterday, and which I have attached to this email, in case the previous email slipped by you.

I am copying Brad Flahiff, the Director of Development for Barnett Management Company, the Burger King franchisee on this reply in case he has more information he can share before the meeting. If the information isn’t available at this time, hopefully it can be provided at or shortly after the meeting. Thank you for your request.

Respectfully,

Kathleen

Kathleen Oweegon

Facilitator, Mediator, Trainer

Bridges of Peace

(505) 501-7000 Santa Fe

(505) 242-6141 Albuquerque

P.O. Box 21966

Albuquerque, NM 87154

oweegon@bridgesofpeace.com

www.bridgesofpeace.com

<Trip_Gen_Analysis_2017-2.pdf>
CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE
PLANNING DEPARTMENT
PROPERTY OWNERSHIP LIST

Hearing Date: Thursday, Feb. 9, 2017
Zone Atlas Page: H-09
Notification Radius: Neighborhood Associations
100ft plus r.o.w

Cross Reference and Location: Southwest corner of Ladera Dr. and Market St. – Heritage Market Place Development

Applicant: Nathan Bisch - One Architecture
8801 N. Central Ave. Suite 101
Phoenix, AZ 85020

Agent:

Special Instructions:
Notice must be mailed from the City 15 days prior to the meeting.

Date Mailed: 01/18/17

Signature: [Signature]
WESTERN ALBUQUERQUE LAND HOLDINGS LLC
GARRETT DEV CORP/JEFF GARRETT
PO BOX 56790
ALBUQUERQUE NM 87187

Nathan Bisch – One Architecture
8801 N. Central Ave. Suite 101
Phoenix, AZ 85020

Parkway N.A (PKW) "R"
Ruben Aleman
8005 Fallbrook NW
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87120

Westside Coalition of N.A.'s
Rene Horvath
5515 Palomino Dr. NW
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87120

LADERA II LIMITED PARTNERSHIP
1850 MT DIABLO BLVD SUITE 410
WALNUT CREEK CA 94597

Laurel Wood N.A (LWD) "R"
Candelaria Patterson
7608 Elderwood Dr. NW
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87120

Parkway N.A (PKW) "R"
Mary Loughran
8015 Fallbrook NW
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87120

Laurel Wood N.A (LWD) "R"
Gregie Duran
7525 Maplewood Dr. NW
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87120

Diamond Shamrock Refining & Marketing
CO C/O AD VALOREM TAX DEPARTMENT
PO BOX 690110
SAN ANTONIO TX 78269-0110

Westside Coalition of N.A.'s
Harry Hendriksen
10592 Rio Del Sole Ct. NW
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87114
SITE PHOTOMETRIC PLAN

BURGER KING
3,327 S.F.

LADERA DRIVE
MARKET STREET

NOTE: THIS DETAIL IS SUBJECT TO CHANGE. ELECTRICAL INSTALLATION AND LIGHTING TO BE PERFORMED BY THE GENERAL CONTRACTOR, STRUCTURAL ENGINEER, AND ELECTRICIAN.

LIGHT POLE DETAIL

LUMINARE SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Luminaire</th>
<th>Lamp Type</th>
<th>Wattage</th>
<th>Lumens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>LED</td>
<td>70W</td>
<td>1,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>LED</td>
<td>90W</td>
<td>2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>LED</td>
<td>150W</td>
<td>3,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STATISTICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Lumens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Line at Street</td>
<td>2,081</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DIMENSIONS

- Site 0-0-0
- Street 0-0-0
- Property Line 0-0-0

SCALE: 1" = 20'-0"
PLANT LEGEND

SCIENTIFIC NAME / WATER USE / COMMON NAME / INSTALLATION SIZE
13. COELESTIS PENDENS / CALAMAGROSTIS / BROOM GRASS / 2'-2' 1/2' BRUSH
14. ECHINOSPORUM BOREALE / CALAMAGROSTIS / BROOM GRASS / 2'-2' 1/2' BRUSH
15. ECHINOPS TARAXACIFOLIUS / ECHINOPS TARAXACIFOLIUS / BROOM GRASS / 2'-2' 1/2' BRUSH
16. HETEROGLOTTOS / HETEROGLOTTOS / BROOM GRASS / 2'-2' 1/2' BRUSH
17. LAKEOVER / LAKEOVER / BROOM GRASS / 2'-2' 1/2' BRUSH
18. LUMKOS YOSHIKURA / LUMKOS YOSHIKURA / BROOM GRASS / 2'-2' 1/2' BRUSH
19. SHAPE / SHAPE / BROOM GRASS / 2'-2' 1/2' BRUSH

GENERAL LANDSCAPE NOTES

MACHINES AND EQUIPMENT SHALL BE TOP DRESSED WITH 25% NITROGEN AMMONIUM BONDO (2'-2' BRUSH)

REINHART PLANT MATERIALS SHALL BE ONE INCH PER PLANT (2'-2' BRUSH)

NATIVE PLANTS SHALL BE TOP DRESSED WITH 10% NITROGEN AMMONIUM BONDO (2'-2' BRUSH)

LUMKOS GRASS FOUNTAIN (2'-2' BRUSH)

LUMKOS YOSHIKURA (2'-2' BRUSH)

LAKEOVER (2'-2' BRUSH)

SHAPE (2'-2' BRUSH)

SHAPED GRASS FOUNTAIN (2'-2' BRUSH)

LAKEOVER (2'-2' BRUSH)

SHAPE (2'-2' BRUSH)

MACHINES AND EQUIPMENT SHALL BE TOP DRESSED WITH 25% NITROGEN AMMONIUM BONDO (2'-2' BRUSH)