Agent: Consensus Planning, Inc.
Applicant: Greystar

Request:
1) Major Amendment to Site Plan – EPC
2) Site Plan - EPC for development of a 171-unit age-restricted, senior housing development.

Legal Description:
Tracts 1-6 North Andalucia at La Luz
Tract 4 North Andalucia at La Luz

Location:
SE corner of Coors Blvd. NW and Montano Rd.

Size:
Approximately 60 acres

Zoning:
PD

Summary of Analysis
The request is for a Major Amendment of a Prior Approved Site Development Plan for property owned by Greystar, as well as approval of a Site Plan - EPC for a senior, age-restricted multi-family development. The property contained within the prior approval is legally described as Tracts 1 thru 4, 5-A, 5-B, and 6, Plat of North Andalucia at La Luz, containing approximately 69.6 acres.

The request consists of the following major changes to the existing, governing site development plan:

1. Increase in density on Tract 4 from 20 units per acre to 24 units per acre.
   - 155 one and two-bedroom apartments
   - 16 duplex cottages

2. Reduction in parking requirements:
   - Multi-family above 1000 square feet from 2 per unit to 1.25 per unit
   - Multi-family less than 1000 square feet from 1.5 per unit to 1.25 per unit

The applicant notified neighborhood associations and property owners as required. Staff has not received any comments in support or opposition to the request. Staff recommends approval subject to conditions needed to ensure that IDO requirements are met and to provide clarification.

Staff Recommendation
APPROVAL of SI-2020-00356 based on the Findings 1-13 beginning on p. 34 and
APPROVAL of SI-2020-00357 based on the Findings 1-18 beginning on p. 39 and subject to Conditions 1-13 beginning on p. 43

Staff Planner
Leslie Naji, Senior Planner
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I. INTRODUCTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Comprehensive Plan Area</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>PD</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>Multi-family Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PD, R-ML</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>Commercial Services/ Multi-Family Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>PD, MX-M</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>Commercial Services /Multi-Family Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>PD, R-MH</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>Commercial Services /Multi-Family Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>R-T</td>
<td>Consistency</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Request

The request is for a Major Amendment of a Prior Approved Site Development Plan for North Andalucia at La Luz (“prior approval”), as well as approval of a Site Plan - EPC for a senior, age-restricted multi-family development. The property contained within the prior approval is legally described as Tracts 1 thru 4, 5-A, 5-B, and 6, Plat of North Andalucia at La Luz, containing approximately 69.6 acres.

The applicant’s proposed amendment and Site Plan will facilitate the development of senior independent living on Tract 4, North Andalucia at La Luz, containing 7.7061 acres (“subject site”). North Andalucia at La Luz is located on the east side of Coors Boulevard NW, south of Montano Road NW. The subject site is within the larger North Andalucia at La Luz development located on Antequera Road NW south of Mirandela Street NW. Coors Boulevard forms the western edge of the subject site.

The request consists of the following major changes to the existing, governing site development plan:

1. Increase in density on Tract 4 from 20 units per acre to 24 units per acre.
   - 155 one and two-bedroom apartments
   - 16 duplex cottages

2. Reduction in parking requirements:
   - Multi-family above 1000 square feet from 2 per unit to 1.25 per unit
   - Multi-family less than 1000 square feet from 1.5 per unit to 1.25 per unit

The IDO’s Site Plan-EPC Criteria 6-6(H)(3) are not fully applicable to the major amendment to
a prior approval request.

The Site Plan – EPC request for the subject site is per the underlying PD zoning for development of a multi-family development.

**EPC Role**

The Environmental Planning Commission (EPC) is hearing this case pursuant to the Integrated Development Ordinance (IDO) Section 14-16-6-4(Y), Amendments of Prior Approvals, which addresses applications for amendments to site development plans approved prior to the effective date of the IDO.

The request exceeds the thresholds for a Minor Amendment, and therefore is being considered pursuant to Section 14-16-6-4(Y)(1)(b)1, which states that Major Amendments shall be reviewed and decided by the decision-making body that issued the approval being amended. In this case, the EPC approved the existing site development plan for the subject site prior to effective date of the IDO. Pursuant to IDO Section 14-6-4(P)(2), the decision-making body may impose conditions necessary to bring the application into compliance with the requirements of this IDO. This is a quasi-judicial matter.

**History/Background**

North Andalucia at La Luz and the surrounding properties have a long zoning history with several site plan approvals and amendments. A brief summary, provided by the applicant, is as follows:

1985  (AX-85-1): Annexation and establishment of mixed-use zoning for a portion of the property, by request of the City.

2001  (1000965; 00128-01743): Annexation and establishment of zoning for an additional 85 acres and Site Plan approval for 229 acres from Montano Road on the north to Namaste Road/La Bienvenida Place NW on the south.

2003  (1000965; 02EPC-01769/01770/01771) Zoning and Site Plan approval, including amendment to Site Plan to carve out the Montano Open Space trailhead.

2003  (1000965; 03EPC-01105) Approval of a Zone Map Amendment to allow for density transfers for the various tracts covered by the Site Plan and for Tract 1 to be replatted into five separate tracts for phased subdivision development.

2005  (1003859; 04EPC-01845): Approval of a new Site Plan for North Andalucia at La Luz (the prior approval for this request), separating it from the larger plan. This was done in conjunction with approval of the Shopping Center located on Tracts 2 and 3.

2006  (1004473): The Site Plan for Andalucia Villas apartments is approved for Tracts 4
and 6 on both sides of Antequera Road.

2007 (1003859): The prior approval was amended administratively to revise the intersection of Learning Road and Antequera Road into a round-a-bout.

2008 (1003859; 08EPC-40055): The prior approval was amended to remove Tracts 7, 8, & 9 from the Site Plan and consolidate them into the separate Bosque School Site Development Plan.

2012 (1003859; 11EPC-40074): The prior approval was amended to subdivide Tract 5 into two tracts, 5-A and 5-B, and amend the zoning to allow a Bank with Drive-Up Service window.

2012 (1004473): The Andalucia Villas Site Plan is amended to lower its density to 15 dwelling units per acre and consolidate all development to Tract 6. Tract 4 left undeveloped.

2017 (1003859; 17EPC-40052): The prior approval was amended to remove a restriction on letter height for building-mounted signs.

**Context**

North Andalucia at La Luz is a 69-acre development at the southeast corner of Coors Blvd. NW and Montano Blvd. NW. The northern half of North Andalucia (north of Mirandela Street) is part of the Coors/Montano Village Activity Center and the entirety of the development, including the subject site, is considered an Area of Change.

The development consists of 6 tracts. North of the subject tract is a recently completed shopping center including a Sprouts grocery store, PetSmart, a veterinary hospital, several restaurants, a brewery taproom, and other retail uses. To the east are the Andalucia Villas apartments and Bosque School (now removed from the original development site) and to the south of the subject site within North Andalucia is a U.S. Eagle Credit Union.

The area surrounding North Andalucia is predominantly residential to the south and west and commercial to the north. Further to the east is the Bosque and Rio Grande.

**Roadway System**

The Long-Range Roadway System (2040 LRRS) map, produced by the Mid-Region Council of Governments (MRCOG), includes existing roadways and future recommended roadways along with their regional role. Coors Blvd to the west and Montano Blvd to the north of North Andalucia are both designated Regional Principal Arterial Roadways.

**Comprehensive Plan Corridor Designation**

The Comprehensive Plan designates both Coors Boulevard and Montano Road as a Major Transit
Corridors. The subject site is within 100 feet of a Major Transit Stop.

**Trails/Bikeways**

The Long Range Bikeway System (LRBS) map, produced by the Mid-Region Council of Governments (MRCOG), identifies existing and proposed trails. The LRBS designates Coors Blvd, along the western edge of the site, and Montano Blvd, along the northern edge, as Bike Lanes. In addition, Learning Road, the south entrance to the site, to Antequera Road is a Bike Lane and becomes a Paved Trail south of Antequera, following along the southern and eastern edge of the North Andalucia development. Antequera Road, and Mirandela Street are Bike Lanes.

A proposed Paved Trail is designated along Mirandela St between Learning Rd and the Pueblo Montano Picnic Area and Trailhead.

**Transit**

High-frequency Rapid Ride transit route 790 runs north-south along Coors Blvd., which is also served by regular service Route 155 and the 96 Commuter Route. Montano Blvd. has regular service Route 157.

**Public Facilities/Community Services**

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

II. **ANALYSIS OF APPLICABLE ORDINANCES, PLANS, AND POLICIES**

**Integrated Development Ordinance (IDO)**

The subject site is zoned PD - Planned Development for residential development. The Master Site Plan for Andalucia at La Luz was approved prior to the effective date of the IDO and may be amended per Subsection 14-16-6-4(Y).

**Definitions**

**Area of Change:** An area designated as an Area of Change in the Albuquerque/Bernalillo County Comprehensive Plan (ABC Comp Plan), as amended, where growth and development is encouraged, primarily in Centers other than Old Town, Corridors other than Commuter Corridors, Master Development Plan areas, planned communities, and Metropolitan Redevelopment Areas.

**Multi-family Residential Development:** Residential development of multi-family dwellings or uses from the Group Living category (except small community residential facilities) in zone districts as allowed per Table 4-2-1. Properties that include both multi-family dwellings and low-density residential development are considered multi-family development for the purposes of this IDO.
Dwelling, Two-family Detached (Duplex): A residential building containing 2 dwelling units, each of which is designed for or occupied by 1 family only, with kitchens for each. Each unit in a two-family dwelling is completely separated from the other by an unpierced wall dividing the 2 units side-to-side or back-to-front or by an unpierced ceiling and floor extending from exterior wall to exterior wall (over-under), except for a stairwell exterior to 1 of the dwelling units.

Master Development Plan: A plan created by an applicant and approved by the City to achieve a coordinated private development, such as a business or industrial park, on larger sites that comprise more than one lot and building. A Master Development Plan may include standards that implement a cohesive design on the site.

Parking Lot: Any off-street outdoor area for the parking of motor vehicles, including any spaces, aisles, and driveways necessary for the function of the parking lot or for the convenience of patrons.

Usable Open Space: Outdoor space to be preserved on-site and managed privately to help ensure livable conditions on each site by providing light and air and meeting visual, psychological, and recreational needs. These areas can be used for a variety of purposes and are not required to be at ground level. Usable open space may include, but is not limited to, lawns; community gardens; decorative and native plantings; open balconies; rooftop decks; plazas; courtyards; covered patios open on at least 2 sides; walkways; landscaped medians, buffers, or setbacks; active and passive recreational areas; fountains; swimming pools; wooded areas; and water courses. Such space shall be available for entry and use by users of the development. Required drainage facilities or land within an easement for overhead utilities that are not landscaped shall not count toward required usable open space. Usable open space does not include public right-of-way, parking lots, off-street parking, driveways, other private vehicular surfaces, or buildings other than swimming pool rooms.

Site Development Plan: A term used prior to the effective date of the IDO for a scaled plan for development on one or more lots that specifies at minimum the site, proposed use(s), pedestrian and vehicular access, any internal circulation, maximum building height, building setbacks, maximum total dwelling units, and/or nonresidential floor area. A more detailed site development plan would also specify the exact locations of structures, their elevations and dimensions, the parking and loading areas, landscaping, and schedule of development. The equivalent approval in the IDO will be determined based on the level of detail provided in the prior approval.

Overlay Zone: Regulations that prevail over other IDO regulations to ensure protection for designated areas. Overlay zones include Airport Protection Overlay (APO), Character Protection Overlay (CPO), Historic Protection Overlay (HPO), and View Protection Overlay (VPO).

Sight Lines: Lines that begin at the east edge of the Coors Boulevard right-of-way and follow a 45-degree angle to the road alignment, in an approximately northeast direction toward the Sandia ridgeline. Sight lines are required to intersect the highest point(s) of the proposed
building(s) on the site and, if the building has no higher point, the lowest elevation(s) of the Coors Boulevard right-of-way abutting or nearest the site (see figure below).

View Frame: A vertical rectangular frame drawn perpendicular (i.e. 90 degrees) to a given sight line through the highest point of the proposed building. The top of the view frame is established by the highest visible point of the Sandia ridgeline within the view frame. The bottom of the view frame is the elevation of the Coors Boulevard right-of-way where the sight line begins. The left and right edges of the view frame are an upward projection of the property lines at the site boundary where the view frame intersects the property lines. As many view frames as necessary to capture all the sight lines on a site are required (see figure below).

View Plane: A view plane 4 feet above the elevation of the east edge of the east driving lane on Coors Boulevard and extending horizontally above sites located east of Coors Boulevard (see figure below).
Zoning

Prior to the effective date of the IDO on May 17, 2018, North Andalucía’s zoning was SU-I for C-2 and PRD (20 DU per acre) with the exception of Tract 5 that was SU-I for O-1. Under the IDO, SU-I for C-2 and PRD was changed to PD and the SU-1 for O-1 was changed to MX-T.

The purpose of the PD zone district is to accommodate small- and medium-scale innovative projects that cannot be accommodated through the use of other base zone districts, provided that those projects are consistent with the Albuquerque/Bernalillo County Comprehensive Plan (ABC Comp Plan), as amended and include standards that would not otherwise be required of the applicant in order to provide significant public, civic, or natural resource benefits. This zone district is applied on a case-by-case basis to reflect a negotiated agreement for uses and standards with the applicant. Allowable uses are negotiated on a case-by-case basis but may not include any use that is not included in Table 4-2-1.

The subject site, Tract 4, is proposing multi-family and duplex residential units. Both uses are included in Table 4-2-1. The applicant references senior, age-restricted housing which, unlike assisted-living is not a specified use. It therefore, does not have different review criteria than multi-family and duplex uses.

Overlay Zones

The subject site is governed by the Coors Character Protection Overlay, CPO-2 and the Coors View Protection Overlay, VPO-1.

Coors Character Protection Overlay, CPO-2

The purpose of the Character Protection Overlay (CPO) zone is to preserve areas with distinctive characteristics that are worthy of conservation but are not historical or may lack sufficient significance to qualify as Historic Protection Overlay (HPO) zones. Those relevant criteria of the Coors CPO-2 are:

3-4(C)(3) Setback Standards
  3-4(C)(3)(b) Setback from Coors Boulevard
    2. Setback from the right-of-way of Coors Boulevard between Western Trail or Namaste Road and NM 528 (Alameda Boulevard), minimum: 35 feet.
All buildings on the site are set back more than 35 feet from the Coors Blvd. right-of-way.

3-4(C)(4) Building Height and Bulk
Buildings and structures shall not exceed the height limitation in the underlying zone. Buildings within the Coors Boulevard – VPO-1 shall comply with the height, bulk, and massing regulations of that Subsection 14-16-3-6(D).

See VPO analysis below.

3-4(C)(5) Other Development Standards
3-4(C)(5)(a) Floodplain
All development shall comply with all adopted drainage policies, including restrictions on development in the 100-year floodplain. Cluster development design on land above the flood level shall be used to the maximum extent practicable, and the floodplain shall be used as open space.

The project is not within the 100-year floodplain and is seeking to use the site to the maximum extent practicable.

3-4(C)(5)(b) Grading
Changes to natural topography shall be kept to a minimum. On slopes of 10 percent or greater, no grading shall take place until a specific development plan has been approved for construction. Grading, drainage, or paving proposals; Master Development Plans; and Site Plans shall retain the sense of the natural features and vegetation. Reconstruction and revegetation to a natural setting shall be pursued to the maximum extent practicable.

The subject site is part of a larger development plan and has been previously graded.

3-4(C)(5)(c) Landscaping in Setback along Coors Boulevard
All of the following must be incorporated into the required setback along Coors Boulevard:
1. Vegetative coverage is required for a minimum of 50 percent of the required setback area.
2. A combination of walls or decorative fences and a vegetative screen that visually screens vehicular circulation areas, parking lots, and parked cars from Coors Boulevard.

An average of 25 feet of the 35-foot buffer along Coors Blvd. is to be landscaped with vegetation creating a visual screen of parking and circulation on-site.

3-4(C)(5)(d) Outdoor Lighting
The mounting height of light fixtures in off-street parking, other vehicular use areas, and/or outdoor storage areas shall be no higher than 20 feet from finished grade.

No information is provided concerning site lighting.
3-4(C)(5)(e) Architectural Design and Details

1. The use of colors that contrast with the predominant color of the building is limited to 10 percent of each façade.
2. Parapet walls shall be treated as an integral part of the building design. Such walls shall not appear as unrelated visual elements.
3. In all zone districts, mechanical equipment shall be screened from public view from streets adjacent to the lot or from adjacent properties. The design of mechanical equipment screening shall be compatible with, and be an integral element of, the building structure. Location of such equipment within the building or at ground level is preferable to roof-mounting, unless such location would adversely affect the streetscape, pedestrian circulation, or open space.

*Architectural design falls within acceptable parameters.*

Coors View Protection Overlay, VPO-1

The purpose of the View Protection Overlay (VPO) zone is to preserve areas with unique and distinctive views that are worthy of conservation, such as those from public rights-of-way to cultural landscapes identified in the ABC Comp Plan, as amended.

Views protected by this VPO-1 are from Coors Boulevard right-of-way, along the segment between Western Trail/Namaste Road and Alameda Boulevard, looking northeast toward the Rio Grande Bosque and Sandia Mountains.

3-6(D)(5) Height, Bulk, and Massing

All development within this VPO-1 shall meet all of the following requirements.

3-6(D)(5)(a) No more than 1/3 of the height of structures (including building parapets, mechanical equipment and associated screening, walls, and fences) shall be allowed to penetrate above the view plane as shown in section diagram below. On lots with developable area that is constrained because the natural grade (or finished grade, if infrastructure is already installed) is less than or equal to 10 feet below the elevation of the east edge of Coors Boulevard and may also include sensitive lands (see Subsection 14-16-5-2(C)), a total height of 16 feet for low-density residential and 20 feet for other uses is allowed (see figure below).
The elevation of Coors Blvd. is 5015.5' with the 4-foot view plane falling at 5019.5'. The elevations of the main building are finished floor at 4992.5' and top of parapet at 5028.0'.

Height above View Plane: 8.5'
Total Building Height: 36.5'
One Third of Structure Height would be 13.16'

At the northern end of the building along Coors, the height above the building plane is 20’ which is acceptable due to site constraints and as permitted for multi-family housing.

3-6(D)(5)(b) Not more than 50 percent of the area within any view frame for a property shall be obscured by the bulk of the structure(s) (including walls and fences) placed on the property (see figure below).
The proposed building is essentially a steady 35’-6” to the top of the parapet with little undulation. The highest point of the elevation is at 39’-0” along the eastern elevation. The...
placement of the view frame above is determined by establishing a site line that runs from the Coors right-of-way at a 45-degree angle towards the Sandia Mountains and passing through the highest point of the building, thus showing the greatest obstruction caused by the building. That resulting location was approximately 70 feet to the south of the site.

The View Field is then configured showing all of the building above the elevation of the Coors right-of-way at the beginning of the Sight Line, this being the bottom of the frame, the top of the highest peak of the Sandia’s forms the top line of the frame, and the sides representing the property line.

Previous building locations produced more impacting view planes. The latest building location results in a view field of less than 50% coverage of the view and not crossing over the Sandia ridge line from the locations set out by the VPO ordinance.

A second View Frame along site line B was presented to neighborhood groups but caused more confusion. Rather than following the view at a 45-degree angle northeastwardly, the site line B was looking at the project from the northern corner toward the southeast. This created a false sense of what view was to be protected. Subsequent view fields show that the proposed building does, in fact fall within acceptable parameters.

**Albuquerque / Bernalillo County Comprehensive Plan (Rank 1)**

The subject site is located in an area that the 2017 Albuquerque/Bernalillo County Comprehensive Plan has designated an Area of Change. Areas of Change are intended to be the focus of urban-scale development that benefits job growth and housing opportunities.

The subject site is located on Coors Boulevard, which the Comprehensive Plan designates as a Major Transit Corridor. Specific Comprehensive Plan policies and IDO regulations apply to these Corridor designations.

Applicable Goals and policies are listed below. The applicant’s policy analysis, which is a response to the Site Plan-EPC Review and Decision Criteria, is in plain *italics*. Staff analysis follows in **bold italic** text.

**Chapter 5: Land Use**

**Goal 5.1-Centers & Corridors:** Grow as a community of strong Centers connected by a multi-
modal network of Corridors.

**Policy 5.1.1-Desired Growth:** Capture regional growth in Centers and Corridors to help shape the built environment into a sustainable development pattern.

a) Create walkable places that provide opportunities to live, work, learn, shop, and play.

g) Encourage residential infill in neighborhoods adjacent to Centers and Corridors to support transit ridership.

*The proposed development is located along a major transit corridor and within walking distance of the Coors/Montano Village Activity Center. It places growth and development where it is appropriate.*

**Policy 5.1.10 - Major Transit Corridors:** Foster corridors that prioritize high-frequency transit service with pedestrian-oriented development.

a) Encourage higher-density residential developments within ¼ mile of transit stops or stations.

**Applicant Response:** *The proposed amendment to the design standards and associated Site Plan - EPC allows for greater residential infill development adjacent to Coors Boulevard, a designated Corridor, and the Coors/Montano Village Activity Center. Greater densities and lower parking requirements support transit ridership and the new residents will be able to walk to nearby commercial retail and services and have access to an extensive pedestrian and bicycle trail network. Tracts 4 and 6 have long been planned for residential development and these requests maintain the original intent to provide a significant number of dwellings that will support the neighboring commercial developments. New residents will be able to walk to the grocery store, several restaurants and other services, to trails within the Bosque open space along the Rio Grande and have access to frequent transit connecting north to the Cottonwood Mall area and south to Downtown.*

*Also, the subject site, proposed for higher density residential development, is less than 100 from a transit stop on Coors Blvd.*

**Goal 5.2 Complete Communities:** Foster communities where residents can live, work, learn, shop, and play together.

**Policy 5.2.1 Land Uses:** Create healthy, sustainable, and distinct communities with a mix of uses that are conveniently accessible from surrounding neighborhoods.

a) Encourage development that offers choice in transportation, work areas, and lifestyles.

d) Encourage development that broadens housing options to meet a range of incomes and lifestyles.
Applicant Response: The requests add to the existing mixed-use character of North Andalucia at La Luz. Approval of the requested senior, age-restricted multi-family development encourages a new housing option for active seniors near shopping, dining, and recreational opportunities. This location also offers a choice in transportation options including transit on both Coors Boulevard and Montano Road as well as walking and bicycling on nearby trails.

A senior, age-restricted community adjacent to the Coors/Montano Village Activity Center offers seniors an environment where they can, not only access the Bosque for a stroll, but walk to shopping and dining. There is also ease of access to other parts of the city through public transit or Coors and Montano.

Goal 5.3-Efficient Development Patterns: Promote development patterns that maximize the utility of existing infrastructure and public facilities and the efficient use of land to support the public good.

Policy 5.3.1-Infill Development: Support additional growth in areas with existing infrastructure and public facilities.

Applicant Response: The requests further this goal and policy by facilitating development of an infill property with existing development in all directions and infrastructure installed and available for use. This development provides for additional growth in an area with existing roadways, transit service, grocery stores, recreational trails, and utilities among other public facilities and amenities.

Staff agrees with the applicant’s response and adds that the use proposed with this site plan is an efficient use of land in this location, given the surrounding context. Not only will the senior community it is designed for have access to shops and restaurants within walking distance, but they will also have easy access to trails along the Bosque.

Goal 5.6-City Development Areas: Encourage and direct growth to Areas of Change where it is expected and desired and ensure that development in and near Areas of Consistency reinforces the character and intensity of the surrounding area.

Policy 5.6.2-Areas of Change: Direct growth and more intense development to Centers, Corridors, industrial and business parks, and Metropolitan Redevelopment Areas where change is encouraged.

c) Foster a range of housing options at various densities according to each Center or Corridor type.

d) Encourage higher-density housing and mixed-use development as appropriate land uses that support transit and commercial and retail uses.

