

# **CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE LAND USE FACILITATION PROGRAM PROJECT MEETING REPORT**

**Project #:** 1005238  
**Property Description/Address:** Coors Corridor Plan (CCP)

**Date Submitted:** December 6, 2014  
**Submitted By:** Diane Grover

**Meeting Date/Time:** December 2, 2014  
**Meeting Location:** Don Newton/Taylor Ranch Community Center  
**Facilitator:** Diane Grover  
**Co-facilitator:** Jesse Eaton Lawrence

## **Parties:**

**Project Team**

Carol Toffaleti,	COA Planning Project Team
Carrie Barkhurst,	City Planning Project Team
Jessica Johnson,	City Planning Project Team
Russell Brito,	City Planning Project Team

## **Neighborhood Associations**

Alamosa NA  
Alban Hills NA  
Andalucia HOA  
Avalon NA  
Crestview Bluff NA  
Encanto Village HOA  
Grande Heights Assn.  
La Luz Del Sol NA.  
La Luz Landowners Assn.  
Ladera Heights NA  
Ladera West NA  
Las Casitas Del Rio HOA  
Las Casitas Del Rio Unit 2 Subdivision HOA  
Laurelwood NA  
Los Volcanes NA  
Oxbow Park HOA  
Oxbow Village HOA  
Paradise Hills Civic Assn.  
Pat Hurley NA  
Piedras Marcadas NA  
Quaker Heights NA  
Rancho Encantado HOA  
Rancho Sereno NA

Rio Oeste HOA  
Riverfront Estates NA  
Riverview Heights NA  
S.R. Marmon NA  
Skyview West NA  
South Valley Coalition of NA's  
St. Joseph Townhouse Assn.  
Stinson Tower NA  
Story Rock HOA  
South West Alliance of Neighbors (SWAN)  
South Valley Coalition of Neighborhood Assn.  
Taylor Ranch NA  
The Enclave at Oxbow HOA  
Villa De Paz HOA, Inc.  
Vista Grande NA  
Vista Magnifica Assn.  
Vista Montecito HOA, Inc.  
Vista West HOA  
West Bluff NA  
West Mesa NA  
Western Trails Estates HOA  
Westside Coalition of NA's  
Windmill Manor Place Subdivision HOA  
North Valley Coalition

(All invited but not all in attendance, see individual names and affiliations at the end of this report)

### **Background/Meeting Summary:**

This meeting was held on December 2, 2014, and concerns the re-working of the Coors Corridor Plan (CCP). The topic of this meeting was Urban Design and View Preservation. It follows numerous meetings and 3 EPC Hearings, the last of which resulted in a 90 day period targeted at further discussions between stakeholders and the City. Three such facilitated meetings have been scheduled and this report covers the third meeting at the Don Newton/Taylor Ranch Community Center. All materials including Facilitator's Reports will be posted on the City Web Site, hopefully early the week of 12/8/14.

It is the Planning team's desire to utilize the feedback gained at the 3 facilitated meetings to incorporate participant ideas into the draft plan they are preparing.

At the beginning of the meeting, Carol announced that Catherine VerEecke, a planner with Bernalillo County, was available at the meeting until 7:00, to answer any questions participants may have for the County. The existing 1984 plan is a joint plan between the City and County. The new plan is a City plan because most of the county land in the plan area is now developed. The county has participated in the new plan, however will not adopt it because there are so few

county properties left in the Coors Corridor. The county will continue to follow the 1984 Coors Corridor Plan.

Carol presented the project to date, giving some details on the changes made between the 1984 plan and the October Plan, and discussed the changes in process to be focused on between now and the hearing in January. Among those things discussed included, but were not limited to Design Overlay Zone; Regulations and Policies; height limits; view windows and deviations.

Attendees asked questions, and suggested some rewording of some of the material presented (see detail, below). Attendees were also motivated to make sure the wording in the plan led to clarity that left little room for interpretation. Planning staff made it clear that they were looking for input to incorporate into the plan and that this was the purpose of these meetings from the standpoint of the EPC and of Planning Staff.

One area of concern was that items defined as public benefit could be used as justification for a deviation request. One attendee felt that “public benefits” that the community may not see as a fair trade-off may be used to justify deviations the community may be unhappy with. Other concerns with the plan are detailed below in **“Meeting Specifics”**

Carol promised to send attendees a copy of the presentation for their review. Attendees also asked when the new draft plan would be available. Carol stated she did not know, but that staff was working diligently to complete and would get it ready as soon as possible.

