

#1005238 – Coors Corridor Plan, August 14, 2014 – COMPARISON OF 1984 AND 2014 PLANS

<i>Page</i>	<i>1984 Plan</i> http://www.cabq.gov/planning/publications/	<i>Page</i>	<i>April 2014 EPC Draft Plan</i> http://www.TinyURL.com/cabq-coorscorridorplan	<i>Objective/Explanation of 2014 Element</i>
1	Purpose, boundaries & Issues	1	A. Introduction	
3	Plan area	3	A.3 Plan Area	The total plan area has been reduced from approximately 4,600 acres to 2,220 acres, mostly by removing land that is now the Rio Grande Valley State Park but also by aligning the boundary with lot lines and removing land under Bernalillo County jurisdiction and single-family properties that are not contiguous to Coors. More detailed maps are provided.
4	Major Issues 1. Traffic Movement/Access and Roadway Design 2. Environmental Concerns and Related Improvements 3. Land Use and Intensity of Development 4. Visual Impressions and Urban Design Overlay Zone (DOZ)	15	A.6.0 Plan Goals 1. Traffic Movement, Access Management, and Roadway Design 2. Environmental and Recreational Resources 3. Urban Design	In 1984, 80% of the land fronting Coors was undeveloped and the Plan included a land use section that recommended the annexation and rezoning of seven small areas south of St. Josephs. In 2014, this section is unnecessary as the land under City jurisdiction has established zoning, and activity centers along Coors (areas for mixed use, higher density development) have been designated by the Comprehensive Plan.
5	Related plans and Policies	17	B. How to use this Plan	The 2014 Plan aims to be more user-friendly and to ensure consistent application of its policies and regulations by providing this practical information upfront and in a single chapter.
111	Major Issues: Visual Impressions...			
118	Implementation			
5	(Related plans and Policies)	17	B.2 Applicability	Besides listing related plans and codes, this explains which regulations prevail in the case of conflicts
118	(Implementation) - Design guidelines - Transportation improvements	18	B.3 Review and Approval	Details the development review and approval process. Identifies agencies' decision-making authority. Describes the implementation process for public projects

#1005238 – Coors Corridor Plan, August 14, 2014 – COMPARISON OF 1984 AND 2014 PLANS

<i>Page</i>	<i>1984 Plan</i> http://www.cabq.gov/planning/publications/	<i>Page</i>	<i>April 2014 EPC Draft Plan</i> http://www.TinyURL.com/cabq-coorscorridorplan	<i>Objective/Explanation of 2014 Element</i>
111	(Major Issues...Policy 4.c View Preservation) Exceptions	20	B.4 Exemptions and Deviations	Sets the parameters and process for deviations to the transportation requirements <i>and</i> the DOZ. The EPC or Planning Director, not the ZHE, reviews deviations to the DOZ, including the View Preservation regulations.
	None	22	B.5 Amending the Plan	Summarizes the process
	None	22	B.6 Glossary	
	Issue 1: Traffic Movement/Access and Roadway Design		C. Traffic Movement, Access Management, and Roadway Design	Based on a transportation study that involved all stakeholder agencies and analyzed several potential scenarios per current traffic forecasts. Advisory to NMDOT
10	Improve traffic-carrying capacity, increase safety, provide reasonable access and complement scenic values of Corridor	26	C.2. Multi-modal strategy	To optimize traffic- <i>and</i> person-carrying function of Coors Blvd. and the Bypass
11	Policy 1 Principal Arterial	33	C.3 Highway component	Traffic modeling for the update indicated that increasing capacity for motorized (private) vehicles would not reduce traffic congestion. Therefore the Plan recommends the same number of lanes as exists today (6 general purpose).
14	Policy 2 Right-of-Way -156 ft.,	50	C.9 Right-of-Way - 160 ft. (156 ft for NM448); 200 ft. - 225 ft. at potential BRT stations	This policy explains the requirements of the different travel modes presented earlier in the Plan, although the typical section diagrams begin earlier, on p. 29. The basic ROW width (away from major intersections and future BRT stations) is virtually the same as in the 1984 Plan, but is wider at major intersections and BRT stations. This is shown clearly in the sections.