Applicant Response: The requests will facilitate additional housing at a variety of densities within an Area of Change. The proposed development includes dwelling units
within a traditional multi-family building, as well as single-story duplex-style apartments that add to the overall density while maintaining a view corridor and offering an alternative to a larger singular building on the property. This combination of housing types is accomplished by the slight increase in density requested in the amended Site Plan from 20 dwelling units per acre to 24 dwelling units per acre. Higher density housing in this location supports the transit available on the surrounding roadways and supports the commercial and retail uses immediately north of the subject site as well as at the other corners of the Coors Boulevard and Montano Road intersection.

Staff agrees with the applicant’s response and notes that the subject site is immediately adjacent to the Coors/Montano Village Activity Center. The added density to the site provides an option not represented near this transit corridor and activity center. To the west of Coors is an abundance of single-family residential development and across Antequera Rd from the subject site is the lower density Andalucia Villa Apartments.

Chapter 7: Urban Design

Goal 7.2 Pedestrian-Accessible Design: Increase walkability in all environments, promote pedestrian-oriented development in urban contexts, and increase pedestrian safety in auto-oriented contexts.

Policy 7.2.1 Walkability: Ensure convenient and comfortable pedestrian travel.

a) Improve the pedestrian environment through coordinated design of subdivisions, streets, development sites, and buildings.

e) Promote trees and landscape elements in the public right-of-way, along trails, and within private development to ensure a high-quality, pleasant, and healthy built environment.

Applicant Response: The proposed development includes numerous trees along Antequera Road and Coors Boulevard, which will help improve the pedestrian environment between La Luz to the south and the shopping centers to the north. Trees located between the sidewalk and travel-way also provide protection to pedestrians and traffic calming effects along Antequera, which neighboring residents expressed as a desire during a pre-application facilitated meeting. Additionally, in response to requests by neighbors, the buildings have been located adjacent to Antequera to create a strong street edge to add to the pedestrian realm.

The location of the project is walkable to the Bosque and nearby activity centers. In addition, the extensive landscaping on the site itself will create a pleasant walking environment.

Goal 7.4-Context-Sensitive Parking: Design parking facilities to match the development context and complement the surrounding built environment.
Policy 7.4.2 Parking Requirements: Establish off-street parking requirements based on development context.

a) Discourage oversized parking facilities.

**Applicant Response:** The proposed amendment to parking requirements directly affects the provision of parking. By allowing a smaller parking ratio for the unique use proposed on Tract 4, this plan will discourage oversized parking facilities. The parking requirement is narrowly tailored to this use and the development context of this PD-zoned property that has a variety of housing types, densities, and commercial uses and intensities near each other. Located at the intersection of two Major Transit Corridors, this area is also an opportune area to relax parking to promote transit ridership on the west side of Albuquerque.

A desire of the development is to reduce the impact of excessive parking. By making use of transit reductions, the parking impact is reduced. The desire was to establish a new parking requirement based on the age-restrictive community the project will serve. Although that was not necessary for this project, it remains an area for future investigation.

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

Policy 9.1.1 Housing Options: Support the development, improvement, and conservation of housing for a variety of income levels and types of residents and households.

e) Provide for the development of quality housing for elderly residents.

i) Provide for the development of multi-family housing close to public services, transit, and shopping.

**Applicant Response:** The requested Site Plans directly respond to a need identified in these policies for quality housing for elderly residents. Table 1 below provides population characteristics by age cohort for the City of Albuquerque between 1980 and 2016, which were obtained from the U.S. Census Bureau. This shows an increase in median age with the largest percentage increase shown for those residents between 65 and 85+ years of age. This housing will be located near shopping and services along two Major Transit Corridors, which will relieve development pressures at the urban edge.

The applicant’s response is appropriate as it acknowledges the aging of our population. Even so, the housing options proposed can serve other age groups as well in the future.
Goal 9.3 Density: Support increased housing density in appropriate places with adequate services and amenities.

Policy 9.3.1 Centers & Corridors: Encourage higher density, multi-unit housing and mixed use development in Downtown, Urban, Activity, and Village Centers, and along Premium and Major Transit Corridors to capture growth, relieve development pressure at the edge of the urban footprint, and maintain low densities in rural areas.

Applicant Response: The requested Site Plans directly respond to a need identified in these policies for quality housing for elderly residents. Table 1 below provides population characteristics by age cohort for the City of Albuquerque between 1980 and 2016, which were obtained from the U.S. Census Bureau. This shows an increase in median age with the largest percentage increase shown for those residents between 65 and 85+ years of age. This housing will be located near shopping and services along two Major Transit Corridors, which will relieve development pressures at the urban edge.

*This site meets the criteria for preferred growth. It is near major transit and commuter corridors, has existing services and infrastructure, and is near to many activities or transit that provides easy accessibility.*

6-6(H)(3)(b) The Site Plan is consistent with any applicable terms and conditions in any previously approved NR-SU or PD zoning covering the property and any related development agreements and/or regulations.

Applicant Response: With the proposed amendments that are concurrently under review, the proposed development complies with the development regulations from the underlying PD zoning based on the prior approval.

Other than the major Amendments to Site plan included in this application, this project complies with previous terms and conditions.
6-6(H)(3)(c) The Site Plan is consistent with all applicable provisions of this IDO, the DPM, other adopted City regulations, and any terms and conditions specifically applied to the development of the property in a prior permit or approval affecting the property.

**Applicant Response:** The proposed development complies with the applicable provisions of the IDO for the closest zone district for the proposed use, as well as the North Andalucia at La Luz Site Plan design standards, which supersede the equivalent IDO standards. The Applicant is requesting approval of an amendment to those standards that will replace other standards to allow for the requested density and parking.

There are a few minor conditions to approval regarding both site and architectural fine tuning. These can be handled prior to DRB with staff review.

6-6(H)(3)(d) The City’s existing infrastructure and public improvements, including but not limited to its street, trail, drainage, and sidewalk systems, have adequate capacity to serve the proposed development, and any burdens on those systems have been mitigated to the extent practicable.

**Applicant Response:** The City’s existing infrastructure has adequate capacity for the proposed development. As a site with a prior approval, the subject site has been studied along with the rest of the North Andalucia development to ensure enough capacity for streets, utility infrastructure, and drainage. There is an approved Drainage Study for this area and a Grading and Drainage plan specific to this development must be reviewed and approved by Hydrology as part of this Site Plan request. Transportation Development has reviewed the proposed number of dwelling units and determined that a traffic study is not meet the City’s threshold for peak hour trips. The Applicant will install sidewalk along all property boundaries as required by Transportation staff. A Water and Sewer Availability Statement request and Fire Marshal approval will be completed prior to issuance of a building permit for construction of the development. These numerous approvals and reviewing agencies will ensure that any burdens are mitigated to the extent practicable.

The proposed development may be subject to infrastructure improvement to mitigate new burdens on adjacent and surrounding infrastructure that should be addressed with a final technical review by the Development Review Board (DRB). This is a recommended condition.

6-6(H)(3)(e) The application mitigates any significant adverse impacts on the surrounding area to the maximum extent practicable.

**Applicant Response:** In response to neighborhood comments at a pre-application facilitated meeting, the Applicant has redesigned the site to further enhance the pedestrian realm along Antequera Road by minimizing the amount of parking and increasing the street edge formed by the building and complemented by a robust landscaping plan. The Site Plan is also compliant with the Coors Corridor View Protection Overlay Zone (VPO-1) requirements for building height, bulk, and massing.
and the Applicant has sought to preserve the spirit of the IDO by placing the larger building farther back on the property with smaller single-story garages closer to Coors, as well as placing all of the single-story duplex-style apartments in a cluster in order to create an expansive view corridor to the Sandia Mountains that also takes advantage of the Mirandela Street corridor. Earth tones have been used on the building facades to integrate the proposed development more closely with La Luz and other surrounding developments.

The applicant has worked with the neighboring communities to adjust the design to make it more appealing. Building location has been set further into the existing slope to open the view across the lower duplex cottages to the Sandia Mountains ridgeline and peaks.

III. SITE PLAN MAJOR AMENDMENT

Request

The request is for a Major Amendment of a site development plan approved prior to the effective date of the IDO. Pursuant to IDO Section 1-10(A), prior approvals remain valid. Because the request exceeds the threshold for minor amendments in Table 6-4-5 (no more than a 10% deviation in numerical standards), a Major Amendment is required.

The request consists of the following major changes to the existing, governing site development plan:

1. Additional dwelling unit density from 20 dwelling units per acre to 24 dwelling units per acre
2. Reduction in parking spaces per unit from 1.5 (2 for units over 1000 square feet) to 1.25 spaces per unit.

Any application for a site plan – EPC shall be approved if it meets all of the following criteria:

6-6(H)(3)(a) the site plan is consistent with the ABC Comp plan, as amended.

The proposed amendment to the design standards and associated Site Plan – EPC allows for greater residential infill development adjacent to Coors Boulevard, a designated Corridor, and the Coors/Montano Village Activity Center. Greater densities and lower parking requirements support transit ridership and the new residents will be able to walk to nearby commercial retail and services and have access to an extensive pedestrian and bicycle trail network. Tracts 4 and 6 have long been planned for residential development and these requests maintain the original intent to provide a significant number of dwellings that will support the neighboring commercial developments. New residents will be able to walk to the grocery store, several restaurants and other services, to trails within the Bosque open space along the Rio Grande and have access to frequent transit connecting north to the Cottonwood Mall area and south to Downtown. It would support the city’s many growth and land use policies by:
• Adding to the existing mixed-use character of North Andalucia at La Luz. Approval of the requested senior, age-restricted multi-family development encourages a new housing option for active seniors near shopping, dining, and recreational opportunities. This location also offers a choice in transportation options including transit on both Coors Boulevard and Montano Road as well as walking and bicycling on nearby trails.
• Facilitating development of an infill property with existing development in all directions and infrastructure installed and available for use.
• Facilitating additional housing at a variety of densities within an Area of Change.
• Including numerous trees along Antequera Road and Coors Boulevard, which will help improve the pedestrian environment between La Luz to the south and the shopping centers to the north.
• Allowing a smaller parking ratio for the unique use proposed on Tract 4, this plan will discourage oversized parking facilities.
• Directly respond to a need identified in these policies for quality housing for elderly residents.
• Reducing the need for automobile travel by increasing infill within a Major Transit Corridor and in close proximity to an established Activity Center which enables residents to easily travel between them by walking, cycling or use of public transportation.

The site plan development is consistent with the ABC Comp Plan especially in the areas of Complete Communities and the encouragement of a broadened housing option to meet an increasing portion of the population, encouraging higher-density housing where it can support transit, commercial, and retail uses, promoting pedestrian-accessible design and discouraging oversized parking. It will also provide higher density adjacent to the Coors/Montano Village Activity Center.

6-6(H)(3)(b) the site plan is consistent with any applicable Terms and Conditions in any previously approved NR-SU or PD zoning covering the property and any related development agreements and/or regulations.

The Site Plan and development standards predate the IDO and are considered a prior approval. Amendments of Prior Approvals are considered in accordance with IDO Section 14-16-6-4(Y). The requested amendments regarding density and parking are Major Amendments to the prior approval due to going beyond the 10 percent threshold generally allowed by the IDO for numerical standards. As Major Amendments, the approval process is by the IDO procedure for the closest-equivalent approval by the original decision-making body – in this case a Site Plan – EPC.

While these two changes to the development standards constitute a Major Amendment to the prior approval, it is important to note that they are consistent with the IDO requirements for similar development in Albuquerque. The IDO does not directly regulate the density of developments, but rather utilizes a set of performance standards to determine the allowable density and number of dwelling units on a site. Parking,
landscaping, usable open space, and building height regulations limit the buildable area, effectively creating a de facto cap on densities. This is especially true of the subject site, which is located within the Coors Corridor View Protection Overlay Zone (VPO-1) and its narrowly tailored height, bulk, and massing requirements. Instead of requesting a complete elimination of the cap or removal of the cap for Tract 4, the Applicant is only proposing a slight increase commensurate with the lessor intensity that was built on the adjacent tract such that the overall dwelling count contemplated by the original approval stays intact.

At 20 dwelling units per acre, Tracts 4 and 6 combined would allow for approximately 450+ dwelling units. 240 units were built on Tract 6, thus approximately 210+ units could be available to be built on Tract 4, density limits notwithstanding. The Applicant is requesting an allowance for 24 dwelling units per acre on Tract 4, which amounts to approximately 185 units and the accompanying Site Plan – EPC currently shows 171.

The 171 units within the proposed senior apartment project include 155 dwelling units within a 3-story building with common spaces and a courtyard with pool. 16 additional dwellings are contained within 8 duplex “cottages” toward the northern end of the site. The 171 dwelling units requested have a density of approximately 22.6 dwelling units per acre, which is consistent with the requested change to the development standard from the prior approval. It is also important to note that the additional units will allow the construction of the 16 single-story, duplex-style apartments on the site. The main building alone, containing 155 dwelling units, is otherwise approximately 20 dwelling units per acre.

The IDO no longer bases development on density of units, but rather, development standards and setbacks, massing and height restrictions, parking, and landscape and usable open space requirements. The density standards for North Andalucia at La Luz are standards determined with the SU-2 (subsequent PD) designation and approved by the EPC. The applicant’s position that the density of 20 dwelling units per acre was for both Tracts 4 and 6 and that Tract 6 was developed at less than 20 units per acre, leaving additional units available within the total density count, is theoretically correct. Within the PD zone, uses and standards are negotiated on a case-by-case basis. The current change is within the IDO standards and is within the combined density established for the site in 2006. Approval of the increased density on Tract 4 would not create a negative impact on the site as long as VPO requirements are met. The applicant is requesting a change to 24 units per acre and states that the additional density allows for the development of single-story cottages. It is also true that the added density allows for the three-story apartment building which could be lowered to two if more of the site was developed as apartments and the duplex cottages were deleted.

The combined considerations of: density adjacent to Centers and Corridors, providing a variety of densities and housing choice within an Area of Change, addressing the needs of an older population, proximity to, and maintaining less than originally proscribed density for
the greater development, offer sufficient justification for the increase in density as long as views are adequately protected per the VPO-1 regulations.

The Applicant also believes that the change to the parking standards is consistent with the IDO’s updated standards that generally reduced parking requirements City-wide. No changes are proposed to the typical parking requirements for multi-family development shown on the Site Plan, which were based on the old Comprehensive Zoning Code. Instead, the Applicant is proposing to add a new parking requirement of 1.25 spaces per dwelling unit for the proposed age-restricted senior housing differentiated from other multi-family developments. This unique use under the PD zone district deserves its own parking standard. Elderly residents will drive less and own cars at a lower rate than younger families do. The requested parking ratio is halfway between the IDO requirement for multi-family apartments (1.5 spaces per unit) and independent living (1 space per unit).

The current parking requirements for the North Andalucia development are 1 parking space per bathroom but not less than 2 spaces per unit unless it is less than 1000 square feet, where there is a minimum of 1.5 spaces per unit. Duplexes are not mentioned in the standards by name but would fall under multi-family housing as it is written and thus requiring 2 spaces per unit as they are all over 1000 square feet.

The resulting calculation would require a minimum of 279 parking spaces; whereas, the request is for a reduction to 235 spaces or 1.25 per unit. The applicant’s request that the nature of the project, independent living for senior residents over 55, warrants a unique parking requirement, is unnecessary and inappropriate in this instance. The IDO does include “Independent Living Facility” as a defined use, which is allowed as an accessory use in many residential zones per Table 4-2-1 and requires 1 space per dwelling unit per Table 5-5-1. Use-specific standard 4-3(F)(10) only allows the use when accessory to an assistive living facility.

Long Range Planning strongly encourages that this request be simply to reduce the parking requirement for multi-family development (see Reviewing Agencies section). Then the question to be considered is whether a reduced requirement for multi-family development is appropriate on this site. The requirements of senior communities have been evaluated in communities across the country be there are currently no special standards within this jurisdiction.

IDO Section 5-5(C)(5)(c) allows for a reduction for Proximity to Transit, stating:
1. The minimum number of off-street parking spaces required may be reduced by 30 percent if the proposed development is located within 1,320 feet of any transit stop or transit station with a peak service frequency of 15 minutes or better.

MRMPO has commented that the Long-Range Transit Network Identifies Coors Blvd. as a “Primary Route” with transit frequencies of 15 minutes or less in the project area. A transit stop is located on Coors at the southwest corner of the site. This 30 percent reduction would put the required parking well below the 235 spaces provided.
These combined considerations, walkable community, older population, transit reduction, offer sufficient justification for the reduction in required parking.

6-6(h)(3)(c) the site plan complies with all applicable provisions of this IDO, the DPM, other adopted city regulations, and any terms and conditions specifically applied to development of the property in a prior permit or approval affecting the property.

5-2 SITE DESIGN AND SENSITIVE LANDS

The project site does not include nor does it abut any sensitive lands or major public open space.

5-3 ACCESS AND CONNECTIVITY

The project site plan has made effort to provide access and conductivity to the site by various means of transportation.

5-3(A)(2) Providing adequate street connectivity.
Access is made to the site from Antequera Road. The entrance is north of the entrance into the Andalucia Villas. A second emergency access point with knox box is located at the southeast corner of the site.

5-3(A)(3) Supporting a multi-modal transportation network.
The project connects to bike paths, pedestrian walkways and bus lines in addition to automobile and motorcycle networks.

5-3(A)(4) Ensuring convenient and efficient access to current and future neighborhoods.
Access to Coors Blvd. is available via Learning Rd. to the south and Mirandela to the north. Montano is to the north of the larger development site.

5-3(A)(5) Mitigating the traffic impacts of new development.
Traffic impact has been previously designed for.

5-3(A)(6) Reducing vehicle miles traveled.
The site will provide housing within walking distance of basic shopping and services.

5-3(D)(3) On-site Pedestrian Connections
Sidewalks are 6’ wide and are provided along Mirandela Rd. and Antequera Rd. There is a note that street trees will be provided at 25’ on center. Sidewalks have connectivity to at least one frontage of the parcel (along Antequera). On-site crosswalks are indicated by change of material.
5-3(E)(3) Driveways and Access

*There are two access points along Antequera. No access is proposed from Coors Blvd. or Mirandela Rd.*

5-5 PARKING AND LOADING

*See response to 6-6(h)(3)(b) above.*

5-5(C)(5)(d) Electric Vehicle Charging Station Credit

2. When a new parking lot containing more than 200 off-street spaces is constructed, at least 2 percent of the vehicle parking spaces shall include electric vehicle charging stations with a rating of 240 volts or higher.

*Parking for this site falls under this requirement and must provide at least 4 electric vehicle charging stations.*

5-6 LANDSCAPING, BUFFERING, AND SCREENING

*The landscape plan, as submitted, complies with the landscape requirements for the property as set forth in development guidelines for the site. Landscaping quantities generally exceed required minimums and planting sizes meet the specifications of both the development plan and IDO.*

5-6(F) PARKING LOT LANDSCAPING

*Condition: The Parking Lot Landscaped Area is calculated based on 152 parking spaces. This is inconsistent with the front page, which shows 235 parking spaces provided. Discounting garages and carports still leaves 154 spaces.*

*Condition: The Parking Lot Tree requirements need to be revised to reflect the proposed 235 parking spaces, which would require 24 parking lot trees. The site plan incorrectly shows 154 parking spaces provided. This is inconsistent with the front page, which shows 235 parking spaces provided.*

5-6(G) SCREENING OF MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT AND SUPPORT AREAS

*The building elevations do not show any visible mechanical equipment.*

*There are no ground mounted mechanical equipment areas identified on the site plan.*

*Garbage dumpsters are appropriately screened with an 8’ CMU wall with stucco exterior and self-closing cedar gates.*

5-7 WALLS AND FENCES

*A perimeter wall is to be constructed along Coors, Mirandela, and partially along Antequera where it will tie into the building and the existing perimeter wall of the bank to the south.*
Although columns along the wall will be determined during construction, the open tubular fencing and wall caps along the wall are within the design parameters for walls and fences. The retaining walls indicated that have no details. These will need to be reviewed and approved through DRB. The dumpster enclosure is the required 8 feet with a stucco finish to match the buildings. Earlier requests by Solid Waste to provide two such enclosure locations have been satisfactorily mitigated through inside compactors and additional dumpsters.

5-8 OUTDOOR LIGHTING

*Outdoor lighting on the site is to be at a maximum height of 16 feet with a fully shielded lighting head. Currently it is only indicated on the site plan with a note stating intended compliance.*

5-11 BUILDING DESIGN

5-11(D) MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

All multi-family residential development in any Residential zone district and containing more than 50 dwelling units shall comply with all of the standards in this Subsection 14-16-5-11(D).

5-11(D)(1) Building Entrances

Primary pedestrian entrances to each primary building shall be emphasized through variations in façade colors or materials, porticos, roof variations, recesses or projections, or other integral building forms.

*Primary entrances into the main building are not sufficiently emphasized. They have projections and changes in materials, but such changes appear about every 15-20 feet along all elevations. More thought needs to go into a standard expression of entrance at all entry locations other than into the office/clubhouse area.*

5-11(D)(2) Façade Design

5-11(D)(2)(a) No street-facing façade of a primary building shall extend more than 8 horizontal feet without projections or recesses. Each façade greater than 100 horizontal feet in length shall incorporate all plane projections or recesses having a depth of at least 5 percent of the length of the façade and extending at least 20 percent of the length of the façade.

*Facade is well delineated. Building frontages visible from major streets provide articulation, detailing, and fenestration as required. Features such as reveals, windows and openings, awnings, projecting beams, color, texture, and material are used to add interest to the building elevations.*

5-11(D)(3) Roof Design

Rooflines longer than 100 horizontal feet shall include at least one vertical elevation change of at least 2 feet. Roofs with a pitch of less than 2:12 shall be screened by a parapet wall, which shall not be calculated as part of building height.
The roof is a flat roof with 2’ parapet. Parapets are utilized to screen rooftop mechanical equipment from the adjacent sidewalks and internal walkways. Equipment will be placed nearer the internal courtyard to further reduce visibility.

5-11(D)(4) Garages and Carports
To the maximum extent feasible, garages and carports shall not be located between any street-facing façade of any primary multi-family building and the abutting street, but shall instead be internalized within building groups so as not to be directly visible from the street frontage.

Garages and carports are located behind the building and before the grade rise up to Coors Boulevard.

5-12 SIGNS

Signage on the site is limited to:

Building mounted signage above the canopy at the clubhouse entrance and below the parapet facing Coors. Signs will be permitted separately.

6-6(H)(3)(d) The City's existing infrastructure and public improvements, including but not limited to its street, trail, drainage, and sidewalk systems, have adequate capacity to serve the proposed development, and any burdens on those systems have been mitigated to the extent practicable.

Applicant Response: The City’s existing infrastructure has adequate capacity for the proposed development. As a site with a prior approval, the subject site has been studied along with the rest of the North Andalucia development to ensure enough capacity for streets, utility infrastructure, and drainage. There is an approved Drainage Study for this area and a Grading and Drainage plan specific to this development must be reviewed and approved by Hydrology as part of this Site Plan request. Transportation Development has reviewed the proposed number of dwelling units and determined that a traffic study is not required because the site does not meet the City’s thresholds for peak hour trips. The Applicant will install sidewalk along all property boundaries as required by Transportation staff. A Water and Sewer Availability Statement request and Fire Marshal approval will be completed prior to issuance of a building permit for construction of the development. These numerous approvals and reviewing agencies will ensure that any burdens are mitigated to the extent practicable.

The application will not exceed current City capacity. Details for approved Fire 1 Plan and coordination with Hydrology are still in progress; therefore, submittal to DRB for final site review is recommended where any necessary mitigation for new burdens on infrastructure and services can be technically addressed.