**Outcome:**

**Areas of Agreement:**

- None noted

**Unresolved Issues, Interests and Concerns:**

- Plan revisions are in process and will be complete prior to the hearing on January 8, 2015,

**Meeting Specifics:**

- 1) Applicant Presentation, Carol Toffaleti
  - a) Need for new plan
    - i) Substantial population increase since 1984 Plan
    - ii) Substantial development along Coors Corridor since 1984
    - iii) Includes land preserved as open space
    - iv) Boulevard widening over time
    - v) Now connects to 6 river crossings
    - vi) Population and traffic forecast is for continued growth
  - b) Two main elements of existing and new plans
    - i) Transportation policies and some projects
      - (1) New plan based on multi-modal strategy; a departure from the 1984 plan
        - (a) Giving big role to transit

- (b) Consistent with transportation plan for whole metro area
  - (c) Recommending BRT (Bus Rapid Transit) for the corridor
- (2) Coors Blvd and Bypass are major transit corridors designated in comprehensive plan
  - (a) Coors is also a limited access arterial to keep traffic flowing
  - (b) Access needs to be spaced so there are not too many driveways, intersections and signals in close proximity
- c) Design Overlay Zone
  - i) Includes general design regulations for development and redevelopment on properties in the corridor
  - ii) Regulations address
    - (1) Buffers
    - (2) Setbacks along Coors
    - (3) Limits on heights of freestanding signs
    - (4) Building height limited on Coors frontage outside of activity centers
      - (a) In activity centers it is appropriate to have somewhat denser development
    - (5) No electronic panel signs are allowed in corridor under new plan
  - iii) Design overlay zone area (map displayed)
    - (1) Starts north of Central and moves north
    - (2) Gets wider by Western Trail and Namaste
    - (3) Extends to Alameda
    - (4) Does not go into Bypass
- d) View Preservation map
  - i) Starts at Namaste and goes to Alameda
  - ii) Width of area does vary
    - (1) Gets narrow north of the bypass in particular
- e) CCP is a Rank III Plan
  - i) Needs to be consistent with higher-ranked plans and help implement policies of
    - (1) Comprehensive Plan
    - (2) Westside Strategic Plan
  - ii) Facility plans relevant to the area
    - (1) For arroyos calling for buffering and opportunities for trails along arroyos
    - (2) Electric Transmission Facility Plan, recently updated
  - iii) Needs to be consistent with the 2035 Metropolitan Transportation Plan
    - (1) Does this through multi-modal strategy
- f) View Preservation-related Policies
  - i) Views of the Bosque and Sandias should be maintained through buffers for waterways and public open spaces and the design of streets, trails and built forms
  - ii) Public view sites should be provided at appropriate locations along Coors Blvd. and within the View Preservation sub-area to enhance the public's enjoyment of the Corridor's scenic assets
  - iii) Need to protect the views and be mindful of private property owners' rights to develop property
  - iv) CCP sets parameters and criteria for how much views can be encroached upon
- g) Vision
  - i) Flows to goals, policies, and details of rules for developer