#1005238 – Coors Corridor Plan, August 14, 2014 – COMPARISON OF 1984 AND 2014 PLANS

<i>Page</i>	<i>1984 Plan</i> http://www.cabq.gov/planning/publications/	<i>Page</i>	<i>April 2014 EPC Draft Plan</i> http://www.TinyURL.com/cabq-coorscorridorplan	<i>Objective/Explanation of 2014 Element</i>
17	Policy 3 Control of access and driveways (incl. frontage and circulation roads)	47	C.8 Access Management for Adjacent Properties (incl. connector streets)	The Plan adopts a similar approach for each type of access, but sets out the policies in a more strategic sequence by beginning with major intersections and ending with driveways for individual properties. The Plan provides concept plans for the major road projects and identifies three potential connector streets.
22	Policy 4 Median openings	45	C.7 Unsignalized Intersections and Median Openings	
23	Policy 5 Signalized intersections	41	C.6 Signalized Major Intersections – (incl. interchanges at Montano and Paseo del Norte; extension of elevated North-bound roadway north of I-40/Coors.	
25	Figures 9 - 18	54	C.13 Corridor Segment Recommendations	The approach is similar, but the multi-modal strategy translates into a longer list of recommendations.
36	Policy 6 Streetscape improvements for public right-of-way (ROW)	51	C.10 Streetscape Design - to improve appearance and walkability of Coors Blvd. and Bypass; addresses standards and maintenance	The policy is more nuanced because of the coordination required between NMDOT and the City in order to implement and maintain streetscape improvements.
38	Policy 7 Public viewsites (recommended locations p. 73, 77)	52	C.11 Public Viewsites (recommended locations p. 111-113)	The approach is similar, but more implementation detail is provided and 17 potential locations are identified.
40	Policy 8 Walks and Trails	39	C.5 Pedestrian and Bicycle Component - Sidewalks, multi-use trails and on-street bicycle facilities.	This section comes earlier in the document because of the emphasis on implementing a multi-modal strategy. The Plan <i>requires</i> pedestrian and bicycle facilities throughout the Corridor.
42	Policy 9 Public transportation and transportation system management program	36	C.4 Transit component	This section comes earlier in the document because of the strategy's emphasis on accommodating premium transit service in the Corridor
44	Policy 10 Noise standards	53	C.12 Traffic Noise	The approach is similar
46	Policy 11 I-40/Coors interchange		See C.6	Completed. New recommendations for interchange projects are combined with section on major signalized intersections

#1005238 – Coors Corridor Plan, August 14, 2014 – COMPARISON OF 1984 AND 2014 PLANS

<i>Page</i>	<i>1984 Plan</i> http://www.cabq.gov/planning/publications/	<i>Page</i>	<i>April 2014 EPC Draft Plan</i> http://www.TinyURL.com/cabq-coorscorridorplan	<i>Objective/Explanation of 2014 Element</i>
	None	83	C.14 Definitions	Provided
50	Issue 2: Environmental Concerns and Related Improvements	85	D. Design Overlay Zone	This section encompasses all the policies and regulations related to development that are spread across three separate sections in the 1984 plan.
52	Policy 1 River lands Policy 2 Bosque Policy 3 Oxbow Marsh	85	D.2.1 ii) Open Space Policy	A significant amount of this land situated between Coors and the river has been acquired by as City Open Space, Petroglyph National Monument and Rio Grande State Park, which the City co-manages with other agencies. The City's Major Public Open Space Plan and Bosque Action Plan now govern these areas. The cited policy focuses on buffering these lands from abutting development.
54	Policy 4 Floodplain		None	The City is part of the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) through the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA).
55	Policy 5 Farmland		None	Any remaining farmland is now either protected as Open Space (e.g. Alamo Farm, Open Space Visitor Center) or is under County jurisdiction
56	Policy 6 Archaeological sites		None	This is now addressed by the City's overarching Archaeological Ordinance
57	Policy 7 Grading	86 91	Policy D.2.4 - Grading and Drainage, Regulation D.3.10	Grading and drainage are combined into a single policy and <i>regulation</i> as they are related from a technical standpoint. Grading: the same intent is expressed in a policy and implemented through regulations. Also addresses fugitive dust per code and statute. Storm drainage: Drainage facilities are owned and operated by AMAFCA or the City. The City Drainage Ordinance has been updated recently. NMDOT is responsible for drainage in the Coors/Bypass ROWs.
58	Policy 8 Storm drainage		None	The separate Albuquerque Bernalillo County