6-6(h)(3)(e) the application mitigates any significant adverse impacts on the surrounding area to the maximum extent practicable.
Applicant Response: In response to neighborhood comments at a pre-application facilitated meeting, the Applicant has redesigned the site to further enhance the pedestrian realm along Antequera Road by minimizing the amount of parking and increasing the street edge formed by the building and complemented by a robust landscaping plan. The Site Plan is also compliant with the Coors Corridor View Protection Overlay Zone (VPO-1) requirements for building height, bulk, and massing and the Applicant has sought to preserve the spirit of the IDO by placing the larger building farther back on the property with smaller single-story garages closer to Coors, as well as placing all of the single-story duplex-style apartments in a cluster in order to create an expansive view corridor to the Sandia Mountains that also takes advantage of the Mirandela Street corridor. Earth tones have been used on the building facades to integrate the proposed development more closely with La Luz and other surrounding developments.

Setbacks, height limitations, and landscaping all assist in mitigating the effects of this development regarding the view of the Sandia Mountains. While no development would do more to preserve the view, the proposed development has adjusted building placement to limit impact. View field analysis and view plane calculations fall within the acceptable level of visual impact.

IV. AGENCY & NEIGHBORHOOD CONCERNS

Reviewing Agencies

Long Range Planning Staff note that this is a request for approval of a Site Plan – EPC and Major Amendment to Site Plan – EPC. Long Range recommends that the request be simplified to a Major Amendment to Site Plan – EPC, adding details for the proposed lot as the current phase of the larger development.

The request includes amending the existing site plan density limit of 20 dwelling units per acre to be 24 dwelling units per acre. The density limit was established both in the adopted site plan and in the site’s zoning prior to the IDO, which was “SU-1 for PRD up to 20 du/a.”

The request includes lowering the required multi-family parking from 1.5 spaces per dwelling unit to 1.25 spaces per dwelling unit. A Major Amendment involving changes to parking standards would typically go to DRB per IDO Subsection 6-4(Y)(1)(b) as a Waiver – DRB (Subsection 6-6(L)); however, this request is before the EPC for other requests related to the same property. The ZEO should be consulted as to the appropriateness of EPC deciding the parking request in addition to the other requests as part of one Major Amendment. (ZEO was consulted and agreed an EPC determination would be appropriate). If so, it would be appropriate for the EPC to include a finding that indicates if the requested reduction to minimum parking requirement is consistent with Comp Plan policy. If the EPC can approve, the site plan should include the required minimum for the 2-family (duplex) use for consistency and enforceability, so that it is clear the parking requirements are pursuant to the site plan.
Given the site’s location at the intersection of two Major Transit corridors and in an Area of Change, the proposed development seems appropriate in this area. The site is located within walking distance of several amenities, including several shopping centers and public open spaces (the Bosque and Rio Grande). The moderate increase in density not only provides alternatives to detached single-family housing, but also may encourage increased use of transit for future tenants.

NMDOT comments that no direct access to NM 45 will be allowed from the property (none is planned) and that all access shall be gained from the existing signalized intersection of NM 45 at Learning or the left in, right in, and right out access just north of this property. Sidewalk shall be established along the west property line paralleling NM 45 as to complete the connectivity between adjacent lots. This sidewalk is already included in this application.

**Transportation Development Staff** offer several comments regarding parking spaces, and general technical details including:

- Provide all parking calculations.
- Sidewalk improvements are required surrounding the entire site.
- In addition to showing sidewalk, label curb ramps both on-site and at intersections along perimeter and provide ramp details.
- 4-foot minimum sidewalk should be provided around obstructions such as power poles and fire hydrants.
- Show clear sight triangle on landscaping plan and site plan. Follow AASHTO requirements. Some of the landscaping may be within clear sight triangles.
- A permit from NMDOT is required to work within DOT right-of-way.
- Label all driving aisle widths and curb radii. Follow DPM criteria.
- Show parking space dimensions for all parking lot segments, or if all of them are the same, indicate it on the plan.
- Label all hammerhead lengths. These should follow minimum criteria for turn-arounds.
- Label curb or turndown sidewalk on the site plan as applicable to vertically separate the parking lot from landscaped areas and sidewalk.
- Show any parking lot bumpers.
- Obtain Solid Waste and Fire Marshall approval.
- Label 2% maximum cross-slope for the sidewalk detail.
- The 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 signs.
- 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)
- Include “Emergency Vehicles Only” signs at the emergency access for the parking lot.

**Hydrology Staff** recommends that final sign-off of the site plan be delegated to the DRB.
MRMPO notes that the Long-Range Transit Network Identifies Coors Blvd. as a “Primary Route” with transit frequencies of 15 minutes or less in the project area.

Appendix G of the MTP recommends the following as it relates to the proposed project:
- Adopt mixed-use and higher-density zoning along transit corridors to support ridership
- Encourage a mix of land uses (retail, housing, entertainment, etc.) and multimodal facilities in appropriate locations to encourage shorter and more active trips
- Promote a diverse mix of housing, in cost, unit types, and neighborhood settings

The Police Department provided several CEPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) comments.

Albuquerque Bernalillo County Water Utility Authority requires a new Serviceability Statement 120311 as the previous one has since expired. Request shall include a City Fire Marshal approved Fire 1 Plan, zone map showing the site location, and a Utility Plan (showing the domestic water, sanitary sewer, and proposed fire protection).

For information only:
From the Utility Plan provided with the submittal it is understood that a new manhole within right-of-way and the intersection of Antequera Rd. and Mirandela St. is proposed. This connection is not condoned. The site shall discharge to an existing manhole adjacent to the site or, with approval from the Water Authorities Utility Development Sections approval, shall install a new manhole on the existing infrastructure available to the site.

Solid Waste, Code Enforcement Division - An additional double trash enclosure will have to added to this site. The proposed and additional double trash enclosures will have to meet all of the city of Albuquerque minimum requirements. (Subsequent discussion with solid waste determined an additional site enclosure was not necessary.) The tree that is shown on the SE island leading to the proposed double trash will have to be relocated.

Neighborhood/Public
The applicant notified the La Luz Landowners Association, Westside Coalition of Neighborhood Associations, and Taylor Ranch NA as required. The applicant also notified property owners within 100-feet of the property boundaries as required.

The applicant conducted a neighborhood meeting on April 22, 2020, prior to application (see attachments). Issues of concern most focused on were the Coors View Protection and the affect a three-story building would have on the views of, not only the Sandia Mountains but the Bosque, building height in general, site density and site drainage.

On June 29, 2020, a second facilitated meeting was held with the neighboring communities.
Participants consider there to be no points of agreement with the three-story height and potential blocking of views being the main concerns.

Details of the second facilitated meeting and additional neighborhood comments are attached latter in this packet.

V. CONCLUSION

The request is for a Major Amendment of a Prior Approval of a Site Plan for an approximately 69-acre property known North Andalucia. Amendments to the plan are for Tract 4, a 7.7-acre site known as the Overture Andalucia, (the “subject site”). Major Amendments are required to be heard by the original, approving body, which in this case is the EPC. Two major changes to the existing site development plan are proposed:

1. Increase in density on Tract 4 from 20 units per acre to 24 units per acre.
   - 155 one and two-bedroom apartments
   - 16 duplex cottages

2. Reduction in parking requirements:
   - Multi-family above 1000 square feet from 2 per unit to 1.25 per unit
   - Multi-family less than 1000 square feet from 1.5 per unit to 1.25 per unit

Several neighborhood organizations are affected and were notified as required. Property owners within 100 feet of the subject site were also notified, as required. The applicant conducted three neighborhood meetings. Most concerns focused on the parking garage, general safety, noise, and traffic impacts.

The subject site is along a Major Transit Corridor and in a Premium Transit (PT) area. The request generally furthers a preponderance of applicable Goals and policies and meets most applicable IDO requirements. Notable exceptions are the setback along Central Avenue, public outdoor space, and building façade design. Instances of non-compliance can be remedied through Conditions of Approval, which are also needed for clarification. The proposed site plan is recommended to go to the Development Review Board (DRB) after the EPC process.
FINDINGS –SI-2020-00356, July 9, 2020 - Site Plan Major Amendment

1. The request is for a Major Amendment of a Prior Approved Site Development Plan for North Andalucia at La Luz ("prior approval"). The property contained within the prior approval is legally described as Tracts 1 thru 4, 5-A, 5-B, and 6, Plat of North Andalucia at La Luz, containing approximately 69.6 acres.

2. The proposed amendment will facilitate the development of senior independent living on Tract 4, North Andalucia at La Luz, containing 7.7061 acres ("subject site"). North Andalucia at La Luz is located on the east side of Coors Boulevard NW, south of Montano Road NW.

3. The subject site is within the larger North Andalucia at La Luz development located on Antequera Road NW south of Mirandela Street NW. Coors Boulevard forms the western edge of the subject site.

4. The request consists of the following major changes to the existing, governing site development plan:
   1. Increase in density on Tract 4 from 20 units per acre to 24 units per acre.
      • 155 one and two-bedroom apartments
      • 16 duplex cottages
   2. Reduction in parking requirements:
      • Multi-family above 1000 square feet from 2 per unit to 1.25 per unit
      • Multi-family less than 1000 square feet from 1.5 per unit to 1.25 per unit

5. The request exceeds the thresholds for a Minor Amendment, and therefore is being considered pursuant to Section 14-16-6-4(Y)(1)(b)1, which states that Major Amendments shall be reviewed and decided by the decision-making body that issued the approval being amended. The EPC approved the existing site development plan for the subject site prior to effective date of the IDO. Pursuant to IDO Section 14-6-4(P)(2), the decision-making body may impose conditions necessary to bring the application into compliance with the requirements of this IDO.

6. The subject site is located in an Area of Change as designated by the Comprehensive Plan. Located along Coors Blvd. the subject site is along a Major Transit Corridor.

7. The Albuquerque/Bernalillo County Comprehensive Plan (ABC Comp Plan) and the Integrated Development Ordinance (IDO) are incorporated herein by reference and made part of the record for all purposes.

8. The request generally furthers the following Comprehensive Plan Goals and policies pertaining to development patterns: Chapter 5: Land Use
A. **Goal 5.1-Centers & Corridors:** Grow as a community of strong Centers connected by a multi-modal network of Corridors.

**Policy 5.1.1-Desired Growth:** Capture regional growth in Centers and Corridors to help shape the built environment into a sustainable development pattern.

The proposed development is located along a major transit corridor and within walking distance of the Coors/Montano Village Activity Center. It places growth and development where it is appropriate.

B. **Policy 5.1.10 - Major Transit Corridors:** Foster corridors that prioritize high-frequency transit service with pedestrian-oriented development.

a) Encourage higher-density residential developments within ¼ mile of transit stops or stations.

   The proposed amendment to the design standards allows for higher density residential infill development adjacent to Coors Boulevard, a designated Corridor, and the Coors/Montano Village Activity Center. Greater densities and lower parking requirements support transit ridership and the new residents will be able to walk to nearby commercial retail and services and have access to an extensive pedestrian and bicycle trail network. Tracts 4 and 6 have long been planned for residential development and these requests maintain the original intent to provide a significant number of dwellings that will support the neighboring commercial developments.

C. **Goal 5.2 Complete Communities:** Foster communities where residents can live, work, learn, shop, and play together.

**Policy 5.2.1 Land Uses:** Create healthy, sustainable, and distinct communities with a mix of uses that are conveniently accessible from surrounding neighborhoods.

b) Encourage development that offers choice in transportation, work areas, and lifestyles.

e) Encourage development that broadens housing options to meet a range of incomes and lifestyles.

   The requests add to the existing mixed-use character of North Andalucia at La Luz. Approval of the requested senior, age-restricted multi-family development encourages a new housing option for active seniors near shopping, dining, and recreational opportunities. This location also offers a choice in transportation options including transit on both Coors Boulevard and Montano Road as well as walking and bicycling on nearby trails.

D. **Goal 5.3-Efficient Development Patterns:** Promote development patterns that maximize the utility of existing infrastructure and public facilities and the efficient use of land to support the public good.
Policy 5.3.1-Infill Development: Support additional growth in areas with existing infrastructure and public facilities.

The requests further this goal and policy by facilitating development of an infill property with existing development in all directions and infrastructure installed and available for use. This development provides for additional growth in an area with existing roadways, transit service, grocery stores, recreational trails, and utilities among other public facilities and amenities.

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

Policy 5.6.2-Areas of Change: Direct growth and more intense development to Centers, Corridors, industrial and business parks, and Metropolitan Redevelopment Areas where change is encouraged.

The requests will facilitate additional housing at a variety of densities within an Area of Change. The proposed development includes dwelling units within a traditional multi-family building, as well as single-story duplex-style apartments that add to the overall density while maintaining a view corridor and offering an alternative to a larger singular building on the property. The added density will counter the abundance of single-family houses in the area.

9. The request furthers the following Comprehensive Plan Goals and policies pertaining to development patterns: Chapter 7: Urban Design

A. Goal 7.2 Pedestrian-Accessible Design: Increase walkability in all environments, promote pedestrian-oriented development in urban contexts, and increase pedestrian safety in auto-oriented contexts.

Policy 7.2.1 Walkability: Ensure convenient and comfortable pedestrian travel.

The proposed development includes numerous trees along Antequera Road and Coors Boulevard, which will help improve the pedestrian environment between La Luz to the south and the shopping centers to the north. Trees located between the sidewalk and travel-way also provide protection to pedestrians and traffic calming effects along Antequera.

B. Goal 7.4-Context-Sensitive Parking: Design parking facilities to match the development context and complement the surrounding built environment.

Policy 7.4.2 Parking Requirements: Establish off-street parking requirements based on development context.

The proposed amendment to parking requirements directly affects the provision of parking. By allowing a smaller parking ratio for the unique use proposed on Tract 4, this plan will discourage oversized parking facilities. Located at the intersection of two Major Transit Corridors, development in this area is an opportunity to decrease parking and promote transit ridership on the west side of Albuquerque.
10. The request furthers the following Comprehensive Plan Goals and policies pertaining to development patterns: Chapter 9: Housing

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

      Policy 9.1.1 Housing Options: Support the development, improvement, and conservation of housing for a variety of income levels and types of residents and households.

      e) Provide for the development of quality housing for elderly residents.

      i) Provide for the development of multi-family housing close to public services, transit, and shopping.

   The requested amendment to density, directly responds to a need identified in these policies for quality housing for elderly residents. Census data over the last several years shows the largest percentage increase shown for those residents between 65 and 85+ years of age is an indication that housing addressed to their needs is essential. This housing will be located near shopping and services along two Major Transit Corridors, which will relieve development pressures at the urban edge.

   B. Goal 9.3 Density: Support increased housing density in appropriate places with adequate services and amenities.

      Policy 9.3.1 Centers & Corridors: Encourage higher density, multi-unit housing and mixed use development in Downtown, Urban, Activity, and Village Centers, and along Premium and Major Transit Corridors to capture growth, relieve development pressure at the edge of the urban footprint, and maintain low densities in rural areas.

   The requested Site Plans directly respond to a need identified in these policies for quality housing for elderly residents. This housing will be located near shopping and services along two Major Transit Corridors, which will relieve development pressures at the urban edge.

   This site meets the criteria for preferred growth. It is near major transit and commuter corridors, has existing services and infrastructure, and is near to many activities or transit that provides easy accessibility.

11. The applicant notified the La Luz Landowners Association, Westside Coalition of Neighborhood Associations, and Taylor Ranch NA as required. The applicant also notified property owners within 100-feet of the property boundaries as required. Two facilitated meetings were held with some changes recommended being incorporated in the final design submittal.

12. The applicant conducted two facilitated neighborhood meetings on April 22, 2020 and June 29-2020. Most of the concerns focused on the building heights and VPO-1 encroachment.
13. As of the writing of this report, planning staff has received two emails mentioning concern for loss of the view.

RECOMMENDATION - SI-2020-00356, July 9, 2020

APPROVAL of Project #2020-00358, Case # SI-2020-00356, a Major Amendment to an existing Site Plan for an approximately 68-acre site located east of Coors Blvd NW and South of Montano. The specific Tract 4 is further located south of Mirandela Rd and north of Learning, zoned PD, based on the preceding Findings 1-13.
FINDINGS –SI-2020-00357, July 9, 2020 - Site Plan - EPC

1. The request is for Approval of a Site Development Plan for North Andalucia at La Luz (“prior approval”), for a senior, age-restricted multi-family development. The property contained within the prior approval is legally described as Tracts 1 thru 4, 5-A, 5-B, and 6, Plat of North Andalucia at La Luz, containing approximately 69.6 acres.

2. The proposed Site Plan will facilitate the development of senior independent living on Tract 4, North Andalucia at La Luz, containing 7.7061 acres (“subject site”). North Andalucia at La Luz is located on the east side of Coors Boulevard NW, south of Montano Road NW.

3. The subject site is within the larger North Andalucia at La Luz development located on Antequera Road NW south of Mirandela Road NW. Coors Boulevard forms the western edge of the subject site.

4. The EPC approved the existing site development plan for the subject site prior to the effective date of the IDO. Pursuant to IDO Section 14-6-4(P)(2), the decision-making body may impose conditions necessary to bring the application into compliance with the requirements of this IDO.

5. The subject site is located in an Area of Change as designated by the Comprehensive Plan. Located along Coors Blvd. the subject site is along a Major Transit Corridor.

6. The Albuquerque/Bernalillo County Comprehensive Plan, the Integrated Development Ordinance (IDO), Coors character Protection Overlay Zone (CPO-2), and Coors View protection Overlay Zone (VPO-1) are incorporated herein by reference and made part of the record for all purposes.

7. The request furthers the following Comprehensive Plan Goals and policies pertaining to development patterns: Chapter 5: Land Use

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

   Policy 5.1.1-Desired Growth: Capture regional growth in Centers and Corridors to help shape the built environment into a sustainable development pattern.

   The proposed development is located along a major transit corridor and adjacent to the Coors/Montano Village Activity Center. It places growth and development where it is appropriate.

B. Policy 5.1.10 - Major Transit Corridors: Foster corridors that prioritize high-frequency transit service with pedestrian-oriented development.

   a) Encourage higher-density residential developments within ¼ mile of transit stops or stations.
Greater densities and lower parking requirements support transit ridership and the new residents will be able to walk to nearby commercial retail and services and have access to an extensive pedestrian and bicycle trail network. Tracts 4 and 6 have long been planned for residential development and these requests maintain the original intent to provide a significant number of dwellings that will support the neighboring commercial developments.

C. Goal 5.2 Complete Communities: Foster communities where residents can live, work, learn, shop, and play together.

Policy 5.2.1 Land Uses: Create healthy, sustainable, and distinct communities with a mix of uses that are conveniently accessible from surrounding neighborhoods.

c) Encourage development that offers choice in transportation, work areas, and lifestyles.

f) Encourage development that broadens housing options to meet a range of incomes and lifestyles.

The requests add to the existing mixed-use character of North Andalucia at La Luz. Approval of the requested senior, age-restricted multi-family development encourages a new housing option for active seniors near shopping, dining, and recreational opportunities. This location also offers a choice in transportation options including transit on both Coors Boulevard and Montano Road as well as walking and bicycling on nearby trails.

D. Goal 5.3-Efficient Development Patterns: Promote development patterns that maximize the utility of existing infrastructure and public facilities and the efficient use of land to support the public good.

Policy 5.3.1-Infill Development: Support additional growth in areas with existing infrastructure and public facilities.

The requests further this goal and policy by facilitating development of an infill property with existing development in all directions and infrastructure installed and available for use. This development provides for additional growth in an area with existing roadways, transit service, grocery stores, recreational trails, and utilities among other public facilities and amenities.

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

Policy 5.6.2-Areas of Change: Direct growth and more intense development to Centers, Corridors, industrial and business parks, and Metropolitan Redevelopment Areas where change is encouraged.

The requests will facilitate additional housing at a variety of densities within an Area of Change. The proposed development includes dwelling units within a traditional multi-
family building, as well as single-story duplex-style apartments that add to the overall density while maintaining a view corridor and offering an alternative to a larger singular building on the property. Multi-family residential will provide a viable option and variety of housing types to this area with an abundance of single-family houses.

9. The request furthers the following Comprehensive Plan Goals and policies pertaining to development patterns: Chapter 7: Urban Design

A. **Goal 7.2 Pedestrian-Accessible Design:** Increase walkability in all environments, promote pedestrian-oriented development in urban contexts, and increase pedestrian safety in auto-oriented contexts.

   **Policy 7.2.1 Walkability:** Ensure convenient and comfortable pedestrian travel.

   The proposed development includes numerous trees along Antequera Road and Coors Boulevard, which will help improve the pedestrian environment between La Luz to the south and the shopping centers to the north. Trees located between the sidewalk and travel-way also provide protection to pedestrians and traffic calming effects along Antequera.

B. **Goal 7.4-Context-Sensitive Parking:** Design parking facilities to match the development context and complement the surrounding built environment.

   **Policy 7.4.2 Parking Requirements:** Establish off-street parking requirements based on development context.

   The proposed site plan promotes lower parking requirements rooted in studies that indicate a reduced number of cars with senior populations and convenient access to public transit with frequent service.

10. The request furthers the following Comprehensive Plan Goals and policies pertaining to development patterns: Chapter 9: Housing

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

   **Policy 9.1.1 Housing Options:** Support the development, improvement, and conservation of housing for a variety of income levels and types of residents and households.

   e) Provide for the development of quality housing for elderly residents.

   i) Provide for the development of multi-family housing close to public services, transit, and shopping.

   The requested amendment to density, directly responds to a need identified in these policies for quality housing for elderly residents. Census data over the last several years shows the largest percentage increase shown for those residents between 65 and 85+ years of age is an indication that housing addressed to their needs is essential. This housing will be located adjacent to shopping and services along two Major Transit Corridors, which will relieve development pressures at the urban edge.
B. Goal 9.3 Density: Support increased housing density in appropriate places with adequate services and amenities.

Policy 9.3.1 Centers & Corridors: Encourage higher density, multi-unit housing and mixed-use development in Downtown, Urban, Activity, and Village Centers, and along Premium and Major Transit Corridors to capture growth, relieve development pressure at the edge of the urban footprint, and maintain low densities in rural areas.

The proposed Site Plan directly responds to a need identified in these policies for increased housing density in appropriate places (Centers and Corridors). This housing will be located near shopping and services along two Major Transit Corridors, which will relieve development pressures at the urban edge.

This site meets the criteria for preferred growth. It is near major transit and commuter corridors, has existing services and infrastructure, and is near to many activities and transit service that provides easy accessibility.

11. The subject site is within the Coors Character Protection Overlay Zone, CPO-2 and meets the requirements for setback from Coors, exterior lighting, signage and landscaping.

12. The subject site is within the Coors View Protection Overlay, VPO-1, the purpose of the View Protection Overlay (VPO) zone being to preserve areas with unique and distinctive views that are worthy of conservation, such as those from public rights-of-way to cultural landscapes identified in the ABC Comp Plan, as amended.

13. Following formula and criteria for analyzing developments falling within the VPO, as presented in the IDO, the subject site design meets those parameters for acceptable view encroachment.

14. The applicant has adequately justified the request pursuant to the Integrated Development Ordinance (IDO) Section 6-6(H)(3)-Review and Decision Criteria for Site Plan EPC and meets the design criteria, with conditions, for the following applicable criteria. Applicable criteria to this site plan are those of:
   - Access and Connectivity
   - Parking and Loading
   - Landscaping, Buffering, and Screening
   - Walls and Fences
   - Outdoor Lighting
   - Building Design for Multi-Family housing
   - Signs

15. Conditions of approval are needed to create compliance with applicable IDO regulations and to provide clarification and to ensure that all applicable requirements are met.
16. The applicant notified the La Luz Landowners Association, Westside Coalition of Neighborhood Associations, and Taylor Ranch NA as required. The applicant also notified property owners within 100-feet of the property boundaries as required. Facilitated meetings were held with some changes recommended being incorporated in the final design submittal.

