
**CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE
CITY COUNCIL**

INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

TO: LUPZ Committee

FROM: Kara Shair-Rosenfield, Policy Analyst/Planning
Andrew Webb, Policy Analyst/Planning

SUBJECT: Downtown Neighborhood Area Sector Development Plan
(R-11-225) – Recommendation Re: “Transition Area” Zoning

DATE: November 30, 2011

History of Proposed Zoning in the “Transition Area”

[Note: For the purposes of this discussion, staff has adopted the term “Transition Area” to refer to the area that is generally bounded by 12th Street on the west, Marquette on the north, Kent/Copper on the south, and 7th Street (the Downtown Core) on the east. See map below:]



An early, pre-EPC-submittal draft of the proposed zoning map that was prepared by Planning staff and consultants contained more proposed OR zoning in the “Transition Area” in order to acknowledge the historic pattern of office uses interspersed with residences in the area. However, because of neighborhood concerns about further encroachment of office uses into the neighborhood, a larger portion of the southeast area was proposed as MR (Mixed Residential) in the EPC Draft (10.28.10). Additionally, restrictive criteria were added to the OR zone that would essentially limit anything that was not already in use as an office at the time of the Plan’s adoption to residential uses.

Over the course of the EPC and early LUPZ hearings on the DNASDP, numerous property owners with proposed MR (Mixed Residential) zoning submitted comments on the proposed zoning and requested the application of a different zoning category based on the fact that their property is currently being or has historically been used for a non-residential purpose, in most cases, as an office. Additionally, neighborhood residents have expressed concerns about the proposed Mixed Use Medium (MUM) zoning along Tijeras between 10th and 12th Streets within the "Transition Area."

At the 9-14-11 LUPZ hearing on the DNASDP, staff suggested that additional discussion with property owners and stakeholders within the "Transition Area" would be useful in order to allow an opportunity to take a closer look at issues in and concerns in hopes of developing a comprehensive, rather than piecemeal, recommendation for the area. After sending mailed notice to property owners and other interested parties, the City held a facilitated meeting on October 13, 2011, which was attended by approximately twenty (20) people. A summary of the meeting prepared by the meeting's facilitator, Tim Karpoff, is attached hereto.

Taking into consideration 1) adopted City goals and policies, 2) competing and conflicting desires expressed and requests made during the public hearing process on the DNASDP, and 3) input received at the 10-13-11 facilitated meeting, Council staff, in consultation with Planning Department staff and the consultants who helped develop the Draft Plan (Consensus Planning), has developed what it believes is a logical, rational, and balanced recommendation for how to treat the rezoning of properties in the "Transition Area." Admittedly, staff's recommendation represents a fairly significant departure from what was proposed in the EPC Draft (10.28.2010), but staff feels that the recommendation is consistent with both the history of this planning process and applicable City goals and policies.

In short, the recommendation is a comprehensive strategy containing two parts: 1) amending the regulations of the OR (Office Residential) zone; and 2) changing the application/mapping of the OR and MUM zones. Each part is described in detail below. Staff has prepared Committee Amendments to make the changes described below should the Committee wish to adopt the recommendations contained herein.

Part 1 – Amend the SU-2/DNA-OR (Office Residential) zone as follows:

1. Remove the restrictive criteria that essentially precluded the possibility of future non-residential development within the zone.
2. Make an extremely limited list of non-residential uses (church; library; office, but not bail bond office) truly permissive within the zone.
3. Add a limited list of non-residential uses that could be applied for as conditional uses, subject to meeting one of the following criteria: 1)

- building on subject property was originally built for commercial uses, or 2) subject property is located on a corner.
4. Add requirements for existing commercial parking lots that mirror those contained in the Downtown 2010 Plan.