#1005238 – Coors Corridor Plan, August 14, 2014 – COMPARISON OF 1984 AND 2014 PLANS

<i>Page</i>	<i>1984 Plan</i> http://www.cabq.gov/planning/publications/	<i>Page</i>	<i>April 2014 EPC Draft Plan</i> http://www.TinyURL.com/cabq-coorscorridorplan	<i>Objective/Explanation of 2014 Element</i>
				Water Utility Authority has responsibility and authority to sewer and water. ABCWUA is represented on the City’s Development Review Board to ensure coordination.
58	Policy 9 Assessment		None	This is covered through standard developer contributions (infrastructure agreements) and/or impact fees as appropriate.
58	Policy 10 Public services		None	The separate Albuquerque Bernalillo County Water Utility Authority has responsibility and authority for sewer and water. ABCWUA is represented on the City’s Development Review Board to ensure coordination.
58	Policy 11 Distribution lines	87, 92	Policy D.2.6 Utilities and Regulations D.3.11	The policy is similar; the regulations have been updated for consistency with the Facility Plan: Electric System Transmission & Generation (2010 – 2020)
59	Issue 3: Land Use and Intensity of Development		(D. DOZ continued)	
60	Policy 1 Adopted plans		See B.2	This section in the “how to” chapter provides more general information about how the Plan applies to a particular property and relates to other plans and (regulatory) codes.
61	Policy 2 Rezoning	85	D.2 Urban Design and Environmental Protection Policies, 1 st paragraph	Explains how the DOZ policies apply to potential zoning requests.
67	Policy 3 Recommended land use		None	Zoning is already established on land under City jurisdiction.
78	Policy 4 Annexation		None	Annexations have occurred. New annexations are per current procedure, i.e. subject to approval by County.
79	Policy 5 Development intensity		D.2 Urban Design and Environmental Protection Policies, 1 st paragraph	Explains how the DOZ policies apply to potential zoning requests that would change density or intensity. In addition, Activity Centers along the Corridor have been designated by the Comprehensive Plan and West Side Strategic Plan where a mix of uses with higher-

#1005238 – Coors Corridor Plan, August 14, 2014 – COMPARISON OF 1984 AND 2014 PLANS

<i>Page</i>	<i>1984 Plan</i> http://www.cabq.gov/planning/publications/	<i>Page</i>	<i>April 2014 EPC Draft Plan</i> http://www.TinyURL.com/cabq-coorscorridorplan	<i>Objective/Explanation of 2014 Element</i>
				density/intensity is appropriate.
80	Policy 6 Sector development plans		None	Planning efforts for smaller areas within the Corridor have been completed by the private sector.
80	Policy 7 Cluster design	86	Policy 2.3 v) Urban Design and Development	In addition to a similar policy, the Plan includes more specific regulations that focus on residential development.
81	Policy 8 Buffer strip along the Corrales Riverside Drain	97	General Regulation D.3.18 ii) e. Multi-family residential development - Usable open space (aggregate)	Same requirement, but it is grouped with all the other special setbacks/buffers required by the Plan.
	None	105	View Preservation Guideline D.4.2 ii)	The Plan also requires buffering for other public land and facilities: designated Major Open Space Arroyos; drains and ditches; National Monument and City Open Space land.
81	Policy 8 Buffer strip along the Corrales Riverside Drain	89	Regulation D. 3.3 ii) Landscape setback/buffer	Same requirement, but it is grouped with all the other special setbacks/buffers required by the Plan.
	None	89	Regulation D.3.3 ii), iii) Landscape setback/buffer	The Plan also requires buffering for other public land and facilities: designated Major Open Space Arroyos; drains and ditches; National Monument and City Open Space land.
82	Issue 4: Visual Impressions and Urban DOZ		D. DOZ (continued)	
82	a. General Policies	88	D.2 Urban Design and Environmental Protection Policies D.3 General Development Regulations	The Plan clearly separates policies, which provide intent, from the regulations and guidelines that implement the policies.
84	Policy a.1, a.2 Views within and beyond the Coors Corridor	86	D.2.2 View Preservation Policies D.2.3 iii), v), vi) Urban Design and Development Policies	The policies reflect current conditions, i.e. the fact that most of the plan area is developed or has development entitlements, and are more focused on how development is designed.
86	Policy a.3 New development	85	D.1 Introduction	Applicability of the DOZ is also detailed in Chapter B. How to use this Plan
86	Policy a.4 Existing development, Design Regulation - Landscaping	20	See B.4.2	Blanket "retro-enforcement" of landscaping regulations by the City Code Enforcement has