17. The applicant conducted two facilitated neighborhood meetings on April 22, 2020 and June 29, 2020. Most of the concerns focused on the building heights and VPO-1 encroachment.

18. As of the writing of this report, planning staff has received two emails mentioning concern for loss of the view.

RECOMMENDATION - SI-2020- 00357 July 9, 2020

APPROVAL of Project #2020-003658, Case # SI-2020-00357, for Site Plan - EPC specific Tract 4 of the North Andalucia at La Luz development, located south of Mirandela Rd and north of Learning, zoned PD, based on the preceding Findings and subject to the following Conditions of Approval.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL – SI-2020- 00357, July 9, 2020

1. The EPC delegates final sign-off authority of this site development plan to the Development Review Board (DRB) to ensure all technical issues are resolved. 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. The applicant shall meet with the Staff planner prior to applying to the DRB to ensure that all conditions of approval are met. Upon receiving final approvals, the applicant shall submit a finalized version of the site plan for filing at the Planning Department.

3. Per IDO 5-5(C)(5)(d), at least 2 percent of the vehicle parking spaces shall include electric vehicle charging stations with a rating of 240 volts or higher. At least 4 electric vehicle charging stations must be provided.

4. The Parking Lot Landscaped Area is calculated based on 152 parking spaces. This is inconsistent with the front page, which shows 235 parking spaces provided. Removing for garages and carports still leaves 154 spaces. Calculations and numbers shall be consistent and accurate.

5. Site Plan (AS-101) and Landscape Plan (L-101) need to be revised to reflect the same acreage number.
6. The retaining walls indicated on the plan do not have accompanying details. These shall be provided and the reviewed and approved through DRB prior to building permit.

7. Refuse enclosure gate indicates painted wood cedar. More durable material such as painted hardie board, shall be used.

8. Grading and Drainage:
   - Where acceptable to City Hydrology, show curb cuts for water harvesting.

9. Outdoor lighting on the site is to be at a maximum height of 16 feet with a fully shielded lighting head. Currently it is only indicated on the site plan with a note stating intended compliance. Lighting locations shall be shown on site plan with mounting details.

10. Primary entrances into the main building are not sufficiently emphasized. They have projections and changes in materials, but such changes appear about every 15-20 feet along all elevations. The standard expression of entrance at all entry locations other than into the office/clubhouse area shall be enhanced.

11. Sidewalk along Antequera where it intersects with main entrance, shall have ADA compliant ramps.

12. Condition from the Solid Waste Management:
   - Site Improvement- The tree that is shown on the SE island leading to the proposed double trash shall be relocated.
   - Compactor units cannot be any larger than a 2-cubic yard compactor.

13. A Water and Sewer Availability Statement request and Fire Marshal approval must be completed prior to issuance of a building permit for construction of the development.

---

Leslie Naji  
Senior Planner

Notice of Decision CC list:

La Luz Landowners Association, Jonathan Abdalla, laluzlandowners@azulstar.com
La Luz Landowners Association, Dan Jensen, dgj1958@gmail.com
Westside Coalition of Neighborhood Associations, Rene Horvath, aboard111@gmail.com
Westside Coalition of Neighborhood Associations, Harry Hendriksen, hlhen@comcast.net
Taylor Ranch NA, Rene Horvath, aboard111@gmail.com
Taylor Ranch NA, Diana Shea, secretary@trna.org
Sharon Miles, sharon@seniorcareoptions.net

Alan Varela, avara@cabq.gov
CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE AGENCY COMMENTS

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Zoning Enforcement - No Comments

Long Range Planning

Long Range Comments for July 9, 2020 EPC Hearing

PR-2020-003658
SI-00356 & 00357 – Site Plan – EPC and Major Amendment to Site Plan – EPC Site Improvement
Address: SW Corner of Mirandela and Antequerra Rd. (red/pink rectangle below)
IDO Zoning: PD
Request: Site Plan Amendment
Application Link
Legal Description Site Plan Amendment: TR 1-4, 5-A, 5-B, and 6 PLAT OF NORTH ANDALUCIA AT LA LUZ CONT 69.6 AC
Legal Description Site Plan Approval: TR 4 PLAT OF NORTH ANDALUCIA AT LA LUZ CONT 7.7061 AC
Background
The applicant, Silver Leaf Ventures/Greystar, represented by Consensus Planning, is requesting an amendment to the previously adopted site plan North Andalucia at La Luz. The requested amendment is to increase the density allowed on the site from 20 dwelling units per acre to 24 dwelling units per acre. The applicant is also requesting to lower the required multi-family parking from 1.5 spaces per dwelling unit to 1.25 spaces per dwelling unit. Lastly, the applicant is requesting an approval for a new site plan for a multi-family housing development on a portion of the site covered by the larger site plan. This request follows the previous system of approving a Site Development Plan for Subdivision to establish design standards for a larger site and then approving a Site Development Plan for Building Permit to establish detailed requirements for a particular development on all or a portion of the site (often a phase of the larger development). The multi-family development consists of a 3-story building with 155 dwelling units designated as age-restricted senior housing (not a use defined by the IDO but would be considered multi-family dwellings) and 8 duplexes for a total of 171 dwelling units. The senior housing is located on the southern portion of the site and has common spaces, a courtyard, and a pool. The additional 16 units are to be located on the northern portion of the site. The proposed site (highlighted in red, above) is located within and is controlled by the Site Plan for North Andalucia at La Luz, shown above in blue.
The site is located in the West Mesa Community Planning Area near the Coors Boulevard and Montano Road intersection. Both Coors Boulevard and Montano Road are classified as Major Transit Corridors in the Comp Plan. The site is zoned PD and is part of the overall North Andalucia at La Luz, which contains lots zoned MX-T to the south and PD to the North and East. The lots surrounding the Coors/Montano intersection have a variety of different zones: MX-M at the southwest corner of the intersection, MX-L and PD at the northwest, and MX-M at the northeast corner. Looking further out into the area, lots have a variety of residential zones including: R-T, R-1C, R-1A, R-ML, and R-MH. There is also a lot zoned NR-PO-C, which is being used as private open space.

Land uses within the North Andalucia site plan include commercial retail in the northern portion. There are already several amenities developed in that portion of the site, including Sprouts, PetSmart, veterinary services, and various restaurants. North of Montano road there are more commercial retail land uses, including a Walgreens Pharmacy. To the west of the site, across Coors, there are retail uses and multi-family dwellings adjacent to low-density residential land uses. To the east of the site are multi-family dwellings and Bosque School; beyond that are the bosque and the Rio Grande. Directly south of the proposed site plan is a bank.

The lots located at intersection of Coors Boulevard and Montano Road (including this Site Plan) are all classified as Areas of Change. Areas of Change are designated in the Comp Plan to receive urban scale development and provide higher-density housing options.

**VPO Internal Review Process**

Code Enforcement and Long Range Planning reviewed two early drafts of the site plan for compliance with the Coors View Protection Overlay regulations in the IDO, specifically Subsection 3-6(D)(5) height, bulk, and massing. There were two internal meetings, the first on Friday April 10, 2020. During that meeting the site plan (which has since been revised) was reviewed by the team. After review, the team asked the agent to provide more information pertaining to the structures and their heights. We also asked the agent to ensure the proper placement of the camera in the view frame rendering to allow proper for proper analysis.
Revised Site Plan and View Frame (4/15/2020)
After the initial internal meeting with Code Enforcement and Long Range Planning, the agent provided a drawing that had more information, shown below. The drawing included building/structure types and heights and called out the highest point of the building in red. In that iteration of the site plan, the high point (39') of the building was located on the southwest portion of the building, the 3-story building was located on the northern portion of the site, and the cottages were on the southern end. The camera placement for the view frame rendering was also changed to be 4 feet above the elevation of Coors Blvd. (the sight line elevation), which resulted in a less obstructive of the view of the Sandia’s (shown below). Although the building took up a higher percentage of the view frame (48.4%), the rendering showed the building to obstruct less of the view of the east, including views of the bosque, the city, and the mountains. The southern end of the mountains and the bosque were completely visible in this view frame because the cottages were located on the southern end of the site; however, more of the view would be obstructed farther north where the bulk of the 3-story building is closer to Coors Blvd. Because there is only one high point to this building, only one sight line is required and only one was provided.
Application Site Plan and View Frame (5/28/2020)
The most recent site plan and view frame analysis are shown below. The applicant made several adjustments to the site and considered the feedback from the City and from residents who participated in the required Neighborhood Meeting. The larger, taller building was moved as far back from Coors Boulevard as possible. The high point of the 3-story building was shifted away from the southwest to the south east of the site. These changes made a noticeable difference in the view frame analysis. The blocked area in the revised view frame is 39.3% as opposed to the 48.4% of the previous version. Because the tallest building is shifted further away from Coors Blvd., the massing of the building will appear to be smaller than in the earlier site layout; however, due to the location of the sight line, this view frame appears to have the building in a more prominent position. If a second view frame were created further north along Coors, then the view would open up where the cottage dwellings are located, revealing substantially unobstructed views of the northern portion of the mountains and bosque above the cottages. At no point does the proposed building penetrate above the ridgeline of the Sandia Mountains, which was a regulation under the Coors Corridor Plan.
Neighborhood Meeting
The required Neighborhood Meeting was facilitated by the City Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) on April 24, 2020. At this meeting Greystar (the applicant), Consensus Planning (the agent), and members of the affected Neighborhood Associations (La Luz Landowners Association, Taylor Ranch Neighborhood Association, and the Westside Coalition of Neighborhood Associations) were present. In short, the areas of agreement were that the development should integrate into the surrounding neighborhood (neighbors would like the building color to have earth tones vs. the white shown in the rendering), and that pedestrian amenities/walkways should be focused on the Antequera Rd. perimeter.

The areas of disagreement/concern were with the request to increase density above 20 dwelling units per acre. The neighborhoods are concerned that the height and massing of the project will block the views of the mountains. The neighbors are concerned that the view frame shown in the drawing does not accurately depict the view along multiple points on Coors Boulevard.

Request Summary and Considerations
As written in the application, the following is the summarized request from the Applicant:

1. A Major Amendment to the existing Site Plan and related design standards (prior approval) to increase the allowable density on Tract 4 from 20 dwelling units per acre to 24 dwelling units per acre and create a lower parking requirement specific to “age-restricted, senior independent living multi-family uses.”

2. A Site Plan – EPC for the subject site in accordance with the underlying PD zoning to allow for development of a senior, age-restricted multi-family development.

If both requests are approved, there would be 2 site plans that apply to this property. While this was standard under the old system, where one was a Site Development Plan for Subdivision and the other a Site Development Plan for Building Permit, the new system does not contemplate more than 1 site plan applying to a property. Long Range recommends that the request be modified to 1 part: Major Amendment of Site Plan – EPC, which would include revising the density cap and parking minimums and providing details about development on the specified portion of the larger site plan area.

Another recommendation to change the request is to remove reference to “age-restricted, senior independent living multi-family uses.” The IDO does not include or define such a use, and Long Range strongly discourages parking requirements being tied to a new use not defined by the IDO. While “age” is not a protected class under the federal Fair Housing Act, the City intentionally avoids regulating land uses by age of residents. If the housing were to change ownership and allow all ages in the future, the City would not be able to regulate who can live there by age.

- The IDO does include “Independent Living Facility” as a defined use, which is allowed as an accessory use in many residential zones per Table 4-2-1 and requires 1 space per dwelling unit per Table 5-5-1. Use-specific standard 4-3(F)(10) only allows the use when accessory to an assistive living facility. IDO Subsection 2-6(A)(4)(b) indicates that PD is subject to use-specific standards but allows the EPC to modify them as part of a Site Plan approval. EPC could consider whether it is appropriate for an accessory use to be allowed as a primary use on this PD property.

- Instead of the above approach, Long Range strongly encourages that this request be simply to reduce the parking requirement for multi-family development. Then the question to be considered is whether a reduced requirement for multi-family development is appropriate on this site. The EPC can consider whether the reduction is justified in this context.

Concerning the request to change the maximum density specified on the existing site plan, the IDO does not limit density to a ratio of dwelling units per acre. It does, however, limit building heights, require useable open space, and other site amenities, such as parking and landscaping. Those regulations effectively cap the density on a given site. Though the requested density of 24 dwelling units per acre is achievable under IDO regulations, the existing site plan restricts the density to 20 dwelling units per acre. Under the existing site plan regulations, at 20 dwelling units per acre, only 154 of the 171 units proposed can be developed on this site. Staff notes that if 171 units are built on this 7.7-acre project site, that results in an overall density of 22.2 dwelling units per acre.
There is ambiguity in whether the reduced parking requirement can be approved by EPC as part of the requested Site Plan or whether, as part of a Major Amendment, it should go to the DRB as a waiver request, per IDO Subsection 6-4(Y)(1)(b) Major Amendments, which indicates that major amendments involving Section 14-16-5-5 should be reviewed by the DRB (i.e. per IDO procedures).

The other argument to be made is that because this property is zoned PD, EPC can approve a parking standard different from IDO requirements pursuant to Subsection 2-6(A)(5)(a) through a Site Plan approval.

The application presents this request as an amendment to the site plan, rather than an exception from the IDO regulations. The approved Site Plan specifies parking requirement for single-family and multi-family development without referring to the zoning code (now IDO) parking requirements.

This revised parking ratio could be considered a policy call that is in the EPC’s purview. The fact that the other part of this request involves changing the density maximum, it seems appropriate for EPC to consider and decide both parts of the request. The ZEO should be consulted about the appropriate procedure for this portion of the request.

The applicant makes the argument that the lowered parking reduction is in line with the IDO; however, the IDO requires a minimum of 1.5 spaces per dwelling unit multi-family dwellings and 1 space per dwelling unit up to 2 bedrooms for 2-family (duplexes) dwellings and 2 spaces per dwelling unit with 3+ bedrooms. The proposed site plan does not specify the number of bedrooms in the duplexes, which drive the parking requirement for this use; it appears that they do not exceed two bedrooms per dwelling unit, thus only needing 1 space per duplex. Under the existing Site Plan parking minimums, and assuming duplexes with 2 bedrooms or fewer per IDO minimum of 1 parking space per dwelling unit, the development would need roughly 248 spaces, shown in the calculations below.

\[
\begin{align*}
1.5 \text{ spaces per 155 multi-family dwelling units} &= 232.5 \text{ spaces (per existing Site Plan minimum)} \\
1 \text{ space per 16 2-family (duplex) dwelling units} &= 16 \text{ spaces (per IDO minimum)} \\
\text{Total} &= 248 \text{ spaces}
\end{align*}
\]

The applicant is requesting EPC approval of the parking ratio of 1.25 spaces per dwelling unit for the 155 multi-family dwelling units, which they describe will be age-restricted in a senior living development. This would bring the total required to 209 spaces total, shown in the calculations below.

\[
\begin{align*}
1.25 \text{ spaces per 155 multi-family dwelling units} &= 193.75 \text{ spaces (per requested Site Plan)} \\
1 \text{ space per 16 2-family (duplex) dwelling units} &= 16 \text{ spaces (per the IDO requirement)} \\
\text{Total} &= 209 \text{ spaces}
\end{align*}
\]

Long Range Planning recommends adding a parking requirement for duplex to the site plan. Presumably the requirement for this land use would default to the IDO standard, since the site plan is silent about this use and it is not addressed by the rates for single-family or multi-family residential. This introduces more complexity to review of a site plan to have some standards identified in the site plan and others defaulting to the IDO. Additionally, the general parking summary provided in the detailed site plan for the proposed development should be removed so that the required parking remains tied to the number of dwelling units, pursuant to the ratios approved by the EPC in this site plan amendment.
The approved site plan indicates that maximum parking requirements to be per zoning code plus up to 10% additional spaces. The parking maximum is unusual, but it is intended to increase pedestrian accessibility and lessen the visual impact of the parking area. It also likely is in recognition that this development is intended to be a mixed-use community.

Comparing the required 1.5 space to 1.25 space leaves a difference of 39 spaces. There is potential for some spaces to be off-street parking; however, this may not make up the difference. The existing development of this subdivision with a mix of uses and its proximity to transit may reduce the parking demand.

**Comp Plan Policy Analysis**

The development of a senior living facility in this location has potential to further several Comp Plan policies, outlined below.

Policy 5.1.1 Desired Growth: Capture regional growth in Centers and Corridors to help shape the built environment into a sustainable development pattern.

a) Create walkable places that provide opportunities to live, work, learn, shop, and play,

b) Encourage residential infill in neighborhoods adjacent to Centers and Corridors to support transit ridership.

This development has potential to achieve the outcomes intended by policies outlined above. The senior living facility is set to be located along Coors Boulevard at Montano Road, which are both Major Transit corridors. There are also several amenities in the form of restaurants, shopping centers (pharmacy, grocery), and outdoor spaces (the Bosque and Rio Grande River). These amenities along with the proposed site amenities have the potential to create a walkable environment for future residents. Given that the facility is located at the intersection of two Major Transit corridors, the increase in density and lower parking requirements can encourage transit ridership.

Policy 5.6.2 Areas of Change: Direct growth and more intense development to Centers, Corridors, industrial and business parks, and Metropolitan Redevelopment Areas where change is encouraged.

c) Foster a range of housing options at various densities according to each Center or Corridor Type.

Westside Albuquerque is generally known for the over-abundance of single-family detached housing. Providing multi-family dwellings for senior living not only increases the types of housing available, it does so for a vulnerable population. It also increases density and provides a space that can accommodate Albuquerque’s changing population. The increase in density also mitigates development on the urban edge by potentially reducing the demand for single-family dwellings. This policy also supports the request for a higher density in residential dwelling units and a reduced parking requirement.

**Conclusion**

This is a request for approval of a Site Plan – EPC and Major Amendment to Site Plan – EPC. Long Range recommends that the request be simplified to a Major Amendment to Site Plan – EPC, adding details for the proposed lot as the current phase of the larger development.
The request includes amending the existing site plan density limit of 20 dwelling units per acre to be 24 dwelling units per acre. The density limit was established both in the adopted site plan and in the site’s zoning prior to the IDO, which was “SU-1 for PRD up to 20 du/a.”

The request includes lowering the required multi-family parking from 1.5 spaces per dwelling unit to 1.25 spaces per dwelling unit. A Major Amendment involving changes to parking standards would typically go to DRB per IDO Subsection 6-4(Y)(1)(b) as a Waiver – DRB (Subsection 6-6(L); however, this request is before the EPC for other requests related to the same property. The ZEO should be consulted as to the appropriateness of EPC deciding the parking request in addition to the other requests as part of one Major Amendment. If so, it would be appropriate for the EPC to include a finding that indicates if the requested reduction to minimum parking requirement is consistent with Comp Plan policy. If the EPC can approve, the site plan should include the required minimum for the 2-family (duplex) use for consistency and enforceability, so that it is clear the parking requirements are pursuant to the site plan.

Given the site’s location at the intersection of two Major Transit corridors and in an Area of Change, the proposed development seems appropriate in this area. The site is located within walking distance of several amenities, including several shopping centers and public open spaces (the Bosque and Rio Grande). The moderate increase in density not only provides alternatives to detached single-family housing, but also may encourage increased use of transit for future tenants.

**Transportation Development**

**PR-2020-003658**

- SI-20356 &00357 – Site Improvement

- Provide all parking calculations.
- Sidewalk improvements are required surrounding the entire site.
- In addition to showing sidewalk, label curb ramps both on-site and at intersections along perimeter and provide ramp details.
- 4-foot minimum sidewalk should be provided around obstructions such as power poles and fire hydrants.
- Show clear sight triangle on landscaping plan and site plan. Follow AASHTO requirements. Some of the landscaping may be within clear sight triangles.
- A permit from NMDOT is required to work within DOT right-of-way.
- Label all driving aisle widths and curb radii. Follow DPM criteria.
- Show parking space dimensions for all parking lot segments, or if all of them are the same, indicate it on the plan.
- Label all hammerhead lengths. These should follow minimum criteria for turn-arounds.
- Label curb or turndown sidewalk on the site plan as applicable to vertically separate the parking lot from landscaped areas and sidewalk.
- Show any parking lot bumpers.
- Obtain Solid Waste and Fire Marshall approval.
- Label 2% maximum cross-slope for the sidewalk detail.
- The 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 signs.
• 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)

• Include "Emergency Vehicles Only" signs at the emergency access for the parking lot.

Hydrology Development
A. Hydrology recommends that final signoff of this Site Plan be delegated to the Development Review Board in order to identify Infrastructure requirements, project phasing, and conformance with the Flood Hazard and Drainage Control Ordinance.

New Mexico Department of Transportation (NMDOT)
Project Number: 2020-003658
Case Description: Site Improvements
Location: 5301 Antequera NW
Type of Development (Residential/Commercial): Commercial
Possible Impacted NMDOT roadway(s): NM 45 Coors Blvd milepost 17.5
Department Comments:
• The NMDOT comments shall include but not limited to the following: NO direct access to NM 45 will be allowed from the property all access shall be gained from the existing signalized intersection of NM 45 at Learning or the left in, right in, and right out access just north of this property. Sidewalk shall be established along the west property line paralleling NM 45 as to complete the connectivity between adjacent lots. A landscaping permit shall be provided to the NMDOT for any landscaping within NMDOT highway right of way. Landscape permit shall be provided to Peter Kubiak at peter.kubiak@state.nm.us.

If there are any questions, please feel free to contact Peter Kubiak at 505.249.5718 or Peter.Kubiak@state.nm.us.

DEPARTMENT OF MUNICIPAL DEVELOPMENT (DMD)
Transportation Planning
No comments.

Traffic Engineering Operations (Department of Municipal Development)

Street Maintenance (Department of Municipal Development)

RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS FROM THE CITY ENGINEER:

ABC WATER UTILITY AUTHORITY (ABCWUA)
Project #2020-003658
SI-00356 & 00357 – Site Improvement

Serviceability Statement 120311 last addressed service for the site and has since expired. As a condition of approval request availability statement at the link: http://www.abcwua.org/Availability_Statements.aspx. Request shall include a City Fire Marshal
approved Fire 1 Plan, zone map showing the site location, and a Utility Plan (showing the domestic water, sanitary sewer, and proposed fire protection).

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH DEPARTMENT

PARKS AND RECREATION

Planning and Design Reviewed. No objection to requested Site Improvement.

Open Space Division

City Forester

POLICE DEPARTMENT/Planning

CPTED comments

- Ensure adequate lighting throughout the project, to include parking areas, pedestrian walkways, and courtyards.
- Ensure natural surveillance and clear lines of sight throughout the facility. Natural surveillance requires a space free from natural and physical barrier (i.e. open picket vs. solid fences). Establish a clear line of sight from the parking areas to the street and the buildings and from the buildings and street the parking areas.
- Ensure that landscaping is maintained to provide natural surveillance, trimming trees up to create a canopy of at least six feet; and trimming shrubs and bushes down to three feet.
- Limit and clearly delineate access to the property; i.e. Employee Parking, Visitor Parking, Deliveries.
- Clearly delineate public, semi-public, semi-private, and private space throughout the project.
- Install No Trespassing signs that cite the City Ordinance so that they are visible immediately upon entering the property.
- Consider installing electronic surveillance (cameras) to monitor entrance and exit points, parking areas, Central Plant and other potential high theft areas.

SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT DEPARTMENT

Project # 2020-003658 – Site Improvement- An additional double trash enclosure will have to be added to this site. The proposed and additional double trash enclosures will have to meet all of the city of Albuquerque minimum requirements. The tree that is shown on the SE island leading to the proposed double trash will have to be relocated.

It appears there are 3 dumpsters in the staging area, and 1 in chute. If this is what is proposed, I am fine with this.