- ii) Opening up objectives of VP regulations for discussion at tonight's meeting
- iii) 3 Priorities for views to the NE
  - (1) Ridgeline of the Sandias
  - (2) Face of the mountains
  - (3) Bosque and lower areas
- Design structures to
  - iv) Provide a variety of silhouettes and building forms.
  - v) Recognize that the community seems to value breaks between buildings
- h) Regulations to limit height
  - i) Went through 1984 plan and October, 2014 plan
    - (1) Came up with revisions (at front table during meeting)
  - ii) 1984 plan says if there's a single-story building, the height of that building is limited by a horizontal view plane at 4 ft. above the level of Coors
    - (1) Very restrictive if site is near to grade of Coors
    - (2) Limited to maybe 14' or less
    - (3) For multi-story buildings 1/3 of the height is allowed to be above horizontal view plane
      - (a) Can be restrictive unless structure is on much lower ground
    - (4) Buildings cannot penetrate the Sandia ridgeline
      - (5) Mass of buildings shouldn't be masking more than 50% of view area
  - iii) October, 2014 version of plan does not differentiate single and multi-story buildings
  - iv) Allows 50% of structure above horizontal view plane instead of 1/3 of building
  - v) Structure can't penetrate above ridgeline as seen in view area.
  - vi) Only 30% of width can extend above the view plane
  - vii) As with 1984 plan, maintaining limit on obstructing view area by 50%
  - viii) Proposing base allowable height of 16' for residential; 20' non-residential
    - (1) To facilitate building on sites at similar grade to Coors
- i) Building mass
  - (a) Another option for north of Paseo would be to allow view windows between buildings
    - (i) If developer provided a window of minimum width the building could be above the horizontal view plane and wider than 30% limit proposed under standard regulations
    - (ii) Couldn't have greater mass; limited to 50% of total view area
    - (iii) View window can be between 45 degrees and 90 degrees with massing measured the usual way
  - (b) Visual mass of the structure(s) on a project site shall obscure no more than 50% of the view frame area or the view area, depending on the number of structures and application type
    - (i) View area does not include any built area beneath grade of Coors
    - (ii) Buildings off the site are not considered in calculations
  - (c) Per Carol, when different view frames are needed to take all buildings into account, one suggestion in the revision is to take a measurement of the mass and use the average of the view frames to figure out compliance
  - (d) When building is behind another but blocks some of the view window
    - (i) Window becomes angled

- j) Exceptions to regulations
  - i) 1984 plan
    - (1) Allows developer to request an exception by demonstrating hardship or proposing an exceptional design that still meets the intent of the plan.
    - (2) Requests all go to the EPC for review
  - ii) October plan
    - (1) Also allows exceptions, called deviations
    - (2) Can request exception based on hardship or public benefit i.e.:
      - (a) Providing jobs
      - (b) Transit stop
      - (c) Park and ride
      - (d) Public view site
      - (e) Preserving historic or archaeologically important structure
    - (3) Additional requirements
      - (a) Meeting with planning department
      - (b) Providing written statements
    - (4) Sites south of Paseo
      - (a) All go to the EPC
      - (b) 25% max deviation
    - (5) Sites north of Paseo
      - (a) If deviation of 25-50% EPC handles them
      - (b) Less than 25% go to the planning director
        - (i) Carol believes this will still require notification
        - (ii) Jolene Wolfley has concerns about the 25% being applied across categories and believes that all deviations should go to the EPC to make things cleaner
        - (iii) Another attendee felt that 25% was definitely too high to go to the planning director
        - (iv) Another attendee stated that there are buildings that are just barely below the ridgeline, and 25% above that is substantial
          - 1. Carrie Barkhurst said she didn't think that would be approved but was making a note of it
  - k) View Plane issues raised by stakeholders (a) and identified by Staff (b)
    - i) Reinstate more visionary language from 1984 plan (a)
    - ii) Sites that qualify for base allowable height option is too vague (a)
    - iii) Sandia ridgeline visible in each view frame, rather than in the overall view area, should establish the maximum building height (a)
    - iv) 30% limit on horizontal expanse of structures is too restrictive (b)
    - v) Regulations are too complex (a)
    - vi) Regulations need to provide some design flexibility (a)
    - vii) Clarify purpose of sight lines (a & b)
      - (1) to provide lines for sections, which establish structure height
      - (2) to provide center lines for view frames
    - viii) Improve explanations and instructions for applicants (a & b)
    - ix) Define hardship for deviations (exceptions) to regulations (a)
    - x) Tighten public benefit criteria for deviations (b)