Staff recognizes that there are valid concerns from neighborhood residents about non-residential uses encroaching into the neighborhood, but staff believes that the goal should be to balance the protection of the residential neighborhood with the need to allow for future development that will complement and serve both the neighborhood and the larger community. Staff believes the above-described changes to the OR zone will accomplish this, based on the following:

1. The name of the zone, "Office Residential," suggests that the zone allows for both office and residential development/uses. However, the restrictive criteria virtually eliminate any opportunity for office development/use for properties with OR zoning that do not already contain an office use. Since the OR zone is only proposed in areas where office uses are already established (refer to Existing Land Use map on page 31 of C/S R-11-225) or have historically been located, and given that the intent of the zone, as stated in the Plan, is "to provide a transition between the higher intensity corridor of Central Avenue and the neighborhood to the north," it seems appropriate to actually allow similarly-situated properties the ability to develop similar uses. Removing the restrictive criteria would achieve this.
2. There are a number of commercial parking lots located along the eastern edge of the Plan area where the DNASDP boundary meets the Downtown 2010 boundary. It has long been a goal of both the Downtown 2010 Plan and now, through the inclusion of Implementation Policy 5, the DNASDP to encourage redevelopment of commercial parking lots. These parking lots have proposed OR zoning, but, because of the restrictive criteria of the OR zone, would not be able to develop as anything other than residential. Removing the restrictive criteria and expanding the range of uses that could potentially be developed would create additional incentives to properties owners to redevelop these lots.
3. The low density, single-family areas of the neighborhood will not be negatively impacted by these changes since the OR zone is only proposed to be mapped in areas at the edge of the neighborhood that serve as transition areas to higher-intensity development, i.e., Central Avenue to the south and the Downtown Core to the east. Staff feels that the large, long-existing office building in the 1000 block of Tijeras is an appropriate boundary beyond (north of) which office and non-residential uses are not appropriate. However, in the area south of that building and north of the SU-2/CC zone along Central Avenue, it is difficult to justify limiting development to purely residential uses. That is not to say that residential uses are not appropriate in this area. In fact, as multi-family is one of the strongest development markets, even during these difficult economic times, it is altogether possible that new development in this area

will be residential in nature. However, to disallow limited non-residential uses that are compatible with a neighborhood setting in this area seems overly restrictive.

4. The Nob Hill Highland Sector Development Plan (NHHSDP), adopted in 2007, serves as a model for creating a true mixed-use transition zone between Central Avenue and established single-family areas without imposing prohibitive restrictions. The NHHSDP contains two "OR" zones: OR-1 and OR-2 (same uses allowed, just slightly different development standards, e.g., height and setbacks). The OR-1 and OR-2 zones permissively allow R-2 and O-1 development and conditionally allow R-C uses. It should be noted that the majority of properties in the area zoned OR-1 in the NHHSDP are used as single-family residences but are zoned OR-1 in order to recognize their proximity to a Major Transit Corridor and high-intensity corridor zone.
5. Amending the OR zone as proposed is consistent with the following applicable goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan:
 - Section II.B.5, Policy i: "Employment and service uses shall be located to complement residential areas and shall be sited to minimize adverse effects of noise, lighting, pollution, and traffic on residential environments."
The subject properties are located in the southern- and eastern-most parts of the Plan area, away from the single-family residential core. They help to serve as transition, or buffer, areas between the single-family residential areas and the Downtown Core and Central Avenue corridor.
 - Section II.B.5, Policy o: "Redevelopment and rehabilitation of older neighborhoods in the Established Urban Area shall be continued and strengthened. Possible Technique 7) Introduce mixed-use concepts as a means of strengthening residential markets."
Appropriately-scaled and -regulated mixed-use areas are intended to serve, not detract from, residential neighborhoods. The area in question contains a number of vacant, undeveloped, and underdeveloped parcels that currently do not serve the neighborhood. Allowing the OR zone to be a true mixed-use zone in this area can help encourage redevelopment of these sites and provide opportunities to introduce new neighborhood-serving uses.
 - Section II.C.1, Policy b: "Automobile travel's adverse effects on air quality shall be reduced through a balanced land use/transportation system that promotes the efficient placement of housing, employment and services. Possible Technique 2) Encourage mixed use and infill development, where appropriate, which integrates residential, commercial and industrial uses for a better employment-housing balance."
The OR zone as currently written does not actually encourage mixed use and infill development. The areas proposed to be zoned OR are appropriately located for mixed-use development since they

serve as a transition between high-intensity activity and low-density, single-family residential areas.