Please inform you client, or the company that will be installing the compactors, the units cannot be any larger than a 2-cubic yard compactor.
FIRE DEPARTMENT/Planning

TRANSIT DEPARTMENT

COMMENTS FROM OTHER AGENCIES

BERNALILLO COUNTY

ALBUQUERQUE METROPOLITAN ARROYO FLOOD CONTROL AUTHORITY
No adverse comments.
Project#PR-2020-003658

ALBUQUERQUE PUBLIC SCHOOLS
No adverse impacts.

PR 2020-003658_SI 2020-00356/00357
MRMPO has no adverse comments.

For informational purposes:
- The Long Range Transit Network Identifies Coors Blvd. as a “Primary Route” with transit frequencies of 15 minutes or less in the project area.
- Appendix G of the MTP recommends the following as it relates to the proposed project:
- Adopt mixed-use and higher-density zoning along transit corridors to support ridership. Encourage a mix of land uses (retail, housing, entertainment, etc.) and as multimodal facilities in appropriate locations to encourage shorter and more active trips
- Promote a diverse mix of housing, in cost, unit types, and neighborhood setting

MIDDLE RIO GRANDE CONSERVANCY DISTRICT

PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF NEW MEXICO

Conditions for Approval for Project #2020-003658 (SI-00356 & 00357 – Site Improvement) located at 5301 Antequera NW between Bosque School Rd and Mirandela St Vacant Land
1. As a condition, the developer shall contact PNM’s New Service Delivery Department to coordinate electric service regarding the project. Please submit a service application at www.pnm.com/erequest for PNM to review.

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.
Figure 1: Looking northeast from Coors across the site.

Figure 2: Looking east from the west property line along Coors of the subject site.
Figure 3: Looking east across the site from view field location.

Figure 4: Looking south from corner of Antequera and Mirandela across the site.
Figure 5: Looking south from Mirandela Rd across center of site.

Figure 6: Northern facing from southern end of the site.
ZONING

Please refer to IDO Section 14-16-2-6 for the PD zone
APPLICANT INFORMATION
**Application Information**

Applicant: Greystar  
Address: 1717 West 6th Street, Suite 262  
Phone: (512) 473-4221  
Email: nwhittaker@greystar.com

City: Austin  
State: TX  
Zip: 78703

Professional/Agent (if any): Consensus Planning, Inc.  
Phone: (505) 764-9801  
Email: cp@consensusplanning.com

Address: 302 8th Street NW  
City: Albuquerque  
State: NM  
Zip: 87102

Proprietary Interest in Site: Contract Purchaser  
List all owners: Silver Leaf Ventures, LLC

**Brief Description of Request**

Requesting a Major Amendment of a Site Plan and a Site Plan - EPC for development of a 171-unit age-restricted, senior housing development.

**Site Information**

Accuracy of the existing legal description is crucial! Attach a separate sheet if necessary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot or Tract No.:</th>
<th>Tract 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Block:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subdivision/Addition:</td>
<td>North Andalucia at La Luz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRGCD Map No.:</td>
<td>E-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone Atlas Page(s):</td>
<td>PD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Existing Lots:</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Proposed Lots:</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Area of Site (acres):</td>
<td>7.7061 acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Location of Property by Streets**

Site Address/Street: 5301 Antequera Rd NW  
Between: Bosque School Road and Mirandela Street

**Case History**

List any current or prior project and case number(s) that may be relevant to your request.

PR-2020-003658, 4003859, and 1004473

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Numbers</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Fees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meeting/Hearing Date:  
Staff Signature: Date: Project #

**Fee Total:**
FORM P1: SITE PLAN – EPC

Please refer to the EPC hearing schedule for public hearing dates and deadlines. Your attendance is required.

☐ SITE PLAN – EPC
☐ MASTER DEVELOPMENT PLAN
☐ MAJOR AMENDMENT TO SITE PLAN – EPC OR MASTER DEVELOPMENT PLAN
☐ EXTENSION OF SITE PLAN – EPC OR MASTER DEVELOPMENT PLAN

✗ Interpreter Needed for Hearing? No, if yes, indicate language: ______________________

✗ A Single PDF file of the complete application including all documents being submitted must be emailed to PLNDRS@cabq.gov prior to making a submittal. Zipped files or those over 9 MB cannot be delivered via email, in which case the PDF must be provided on a CD. PDF shall be organized with the Development Review Application and this Form P1 at the front followed by the remaining documents in the order provided on this form.

✗ Zone Atlas map with the entire site clearly outlined and labeled

✗ Letter of authorization from the property owner if application is submitted by an agent

✗ Sites 5 acres or greater: Archaeological Certificate in accordance with IDO Section 14-16-6-5(A)

✗ Signed Traffic Impact Study (TIS) Form

✗ Justification letter describing, explaining, and justifying the request per the criteria in IDO Sections 14-16-6-6(H)(3) or 14-16-6-6(F)(3), as applicable

N/A Explanation of requested deviations, if any, in accordance with IDO Section 14-16-6-4(O)

✗ Proof of Pre-Application Meeting with City staff per IDO Section 14-16-6-4(B)

✗ Proof of Neighborhood Meeting per IDO Section 14-16-6-4(C)

✗ Office of Neighborhood Coordination neighborhood meeting inquiry response

✗ Proof of email with read receipt OR Certified Letter offering meeting to applicable associations

✗ If a meeting was requested/held, copy of sign-in sheet and meeting notes

✗ Sign Posting Agreement

✗ Required notices with content per IDO Section 14-16-6-4(K)(6)

✗ Office of Neighborhood Coordination notice inquiry response

✗ Copy of notification letter and proof of first class mailing

✗ Proof of emailed notice to affected Neighborhood Association representatives

✗ Buffer map and list of property owners within 100 feet (excluding public rights-of-way) provided by Planning Department or created by applicant, copy of notifying letter, and proof of first class mailing

✗ Completed Site Plan Checklist

✗ Scaled Site Plan or Master Development Plan and related drawings (10 copies, 24” x 36” folded)

Master Development Plans should include general building and parking locations, as well as design requirements for buildings, landscaping, lighting, and signage.

✗ Copy of the original approved Site Plan or Master Development Plan (for amendments only) (1 copy, 24” x 36”)

✗ Site Plan or Master Development Plan and related drawings reduced to 8.5” x 11” format (1 copy)

N/A Landfill disclosure statement per IDO Section 14-16-5-2(G) if site is within a designated landfill buffer zone

☐ VARIANCE – EPC

— In addition to the above requirements for the Site Plan – EPC or Master Development Plan the proposed variance request is related to, please describe, explain, and justify the variance per the criteria in IDO Section 14-16-6-6(M)(3).

Note: Any variance request from IDO Standards in Sections 14-16-5-3 (Access and Connectivity), 14-16-5-4 (Subdivision of Land), 14-16-5-5 (Parking and Loading), or DPM standards shall only be granted by the DRB per IDO Section 14-16-6-6(L) See Form V.

I, the applicant or agent, acknowledge that if any required information is not submitted with this application, the application will not be scheduled for a public meeting or hearing, if required, or otherwise processed until it is complete.

Signature: _____________________________ Date: 5/28/20

Printed Name: James K. Strozier, FAICP ☐ Applicant or ☒ Agent

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Case Numbers: Project Number:

Staff Signature: _____________________________ Date: _____________________________

Revised 2/6/19
April 15, 2020

Mr. Dan Serrano, Chair
Environmental Planning Commission
City of Albuquerque
Planning Department
600 Second Street NW
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87102

RE: Andalucía Senior Housing Site Plan and Related Applications

Dear Mr. Serrano:

The purpose of this letter is to authorize Consensus Planning, Isaacson & Arfman, and Meeks and Partners to act as our agents for approval of a Site Plan – EPC and related applications for a multi-family development on the below referenced property.

Legal Description: Tract 4, North Andalucía at La Luz, containing 7.7061 acres

Silver Leaf Ventures, LLC is the owner of the property and Greystar is the contract purchaser. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Nic Whittaker
Senior Director
Development
Greystar
April 15, 2020

Mr. Dan Serrano, Chair
Environmental Planning Commission
City of Albuquerque
Planning Department
600 Second Street NW
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87102

RE: Andalucía Senior Housing Site Plan and Related Applications

Dear Mr. Serrano:

The purpose of this letter is to authorize Greystar, Consensus Planning, Isaacson & Arfman, and Meeks and Partners for approval of a Site Plan – EPC and related applications for a multi-family development on the below referenced property.

Legal Description: Tract 4, North Andalucía at La Luz, containing 7.7061 acres

Silver Leaf Ventures, LLC is the owner of the property and Greystar is the contract purchaser. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Managing Member
Silver Leaf Ventures, LLC
CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE
TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDY (TIS) FORM

APPLICANT: Greystar
DATE OF REQUEST: 05/22/20
ZONE ATLAS PAGE(S): E-12

CURRENT:

ZONING_PD

PARCEL SIZE (AC/SQ. FT.) 7.7061 acres

LEGAL DESCRIPTION:

LOT OR TRACT # Tract 4 BLOCK #

LEGAL DESCRIPTION:

SUBDIVISION NAME North Andalucia at La Luz

ADDRESS: 5301 Antequera Road NW

REQUESTED CITY ACTION(S):

ANNEXATION [ ]

ZONE CHANGE [ ]: From__________ To__________

SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN:

SECTOR, AREA, FAC, COMP PLAN [ ]

AMENDMENT (Map/Text) [ ]

AMENDMENT [X]

SUBDIVISION* [ ]

AMENDMENT [X]

BUILDING PERMIT [X]

ACCESS PERMIT [ ]

BUILDING PURPOSES [ ]

OTHER [ ]

*includes platting actions

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:

NO CONSTRUCTION/DEVELOPMENT [ ]

NEW CONSTRUCTION [X]

EXPANSION OF EXISTING DEVELOPMENT [ ]

Development of a senior age-restricted multi-family community: 158 dwelling units within a three-story apartment building with an additional 16 units contained within 8 1-story duplex cottages. An amendment is included to increase the density from 20 to ~24 dwelling units per acre for this tract to allow the proposed development to add the cottages and due to a lower density that was built on the adjacent tract (~15 units per acre).

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

APPLICANT OR REPRESENTATIVE DATE 05/22/20

(To be signed upon completion of processing by the Traffic Engineer)

Planning Department, Development & Building Services Division, Transportation Development Section - 2nd Floor West, 600 2nd St. NW, Plaza del Sol Building, City, 87102, phone 924-3994

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

THRESHOLDS MET? YES [ ] NO [X] MITIGATING REASONS FOR NOT REQUIRING TIS: PREVIOUSLY STUDIED: [ ]

Notes:

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 5/22/2020

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
DATE: April 24, 2020

SUBJECT: Albuquerque Archaeological Ordinance - Compliance Documentation

Case Number(s): PR-2020-003658
Agent: Consensus Planning, Inc.
Applicant: Greystar
Legal Description: Tract 4, North Andalucia at La Luz
Zoning: PD
Acreage: 7.7061
Zone Atlas Page(s): Z-E-12

CERTIFICATE OF NO EFFECT: [✓] Yes [☐] No
CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL: [☐] Yes [✓] No

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION:
Google Earth historic images

SITE VISIT: N/A

RECOMMENDATIONS:
Aerial photographs show the tract had been bladed by June 2005 and again by April 2006.
CERTIFICATE OF NO EFFECT ISSUED under 6-5(A) (3)(a) criterion 2 "The property has been disturbed through previous land use"

SUBMITTED BY:

[Signature]

Douglas H. M. Bogess, MA, RPA, Date
Senior Principal Investigator
Acting City Archaeologist
Lone Mountain Archaeological Services, Inc.

SUBMITTED TO:
Russell Brito, Planning Manager
City of Albuquerque Planning Department
The purpose of this memo is to respond to Long Range Planning’s parking comments regarding our requests for a Major Amendment to the Site Plan for North Andalucia at La Luz and a Site Plan – EPC for Tract 4, North Andalucia at La Luz. Our request was to amend the prior approval to stipulate a parking ratio of 1.25 spaces per dwelling unit for “age-restricted (55+) senior housing.” We have reviewed the comments and agree with the suggestion that we eliminate our request to amend the parking standards on the approved Site Development Plan for Subdivision.

The following is a more detailed response:
The Applicant requested a parking ratio of 1.25 spaces per dwelling unit that addresses the proposed use of the property as age-restricted senior housing. However, as Long-Range Planning pointed out in their comments, this is not a defined use in the IDO. Instead, the Long-Range comments detail how this might be considered as a combination of “Dwelling, multi-family” and “Dwelling, two-family detached (duplex)” as defined in the IDO. The approach of using “Independent Living Facility” is also suggested as a possibility, though discouraged. We have reviewed these comments and agree with them.

Further, the Long-Range comments identify an ambiguity as to whether the EPC is given the authority to approve a change to the parking requirement due to language in the IDO limiting review of Parking and Loading Standards to the Development Review Board, or whether the EPC can adjust them in the PD zone through the Site Plan process. By withdrawing the requested amendment, this issue can be addressed through another avenue.

Based on these comments and without overanalyzing the different ways to amend the plan and calculate the parking requirement, the Applicant requests withdrawal of the request to amend the parking standards contained in the prior approval. Instead, the proposed development will utilize the existing requirement for “multi-family residential development” shown on the prior approval while applying the 30 percent transit parking reduction afforded this property under the IDO. There is a bus stop located adjacent to this property in front of the credit union to the south with a combination of bus routes that meet the peak hour frequency requirement in the IDO (see Figure 1).
The existing parking requirements are based on the old Comprehensive Zoning Code and are determined by a combination of the square footage of dwelling units within the development and the number of bathrooms in each as follows:

- 1 space per bath, but not less than 2 spaces
- 1 space per bath for dwellings with less than 1,000 square feet of net leasable area, but not less than 1.5 spaces

The proposed Site Plan shows unit sizes and can be easily updated to reflect the number of bathrooms for each unit. All Type A units except Type A4 are less than 1,000 square feet net leasable area and are one-bath units; Type A4 has 1.5 baths; all Type B units are two-bath units; and the cottages have 2.5 baths. Based on those numbers, the following are the parking requirements for this project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Type</th>
<th>Number of Units</th>
<th>Parking Ratio</th>
<th>Parking Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Bathroom</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>1.5 spaces per unit</td>
<td>175 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 and 2 Bathrooms</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2 spaces per unit</td>
<td>76 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Bathrooms</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.5 spaces per unit</td>
<td>40 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Parking Required</td>
<td>291 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maximum Parking Allowed (Required + 10%)</td>
<td>320 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30% Transit Reduction</td>
<td>87 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum Parking Allowed</td>
<td>204 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Parking Provided</td>
<td>235 spaces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the above, the proposed project meets the existing parking requirements, and we respectfully request approval as such. It would be appropriate to add a condition of approval to add this table to the Site Plan prior to sign-off by the DRB.

Thank you for your work and analysis of this project and coordination with the other City agencies.
June 30, 2020

Dan Serrano, Chairman
Environmental Planning Commission
City of Albuquerque
600 Second Street NW
Albuquerque, NM 87102

Re: Request for Approval of a Site Plan – EPC and Major Amendment to a Prior Approval

Dear Mr. Chairman:

The purpose of this letter is to request approval of an amendment to the existing Site Development Plan for Subdivision for North Andalucia at La Luz (“prior approval”), as well as approval of a Site Plan for a senior, age-restricted multi-family development. The property contained within the prior approval is legally described as Tracts 1 thru 4, 5-A, 5-B, and 6, Plat of North Andalucia at La Luz, containing approximately 69.6 acres. The proposed amendment and Site Plan will facilitate the development of senior independent living on Tract 4, North Andalucia at La Luz, containing 7.7061 acres (“subject site”). North Andalucia at La Luz is located on the east side of Coors Boulevard NW, south of Montano Road NW. The subject site is within the larger North Andalucia at La Luz development located on Antequera Road NW south of Mirandela Street NW. Coors Boulevard forms the western edge of the subject site (Figure 1).

Figure 1. Site vicinity map showing overall area of prior approval (blue) and subject site (red) for the proposed senior, age-restricted multi-family development.
PROJECT CONTEXT

History
North Andalucia at La Luz and the surrounding properties have a long zoning history with several site plan approvals and amendments. A brief summary is as follows:

1985 (AX-85-1): Annexation and establishment of mixed-use zoning for a portion of the property, by request of the City.

2001 (1000965; 00128-01743): Annexation and establishment of zoning for an additional 85 acres and Site Plan for Subdivision approval for 229 acres from Montano Road on the north to Namaste Road/La Bienvenida Place NW on the south.

2003 (1000965; 02EPC-01769/01770/01771) Zoning and Site Plan approval, including amendment to Site Plan for Subdivision to carve out the Montano Open Space trailhead.

2003 (1000965; 03EPC-01105) Approval of a Zone Map Amendment to allow for density transfers for the various tracts covered by the Site Plan for Subdivision and for Tract 1 to be replatted into five separate tracts for phased subdivision development.

2005 (1003859; 04EPC-01845): Approval of a new Site Plan for Subdivision for North Andalucia at La Luz (the prior approval for this request), separating it from the larger plan. This was done in conjunction with approval of the Shopping Center located on Tracts 2 and 3.

2006 (1004473): The Site Plan for Andalucia Villas apartments is approved for Tracts 4 and 6 on both sides of Antequera Road.

2007 (1003859): The prior approval was amended administratively to revise the intersection of Learning Road and Antequera Road into a round-a-bout.

2008 (1003859; 08EPC-40055): The prior approval was amended to remove Tracts 7, 8, & 9 from the Site Plan and consolidate them into the separate Bosque School Site Development Plan.

2012 (1003859; 11EPC-40074): The prior approval was amended to subdivide Tract 5 into two tracts, 5-A and 5-B, and amend the zoning to allow a Bank with Drive-Up Service window.

2012 (1004473): The Andalucia Villas Site Plan is amended to lower its density to 15 dwelling units per acre and consolidate all development to Tract 6. Tract 4 left undeveloped.

2017 (1003859; 17EPC-40052): The prior approval was amended to remove a restriction on letter height for building-mounted signs.
Existing Conditions and Land Use

North Andalucia and the subject property are located within the West Mesa Community Planning Area near the intersection of Coors Boulevard and Montano Road, which are both designated as Major Transit Corridors by the Albuquerque/Bernalillo County Comprehensive Plan. ABQ Ride Routes 96, 155, and 790 Rapid Ride are on Coors with stops adjacent to the subject site just north of the Coors Boulevard and Dellyne Avenue/Bosque School Road intersection. Routes 157 and 162 travel along Montano Road with stops located between Coors Boulevard and Mirandela Street/Winterhaven Road.

The northern half of North Andalucia (north of Mirandela Street) is part of the Coors/Montano Village Activity Center and the entirety of the prior approvals, including the subject site, is considered an Area of Change.

The area surrounding the subject site includes a wide variety of land uses. These land uses are both part of the prior approval and on other properties in the vicinity. North of the subject site within North Andalucia is a recently completed shopping center including a Sprouts grocery store, PetSmart, a veterinary hospital, several restaurants, a brewery taproom, and other retail uses. Farther north outside of North Andalucia are a Walgreens and more shopping center uses. To the east are the Andalucia Villas apartments and Bosque School. Beyond that is the Bosque and Rio Grande. To the west across Coors Boulevard are the Taylor Ranch Luxury Apartments and numerous single-family residential subdivisions with a variety of lot sizes. Immediately south of the subject site within North Andalucia is a U.S. Eagle Credit Union. Beyond that is vacant land zoned for single-family residential, the La Luz development, and private open space.

Figure 2. Land use context with overall area of prior approval in blue and subject site in red.
Zoning

The subject site and surrounding tracts are zoned PD: Planned Development based on a former zoning designation of SU-1 for C-2, O-1 uses, and PRD (20 DU/AC) as designated in the prior approval. Tract 4 is specifically designated as “PRD Uses – 20 du/ac.” The subject site is also located within the Coors Corridor Character Protection and View Protections Overlay Zones (CPO-2 and VPO-1).

The Andalucia Villas, located on Tract 6, are also designated for “PRD Uses – 20 du/ac;” however, they were built at a lower density of approximately 15 dwelling units per acre. The U.S. Eagle Credit Union property was converted to MX-T: Mixed-use Transition Zone under the IDO due to the specific bank use identified by the prior approval and built on the property. Outside of the prior approval, the Bosque School is zoned a combination of PD and R-MH; La Luz and other single-family subdivisions are R-T, R-1A, and R-1C; private open space to the south is NR-PO-C; Taylor Ranch Luxury Apartments are R-ML; and surrounding commercial uses are a combination of MX-T and MX-M.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1. Surrounding Zoning &amp; Land Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NORTH</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EAST</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOUTH</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WEST</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3. Existing zoning with overall area of prior approval in blue and subject site in red.
SUMMARY OF REQUEST

The Applicant, Greystar, is requesting approval of the following two requests:

1. A Major Amendment to the Site Plan for Subdivision and related design standards (prior approval) to increase the allowable density on Tract 4 from 20 dwelling units per acre to 24 dwelling units per acre and create a lower parking requirement specific to age-restricted, senior independent living multi-family uses.

2. A Site Plan – EPC for the subject site in accordance with the underlying PD zoning to allow for development of a senior, age-restricted multi-family development.

The Site Plan for Subdivision and development standards predate the IDO and are considered a prior approval. Amendments of Prior Approvals are considered in accordance with IDO Section 14-16-6-4(Y). The requested amendments regarding density and parking are Major Amendments to the prior approval due to going beyond the 10 percent threshold generally allowed by the IDO for numerical standards. As Major Amendments, the approval process is by the IDO procedure for the closest-equivalent approval by the original decision-making body – in this case a Site Plan – EPC.

While these two changes to the development standards constitute a Major Amendment to the prior approval, it is important to note that they are consistent with the IDO requirements for similar development in Albuquerque. The IDO does not directly regulate the density of developments, but rather utilizes a set of performance standards to determine the allowable density and number of dwelling units on a site. Parking, landscaping, usable open space, and building height regulations limit the buildable area, effectively creating a de facto cap on densities. This is especially true of the subject site, which is located within the Coors Corridor View Protection Overlay Zone (VPO-1) and its narrowly tailored height, bulk, and massing requirements. Instead of requesting a complete elimination of the cap or removal of the cap for Tract 4, the Applicant is only proposing a slight increase commensurate with the lessor intensity that was built on the adjacent tract such that the overall dwelling count contemplated by the original approval stays intact.

At 20 dwelling units per acre, Tracts 4 and 6 combined would allow for approximately 450+ dwelling units. 240 units were built on Tract 6, thus approximately 210+ units could be available to be built on Tract 4, density limits notwithstanding. The Applicant is requesting an allowance for 24 dwelling units per acre on Tract 4, which amounts to approximately 185 units and the accompanying Site Plan – EPC currently shows 171.

The 171 units within the proposed senior apartment project include 155 dwelling units within a 3-story building with common spaces and a courtyard with pool. 16 additional dwellings are contained within 8 duplex “cottages” toward the northern end of the site. The 171 dwelling units requested have a density of approximately 22.6 dwelling units per acre, which is consistent with the requested change to the development standard from the prior approval. It is also important to note that the additional units will allow the construction of the 16 single-story, duplex-style apartments on the site. The main building alone, containing 155 dwelling units, is otherwise approximately 20 dwelling units per acre.

The Applicant also believes that the change to the parking standards is consistent with the IDO’s updated standards that generally reduced parking requirements City-wide. No changes are proposed to the typical parking requirements for multi-family development shown on the Site Plan for Subdivision, which were based on the old Comprehensive Zoning.
Code. Instead, the Applicant is proposing to add a new parking requirement of 1.25 spaces per dwelling unit for the proposed age-restricted senior housing differentiated from other multi-family developments. This unique use under the PD zone district deserves its own parking standard. Elderly residents will drive less and own cars at a lower rate than younger families do. The requested parking ratio is halfway between the IDO requirement for multi-family apartments (1.5 spaces per unit) and independent living (1 space per unit).

JUSTIFICATION
Both Site Plan – EPC requests comply with the criteria outlined in IDO Section 14-16-6-6(H)(3) as follows:

6-6(H)(3)(a) The Site Plan is consistent with the ABC Comp Plan, as amended.