- i) Proposed revisions (In Revised VP Section dated 12/2/14)
  - i) Limit and specify where base allowable height is allowed: sites  $\leq$  10 ft. below Coors
  - ii) Reduce maximum height to lowest Sandia ridgeline within view frame
    - (1) Attendee preferred wording in a handout saying “Maximum height is 35% above the horizontal view plane or 50% above the horizontal view plane, with provision of a view window or a pedestrian-oriented view site”
    - (2) Attendee concerned that if there are deep valleys in the ridgeline, could be overly restrictive to building height.
      - (a) Could be limiting in larger site
      - (b) Carol stated could look at this more carefully
  - iii) Replace two regulations (limits on structure height & horizontal expanse) with one regulation (lower structure height w/potential height allowance)
  - iv) Regulations have been simplified
    - v) A height allowance is acceptable if site provides a view-related public benefit. Allowance would still comply with a “Sandia ridgeline” maximum
    - vi) Sightlines have been clarified
    - vii) Instructions for applicants have been expanded
    - viii) Proposing changes to deviations (exceptions)
- m) View windows
  - i) October draft plan says view windows could be applied north of Paseo
    - (1) This is an option, not a requirement
    - (2) Views to the northeast heading north on Coors are viewed as the most special views warranting protection through regulations.
  - ii) Attendee stated that revision v) above applies south of Paseo as well
  - iii) Would allow a view window other than north of Paseo
  - iv) Gives opportunity to build higher if view window is provided
  - v) Pat Gallagher concerned that view window becomes an exception and a loophole to get around doing it the right way
    - (1) Carol stated that October plan allows 50% above with restriction on width
    - (2) Now proposing only 35%; can only get 50% if providing a window or public view site. Cannot be used in every situation
    - (3) Pat stated making it allowable south of Paseo opens up new set of loopholes in view preservation concept
  - vi) Jolene stated that view windows were introduced for north of Paseo. For south we wanted to achieve more view preservation by using other techniques
  - vii) Hugh Floyd stated that view windows are a good, creative idea.
    - (1) What's been implemented under 1984 plan has obstructed mountains
    - (2) If more creative language under the plan, people have incentive to look at the big picture and see we want unobstructed views
    - (3) Could be a much better scenario than what happened in the old plan
  - viii) Pat stated view window at 45 degrees and 40' wide, at 40 mph which is about 60' per second, people have less than a second to see through that 40' view window. If at 70 degrees wouldn't see anything
    - (1) Jessica stated that the intent of the plan is multi-modal so also considering other modes besides the car. That's the strategy being considered with this revision
  - ix) Rene Horvath stated that views are preserved for pedestrians no matter what.

- (1) Goal should be to preserve for cars; pedestrians will benefit by default.
- (2) View regulations in 1984 plan are very good and layer on top of each other
  - (a) Exception is for difficult sites when nothing else can be done.
  - (b) Most are north of Paseo, not south
- (3) 1984 plan is perfect for Namaste to Paseo, because land is more sloped than north of Paseo.
- (4) Buildings north of Paseo may need to rely on view windows
- (5) Heights should be lowered so folks can see some of the mountains
  - (a) Better view of the mountains getting closer to Alameda
- n) Excavation
  - i) Jolene stated that south of Paseo where there's more distance between Coors and the river, developers are motivated to excavate and drop buildings
    - (1) This has worked well south of Paseo
    - (2) Don't want developers to start filling certain sites so they become closer to grade at Coors
      - (a) Unintended consequences we don't want to see happen
    - (3) Carol stated there are goals and policies in October plan to discourage changes in topography.
  - ii) Jackie Fishman stated that not all sites south of Paseo can be lowered below Coors grade.
    - (1) Currently working on project where not all of it can be lowered 10'
    - (2) Jolene stated that excavation may not work for 10% of sites but that's a minority of the frontage between Namaste and Paso
  - iii) Pat asked what stops a developer from building up a site
    - (1) Hugh Floyd stated they are addressed in ordinance
      - (a) If more than a small amount of earth work is needed, approval from city hydrologist is required.
    - (2) Carol stated Page 96 of October plan had grading and drainage regulations. They refer to city drainage control ordinance.
  - iv) Rene stated that regarding the 1984 plan on grading, purpose was to follow natural topography.
    - (1) Had to deal with west side of Coors and Taylor Ranch bluff.
    - (2) In last 10 years there's been much cut-and-fill.
      - (a) Some places are really high
      - (b) Things are sitting in holes
  - v) Hugh stated that he thought we agree that regulations restricting excavation should be limited to the west side of Coors, not the east side
- o) Varying Silhouettes
  - i) Carol stated there was language in 1984 plan about providing variety of silhouettes
    - (1) October Plan says developments with several buildings should provide a variety of building silhouettes and massing. A transition from lower building elevations on the Coors Blvd. frontage or adjoining Major Public Open Space to taller structures and larger buildings at the interior of the site is encouraged.
    - (2) Would like applicants to start thinking about context-sensitive design and strategies for laying out the site.