Part 2 – Amend the mapping of the OR and MUM zones as follows:

1. Change the zoning designation of the following properties **from HDA (High Density Apartments) and SU-3/Housing Focus to OR (Office Residential) rather than previously-proposed MR (Mixed Residential):**
 - a. 215, 216, 219, 220, and 223 9th Street, NW
 - b. 918 and 920 Kent Ave., NW
 - c. 120, 122, and 124 10th Street, NW

Justification: Structures on the subject properties vary from single-family detached houses to what appears to have once been a commercial storefront (120 10th St., NW), and at least four are currently in use as offices, some for decades. Allowing office and very limited commercial uses is appropriate for this transition area between the higher-density SU-2/DNA-CC (Central Corridor) zone to the south and the residential areas of the neighborhood to the north. Furthermore, this rezoning is more advantageous to the community because it furthers/complies with II.B.5 Policy i, II.B.5 Policy o, and II.C.1 Policy b of the Comprehensive Plan (see Part 1, #5 above).

2. Change the zoning designation of the following properties **from MRO (Mixed Residential Office) and HDA (High Density Apartments) to OR (Office Residential) rather than previously-proposed MR (Mixed Residential) or MUM (Mixed Use Medium):**

- a. 903, 909, 913, 915, 917, and 919 Copper Ave., NW

Justification: Owners of the subject properties submitted comments to Planning staff during the EPC hearing process, requesting the MUM (Mixed Use Medium) zone instead of the proposed MR (Mixed Residential) zone and citing the fact that their respective properties had been used for non-residential purposes, namely offices, in the past as reason for desiring a zoning designation that would allow more than just residential uses. The EPC recommended changing the zoning of this block to MUM per property owners' request, and Council staff initially agreed with the recommendation.

However, based on the above-recommended changes to the OR (Office Residential) zone, staff now feels that the revamped OR zone is more appropriate for the subject location given the proposed zoning of surrounding properties, historic use of the properties on this block, and the properties generally being more in line with the intent of the OR zone than the MUM zone, which is primarily intended to be a corridor zone and is more suitable for higher-activity/higher-trafficked areas (such as Lomas Blvd.). Furthermore, this rezoning is more advantageous to the community because it furthers/complies with II.B.5 Policy i, II.B.5 Policy o, and II.C.1 Policy b of the Comprehensive Plan (see Part 1, #5 above).

3. Change the zoning designation of the following properties **from RC (Residential Commercial) to OR (Office Residential) rather than previously-proposed MUM (Mixed Use Medium)**:
 - a. The entire block bounded by Tijeras Avenue to the north, 11th Street to the west, Kent Avenue to the south, and 10th Street to the east.
 - b. The southernmost 100 feet of lots 1 through 8 of the southern 1100 block of Tijeras, NW, whose legal descriptions are:
 - i. 057N M T ADD SOUTH 100 FT OF LOT 1 & 2;
 - ii. SOUTH 100 FT OF LOTS 3 & 4 OF THE N M TOWN COMP ANY'S ORIGINAL TOWNSITE;
 - iii. S 100FT OF LOT 5 & 6 BLK 57 NEW MEXICO TOWNSITE ADD; and
 - iv. 057N M T ADD S100FT OF LOT 7 X 8

Justification: The MUM zone was primarily intended to be a “corridor” zone and is more suitable for higher-activity/higher-trafficked areas (Lomas and 5th/6th Streets). During the EPC process, neighbors expressed concerns about there being too many permissive non-residential uses allowed in the MUM zone for this area, so the EPC recommended applying the MUL (Mixed Use Light) zone instead. However, the MUL zone was specifically designed for conditions along and adjacent to Mountain Road, and this section of Tijeras is decidedly different in character than Mountain Road, making MUL seem inappropriate, too.