**Applicant Response:** The two Site Plans are consistent with the Comp Plan by furthering the following Goals and Policies:

Comprehensive Plan Goals and Policies (responses in italics):

**Goal 5.1 Centers & Corridors:** Grow as a community of strong Centers connected by a multi-modal network of Corridors.

**Policy 5.1.1 Desired Growth:** Capture regional growth in Centers and Corridors to help shape the built environment into a sustainable development pattern.
  a) Create walkable places that provide opportunities to live, work, learn, shop, and play.
  g) Encourage residential infill in neighborhoods adjacent to Centers and Corridors to support transit ridership.

**Policy 5.1.6 Activity Centers:** Foster mixed-use centers of activity with a range of services and amenities that support healthy lifestyles and meet the needs of nearby residents and businesses.
  a) Incorporate a compatible mix of commercial and residential uses with a range of higher-density housing types.

**Policy 5.1.10 Major Transit Corridors:** Foster corridors that prioritize high-frequency transit service with pedestrian-oriented development.
  a) Encourage higher-density residential developments within ¼ mile of transit stops or stations.

**Applicant Response:** The proposed amendment to the design standards and associated Site Plan – EPC allows for greater residential infill development adjacent to Coors Boulevard, a designated Corridor, and the Coors/Montano Village Activity Center. Greater densities and lower parking requirements support transit ridership and the new residents will be able to walk to nearby commercial retail and services and have access to an extensive pedestrian and bicycle trail network. Tracts 4 and 6 have long been planned for residential development and these requests maintain the original intent to provide a significant number of dwellings that will support the neighboring commercial developments. New residents will be able to walk to the grocery store, several restaurants and other services, to
trails within the Bosque open space along the Rio Grande and have access to frequent transit connecting north to the Cottonwood Mall area and south to Downtown.

Goal 5.2 Complete Communities: Foster communities where residents can live, work, learn, shop, and play together.

Policy 5.2.1 Land Uses: Create healthy, sustainable, and distinct communities with a mix of uses that are conveniently accessible from surrounding neighborhoods.
   b) Encourage development that offers choice in transportation, work areas, and lifestyles.
   d) Encourage development that broadens housing options to meet a range of incomes and lifestyles.

**Applicant Response:** The requests add to the existing mixed-use character of North Andalucia at La Luz. Approval of the requested senior, age-restricted multi-family development encourages a new housing option for active seniors near shopping, dining, and recreational opportunities. This location also offers a choice in transportation options including transit on both Coors Boulevard and Montano Road as well as walking and bicycling on nearby trails.

Goal 5.3 Efficient Development Patterns: Promote development patterns that maximize the utility of existing infrastructure and public facilities and the efficient use of land to support the public good.

Policy 5.3.1 Infill Development: Support additional growth in areas with existing infrastructure and public facilities.

**Applicant Response:** The requests further this goal and policy by facilitating development of an infill property with existing development in all directions and infrastructure installed and available for use. This development provides for additional growth in an area with existing roadways, transit service, grocery stores, recreational trails, and utilities among other public facilities and amenities.

Goal 5.6 City Development Areas: Encourage and direct growth to Areas of Change where it is expected and desired and ensure that development in and near Areas of Consistency reinforces the character and intensity of the surrounding area.

Policy 5.6.2 Areas of Change: Direct growth and more intense development to Centers, Corridors, industrial and business parks, and Metropolitan Redevelopment Areas where change is encouraged.
   c) Foster a range of housing options at various densities according to each Center or Corridor type.
   d) Encourage higher-density housing and mixed-use development as appropriate land uses that support transit and commercial and retail uses.

**Applicant Response:** The requests will facilitate additional housing at a variety of densities within an Area of Change. The proposed development includes dwelling units within a traditional multi-family building, as well as single-story duplex-style apartments that add to the overall density while maintaining a view corridor and offering an alternative to a larger...
singular building on the property. This combination of housing types is accomplished by the slight increase in density requested in the amended Site Plan for Subdivision from 20 dwelling units per acre to 24 dwelling units per acre. Higher density housing in this location supports the transit available on the surrounding roadways and supports the commercial and retail uses immediately north of the subject site as well as at the other corners of the Coors Boulevard and Montano Road intersection.

Goal 7.2 Pedestrian-Accessible Design: Increase walkability in all environments, promote pedestrian-oriented development in urban contexts, and increase pedestrian safety in auto-oriented contexts.

Policy 7.2.1 Walkability: Ensure convenient and comfortable pedestrian travel.
   a) Improve the pedestrian environment through coordinated design of subdivisions, streets, development sites, and buildings.
   e) Promote trees and landscape elements in the public right-of-way, along trails, and within private development to ensure a high-quality, pleasant, and healthy built environment.

Applicant Response: The proposed development includes numerous trees along Antequera Road and Coors Boulevard, which will help improve the pedestrian environment between La Luz to the south and the shopping centers to the north. Trees located between the sidewalk and travel-way also provide protection to pedestrians and traffic calming effects along Antequera, which neighboring residents expressed as a desire during a pre-application facilitated meeting. Additionally, in response to requests by neighbors, the buildings have been located adjacent to Antequera to create a strong street edge to add to the pedestrian realm.

Goal 7.4 Context-Sensitive Parking: Design parking facilities to match the development context and complement the surrounding built environment.

Policy 7.4.2 Parking Requirements: Establish off-street parking requirements based on development context.
   a) Discourage oversized parking facilities.

Applicant Response: The proposed amendment to parking requirements directly affects the provision of parking. By allowing a smaller parking ratio for the unique use proposed on Tract 4, this plan will discourage oversized parking facilities. The parking requirement is narrowly tailored to this use and the development context of this PD-zoned property that has a variety of housing types, densities, and commercial uses and intensities near each other. Located at the intersection of two Major Transit Corridors, this area is also an opportune area to relax parking to promote transit ridership on the west side of Albuquerque.

Goal 9.1 Supply: Ensure a sufficient supply and range of high-quality housing types that meet current and future needs at a variety of price levels to ensure more balanced housing options
Policy 9.1.1 Housing Options: Support the development, improvement, and conservation of housing for a variety of income levels and types of residents and households.

  e) Provide for the development of quality housing for elderly residents.

  i) Provide for the development of multi-family housing close to public services, transit, and shopping.

Applicant Response: The requested Site Plans directly respond to a need identified in these policies for quality housing for elderly residents. Table 1 below provides population characteristics by age cohort for the City of Albuquerque between 1980 and 2016, which were obtained from the U.S. Census Bureau. This shows an increase in median age with the largest percentage increase shown for those residents between 65 and 85+ years of age. This housing will be located near shopping and services along two Major Transit Corridors, which will relieve development pressures at the urban edge.

| TABLE 1: CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS, 1980-2016 |
|-----------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------------------|
| Total Population| 331,767| 384,736| 448,607| 545,852| 556,859| 40%               |
| 0-14 Years      | 22%   | 21%   | 20%   | 20%   | 20%   | -14%              |
| 15-24 Years     | 20%   | 15%   | 15%   | 15%   | 13%   | -52%              |
| 25-44 Years     | 31%   | 35%   | 31%   | 28%   | 29%   | -7%               |
| 45-64 Years     | 18%   | 18%   | 22%   | 25%   | 25%   | 26%               |
| 65-85+ Years    | 8%    | 11%   | 12%   | 12%   | 14%   | 39%               |
| Median Age      | 28.5  | 32.4  | 34.9  | 35.1  | 36.0  | 21%               |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, SF1 100%.

Goal 9.3 Density: Support increased housing density in appropriate places with adequate services and amenities.

Policy 9.3.1 Centers & Corridors: Encourage higher density, multi-unit housing and mixed-use development in Downtown, Urban, Activity, and Village Centers, and along Premium and Major Transit Corridors to capture growth, relieve development pressure at the edge of the urban footprint, and maintain low densities in rural areas.

Applicant Response: The requests to increase density and provide for the proposed senior, age-restricted multi-family development is particularly appropriate at the proposed location. Located abutting an Activity Center and along two Major Transit Corridors this increased density will provide quality housing that will capture growth within the existing urban footprint and relieve development pressures at the urban edge.

6-6(H)(3)(b) The Site Plan is consistent with any applicable terms and conditions in any previously approved NR-SU or PD zoning covering the property and any related development agreements and/or regulations.

Applicant Response: With the proposed amendments that are concurrently under review, the proposed development complies with the development regulations from the underlying PD zoning based on the prior approval.
6-6(H)(3)(c) The Site Plan is consistent with all applicable provisions of this IDO, the DPM, other adopted City regulations, and any terms and conditions specifically applied to the development of the property in a prior permit or approval affecting the property.

**Applicant Response:** The proposed development complies with the applicable provisions of the IDO for the closest zone district for the proposed use, as well as the North Andalucia at La Luz Site Plan for Subdivision design standards, which supersede the equivalent IDO standards. The Applicant is requesting approval of an amendment to those standards that will replace other standards to allow for the requested density and parking.

6-6(H)(3)(d) The City’s existing infrastructure and public improvements, including but not limited to its street, trail, drainage, and sidewalk systems, have adequate capacity to serve the proposed development, and any burdens on those systems have been mitigated to the extent practicable.

**Applicant Response:** The City’s existing infrastructure has adequate capacity for the proposed development. As a site with a prior approval, the subject site has been studied along with the rest of the North Andalucia development to ensure enough capacity for streets, utility infrastructure, and drainage. There is an approved Drainage Study for this area and a Grading and Drainage plan specific to this development must be reviewed and approved by Hydrology as part of this Site Plan request. Transportation Development has reviewed the proposed number of dwelling units and determined that a traffic study is not required because the site does not meet the City’s thresholds for peak hour trips. The Applicant will install sidewalk along all property boundaries as required by Transportation staff. A Water and Sewer Availability Statement request and Fire Marshal approval will be completed prior to issuance of a building permit for construction of the development. These numerous approvals and reviewing agencies will ensure that any burdens are mitigated to the extent practicable.

6-6(H)(3)(e) The application mitigates any significant adverse impacts on the surrounding area to the maximum extent practicable.

**Applicant Response:** In response to neighborhood comments at a pre-application facilitated meeting, the Applicant has redesigned the site to further enhance the pedestrian realm along Antequera Road by minimizing the amount of parking and increasing the street edge formed by the building and complemented by a robust landscaping plan. The Site Plan is also compliant with the Coors Corridor View Protection Overlay Zone (VPO-1) requirements for building height, bulk, and massing and the Applicant has sought to preserve the spirit of the IDO by placing the larger building farther back on the property with smaller single-story garages closer to Coors, as well as placing all of the single-story duplex-style apartments in a cluster in order to create an expansive view corridor to the Sandia Mountains that also takes advantage of the Mirandela Street corridor. Earth tones have been used on the building facades to integrate the proposed development more closely with La Luz and other surrounding developments.
CONCLUSION

Based on all the information provided, on behalf of Greystar, we respectfully request approval of the Major Amendment to the existing Site Plan for Subdivision and the proposed Site Plan – EPC for development of a 171-unit senior, age-restricted multi-family development.

Sincerely,

James K. Strozier, FAICP
Principal
PRE-APPLICATION REVIEW TEAM (PRT) MEETING NOTES

PA# 20-065          Date: 3/9/20          Time: 1 pm

Address: 5301 Antequera Rd SW

AGENCY REPRESENTATIVES AT MEETING:
Planning: Linda Kemp
Code Enforcement: Carl Garcia, Charles Maestas
Fire Marshall: 
Transportation: 
Other: 

PRT DISCUSSIONS ARE FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES ONLY!
THEY ARE NON-BINDING AND DO NOT CONSTITUTE ANY KIND OF APPROVAL.
Additional research may be necessary to determine the exact type of application and/or process needed.
Factors unknown at this time and/or thought of as minor could become significant as the case progresses.

REQUEST: 55+ active adult apartment community at approx. 23 dwelling units per acre.

SITE INFORMATION:
Zone: PD          Size: 7.7 acres
Use: Multifamily  Overlay Zone: VPD-1, CPO-2
Comp Plan Area Of: Chang  Comp Plan Corridor: Major Transit
Comp Plan Center:      MPOS or Sensitive Lands: 
Parking: 5-5, 225     MR Area: 
Landscaping: 5-10    Street Trees: 5-6CDY(1)
Use Specific Standards: Table 4-2-1
Dimensional Standards: 5-1

*Neighborhood Organization/s: Westside Coalition, La Luz NA, Taylor Ranch*

*This is preliminary information only. Neighborhood Organization information is only accurate when obtained from the Office of Neighborhood Coordination (ONC) at www.cabq.gov/neighborhoods/resources.

PROCESS:
Type of Action: 6-4(8) Major Amendment, 6-6(4) Site Plan EPC
Review and Approval Body: EPC  is this PRT a requirement? Yes
# PRE-APPLICATION REVIEW TEAM (PRT) MEETING NOTES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PA#</th>
<th>20-065</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>3/7/20</th>
<th>Time:</th>
<th>1 p.m.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
<td>5301 Antequera Rd NW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES:**
- Old SU-1 SBS has design standards/research get a copy of SIR plan.
- New PD Zone. 2-6(4), p. 53
- Amend text of SIR plan to change text that limits density to 20 dwelling units/acre.
- Process
  - Major amendment - 6-4(4) Amendments of Prior Approvals, p. 368
  - SIR Plan - EPC 6-6(4), p. 391
    - increase density - change language show what you're building
- Provide view demonstration per VPD
- Cross - Major Transit
  - Area of Change
    - VPD-1 - 3-6(3) Cierro Blvd. VPD-1, p. 121
    - CPO-2 - 3-4(6) Cierro Blvd. CPO-2, p. 70
- Propound height - 3 stories
- To do - follow up at the counter re VPD-1
  - Carl will bring in a planner 924-3838 Carl Garcia
STAFF INFORMATION
Hi Jim,

I am concerned about the view field drawing submitted and all the foreground it shows. That was not appearing in the two previous analyses. I would like to have another view field submitted that shows the bottom plane similar to the ones previously reviewed. Without that I cannot make a proper determination of mass compliance.

Thanks.

Leslie Najj
senior planner, landmarks commission
505.924.3927
lnajj@cabq.gov
cabq.gov/planning
Hi Jim,

As things stand now, we may be looking for a deferral on this project because of the view field and Long-Range comments concerning parking as listed on the drawings.

Concerning the latter, it is believed that the plans should refer to parking standards as currently approved and not as requested. Or both can be present but just referring to the requested as a number the design is exceeding is problematic. I had also requested additional comp plan justification which I am still waiting for.

In addition, the view field as submitted is very different from previous submittals. I believe it requires some adjusting before it can be properly analyzed. I will be working on this all evening if you can get the information requested to me tonight. Otherwise we may be requesting deferral.

Thanks.

ONE ALBUQUERQUE

LESLIE NAJI

senior planner,
landmarks commission
505.924.3927
lnaji@cabq.gov
NEIGHBORHOOD MEETING
CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE
LAND USE FACILITATION PROGRAM
PROJECT MEETING REPORT

Project Number: N/A: Pre-Application Meeting
Property Description: Tract 4, North Andalucia at La Luz, addressed as 5302 Antequera Rd NW, Albuquerque, NM 87120
Date Submitted: April 24, 2020
Submitted by: Jessie Lawrence
Meeting Date and Time: April 22, 2020, 5:30pm – 7:30pm
Meeting Location: Online via Zoom
Facilitator: Jessie Lawrence
Co-facilitator: Leslie R. Kryder

Parties:
• Applicant:
  o Greystar
• Agent:
  o Consensus Planning
• Affected Neighborhood Associations (per City of Albuquerque notification requirements):
  o La Luz Landowners Association
  o Taylor Ranch Neighborhood Association
  o Westside Coalition of Neighborhood Associations

Background/Meeting Summary:
This was a pre-application meeting for a project being planned at 5302 Antequera Rd, NW. It is designed as an age-restricted, senior, independent living community with no care facilities. One hundred fifty-five units are contemplated on a 7.7-acre site, resulting in between 23 du/ac and 24 du/ac. The developer plans to request a variance to allow the density to exceed the approved maximum of 20 du/ac. The property is zoned PD – Planned Development.

Neighbors’ primary concerns are density, preservation of views along Coors Blvd., and integration of this facility with the surrounding neighborhood and in particular along Antequera Rd. Other concerns including the planned landscaping and green space and the lighting and protection of the night sky. Requests for changes and additional considerations included:
1. Evaluation of the 3-story design as it affects views along Coors Blvd.
2. Evaluation of additional sight lines vis-à-vis view obstruction.
3. Landscape design:
   a. Protecting walkability along Antequera Rd.
   b. Additional landscaping areas on site.
   c. Landscaping along Coors Blvd for view preservation and to meet intent of street tree ordinance.
4. Further evaluation of the “edge” of the property along Mirandela St.
5. Design lighting to ensure that lights are pointed downward and not shining into neighboring properties.
6. Enhance integration of the property colors with the surrounding community by using sand and earth tones for buildings rather than white.
The agent stated that they would consider the concerns as the plan is developed and refined. Updated design documents will be made available to interested neighbors at the time the application is submitted to the City. Neighborhood associations can request another facilitated meeting after the application is submitted.

Outcomes:

- **Areas of Agreement:**
  - The developer and neighbors agree in principle that the development should integrate into the surrounding neighborhood and enhance walkability, especially along the Antequera Rd. perimeter.

- **Unresolved Issues and Concerns:**
  - Neighbors are especially concerned about potential obstruction of views along Coors Blvd. due to height and length of proposed 3-story building. Neighbors feel that although the design may meet the letter of the Integrated Development Ordinance (IDO), it violates the spirit of it, and that at a number of points along Coors Blvd, the proposed design would block views of the Sandia Mountains.
  - Neighbors object to a density higher than 20 un/ac as provided by the previous approval for this site. The developer is requesting a density between 23 un/ac and 24 un/ac.

Meeting Specifics:

1. **Introduction and Project Summary:**
   a. This is a pre-application meeting.
   b. Jim Strozier of Consensus Planning, Project Agent, introduced the rest of the project team:
      i. Nic Whittaker with Greystar, the developer
      ii. Michael Vos, Katie Paquette, and Chris Green with Consensus Planning
      iii. Ryan Meeks and Eric Cody with Meeks & Partners, the architect
      iv. Fred Arfman with Isaacson & Arfman, the civil engineer
   c. Agent: This is proposed as an age-restricted senior independent living community with no care facilities.
      i. There will be 155 units.
      ii. Site is 7.7 acres.
      iii. Nic Whittaker, Applicant: With the senior housing, it’s a bit different than the usual apartment complex. For example, it’s important to have elevators. This plan has 3 elevators. An elevator for 2 floors is inefficient, hence we went with 3 stories.
         1. We have a similar project on Paseo del Norte, with 4 stories. Different zoning there, but a good example of the type of product.
         2. We’ve gone with a flat roof to limit building height.
         3. It’s independent living, but our model is a little different. Independent living is typically a costly model because of higher level of service, meals, housekeeping, etc. Here, it’s age-restricted apartments. The cost is about half of typical independent living.
         4. The cottages mixed in give some the opportunity for something similar to a single family dwelling situation.
5. We call this line of apartments “Overture.” You can visit our website for more details.

d. Agent displayed several drawings as he described the project:
   i. East elevation:
      1. Shows a view of the main building toward Coors Blvd. from Antequera Rd.
      2. Displays main entry and single-story clubhouse.
      3. The main building is 3 stories high with a flat roof.
      4. Tallest portion of the building is behind the clubhouse.

   ii. Site plan:
      1. [The right-hand side of the drawing is roughly due North and will be called North for purposes of convenience in this report. Similarly, along Antequera Rd. will be considered East, and so forth.]
      2. On this drawing, Coors Blvd is at the top, on the right is Mirandela St, and at the bottom is Antequera Rd.
      3. The main building is in the NE corner of the lot.
      4. To the South side are the cottages, which are 1-story apartment units.
      5. To the South of the project (next lot) is a credit union.
      6. Along Coors there is a row of 1-story garages.
         a. These are placed in the 35’ setback along Coors Blvd.
         b. The setback will be a combination of retaining walls and landscaping.
         c. The setback is significantly below Coors Blvd elevation, helping to preserve views.
      7. The main amenities and pool are in the central courtyard of the main building.
      8. There will be a dog park on the NE corner of the lot.
      9. To the south of the main building will be a parking lot.
     10. The main entry to the complex is from Antequera Rd.; there is no access directly from Coors Blvd or Mirandela St.
     11. Note that there is a significant grade change along Coors, which the design takes into account as much as possible.

   iii. Preliminary elevations:
      1. Elevation #1 shows the view from the East side.
      2. Starting at the left you see the clubhouse with the taller building behind it.
      3. Moving right is moving northward.
      4. Elevation #2 shows the view from Mirandela St.
         a. Bottom is north elevation.
         b. Top is south elevation, view from credit union property.

   iv. View frame:
      1. This is a color-coded site plan.
         b. Pink – main building, apartments, 3 stories, nearly 39’ down to 36’.
      2. The sight line goes through the tallest part of building at a 45 degree angle. This defines the view frame.
3. Diagrams (on right of page and below):
   a. Top – sight line – shows relationship between top of building and top of ridge line of Sandia Mountains.
   b. Building does not cover top of ridge.
   c. View plane section – depicts allowable height relative to 2/3 - 1/3 rule.
      i. According to specifications, if the finished elevation is more than 10’ below Coors Blvd, then 1/3 of building can penetrate above the view plane.
      ii. This building is 24% above view plane, which is within tolerance.

4. View frame at sight line A:
   a. Colored picture is the view plane.
   b. The blue box is the “frame” showing allowable building space.
      i. Buildings are not allowed to exceed the Sandia Mountains ridge line.
      ii. Buildings cannot block more than 50% of view plane area.
   c. This plan is at 48%, which is within tolerance.

2. Questions and Concerns about Density, Height, and Views:
   a. Participant (P): Can you please explain the proposed density for the site? Density is one of the biggest concerns of neighbors and the main change being requested.
      i. Agent: The multi-family portion was originally limited to 20 units/acre (un/ac).
         1. The developer requests an amendment to allow up to between 23 and 24 un/ac.
         2. Main building has 155 apartments which comes to 20 un/ac; the 20 cottages bring the site total to 175 units or almost 24 un/ac.
         3. The property to the East, Andalucia Villas Project, has under 20 un/ac.
   b. P: According to the letter you sent out there will be 15 un/ac. Does this refer to Andalucia Villas? It asks to go to 20 un/ac. I also notice that Andalucia Villas is 2 stories high, not 3. Why is this one proposed at 3 stories in the view corridor?
      i. Agent: For senior projects, typically, the goal is to create a smaller building footprint, but taller building, compared to non-age-restrictive projects like the Andalucia Villas.
         1. The Villas was at less density than the maximum; with this project we are asking to go over.
      ii. Ryan Meeks, Architect: Relative to site density, we do 10-15 projects similar to this each year nationwide. On this site, there’s a lot of elbow room compared to lots of other projects. Lots of perimeter space and islands in the parking. Also the dog park buffer and Coors Blvd. buffer. I really believe this will sing with the landscape.
   c. P: How far below the grade of Coors Blvd. is this site?
      i. Architect: The high point of Coors Blvd. is more than 20’ higher than the base of our building.
      ii. Agent: The base is about 24’ below.
      iii. Architect: The top of the building is only about 12’ above Coors Blvd. What we’re trying to do is excavate the site from low point and create a nice environment on Antequera Rd. I think it’s a win-win from a site development
standpoint. Coors Blvd. does drop, so the building extends upward more and more as you travel along Coors Blvd.

1. To reduce the buildings to 2 or 1 story doesn’t work. The alternative to perimeter parking is a parking lot at one end of the lot, which is not workable for older residents.