- ii) Jackie stated that this seems to speak to commercial buildings. Single-family developments aren't going to have the variety of silhouettes
    - (1) Carol stated that staff has looked at what's available for single-family residential and there are very few left
      - (a) They didn't want to gear regulations to very specific sites.
      - (b) Seems that even in residential design there could be different building types which could be considered
- p) Proposed deviation language
  - i) Attend a meeting with the Pre-Application Review Team (PRT) or Design Review Team (DRT) before submitting the request for deviation
  - ii) Provide a written statement detailing how the deviation still meets the intent of the plan, including its goals and policies
  - iii) Demonstrate at least one of the following
    - (1) Hardship
      - (a) The site is unique in terms of its inherent physical characteristics and requires the deviation in order to be developed.
      - (b) They may include but are not limited to topography, existing infrastructure, drainage channels and arroyos
    - (2) Public Benefit (see below)
  - iv) Detail how the proposed development relates to its surroundings, including but not limited to any adjacent Major Public Open Space and residential neighborhoods
  - v) In coming to a decision, the EPC or Planning Director or his/her designee shall consider whether the project is of a comparable quality and design as otherwise required by the Plan and will enhance the area
- q) Public Benefits
  - i) The development will provide a diversity of land uses in designated Activity Centers
  - ii) The development will support the use of transit, e.g. through provision of a stop/station or a park and ride within 660' of a Rapid Ride stop or BRT Station, subject to approval and acceptance by the transit provider
  - iii) The proposal includes a public amenity, such as Public Art or a public view site, that is not otherwise required by the Plan or the City. Improvements do not need to be publicly owned, but shall be accessible or visible in perpetuity to the public. They shall be implemented by the developer and maintained by the property-owner per agreement with the City. Subject to approval and acceptance by the department or agency responsible for maintenance
    - (1) One attendee had concerns about public art being seen as a qualifying benefit as this could be very easy to achieve
  - iv) The project will preserve a historic building, structure or archaeological site. Subject to approval by the appropriate department and/or agency
- r) Concern about public benefits.
  - i) Very hard to sort out that those public benefits are worth the trade-off to lose more view.
  - ii) Seems arbitrary with lack of definition
  - iii) Hard to anticipate
  - iv) Concern that this might open up very different direction for Coors and Montano activity center

- v) Looking at vacant land, focusing from Paseo to Namaste, feel like stage has been set with 1984 plan that view can mostly be preserved.
  - (1) Not sure we need to say we want to trade view for these things. A lot of them can be achieved without giving up the view, and a lot of them can be achieved while keeping the view in place.
- vi) Per Carol: Designed to provide more flexibility.
  - (1) Applicant is required to do a lot to show trade-off is warranted
    - (a) They have to provide written statement, show deviation still meets intent of plan
    - (b) Have to detail how development relates to surroundings
    - (c) Gives guidance to decision-maker, and in this case it would only be the EPC.
    - (d) Deviations are to general design regulations as well.
      - (i) Area south of Paseo, all deviations to VP regulations would go to the EPC.
      - (ii) Whether public benefit is worth it would be reviewed fully in a public hearing.
  - (2) Jolene concerned with unintended consequence
    - (a) Risk is if I want a deviation and achieve one of the “public benefits” the EPC is more beholden to grant the deviation even if the community does not feel that it’s a merited trade off.
- s) Design Regulations
  - i) Mass regulations
    - (1) Change is that visual mass shall obscure no more than 50% of the view frame or view area depending on number of structures or application type.
    - (2) Some sites are larger with multiple view frames, and some are smaller and a single view frame can cover the whole site.
    - (3) Applicant would have to provide: view analysis to demonstrate compliance with regulations.
    - (4) 2 ways of showing view analysis, elevations and massing
      - (a) Massing: Demonstrate in an exhibit that the structures will obscure no more than 50% of the view area
        - (i) Draw 3D rendering of structure
        - (ii) Locate related sight line.....
        - (iii)....and observation point on Coors Blvd
        - (iv)Draw the view frame
        - (v) Project the silhouette of the structure and the view frame onto an image of the project site and its backdrop, which reflects conditions at the time of application.