The revised OR zone is an appropriate designation for properties on the south side of the 1000 block of Tijeras, given: 1) the existing, large office building on the north side of Tijeras in this same block, which is proposed to be zoned OR, 2) their proximity to Central Avenue and property that is proposed to be zone CC (Central Corridor), the highest-intensity zone within the DNASDP, and 3) furtherance of/compliance with II.B.5 Policy i, II.B.5 Policy o, and II.C.1 Policy b of the Comprehensive Plan (see Part 1, #5 above).

The revised OR zone is an appropriate designation for properties that face Kent Avenue between 11th and 12th Streets, given: 1) their proximity to Central Avenue and property that is proposed to be zone CC (Central Corridor), the highest-intensity zone within the DNASDP, and 2) furtherance of/compliance with II.B.5 Policy i, II.B.5 Policy o, and II.C.1 Policy b of the Comprehensive Plan (see Part 1, #5 above).

4. Change the zoning designation of the following properties **from CC (Community Commercial) to OR (Office Residential) rather than previously-proposed CC (Central Corridor)**:
 - a. Lots 9, 10, 11, and 12 of the 1100 block of Tijeras NW, whose legal descriptions are:
 - i. S 118FT OF LOTS 9 THRU 12 BLK 57 NMT ADD; and

ii. 057N MT ORIGINAL N 50FT L9 TO L12

Justification: Establishing SU-2/DNA-OR zoning on the subject properties rather than SU-2/DNA-CC will allow for the existing office uses and limited commercial uses in the future, while providing an appropriate buffer zone that is more compatible with the residential area to the immediate north than the CC zone would be. The CC zone would potentially allow for building heights up to 52 feet and many more permissive uses than the OR zone, which would cap building heights at 40 feet and allows fewer, more neighborhood-compatible non-residential uses. The proposed OR zone in this location will result in better compliance with II.B.5 Policy i, in particular, of the Comprehensive Plan.

5. Change the zoning designation of the following properties **from HDA (High Density Apartments) to MR (Mixed Residential) rather than previously-proposed OR (Office Residential):**

- a. 312 and 314 Keleher St., NW
- b. 800 Marquette Ave., NW
- c. 417 8th St., NW

Justification: The properties are currently used for residential purposes, and given the predominantly residential character of Marquette and concerns from neighborhood residents about further encroachment of non-residential uses into residential areas, it is appropriate to limit these properties to their existing residential uses.

6. Change the zoning designation of the following property **from TH (Townhouse) to SF (Single Family) rather than previously-proposed OR (Office Residential):**

- a. 211 12th Street, NW

Justification: The subject property is currently zoned SU-2/TH per the 1976 DNASDP and contains a single-family detached house located between several registered historic homes to the south, which are currently used as offices, and a registered historic home to the north that is currently in use as a residence. At the time that the land-use survey that informed proposed new zoning was developed in 2009-2010, the property was in use as a law office. For that reason, the proposed zoning in the EPC Draft (10.28.10) was OR (Office Residential) to reflect the then-use of the property. Since that time, a number of things have happened that made staff revisit the proposed zoning of this property, which has resulted in a changed recommendation.

First, the law firm that was operating from the property has relocated, and there is no indication that the property is currently in use as a law or other office. Second, there are extensive comments in the record from property owners and residents along and in the immediate area of the 12th Street residential area, requesting protection from further encroachment of non-residential uses into established single-family residential areas.

It is unclear how this property came to be used as an office in the first place, given that its zoning is TH (townhouse), but there is an opportunity, now, to restore zoning to the property that matches both its use and design and that is more compatible with surrounding uses. It should be noted that the property to the immediate south of the subject property that is located on the corner of 12th and Tijeras is proposed to have OR zoning; this is because the property has been in use as an office since 1975, predating the 1976 DNASDP. Furthermore, its large size would likely preclude its reversion to single-family use, and its proximity to Central Avenue makes it an appropriate location for a non-residential use.