2. I believe we have some surplus parking spots that could potentially be converted to landscaping.

iv. P: You’re saying you’re 24’ below Coors Blvd.?
   1. Architect: Yes, at the high point.

v. P: And the buildings will stick up 11 to 15’ above view plane?
   1. Agent: It’s a little less than 10’ above the view plane.

d. P: You want to go higher than 20 un/ac on this project. I recommend that you not exceed 20, and 15 is more appropriate. Can building heights be negotiated?
   i. Agent: It is a PD zone, and the site plan will to the Environmental Planning Commission (EPC) for approval.
   ii. P: Can we negotiate for building height at 26’? I like cottages. I’d say the building should be pushed closer to Antequera Rd.

e. P to Applicant: Did Jim tell you that views are very important to the community? We’ve been saying this for the past 2 decades. This is one of the best areas to preserve views, with the grade difference from Coors Blvd. I’m surprised you’re going to 3 stories; it’s not been done along here before. The 2-story at Andalucia Villas is perfect. This lot is closer to the road, but you’re designing with 3 stories. It doesn’t match the surrounding area. I’m wondering why we’re going up this high. Wasn’t this explained from the get go?
   i. Applicant: The importance of the views was definitely explained to us right from the start.
   ii. Agent: We started by discussing the view regulations right away. The developer commissioned a new topographic survey. We immediately started working on the grading before any other site planning. There’s a large single-story corridor along the south side of project. From view frame analysis, it helps keep the total are below 50%, and we’ve worked to make sure this design complies with requirements.

f. P: Regarding sight lines, you chose one at the highest place along Coors Blvd. As a result you get better results than you would any other place on the property. Are you planning to prepare some other sight lines? For instance, the west-most corner of the purple part. That corner is likely to be much higher in the view than the place you chose. Further north along Coors Blvd., you may find a place where the view gets completely covered. Would you please choose and present additional sight lines?
   i. Agent: We can take a look at that. Per IDO, the sight line is through the highest point of the building elevation. There’s elevators and stairwell at that location. That’s the focal point of the building. But we’ll look at that.
   ii. P: From the point-of-view of a person standing on Coors Blvd., we get a different situation. It’s about the spirit vs. the letter of the IDO. If we did a view analysis from other places along Coors Blvd., you’d find that the buildings do obstruct the view of the mountain. Can we have more adherence to the spirit of IDO?

3. Questions and Concerns about Drainage:
a. P: The agent and I talked today about drainage and grading. It’s important to establish the drainage plan first off; it determines where the floor will be. I’m wondering where we are on the drainage plan? Can that be presented very soon so view analysis can be done independently?
   i. Fred Arfman, Civil Engineer: We started from the grade of the main building, ensuring no steps are needed to comply with ADA access; then around the building to ensure waters discharge from the low point of site. We’re pretty comfortable that we’re where we need to be.
   ii. P: Right now the current finished floor is about 7’ below the contour of the land. Does that mean you will dig down 7’? How does it affect drainage?
   iii. Engineer: Yes, the floor does need to be lowered, and the dirt will be exported. Allows for storm drainage system around the building. Without this, some areas don’t have enough slope to bring water to the low point.
   iv. P: Does the IDO permit that kind of modification?
   v. Engineer: I don’t know why it wouldn’t.
   vi. Agent: The low part of the project and storm drain outfall – can you indicate how that will connect to the larger drainage system for Andalucia?
      1. Engineer: The master plan storm drains are nearby. You can see the inlets in the dog park which will be a retention pond; the majority of storm water capacity will be detention. It gets into the storm drain system to the west, where there are some ponds. The portion that will be retained is pretty minor, and protects storm water quality. The dog park at the northeast corner is the low point of site. All storm flows will be discharged from there.

4. Questions and Concerns about Architectural Style:
   a. P: The site is dense with built architecture and cars. The Albuquerque canopy requirement used to be 25%; now it’s 6%. Please comment on style of architecture. It looks like it may be too dense with buildings and cars. Where’s the softness, the natural feeling?
      i. Agent: I think it will become clearer when we get the landscape plan developed. We’ve worked on the dog park area (NE corner). Notice the terraced setback along Coors Blvd., and significant setback along Mirandela St. and at the roundabout (NE corner). We’ve tried to maximize throughout, not just the right-of-way. There will be significant landscaping along Antequera Rd and Mirandela St. and Coors Blvd. I’m hopeful that this project will raise the canopy level. We are looking at the landscape, perimeters, and pedestrian realms right now.
      ii. Architect: We’re trying to maintain southwest aesthetics, adding contemporary elements. We’re trying to keep a low profile on the buildings. Although it’s 3 stories, it’s low relative to Coors Blvd. Almost half the building is buried below Coors Blvd. We want to work with the neighbors and the city.
   b. P: I’m still concerned about the 3-story buildings. The whole point of the Coors Blvd. corridor plan, which the IDO is supposed to help maintain, was to blend the built and natural environments. It’s near our bosque. The IDO says to blend with character of the area. It sounds like a great project, but it may be in the wrong location, because it’s out of scale with the nearby buildings. At Andalucia Villas they did a great job of keeping it to 26’. Putting three stories closer to Coors Blvd. will dominate the landscape and block views. The great views give neighbors great joy. I’d like to see something built that respects those values.
5. **Questions and Concerns about Walkability:**
   a. **P:** The word that keeps coming to me is ‘enhance.’ How is this project going to enhance the neighborhood? I’m thinking about walkability of Antequera Rd. The comprehensive plan and IDO are designed to enhance walkability. It is a major pedestrian street. Will pedestrians look at an ugly parking lot? Will it be safe to walk there?
      i. **Agent:** On a site visit we walked the perimeter of the site. The idea along Antequera Rd.—still in planning stage—we will continue sidewalk and street tree configuration as on east side of Antequera Rd. Same thing along Mirandela St. As on past projects, we will try to meet intent of street tree ordinance along Coors Blvd., but also being sensitive to views.
   b. **P:** Getting back to the suggestion that the pedestrian area along Antequera Rd is really critical for neighbors. It’s between homes and the shopping area. And just a lot of people walking. [Shows a sketch with a tree-lined street along Antequera Rd. and buildings moved closer to the road.] In this approach, the building is next to the street and parking is internal. It puts life along the street. I think it would be very helpful to have a section that goes through the building and Antequera Rd. By putting the building closer to the sidewalk—15 or 20’ setback, it creates a connection between residents and pedestrians. What’s happening with Antequera Rd, is that it’s becoming a raceway—lots of traffic. It would be a plus to have the City get involved with developer to calm the traffic on Antequera Rd, perhaps with guest parking as parallel parking on the street. Maybe make the building entrance from the sidewalk, which would enliven the street. Antequera Rd is 40’ wide. Parallel parking would narrow travel way to about 24’, which would slow things down. Could reduce onsite parking requirement.
      i. **Agent:** We did take a lot of photos of existing edge of existing villas as well as commercial side along Mirabella. We will look at how to treat that edge.
      ii. **Architect:** Our building footprint will never be long enough to go all along the whole length of Antequera Rd. If parking isn’t along Antequera Rd, we’d be forced to put a parking lot on the west side of the property. This plan has about 1/3 cottages. An urban edge along Mirandela St. as well would increase this effect.
      iii. **P:** The footprint I used in the sketch is the same as your building, except locating it along Mirandela St.
   c. **P:** There were lots of comments about the setbacks from Coors Blvd. and Mirandela St. Pedestrians won’t use those streets. Antequera Rd is the street pedestrians will use. Why the emphasis on setbacks on those other streets?
      i. **Agent:** I didn’t mean to emphasize the other two edges. I agree with comments about Antequera Rd. and we will be evaluating how to make that a strong pedestrian area.
   d. **P:** What if you mass the parking between Coors Blvd. and put the building closer to Antequera Rd?
   e. **P:** When I look at site plan with all parking on perimeter, I ask myself, could the parking be moved so more people are looking out onto Antequera Rd? Just a suggestion.
      i. **Agent:** We can take a look at that.

6. **Other Questions and Concerns:**
   a. **P:** What about integration? Does this project fit in with character of neighborhood? Does it account for pedestrians? The bosque? Night sky? The lights from Sprouts shine directly into home of three neighbors. I’m concerned about lighting. Our view of the
night sky is really important. I want to make sure that lighting will not interfere with night sky character.

i. Agent: We haven’t gotten to lighting design yet. I may have to go at night and see for myself the issue of shopping center lights. We’ll try to keep the lights directional and avoid light pollution.

ii. P: It’s important that we all see ourselves as part of this greater neighborhood. You have responsibility to ensure you integrate and fit in with the whole neighborhood.

b. P: Please listen to the noise along Coors Blvd. It’s really loud. I’d say that’s the wrong place to put terraces. You can’t talk there.

i. Agent: Those terraces would not be gathering places, rather, opportunities to soften the edge looking upward toward Coors Blvd. The 1-story garages likely won’t be visible from Coors Blvd. So, vegetation, but not gathering areas there. Gathering is the dog park and in the courtyard.

c. P: Is the swimming pool area covered or not?

i. Architect: Not covered.

ii. P: For myself, as an older person, it might be better inside and usable year-round.

iii. Architect: Many pools we build are heated, so those are usable year-round.

d. P: What safety and protection services are you planning for?

i. Applicant: We’ll have staff on site 7 days a week from 9am to 7 or 8pm. Other hours there will be a courtesy patrol, an unarmed security guard. We recognize that’s an important thing for an older population.

e. P: Please describe the materials, quality, and sustainability considerations in this design. Also the sustainability of the landscaping.

i. N: Sustainability is always an important focus. We’re early in the design so we don’t know yet the materials or landscaping. I suggest visiting the project on Paseo del Norte. It won’t be identical, but similar.

ii. P: You could take a look at La Luz. It’s 50 years old and lasted well.

f. Facilitator: The question was asked via Zoom chat whether there will be solar panels.

i. Applicant: We’re not there yet. We’ve done that in other locations, but we haven’t yet gotten to that point here.

g. P: I’m concerned about color. Please do not use white like the Sprouts. It doesn’t blend in well with the surroundings.

i. Architect: We can go to sand and earth tones. We’ll build a mockup to make sure it blends in.

ii. P: Please change the exterior color to blend with La Luz and the credit union colors. Blending in with natural area was in the comprehensive plan.

h. P: It’s pretty clear our concern is that the applicant is asking for something beyond what the property was previously approved for, i.e. increased density. And the applicant needs to consider how the project fits into the neighborhood.

Names and Affiliations of All Attendees:
Dan Jensen, La Luz Landowners Association
Kathy Adams, La Luz Landowners Association
Nick Harrison
Pat Gallagher
Appendix: Zoom Chat Comments

- From Anne Taylor: I have a question but no hand to designate...my question is this seems like a site that is built architecture and parked cars...where is the green
- From Anne Taylor: That would help to decreasing or increasing canopy of Albuquerque. Can you speak to sustainability planning in this development? Talk about the architecture style...is it southwest...what materials are you looking at etc. and where or where are the trees?
- From ericberendt: I am interested to know if there are any solar panels planned for the site, such as over the garages or the buildings themselves.
- From ericberendt: No offense to Arlo, but I think parallel parking on Antequera would be a bad idea.
- From Anne Taylor: Question about sustainability, safety and protection services and green architecture. Is your pool covered or not and is that a part area? It’s labelled on your plan is site 4.
- From kathleenadams: The color aspect is very important. The Sprouts development is unattractively white and does not enhance the beauty of the Bosque or the mountains.
- From kathleenadams: I am not opposed to density in general; I am opposed to density for density sake and for density that would impact the view corridor and the overall appearance of the development and how it fits into the area. This is a neighborhood and it should be cohesive.
- From kathleenadams: Part of and apart from.... A good way to express what we hope for.
- From kathleenadams: NOT apart from
NOTIFICATION
Jim:

See list of associations below and attached regarding your Neighborhood Meeting Inquiry for the EPC. In addition, we have included web links below that will provide you with additional details about the new Integrated Development Ordinance (IDO) requirements. The web links also include notification templates that you may utilize when contacting each association. Thank you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Association Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Address Line 1</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip</th>
<th>Mobile Phone</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>La Luz Landowners Association</td>
<td>Jonathan</td>
<td>Abdalla</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lauluzlandowners@azulstar.com">lauluzlandowners@azulstar.com</a></td>
<td>6 Fumbleweed NW</td>
<td>Albuquerque</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>87120</td>
<td>5053211779</td>
<td>5058977030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Luz Landowners Association</td>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>Jensen</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dgj1958@gmail.com">dgj1958@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>7 Alto NW</td>
<td>Albuquerque</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>87120</td>
<td>5056100742</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westside Coalition of Neighborhood Associations</td>
<td>Rene</td>
<td>Horvath</td>
<td><a href="mailto:aboard111@gmail.com">aboard111@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>5515 Palomino Drive NW</td>
<td>Albuquerque</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>87120</td>
<td>5058981179</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westside Coalition of Neighborhood Associations</td>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>Hendriksen</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hhen@comcast.net">hhen@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>10592 Rio Del Sol NW</td>
<td>Albuquerque</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>87114</td>
<td>5058903483</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor Ranch NA</td>
<td>Rene</td>
<td>Horvath</td>
<td><a href="mailto:aboard111@gmail.com">aboard111@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>5515 Palomino Drive NW</td>
<td>Albuquerque</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>87120</td>
<td>5058982114</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor Ranch NA</td>
<td>Diana</td>
<td>Shea</td>
<td><a href="mailto:secretary@trna.org">secretary@trna.org</a></td>
<td>5113 Spinning Wheel Road NW</td>
<td>Albuquerque</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>87120</td>
<td>5059343308</td>
<td>5058986633</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IDO – Public Notice Requirements & Template: [https://www.cabq.gov/planning/urban-design-development/public-notice](https://www.cabq.gov/planning/urban-design-development/public-notice)


Dear Applicant,

See list of associations below regarding your Public Notice Inquiry. In addition, we have included web links below that will provide you with additional details about the new Integrated Development Ordinance (IDO) requirements. The web links also include notification templates that you may utilize when contacting each association. Thank you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Association Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Email Address</th>
<th>Address Line 1</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip</th>
<th>Mobile Phone</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>La Luz Landowners Association</td>
<td>Jonathan</td>
<td>Abdalla</td>
<td><a href="mailto:luluzlandowners@azulstar.com">luluzlandowners@azulstar.com</a></td>
<td>6 Tumbleweed NW</td>
<td>Albuquerque</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>87120</td>
<td>5053217795</td>
<td>5058973030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Luz Landowners Association</td>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>Jensen</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dgj1958@gmail.com">dgj1958@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>7 Arco NW</td>
<td>Albuquerque</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>87120</td>
<td>5056100742</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westside Coalition of Neighborhood Associations</td>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>Hendriksen</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hlhen@comcast.net">hlhen@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>10592 Rio Del Sol NW</td>
<td>Albuquerque</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>87114</td>
<td>5058903481</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westside Coalition of Neighborhood Associations</td>
<td>Rene</td>
<td>Horvath</td>
<td><a href="mailto:aboard111@gmail.com">aboard111@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>5515 Palomino Drive NW</td>
<td>Albuquerque</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>87120</td>
<td>5058982114</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor Ranch NA</td>
<td>Rene</td>
<td>Horvath</td>
<td><a href="mailto:aboard111@gmail.com">aboard111@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>5515 Palomino Drive NW</td>
<td>Albuquerque</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>87120</td>
<td>5058982114</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor Ranch NA</td>
<td>Diana</td>
<td>Shea</td>
<td><a href="mailto:secretary@trna.org">secretary@trna.org</a></td>
<td>5113 Spinning Wheel Road NW</td>
<td>Albuquerque</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>87120</td>
<td>5059343308</td>
<td>5058986633</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IDO – Public Notice Requirements & Template: [https://www.cabq.gov/planning/urban-design-development/public-notice](https://www.cabq.gov/planning/urban-design-development/public-notice)


Thanks,

Dalaina L. Carmona
Senior Administrative Assistant
Office of Neighborhood Coordination
Council Services Department
1 Civic Plaza NW, Suite 9087, 9th Floor
Albuquerque, NM 87102
505-768-3334
dlcarrona@cabq.gov or DNC@cabq.gov
Website: [www.cabq.gov/neighborhoods](http://www.cabq.gov/neighborhoods)

Confidentiality Notice: This e-mail, including all attachments is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited unless specifically provided under the New Mexico Inspection of Public Records Act. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and destroy all copies of this message.
Public Notice Inquiry For:
   Environmental Planning Commission
If you selected "Other" in the question above, please describe what you are seeking a Public Notice Inquiry for below:

Contact Name
   Michael Vos
Telephone Number
   5057649801
Email Address
   vos@consensusplanning.com
Company Name
   Consensus Planning, Inc.
Company Address
   302 8th Street NW
City
   Albuquerque
State
   NM
ZIP
   87102
Legal description of the subject site for this project:
   Tract 4, North Andalucia at La Luz
Physical address of subject site:
   5301 Antequera Road NW
Subject site cross streets:
   Coors Blvd and Mirandela Street NW
Other subject site identifiers:
   southerly corner of the referenced intersection
This site is located on the following zone atlas page:
   E-12

This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
Dear Neighbors:

This email is notification to La Luz Landowners Association, Taylor Ranch Neighborhood Association, and the Westside Coalition of Neighborhood Associations that Consensus Planning is preparing an application on behalf of Greystar for a Site Plan – EPC to be submitted to the Environmental Planning Commission (EPC) for the property located at 5302 Antequera Road NW, just east of Coors Boulevard and is legally described as Tract 4, North Andalucia at La Luz. The property is approximately 7.7 acres in size, currently vacant, and zoned PD (see attached zone atlas page).

The applicant is proposing to develop the property with a senior (age restricted) multi-family project. This will require an amendment to the existing approved Site Development Plan for Subdivision to allow for slightly higher density on this tract, which was limited in combination with Tract 6 (developed as the Villas at Andalucia) to 20 du’s per acre. Tract 6 developed at a lower density (approximately 15 du/acre). Due to the PD zoning, the project also requires a Site Plan to be reviewed and approved by the EPC. We are currently working on the site plan and reviewing the View Preservation Overlay requirements in the IDO and performing that set of analyses. We will share the site plan and view analysis once it is complete.

As part of the IDO requirements, we are providing you an opportunity to discuss the application prior to submittal. Should you have any questions or would like to request a meeting regarding this pending application, please do not hesitate to email me at cp@consensusplanning.com or contact me by phone at 505-764-9801. Per the IDO, you have 15 days or until April 9, 2020 to request a meeting. If you do not want to schedule a meeting, please also let me know, so we can continue in our application process.

We are committed to work with the City ADR staff to figure out an appropriate and safe way to conduct meetings during the COV19 regulations. If a meeting is requested, we will work with you and the City facilitators to utilize video and conference call technology to create a workable solution, which may require multiple meetings to allow for everyone to participate.

Sincerely,

Jim Strozier, FAICP
Consensus Planning, Inc.
302 8th Street NW
(505) 764-9801
Dear Neighbors:

This email is notification that Consensus Planning has applied for a Site Plan – EPC and a Major Amendment to a Prior Approval (Site Development Plan for Subdivision) on behalf of Greystar. Silver Leaf Ventures, LLC is the owner of the property.

The subject site consists of Tract 4, North Andalucia at 5301 Antequera Road NW, containing 7.7061 acres. The applicant is requesting approval of a Site Plan for a 171-unit age-restricted senior housing development on the subject site. 155 of the units are within a three-story building with clubhouse and the remaining 16 are within 8 one-story “cottages.” In addition, the Applicant is requesting approval of two changes to the North Andalucia at La Luz Site Development Plan for Subdivision, approved prior to enactment of the IDO, in order to accomplish the following:

1. Increase the allowable density specific to Tract 4 and the proposed development from 20 dwelling units per acre to 24 dwelling units per acre.
2. Identify a parking requirement of 1.25 spaces per dwelling unit that will apply only to age-restricted senior housing developments within the North Andalucia PD zoning district.

The EPC Public Hearing for this application will be held on July 9, 2020 starting at 8:40 AM. Due to the ongoing public health orders, this meeting will be in a virtual format via the Zoom software platform. The URL for joining via videoconference or call-in numbers for audio only are as follows:

Join Zoom Meeting: https://cabq.zoom.us/j/91574588404

Meeting ID: 915 7458 8404
One tap mobile
+16699006833,,91574588404# US (San Jose)
+12532158782,,91574588404# US (Tacoma)

Dial by your location
+1 669 900 6833 US (San Jose)
+1 253 215 8782 US (Tacoma)
+1 346 248 7799 US (Houston)
+1 646 558 8656 US (New York)
+1 301 715 8592 US (Germantown)
+1 312 626 6799 US (Chicago)

Meeting ID: 915 7458 8404
Find your local number: https://cabq.zoom.us/u/ab6MykgFfy
The meeting agenda will be posted on the Planning Department website one week prior to the hearing on July 2, 2020. Please visit http://www.cabq.gov/planning/boards-commissions/environmental-planning-commission/epc-agendas-reports-minutes to review the agenda and staff reports.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions, would like to meet, or desire any additional information. Under the IDO, anyone may request, and the City may require an applicant to attend a City-sponsored facilitated meeting with Neighborhood Associations, based on the complexity and potential impacts of a proposed project (IDO Section 14-16-6-4(D)). Visit: https://www.cabq.gov/planning/urban-design-development/facilitated-meetings-for-proposed-development/ to view and download the Facilitated Meetings Criteria. If you wish to request a Facilitated Meeting, please contact the Planning Department at (505) 924-3337.

Sincerely,

Michael Vos, AICP
CONSENSUS PLANNING, INC.
302 Eighth Street NW
Albuquerque, NM 87102
phone (505) 764-9801
vos@consensusplanning.com
May 28, 2020

Dear Neighbors:

This letter is notification that Consensus Planning has applied for a Site Plan – EPC and a Major Amendment to a Prior Approval (Site Development Plan for Subdivision) on behalf of Greystar. Silver Leaf Ventures, LLC is the owner of the property.

The subject site consists of Tract 4, North Andalucia at 5301 Antequera Road NW, containing 7.7061 acres. The applicant is requesting approval of a Site Plan for a 171-unit age-restricted senior housing development on the subject site. 155 of the units are within a three-story building with clubhouse and the remaining 16 are within 8 one-story “cottages.” In addition, the Applicant is requesting approval of two changes to the North Andalucia at La Luz Site Development Plan for Subdivision, approved prior to enactment of the IDO, in order to accomplish the following:

1. Increase the allowable density specific to Tract 4 and the proposed development from 20 dwelling units per acre to 24 dwelling units per acre.
2. Identify a parking requirement of 1.25 spaces per dwelling unit that will apply only to age-restricted senior housing developments within the North Andalucia PD zoning district.

The EPC Public Hearing for this application will be held on July 9, 2020 starting at 8:40 AM. Due to the ongoing public health orders, this meeting will be in a virtual format via the Zoom software platform. The URL for joining via videoconference or call-in numbers for audio only are as follows:

Join Zoom Meeting: https://cabq.zoom.us/j/91574588404
Meeting ID: 915 7458 8404
One tap mobile
+16699006833,,91574588404# US (San Jose)
+12532158782,,91574588404# US (Tacoma)

Dial by your location
+1 669 900 6833 US (San Jose)
+1 253 215 8782 US (Tacoma)
+1 346 248 7799 US (Houston)
+1 646 558 8656 US (New York)
+1 301 715 8592 US (Germantown)
+1 312 626 6799 US (Chicago)

Meeting ID: 915 7458 8404
Find your local number: https://cabq.zoom.us/u/ab6MykgFfy

The meeting agenda will be posted on the Planning Department website one week prior to the hearing on July 2, 2020. Please visit http://www.cabq.gov/planning/boards-commissions/environmental-planning-commission/epc-agendas-reports-minutes to review the agenda and staff reports.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions, would like to meet, or desire any additional information. Under the IDO, anyone may request, and the City may require an applicant to attend a City-sponsored facilitated meeting with Neighborhood Associations, based on the complexity and potential impacts of a proposed project (IDO
Section 14-16-6-4(D)). Visit: https://www.cabq.gov/planning/urban-design-development/facilitated-meetings-for-proposed-development/ to view and download the Facilitated Meetings Criteria. If you wish to request a Facilitated Meeting, please contact the Planning Department at (505) 924-3337.