*Note: Measure the area of the visual mass of the structure relative to the total area of the view frame*

- (b) If the project site requires more than one view frame, provide the view frames and the resulting view area
  - (i) Draw 3D image to scale (model) of structure(s) (conceptual if footprint is as yet undefined)
  - (ii) Draw view frames to cover the entire horizontal expanse of the site
  - (iii)Project the silhouette(s) and each view frame onto site’s backdrop of the Sandias

(iv) Combine view frames into a view area

**Note:** Measure the area of the visual mass of the structure relative to the total view area

An alternative is to stop after 3, measure the visual mass for each view frame and calculate the average. If the average is less than or equal to 50%, the application complies

ii) Signage

- (1) Sign regulations in general design section of plan.
  - (a) Regulations in zoning code are currently in a certain sequence.
    - (i) New plan is proposing to use same sequence.
  - (b) Rene stated that in 1984 plan signs are limited to 75 sq. ft.
    - (i) Everyone has been following that.
    - (ii) Now you're saying up to 105 sq. ft.
    - (iii) Also eliminated part with only 10 items of information allowed per frontage.
  - (c) Carol stated that existing regulations are difficult to understand and implement
    - (i) In reviewers' experience that 10 items were difficult to review and figure out compliance on
      1. Item can be a number; an abbreviation; a word; a symbol
      2. Made rules unenforceable because of different interpretations of what an item was
      3. Unreasonable to tell people what they could put on their signs
  - (d) Other issue is whether a 75 sq. ft. sign is legible.
    - (i) Cars can go pretty fast on Coors, and people may not be able to see the sign.
  - (e) New plan allows for 105 sq. ft. sign if it's a multi-tenant sign
    - (i) 1 sign allowed for each street frontage of at least 100'
    - (ii) If the premises is governed by site development plan that is 5 acres or larger, a second sign is allowed on each street frontage longer than 600 feet according to October draft
      1. Limit is 2 signs if site is 5 acres or more
  - (f) Jackie stated that getting rid of "pieces of information" element of plan is a great idea which she supports wholeheartedly
  - (g) Rene stated that there was legislation in 1989 from Pat Baca limiting maximum sign size to 75 sq. ft.
  - (h) Where over 12 acres in development a second freestanding sign was allowed on any street frontage longer than 1500 linear feet.

2) Carrie Barkhurst presentation (computer slides depicting imagined development for discussion purposes)

  - a) Site at Coors and Eagle Ranch
    - i) 4 parcels zoned C-1, O-1, residential
    - ii) Placed a couple buildings in the residential parcel, 16' in height
      - (1) Commercial/office zone allows up to 20'
    - iii) Treated as 4 parcels
    - iv) Showed view from corner of Eagle Ranch and Coors
      - (1) View window between buildings

- (2) Shows view plane, grade of Coors and 4 feet above
- (3) Building is obscuring ridgeline
- (4) Showing 45 degree angle plane
- v) Final buildings speaks to issue of buildings on multiple sites which may or may not meet massing requirements if looking at each site individually. The buildings shown in the image definitely **do not meet** the massing requirements if this was considered to be one development site
  - (1) Base heights can penetrate the ridgeline, but no deviation is allowed to base height.
    - (a) If you use a 16' or 20' scenario you can't ask for a deviation to that
    - (b) If penetrating ridgeline you could not build higher than the base height
    - (c) If developer wanted 30' tall building and lowered site by 15' could go through the regular EPC process
      - (i) If south of Coors and choosing to excavate and do a view plane analysis, this would need to go through the EPC
- vi) Attendee stated that it becomes tricky to define existing infrastructure and define what will make you eligible for a deviation.
  - (1) Even existing infrastructure has a bit of a gray area because people could have not paid attention to the plan when they did their infrastructure.
    - (a) Carol stated plan says infrastructure is a potential hardship, but you would have to go through and demonstrate.
- vii) Another attendee asked if there was a possibility Coors would be widened
  - (1) Carol stated that the transportation strategy in the plan is only to widen road to provide dedicated transit lane
  - (2) Also could be opportunities where right turn lane is required at intersection
    - (a) Draft plan has requirement for 35' landscape setback.
    - (b) If NMDOT requires a right-hand turn lane, could be a reason to reduce the 35' buffer
      - (i) Rene asked if we would automatically cut into the 35' buffer or is there enough space now
        - 1. Carol replied that in this area, existing ROW (Right-of-way) is quite wide
        - 2. Proposed width in new plan is 160' which is not much different from the old plan.
        - 3. New plan is specific about intersections possibly needing wider ROWs
- 3) Questions for Catherine VerEecke, Bernalillo County Planning Representative
  - a) County is not adopting the new CCP Plan
    - i) Adopted 1984 plan which still applies to properties in Bernalillo County along Coors
    - ii) Most County properties have been annexed into the City
      - (1) A few remain
    - iii) Over the years most County properties were annexed
    - iv) Most are already developed or have existing development plans
    - v) County has been following this process
      - (1) Participated in transportation component
      - (2) Viewed in relation to county plans