#1005238 – Coors Corridor Plan, August 14, 2014 – COMPARISON OF 1984 AND 2014 PLANS

<i>Page</i>	<i>1984 Plan</i> http://www.cabq.gov/planning/publications/	<i>Page</i>	<i>April 2014 EPC Draft Plan</i> http://www.TinyURL.com/cabq-coorscorridorplan	<i>Objective/Explanation of 2014 Element</i>
				not proven to be feasible. It can be done on a case-by-case basis. The Plan sets out when redevelopment triggers a requirement to comply with <i>all</i> the regulations.
88	b. Site Planning and Architecture		(General Development <i>Regulations</i> Cont.)	
88	Policy b.1 Site design	88	D.3.2 Site Design	The different aspects of site design are addressed in one regulation instead of a policy: natural context as well as building orientation and circulation. It also cross-references access management policies in Chapter C
88	Policy b.2 Building setback, height & bulk, Design Regulation A	89	D.3.3 Landscape Setbacks/Buffers D.3.4 Setbacks for Structures	A similar landscape setback is required along Coors except that the wider setback north of Western Trail/Namaste can be reduced to 15 ft minimum for good cause, e.g. a right-turn access lane or BRT lane. Other buffers are included in this regulation.
89	Policy b.2 Building setback, height & bulk, Design Regulation B	93	D.3.12 Structure Height	Same approach to height limit, but the regulation is more comprehensive as it applies to structures, not just buildings. It allows an exemption for development within designated Activity Centers where higher density/intensity is appropriate.
90	Policy b.3 Front landscaped street yard		See D.3.3	Design is integrated with the setback/buffer regulation.
	None		D.3.5 Walls and Fences	They complement the extensive general regulations in the Zoning Code for walls, fences and retaining walls.
92	Policy b.4 Site landscaping Regulation A. Landscape design Regulation B. Landscape materials	91	D.3.9 Landscaping -	The regulation is complementary to the regulations in the Zoning Code. It calls for respecting the natural setting of the Corridor and a desire to retain open-ness, but avoids duplication..
94	Policy b.5 Off-Street Parking Regulations A & B	91	D.3.8 Off-Street Parking	It sets maximum parking at 10% over the Zoning Code minimum requirement, which supports the multi-modal strategy,

#1005238 – Coors Corridor Plan, August 14, 2014 – COMPARISON OF 1984 AND 2014 PLANS

<i>Page</i>	<i>1984 Plan</i> http://www.cabq.gov/planning/publications/	<i>Page</i>	<i>April 2014 EPC Draft Plan</i> http://www.TinyURL.com/cabq-coorscorridorplan	<i>Objective/Explanation of 2014 Element</i>
				and refers to access management policy in Chapter C. It does not duplicate the design standards for off-street parking in the Zoning Code.
96	Policy b.6 Commercial sites.	88	See D.3.2 ii) Site Design	Similar approach, but also addresses grade differences within the Corridor.
96	Policy b.7 Access	90	D.3.6 Pedestrian Circulation	Regulatory, i.e. mandatory. Connections are also required to adjacent (public) Open Space.
96	Policy b.8 Bikeways and Horse Trails	91	D.3.7 Multi-Use Trail Network	The provision of segments and connections are mandatory based on specific criteria. This supports the multi-modal strategy.
98	Policy b.9 Site Lighting, as amended (see resolution at front of document) Regulation A Guidelines	94	D.3.15 Lighting	Adds a height limit for building-mounted lighting and on night-time operation., but does not duplicate the regulations in the Zoning Code.
99	Policy b.10 Architectural Design Regulations A Regulations B Guidelines	94	D.3.14 Architecture	These regulations are tailored for the Corridor and do not duplicate the General building and site design regulations in the Zoning Code. Address the same elements, except for human scale. Are more specific and many are mandatory.
		97	D.3.18 Residential Development Regulations	Regulatory, i.e. mandatory, and are much more comprehensive.
	None	97	D. 3.19 Phased Development	Expands requirements for public safety and welfare, in addition to addressing aesthetics.
	c. View Preservation	94	D.3.13 Solar Access	Protects access for non-residential as well as residential buildings
	None	96	D.3.17 Drive-up service windows	Provides design standards that complement zone-based and general regulations in the Zoning Code..
	c. View Preservation	99	D.4. View Preservation Regulations	[Note: a revised section has been prepared for the August 2014 EPC hearing]