Sincerely,

Jim Strozier, FAICP
Principal

Attached: Proposed Site Plan and Elevations
NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

Notice is hereby given that the City of Albuquerque Environmental Planning Commission will hold a Public Hearing on Thursday, July 9, 2020 at 8:40 a.m. to consider the following items. Due to the ongoing public health orders, this meeting will be in a virtual format via the Zoom software platform. The URL for joining via videoconference or call-in numbers for audio only are as follows:

Join Zoom Meeting: https://cabq.zoom.us/j/91574588404
Meeting ID: 915 7458 8404
One tap mobile
+16699006833,,91574588404# US (San Jose)
+12532158782,,91574588404# US (Tacoma)

Dial by your location
+1 669 900 6833 US (San Jose)
+1 253 215 8782 US (Tacoma)
+1 346 248 7799 US (Houston)
+1 646 558 8656 US (New York)
+1 301 715 8592 US (Germantown)
+1 312 626 6799 US (Chicago)
Meeting ID: 915 7458 8404
Find your local number: https://cabq.zoom.us/u/ab6MykgFfy

EPC RULES OF CONDUCT OF BUSINESS

A copy of the Rules of Conduct is posted on the Planning Department's website at http://www.cabq.gov/planning/boards-commissions/environmental-planning-commission and printed copies are available in the Planning Department office on the third floor of the Plaza del Sol Building, 600 Second Street NW. For more information, please contact Russell Brito, Current Planning Division Manager, at (505) 924-3337 or at rbrito@cabq.gov.

Staff reports and supplemental materials will be posted on the City website, http://www.cabq.gov/planning/boards-commissions/environmental-planning-commission/epc-agendas-reports-minutes, on Friday, July 3, 2020.

REQUEST

Consensus Planning, Agent for Greystar has submitted an application for approval of a Site Plan – EPC and a Major Amendment to a Prior Approval (Site Development Plan for Subdivision). Silver Leaf Ventures, LLC is the owner of the property.

The subject site consists of Tract 4, North Andalucia located at 5301 Antequera Road NW, containing 7.7061 acres. The Applicant is requesting approval of a Site Plan for a 171-unit age-restricted senior housing development on the subject site. 155 of the units are within a three-story building with clubhouse and the remaining 16 are within 8 one-story “cottages.” In addition, the Applicant is requesting approval of two changes to the North Andalucia at La Luz Site Development Plan for Subdivision, approved prior to enactment of the IDO, in order to accomplish the following:
1. Increase the allowable density specific to Tract 4 and the proposed development from 20 dwelling units per acre to 24 dwelling units per acre.

2. Identify a parking requirement of 1.25 spaces per dwelling unit that will apply only to age-restricted senior housing developments within the North Andalucia PD zoning district.

If you have questions or need additional information regarding this request contact Mr. Russell Brito, City Planning at (505) 924-3337 or at rbrito@cabq.gov.

Sincerely,
Consensus Planning, Inc.
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FACILITATED MEETING
CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE
LAND USE FACILITATION PROGRAM
PROJECT MEETING REPORT

Project Number: 2020-003658
Property Description: Tract 4, North Andalucia at La Luz Subdivision, addressed as 5301 Antequera Rd NW, Albuquerque, NM 87120
Date Submitted: July 1, 2020
Submitted by: Jessie Lawrence
Meeting Date and Time: June 29, 2020, 5:30pm – 7:30pm
Meeting Location: Online via Zoom
Facilitator: Jessie Lawrence
Co-facilitator: Leslie R. Kryder

Parties:
• Applicant: o Greystar
• Agent: o Consensus Planning
• Affected Neighborhood Associations (per City of Albuquerque notification requirements): o La Luz Landowners Association o Taylor Ranch Neighborhood Association o Westside Coalition of Neighborhood Associations

Background/Meeting Summary:
Applicant requests approval of an amendment to the existing Site Development Plan for Subdivision and approval of a Site Plan for an age-restricted senior multi-family development on a 7.7-acre site at 5301 Antequera Rd. NW. This is the second facilitated meeting about this project; a pre-application meeting was held in April, 2020. At the time of the pre-application meeting, primary concerns were density, preservation of views along Coors Blvd., and integration of the project with the surrounding neighborhood and in particular along Antequera Rd.

At this meeting, the preservation of views and compliance with the view preservation ordinance was still a primary concern and an area of disagreement between the project team and neighbors. The overall size of the main building, including the height and massing, was also a primary concern of neighbors, as was traffic. All questions and concerns are included in the Meeting Specifics section. The project team presented a new site plan responding to the prior concern about the orientation to Antequera Rd., and there were few questions or concerns about that discussed at this meeting.

Outcomes:
• Areas of Agreement: o None noted among all meeting participants.
• Unresolved Issues and Concerns: o Neighbors are still concerned about potential obstruction of views along Coors Blvd. due to the height and overall size of the proposed 3-story building. There was disagreement about the project team’s interpretation of the view protection requirements in the IDO.
Neighbors still objected to the three-story height and large size of the primary apartment building on the site, stating that it was too big for the site and the three-story height contributed to the view problem, and suggested reducing the height of that building to two stories.

Neighbors had concerns about increased traffic from the large number of new residents.

Meeting Specifics:

1. Introduction and Project Summary:
   a. Jim Strozier of Consensus Planning, Project Agent, introduced the rest of the project team:
      i. Nic Whittaker with Greystar, the developer
      ii. Michael Vos and Katie Paquette with Consensus Planning
      iii. Eric Cody with Meeks & Partners, the architect
      iv. Justin Simensen with Isaacson & Arfman, the civil engineer
   b. Developments since the April meeting:
      i. [Note: For discussion purposes, Coors Blvd. is considered the west side of the property; Mirandela St. the north side; and Antequera Rd. the east side.]
      ii. Site plan diagram. Displays the original (April) and current site plans for comparison purposes.
         1. The main building has been moved.
            a. Originally it was centered between Coors Blvd. and Antequera Rd.
            b. It has been relocated toward the south of the property and brought closer to Antequera Rd.
            c. This was done per suggestions from neighbors at last meeting in order to improve street presence along Antequera Rd.
            d. The main building is now about 145’ away from Coors, about 50’ further than before.
      2. The original main entry to the main building was at Antequera Rd.; now it’s on the north side of the main building within the property.
      3. Garages and cottages are now further from Coors; instead of 35’ back, now 48’ to 59’ back.
         a. The cottages have been moved to the north end of the property.
         b. The number of cottages has been reduced from 10 to 8.
      iii. Color elevation drawing.
         1. This shows the view from Antequera Rd looking west.
            a. The tallest part of the main building is just south of the clubhouse.
      2. Main building is 3 stories tall.
      3. Colors have been modified to be more neutral in response to comments at the last meeting.
   iv. Landscape plan.
      1. There will be street trees along Coors Blvd. as required.
      2. There is a series of stepped retaining walls from Coors along south boundary with landscaping.
a. This change opens up the natural view corridor.
3. There are street trees along Mirandela St. and also along Antequera Rd.
4. Inside the central courtyard of the main building is a pool.
5. Along Mirandela St. there is a dog park and pedestrian route.
6. Ponding areas, which are required for stormwater drainage, are along the east side of the property. The largest pond is in the northeast corner of the property.
v. View analysis diagram.
1. This has been modified to show the new sight plan according to the Integrated Development Ordinance (IDO) requirements.

2. **Questions and Concerns about Density, Height, and Size of Main Building:**
   a. Participant (P): The main building is still just so big. It’s hard to see anything else. I appreciate the color change and making it blend in more with the neighborhood, but I still don’t see the value added of the project to the area.
   i. Agent (A): It is a large building, but we’ve tried to orient it where the grade change is largest. Along Antequera there’s a much more intimate relationship between street and building.
      1. A: At the last meeting our attention was drawn to the Antequera Rd. edge of the project. So in response, from Antequera Rd. you can see we added a lot of variation of the building edge in and out along the façade to add visual interest. We also put in quite a bit of landscaping along this edge. The sidewalk meanders. There’s now a parkway strip.
      2. A: At the north end of the site, we put the cottages, which are 1-story buildings. In terms of the view from Coors Blvd., we added a variety of trees to break up the edge along there. We moved the 1-story garages along that side to push the tall buildings back.
   b. P: I am concerned about the massing of the building, that it doesn’t meet massing requirements. The view analysis illustrations don’t include existing buildings in the area, like the Sprouts or Andalucia buildings. Those already block a certain amount of the views. And that is the primary goal of the overlay, the Coors Corridor Plan. Between the 3-story height and the number of units, and what’s already built in the area, the analysis needs to include existing buildings already blocking the view. Are you still requesting a variance to increase density?
   i. A: Yes, the project is requesting the variance to increase the density. The currently allowed density would only allow the main building. The variance will allow the project to add the cottages. On the view frame analysis diagram, at far left is where you would see the existing buildings. But as you travel north along Coors Blvd, once you get beyond the 45-degree angle of the main building, the area near Mirandela St. will be pretty much unobstructed. You will see some of Bosque School and commercial buildings, but only along the far edge. While there are tall buildings at Bosque School, they are so far away that I don’t think they will impinge on the view. But looking at the other buildings is a good point and we’ll take a look at it.
   ii. P: I look at what’s happened in the past regarding views. So far, we’ve been able to get buildings to comply for the most part, and I don’t want to set a bad precedent to undermine all the hard work that’s been done. When I look at Andalucia and calculate the numbers, it comes to 15 dwelling units per acre
(du/ac) over 16 ac. This parcel is only 7.7 ac with 20+ du/ac. I don’t have a problem with the cottages, but what can be done to lower the height of the main building to comply with view regulations?

1. Nic Whittaker, Applicant: Density is a really important metric with traffic and number of residents, but less scientific metric for massing, which is where your focus is. I want to make sure you know the unit size is relatively small. The average size is about 800 sq ft; compared to Andalucia, where it’s over 1000 sq ft. One has to think about the size of the units; at Andalucia they are about 25% larger, so of course our density is higher.
   a. P: The reason I raised the point is that Andalucia is in perfect compliance; it’s two stories, only 26' high, and meets the goals of the Coors Corridor Plan. It’s 15 du/ac versus about 22 du/ac here. Instead of eliminating the cottages, it seems like the big building needs to be more in scale. Maybe half of it could be two-story. This would also help with the views, too.

3. Questions and Concerns about Sight Lines and Views:
   a. P: I am concerned about the sight lines and whether they meet the requirements, specifically sight line A, which is the only one that I could get to pass any of the tests in my analysis. Moving along Coors Blvd. across the building face, the sight line passes very few tests. We need some analysis across the center of this building, so we can see what it will do to the views. It blocks the mountain, especially halfway down.
      i. A: The way the view preservation regulations are in the IDO, it sets that sight line based on the highest part of the building. This is a change from the old Coors Corridor Plan. The highest part of the building is at the “eggabout,” where the façade on Antequera provides a visual break between the main building and the clubhouse. It’s true that with different sight lines you get different results. We also did a separate analysis using the northernmost corner, even though it’s not required by IDO.
      ii. P: At the north edge of the building, it doesn’t pass any tests; it obscures the mountain and the 1/3 - 2/3 rule is broken. It’s at 69% of the view frame. Are we putting this building here to satisfy the IDO, or to further the preservation overlay?
         1. A: We relocated the main building to address a number of things. The more we can move the building away from Coors Blvd., the more it helps to improve the view. We’re trying to work on the practical side and address comments from neighbors, but also adhere to the IDO.
   b. P: A question about the bulk and massing simulation. The bottom of view frame is depicted as somewhere in the parking lot. The bottom of the view frame should be the elevation at Coors, hitting the building somewhere in the middle. When you redo the calculation when the view frame is done correctly, it’s not 50%, but a great deal larger. I would like to see that be fixed before the EPC meeting.
      i. A: I would like Justin Simensen, Isaacson & Arfman, Civil Engineer, to explain how he did this. He sets his camera for the view 4’ above Coors Blvd. What you’re seeing is the foreground along Coors Blvd. One of the differences from the old plan: you would take that view frame to a projected continuation of the
southeast property line. In the IDO, the view frame is set perpendicular to the sight line and stops at the property line.

1. Justin Simensen: We use 3D modelling software. I created a model of the mountains and the site. I placed a camera at our point on Coors Blvd., 4' above the road. The blue line is the elevation at the right-of-way. I see the point about how it should be at a middle of the building. But in a 3D world, you’re far enough back from the property, the camera opens up and down, and you get a wider view as you get further away from where the camera is. The black line at bottom of diagram is the actual sight line. Where the black line hits the blue frame is the edge of the right-of-way. Per the IDO, you’re thus creating a view from this location.

2. A: In this 3D model, we also don’t see the landscaping that will be added, specifically the street trees.

3. P: The ordinance was written in 1983 and we have a lot of practice applying it. In most ways the requirements carried over to the IDO. In our experience, we never changed the bottom of the view frame. It’s articulated in the ordinance. The bottom of view frame is a projection across the horizontal plane. Where it cuts the building in 3D, that’s where the bottom of the view frame is. Doing it this way makes a big difference. I’ve never seen anyone interpret the requirements the way you have and I think we need to take a second look at what is meant by “bottom of the view frame.”

c. P: Regarding the selection of the view plane. The view plane isn’t chosen arbitrarily, but rather at the view point; across the building there could be several view planes. What you’ve done doesn’t comply with the IDO. The view plane should be selected at each of your sight lines.
   i. Civil Engineer: The view plane, as we read it in the IDO, says it’s at 4’ above the edge extending horizontally. We chose the south property line of the site as depicted. If we can slide that elevation out to where the sight line is, that will only improve our view plane section.
   ii. A: Even at the pre app meeting with city zoning, we spent time reviewing the IDO regulations. As we pointed out, there are some differences from the old corridor plan. We followed up on the preliminary view analysis with them. We will continue to follow up on that.

d. P: My question is about the drawing showing the highest point. Will there be HVAC units on the roof?
   i. Applicant: HVAC units will be on interior of roof around the courtyard, not visible from Coors Blvd.
   ii. P2: I’ve heard concerns over the years about mechanical equipment. The other thing, we don’t want HVAC or the parapets to increase the building height. I still would like the applicant to reduce the size of the building.
   iii. A: The strategy has been to keep the parapets as low as possible to provide screening. Because of the building height, the screen is actually easier than it would be if the building were lower.

e. P: So I understand the drawing with the highest point, that’s the highest point people on Coors will see.
i. A: The image at the bottom of the view analysis is as you would see it from Coors Blvd. in a car.
ii. P: And I do not see any mechanical items in the drawing.
iii. A: It’s designed so you would not.
f. P: Are you going to be screening the HVAC equipment, and how high are the parapets?
   i. Architect: The parapet heights vary, to help vary the top of the building. Heights range between 2’ to 6’. If we are required to screen, we would, but I believe we are not required based on distance from the edge of the building. Keep in mind that the condensers are similar to a single family home, not the size they would be on a commercial project.
   ii. P: So, when the view analysis is complete, no HVAC equipment will be visible, correct?
      1. Architect: I don’t believe we have that included in the drawing. Closest condenser would be 20’ from the edge of building.
      2. P: what happens if they stick up?
         a. Applicant: A typically unit is 3’ tall. With a 2’ tall parapet, you’d only see it if you were adjacent to the parapet. Based on the distance from Coors Blvd., I don’t believe you will see it.

4. Questions and Concerns about Traffic:
   a. P: I’m concerned about traffic. Has the City thought about traffic? The light at Dellyne is very slow and there are lots of accidents on Mirandela St. Is there a solution?
      i. A: Since this is a senior project, it tends to have less traffic overall than a typical apartment complex. Maybe more important, the number of peak hour trips tends to be less. People are not commuting to & from work. In this area one of the main issues is the Bosque School pickup & drop-off. This project is less than the City threshold for a traffic study.
   b. P: Regarding traffic light duration at the Bosque School Rd. That light is really long. There aren’t many ways for residents east of Coors Blvd. to enter and exit this area, so it’s pretty busy. It’s well taken that residents won’t contribute to peak hour traffic. You might consider roundabout lessons, since that’s foreign to many people.
      i. A: There may need to be some follow-up with the City in terms of overall traffic flow, taking into consideration this project, along with several others nearby, as well as the shopping area. The City may be willing to do a traffic study for the overall neighborhood, which is different than for a specific project. Tim Brown is the person at the city. You could potentially follow up with him.
   c. P: The assumption was that these are seniors who won’t go out much; I’m 65 and I still work, go to meetings, etc. I question the assumption. It will indeed impact the traffic in the area. Last week there was a fatal accident.
      i. A: I didn’t mean to imply they don’t go out; but overall senior projects generate less traffic with less peak hour impacts than other projects.
      ii. P: I would have to see the data because I don’t believe it.
   d. P: I’m always amazed that the threshold for peak hour traffic is 100 cars, and somehow all these large projects come in as not needing a traffic study. This is not a very walkable street. I’m amazed at the apartments already in place. I don’t know what the Coors views will be like, will the mountains still be visible? It seems if you reduced height by a story, it would resolve a lot of the concerns.
A: I’m not a traffic engineer, but in my experience, under the old system, the threshold for multifamily projects was 300 trips in a peak hour; for single family it was 150 trips. In this case I don’t know that the old system ever had a specific threshold for senior living, but it would probably have been higher. In the IDO the threshold is 100 peak hour trips—and that’s what 300 multifamily units are expected to produce. We submit the traffic impact study form to the City along with site plan and they determine whether a traffic study is warranted.

P: What is the senior age range?

Applicant: 55 and older. And there are restrictions in terms of how long guests with children may stay.

A: Looking at the first meeting report it said that there wouldn’t be age related services or dining. So more like a regular apartment complex; no shuttle service and people will use cars to get around. Bus services is limited. The intersection at Coors Blvd. and Montano Blvd. is probably the busiest in the city. So we do have to consider traffic issues.

Applicant: Our average age tends to be 72 years. But it will be an active population; about 75% will be retired.

5. Questions and Concerns about Parking:
   a. P: Please talk about the parking for the residents and the guests. How did they determine the number of spaces?
      i. A: There are now gates at the entrance to the cottages and just beyond the roundabout. There are parking spaces in several places around the property. We have wrapped parking all around the building. There’s an emergency only access at the southeast corner of the property. Guest parking is near the entry. Parking is designed based on Greystar’s experience with independent living projects; they have a lot of experience with this type of project.
      ii. Applicant: Regarding the number of parking spaces, in general about 65% of our apartment homes are single occupancy and about 35% are double occupancy. Of the doubles, about half are single car and half double car. We used those metrics to calculate what’s needed. Here we have an additional 20 spaces over and above what we calculated is needed.
   b. P: I want to ask about guest parking. From the drawing, it looks like there are only 10 guest spots, including the two handicap spots. We have a lot of problem with people parking on the north end of Mirandela St. and blocking the bike lane. How do you come up with only 10 guest parking spots?
      i. Nick: There are two types of guest parking: the 10 you refer to are the “outside the gate” parking—for, say, prospective residents or vendors. Each resident is allowed to give the gate code to a guest and that allows parking inside the gate. There is excess inside to accommodate guests.

6. Other Questions and Concerns:
   a. P: This meeting didn’t work well. I couldn’t stay connected and hear what was going on. I haven’t had this problem with other meetings.

EPC Application Hearing Details:
1. The Environmental Planning Commission (EPC) is an appointed, nine-member, volunteer citizen board with authority on many land use and planning issues. The EPC was formed in 1972 per City of Albuquerque Ordinance #294-1972. Members:
   - Dan Serrano, Chair, Council District 1
   - David Shaffer, Vice Chair, Council District 7
   - Richard Meadows, Council District 2
   - Joseph Cruz, Council District 3
   - Robert Stetson, Council District 4
   - Gary L. Eyster P.E. (Ret.), Council District 6
   - Timothy J. MacEachen, Council District 8
   - Johnathan R. Hollinger, Council District 9

2. Hearing Time:
   i. The hearing is scheduled for July 9, 2020.
   ii. The Commission will begin hearing applications at 8:30 a.m.
   iii. The actual time this application will be heard by the Commission will depend on the applicant’s position on the Commission’s schedule.

3. Hearing Process:
   i. Comments from facilitated meetings will go into a report which goes to the City Planner.
   ii. City Planner includes facilitator report in recommendations.
   iii. The Commission will make a decision and parties have 15 days to appeal the decision.

4. Resident Participation at Hearing:
   a. Comments may be sent to:
      
      Leslie Naji, Staff Planner
      lnaji@cabq.gov

      OR

      Dan Serrano, Chair, EPC
      David Shaffer, Vice Chair, EPC
      c/o Planning Department
      600 2nd St, NW, Third Floor
      Albuquerque, NM  87102

Names and Affiliations of Attendees:
Dan Jensen
Pat Gallagher
Jim Strozier, Consensus Planning
Michael Vos, Consensus Planning
Arlo Braun
Nic Whittaker, Greystar
Eric Cody, Meeks & Partners
Nick Harrison
Rene Horvath
Kathy Adams
Peggy Norton
Bob Wilson
Rosie Rodriguez
David Shaw
Mary Oertel-Kirschner
Carol Hopper
Ann Prinz
Evelyn Rivera
Matthew Caulkins
Therese Saunders
Justin Simensen, Isaacson & Arfman
Katie Paquette, Consensus Planning
Diana Shea
Mary Louise Sena
Joseph Felice
Dear Leslie,
I am sending you the attachment I saved regarding the Antequera Apartment view analysis, sent to us for the facilitated meeting. This illustration has two sight lines for the view analysis. There are two pictures in the illustration. The second picture shows the building penetrating above the Sandia mountain. The Sprouts shopping center adjacent to this site, is not shown in the background. It would block the views in the view area, and should be calculated as building mass. The foreground in the first picture is gray. It appears to be the street and curb area. Should be included as the part of the building infrastructure. Not views preserved.
Thank you,
Rene’ Horvath

PS. Please let me know you received the email.

This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
The Coors corridor plan, so sadly and willfully mangled by the city, will be further intruded upon if these apartments are built in a manner that obstructs views and contributes to the degradation of one of Albuquerque's finest attributes: the bosque and the views of it and the Sandias.

All too often, development means destruction. Let's not repeat that pattern here.

Arlette Miller
Taylor Ranch

Sent from my iPad

This message has been analyzed by Deep Discovery Email Inspector.
REDUCTIONS
GENERAL LANDSCAPE NOTES

IRRIGATION

All irrigation systems shall be designed to comply with the requirements of the Water Conservation Landscaping Ordinance. The irrigation system shall be designed to effectively irrigate the landscape area, taking into account the plant species and their water requirements. The irrigation system shall be designed to promote water conservation by minimizing waste and ensuring efficient use of water resources. Landscaping permits shall be provided to the NMDOT for any landscaping activities.

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMMON NAME

PLANT LEGEND

COMM
Detached Garages for 28 Vehicles
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Pool

Carports for 21 Vehicles
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FENCE/WALL GENERAL DESIGN INFORMATION

BICYCLE RACK / PAD DETAIL

ACCESSIBILITY SYMBOL DETAIL

(VAN ACCESSIBLE) PARKING PLAN DETAIL

PARKING SIGNS

CONCEPTUAL SITE DETAILS

OVERTURE ANDALUCIA
Albuquerque, New Mexico
a development of Greystar Development Group, LP

© 2020 Isaacson & Arfman, Inc. This design, calculations, and concepts are owned by and remain the property of Isaacson & Arfman, Inc. Not for construction. Use of any part of this design in whole or in part by any person, firm or corporation for any purpose whatsoever except with the written permission of Isaacson & Arfman, Inc.