7. Change the zoning designation of the following properties **from RC (Residential Commercial) to SF (Single Family) rather than previously-proposed MUM (Mixed Use Medium):**

- a. 1100 and 1120 Tijeras Ave., NW, whose legal descriptions, respectively, are:
 - i. 057N M T ADD ORIGINAL N 57FT X 4 1/2IN OF LOTS 1 TH RU 4; and
 - ii. 057NMT ORIGINAL N57FT4IN OF LTS 5 6 7X8 LESS AL

Justification: Both of these properties are located within the Fourth Ward Historic Overlay Zone and are currently used as single-family homes; they face similar residential development on the north side of Tijeras.

Establishing Single-Family zoning on the subject properties will help buffer the residential area to the immediate north from more intense uses near Central Ave. to the south, while preventing further encroachment of office uses in single-family structures on the north side of this block, which is a concern that has been expressed by neighborhood residents.

Furthermore, rezoning these properties to SF would be more advantageous to the community based on the following:

- R-270-1980, Policy (B): "Stability of land use and zoning is desirable; therefore the applicant must provide a sound justification for the change. The burden is on the applicant to show why the change should be made, not on the city to show why the change should not be made." [Note: In the case of Sector Development Plans, the City is the applicant.]

The existing land use of the subject properties is single-family residential development, while the existing zoning is SU-2/RC (Residential Commercial). It should be noted that the existing zoning has been in place for 35 years, but non-residential development has not occurred on the subject properties. Also, the first of the "Major Planning Themes" listed in the Executive Summary of the Plan is "Matching the zoning with the existing land use for properties within the Downtown Neighborhood Area" (C/S R-11-225, p. 4).

Given the discrepancy between existing land use and existing zoning, staff believes that protecting the stability of existing

land use, which is far less intense than what existing zoning allows, is what will help to "promote the health, safety, convenience, and general welfare of the citizens of the city," which is the stated intent of the Zoning Code (§ 14-16-1-3 (A)), and, therefore, outweighs the need to preserve the existing zoning, which, as noted above, has never been utilized.

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

The subject properties are actually part of the "residential environment" and are, therefore, not appropriate locations for employment and service uses.

City of Albuquerque
Downtown Neighborhood Area Sector Development Plan
Community Meeting on Possible Amendments to the Draft Plan
October 13, 2011

Summary Report, Prepared by Timothy F. Karpoff, Facilitator

A proposed revision of the Downtown Neighborhoods Sector Development Plan (DNASDP) has been under review since October 2010. Components of this review include:

- Submission of the draft consultant plan (completed by Consensus Planning) to the Environmental Planning Commission (EPC). The EPC passed the draft plan on to the City Council, with recommendations.
- Hearing of the draft, with recommendations, by the Land Use, Planning and Zoning Committee of the City Council (LUPZ). The LUPZ has heard the plan twice and has deferred a decision to its November 30, 2011 meeting.
- Review by Council Services staff. Such review is required to assure that all recommendations of the plan adhere to City policy and code.
- Comments from members of the public collected during EPC and LUPZ hearings. (These comments are in addition to the many public comments received during the planning process conducted by the consultant.)

During this review process, Council Services staff identified two geographical areas covered by the plan where questions remain about recommendations for future land use and zoning. These areas are bounded by:

- ✓ 8th St. on the east; Tijeras on the north; 12th St. on the west; and Central on the south.
- ✓ 7th St. on the east; Roma on the north; 8th St. on the west; and Tijeras on the south.

In both areas, there are a number of legitimate contending values, including the property rights of individual owners; how to maintain and strengthen the integrity of the surrounding neighborhoods; how to encourage appropriate commercial development in downtown Albuquerque and along Central; and how to maintain fidelity with City plans and policies. These values all come to bear in the two areas, both of which are transitional in nature, facing commercial areas on one side, and residential areas on the opposite side.

Council Services staff convened a community meeting on October 13, 2011 to present the issues they are facing in their internal review, and their analysis of the situation; to propose a possible set of recommendations, and to invite reactions and ideas from the community. Twenty-five people attended the meeting, which was held at the Mid-Region Council of Governments offices. The summary below briefly outlines 1) the proposal; 2) main points from the discussion; and 3) written comments recorded during the meeting.