#1005238 – Coors Corridor Plan, August 14, 2014 – COMPARISON OF 1984 AND 2014 PLANS

<i>Page</i>	<i>1984 Plan</i> http://www.cabq.gov/planning/publications/	<i>Page</i>	<i>April 2014 EPC Draft Plan</i> http://www.TinyURL.com/cabq-coorscorridorplan	<i>Objective/Explanation of 2014 Element</i>
2	Segments 3 & 4	6	View Preservation sub-area	Similar area
103	Policy 1. View Preservation	86	Policy D.2.3 v)	Similar policy. The introduction under D.4 provides additional information.
103	Definitions	100	D.4.1 Definitions	Simplifies sightlines; emphasizes actual view from Coors; provides more diagrams to illustrate different development scenarios.
104	Regulation A Setback		None	An additional meandering setback based on grade difference with Coors, coupled with differentiating single-story from multi-story buildings, seems unnecessarily complex when what matters is total structure height and mass on a site as seen from the public thoroughfare.
109	Regulation B.1 Building Heights Regulation B.2 Building Bulk	105	D.4.3 i) Structure Height and Mass	Applies to structures, not just buildings. No exceptions are allowed for towers, etc. The regulations are tailored to different conditions south and north of Paseo del Norte, re. elevations and lot configuration.
		105	D.4.3 ii) Sites south of Paseo del Norte	Same maximum height limit, except that 50% of the height and 30% of its width can extend above the view plane . Same limit on massing.
		106	D.4.3 iii) Sites north of Paseo del Norte	Allows provision of a "view window" as a second option, with the same maximum height limit.
110	Guideline B.3 Massing	105	D.4.2 Building and Site Design Guidelines	Comes prior to regulations to provide general guidance for how elements of site and building design can be arranged to be opportunities for view protection.
111	Regulation C Site landscaping	106	D.4.4 Landscaping	No longer attempts to regulate the pruning of private landscaping, which is impossible to enforce Corridor-wide.
	See resolution at front of document amending Policy b.9 Site Lighting	106	D.4.5 Lighting	Same 20 ft limit on pole height.
	None	106	D.4.6 Signage	Restricts illumination of higher signs.
	None	106	D.4.7 Application Requirements	Provides information for applicants
111	Regulation D Exceptions	20	B.4 Exceptions and Deviations	Sets the parameters and process for deviations to

#1005238 – Coors Corridor Plan, August 14, 2014 – COMPARISON OF 1984 AND 2014 PLANS

<i>Page</i>	<i>1984 Plan</i> http://www.cabq.gov/planning/publications/	<i>Page</i>	<i>April 2014 EPC Draft Plan</i> http://www.TinyURL.com/cabq-coorscorridorplan	<i>Objective/Explanation of 2014 Element</i>
				the View Preservation regulations. The EPC or Planning Director, not the ZHE, decides.
112	d. Signage		(General Development <i>Regulations</i> Cont.)	
112	Policy d.1, as amended(see resolutions at front of document) Regulations	95	D.3.16 Signage	They complement the extensive general sign regulations in the Zoning Code, but include regulations tailored to conditions in the Corridor, such as: free-standing signs must be monument signs; some allowances (size and number) are afforded .
117	Implementation	109	Public Projects	Focuses on public projects only. No specific cost information is provided.