- (3) Still participating in process but not planning to adopt new CCP under review now
  - vi) 1984 plan will remain in effect for the few properties in the County.
  - vii) Any questions, please tell Carol and she will get in touch with Catherine, or call Catherine
- b) Urgency due to county reliance
  - i) Attendee stated that roughly a year ago were told plan needed to go through quickly because county was reliant on it and needed it approved
  - ii) Russell Brito stated that CCP process began almost simultaneously with the Comprehensive Plan update which had urgency for the county. The two may have been confused.
  - iii) Attendee stated that was told that process had to be rushed because of a transportation grant
    - (1) Carol clarified that the City Department of Municipal Development was working on the Transportation element when planning came on board a bit later.
      - (a) There was an urgency about remaining funds for transportation consultants
      - (b) They were able to extend a small pot of money

#### **Next Steps:**

- Planning team to get draft report completed as soon as possible. Not projected completion date is available

#### **Action Plan:**

- Planning team to take information gathered at facilitated meetings and communicated to team to attempt to incorporate into revised plans

#### **Action Items:**

- Carol will send presentation slides to attendees
- Attendees were asked to contact Carol Toffaleti with questions, concerns and suggestions

#### **Comments:**

- Rene asked why a new plan is needed and why the City can't just modify the 1984 plan rather than creating so much change
  - Carol stated that a lot has changed in 30 years, not just on the ground but in city policies.
  - Carol said they also want to integrate transportation policies in the plan with the design regulations and view preservation regulations.

#### **Application Hearing Details:**

1. Hearing scheduled for January 8, 2015
2. Hearing Time:

- a. The Commission will begin hearing applications at 8:30 a.m.
  - b. The actual time this application will be heard by the Commission will depend on the applicant's position on the Commission's schedule
  - c. The agenda is posted on [www.cabq.gov/planning/epc/index](http://www.cabq.gov/planning/epc/index) on the Friday immediately prior to the EPC Hearing
3. Hearing Process:
- a. Comments from facilitated meetings will go into a report which goes to the City Planner.
  - b. City Planner includes facilitator report in recommendations.
  - c. The Commission will render a recommendation and parties have 15 day protest period to respond to the recommendations.
  - d. City Council will make the final decision.
4. Resident Participation at Hearing:
- a. Written comments must be received by December 18, 2014 to be included in the Planner's staff report. Comments can be sent to:

Carol Toffaleti, Staff Planner  
 600 2<sup>nd</sup> Street NW, Third Floor  
 Albuquerque, NM 87102  
[cgtoffaleti@cabq.gov](mailto:cgttoffaleti@cabq.gov)  
 (505) 924-3345

OR

Peter D. Nicholls, EPC Chair  
 % Planning Department  
 600 2<sup>nd</sup> St, NW, Third Floor  
 Albuquerque, NM 87102

### Comments:

#### Names & Affiliations of Attendees:

Candy Patterson	Laurelwood NA
Catherine VerEecke	Bernalillo County Planning
Hugh Floyd	Floyd Development Services, LLC
Jackie Fishman	Consensus Planning
Jolene Wolfley	Taylor Ranch NA
Judith A. Kanester	Villa de Paz HOA
Lynne Scott	Alban Hills
Nancy Loisel	Andalucia at La Luz Landowners Assoc
Pat Gallagher	La Luz Landowners Assoc.
Rae Perls	La Luz Landowners Assoc.
Rene Horvath	Taylor Ranch NA
Forrest Adams	La Luz Landowners Assoc.
Betsy King	La Luz Landowners Assoc.

Steve Perls	La Luz Landowners Assoc.
Joanne Kimmey	La Luz Landowners Assoc.
Joyce Woods	La Luz del Sol
Jill Greene	Oxbow Enclave
Katrina Baca	City Planning Intern
Mary Zaremba	Las Casitas del Rio I
Joyce DeHarney	Laurelwood
Rachel Miller	CABQ
Russell Brito	COA Planning
Carrie Barkhurst	COA Planning
Jessica Johnson	COA Planning
Carol Toffaleti	COA Planning