

**From:** [Ellen Dueweke](#)  
**To:** [Duarte, Leroy D.](#)  
**Subject:** Hoffmantown Church Property Development analysis  
**Date:** Monday, October 18, 2021 10:26:52 PM

---

Hello Leroy,

I read your analysis of the Hoffmantown Property rezone request, and I have a few questions.

1) I am confused about the project number on this project. PR 2018-001560 dates back to the last attempted rezone change application dated 6-29-17. It was before the planning dept changed the project numbers. It was #1007412, and was changed to 2018-001560 in 2018. The only activity with that project number was the sewer and water vacation application which went before the DRB on 10-3-18 and 1-23-19. Shouldn't this have a new project number since it has nothing to do with that project?

2) There is an error on page 9 of your analysis. You state that transit is within 1/2 mile of Wyoming Blvd. But it is actually over 3/4 mile to the nearest bus stop. The distance to Wyoming Blvd is irrelevant if we are trying to establish how far these residences will be from transit. I realize that this is not anywhere in the goals for low density housing, but I just think the report should be accurate.

3) I disagree that this property qualifies as infill. The IDO definition of Development Infill is "An area of platted or unplatted land that includes no more than 20 acres of land, that has a public water main and a public sewer main fronting the property within the City right-of-way, and where at least 75 percent of the adjacent lots are developed and contain existing primary buildings." The Comprehensive Plan definition is "The development of new commercial or residential buildings on scattered vacant sites or small groups of sites in an otherwise built up area." The CP gives us the general intent of the word, and the IDO sets quantitative specifics to achieve the intent. If one considers each of the lots in Cherry Hills that are adjacent to the property individually, then yes, we will calculate that at least 75% of adjacent lots are developed and contain existing primary buildings. But if one looks at the overall view of the area, the property is clearly not "scattered vacant sites or small groups of sites in an otherwise built up area." We can clearly see that it is mostly surrounded by large vacant lots of, raw, undeveloped land. I know I can't argue with the IDO, even though it is probably not supporting the CP vision. But what about the requirement that it has "a public water main and a public sewer main fronting the property"? I don't know if that exists on Harper. Bohannon Huston's easement application in 2018 showed the existing water and sewer lines running through the site that were going to be vacated and replaced. It doesn't show any such lines on Harper. They may exist. I don't know. I just wanted to be sure that you checked into that, since if there is no such infrastructure, this site does not meet the definition of infill.

4) This brings me to my concern about the statement that there is existing infrastructure. The IDO definition of Infrastructure is "Streets, sidewalks, public or private utility facilities, sanitary sewer and water system facilities, drainage and flood control facilities, street lighting, and other improvements used by the public or used in common by owners of lots within a subdivision." None of those things exist "within (the) subdivision". In fact, they don't even exist on Harper fronting that site. There are no sidewalks, no utilities, no street lights, and perhaps no water and sewer lines. So in your analysis of Goal 5.3 and Policy 5.3.1, I am not sure what "existing infrastructure" that "surrounds the site" you are referring to. The applicant also consistently states that there is existing infrastructure, but does not identify it. The applicant does state that the developer will provide an Infrastructure Improvement Agreement which suggests that there is no existing infrastructure.

5) If I am correct about the definitions of Infill and Infrastructure, this zone request does not further the Goal of 5.3, for either Policy 5.3.1 or 5.3.2. (But then, neither does the current zoning of MX-L).

6) And my last issue is something that I was not previously aware of. Figure 5-3 Community Green Space, and Figure 10-3 City and County Trails Network, both show a "proposed trail" running directly to the south of the site. I know this is the arroyo, but I did not know it was proposed to be developed into a trail. Shouldn't this be discussed in the analysis? That seems very significant to me. I have never been able to ascertain who owns that property. Is it AMAFCA or City? Or is it Albuquerque Academy or Hoffmantown Church with an easement? If you could clarify

that for me, I would be very grateful.

I don't mean to be contentious with my concerns Leroy. But it is important that the analysis be objective. We went through a lot of stress and money with the last proposed development. It was very clear from the beginning that the city planner who performed that analysis had an agenda, and that was to pass the application for approval. It was almost as though he was working for Consensus Planning already. It was completely cut and paste from the application, and our concerns and questions were skirted and never answered. I see that you did your own analysis, and that even if you were to cite the exceptions I have raised, you would likely still be justified in recommending approval. But it is really important that any exceptions to the decision criteria in 14-16-6-7 be noted and provided to the EPC so they can make a fully informed decision.

Thanks so much for your work. Please reply to this email or give me a call at (505) 573-1537.

Ellen Dueweke  
Cherry Hills Civic Association President