Proposal

Council Services staff reported that, in their analysis, they discovered several similarities between the DNASDP and the Nob Hill Sector Development Plan. The essence of the staff proposal, therefore, was to create a new zone based on a similar zone in Nob Hill, but tailored for the DNASDP. The new zone, adapted from the Plan's proposed OR (Office/Residential) zone, would be a mixed-use zone permitting residential development (single-family up to apartments) and offices, as well as a short list of conditional commercial uses.

Main Points in the Discussion

- 1) **For the area between 7th & 8th and Tijeras & Roma: There was general endorsement for the OR zone proposal.**
 - The only questions had to do with whether a parking lot in that area would remain in conformance.
 - There was little discussion about this area, and general assent to the proposal.
- 2) **For the area between 8th & 12th and Tijeras and Central: There was a general sense that 10th Street represents a dividing line of sorts, with MR being more appropriate west of 10th.**
 - There was more of a concern that the residential character of the neighborhood may be undermined with the OR proposal west of 10th.
 - There was generally more agreement with the OR proposal for most properties in the section between 8th and 10th.
 - This may be due to the relative lack of a buffer between the Central commercial corridor and the neighborhood between 10th and 12th (because of the southeast-to-northeast configuration of Central).
- 3) **A number of residents expressed concern about possible impacts on the north side of Tijeras.**
 - That is, they were concerned that any contiguous mixed-use zone beginning on the south side of Tijeras could eventually have a negative impact on properties on the north side of Tijeras.
 - This sense is reinforced by experience with residential properties (in this area) being converted to office space over the years.
- 4) **Several specific issues should be noted:**
 - The property owner with the HDA designation adamantly opposes any zoning change to that property.
 - There is some confusion over whether it is possible for the City to regulate the operation of bail bond operations, which are state-certified. This will need to be clearly explained.
 - There were several requests that the City have handouts for all persons attending the November 30 LUPZ Committee meeting, outlining any changes proposed at that meeting.

Participant Comments

The following comments were taken down during the discussion:

- A procedural question: Can you take evidence at a meeting like this? (*It was clarified that this public meeting is an informational, not an evidentiary, meeting.*)
- Re: Tijeras between 11th and 12th: Why not leave that area (on the south) mixed residential (MR)? There are only two small houses there. Make the north half single family (SF).
- I have an objection to language targeting a particular use. The sector plan targets bail bonds operations unfairly.
- Re: The 1000 & 1100 block of Tijeras: On the south side of Tijeras there are five residences and one office; the plan would possibly add more commercial use across the street (on the north side).
- You can't make apartment buildings conform to single-family zoning. The Biltmore has been there for years.
- There are more offices on the southwest corner of 10th & Tijeras than is reflected on the map. Zoning residential what is currently used as offices doesn't make sense.
- I would like the proposal to add a "transition zone" (between the commercial area along Central and the residential neighborhood north of Tijeras).
- The goal of the sector plan is to support more residential uses, not office uses. Allowing commercial uses amounts to "office creep," with more houses eventually turned into offices. This means that there will no longer be a buffer between the Central corridor and the neighborhood. Keep the MR zoning.
- More offices will result in an increase in traffic through the neighborhood.
- Question: Will the parking lot at 7th & Tijeras become a conditional use?
- Re: 12th & Tijeras: There are homes directly across from the office block; leave the MR zone.
- Would commercial development set a precedent?
- There has been a lack of notification of the public. I was not consulted until now.
- Re: south of Tijeras between 10th & 12th (2 blocks): I prefer the residences to remain zoned as they are, and would ask enforcement to remove trash on vacant lots.
- It makes sense to keep the 10th & Kent area more permissive and leave the Tijeras blocks residential.
- Recommendation: Grandfather in the existing businesses, and leave the rest residential.
- Why not zone the rest of the block southeast of the corner of 10th & Tijeras HDA (high density)?
- What is the definition of "office"? Bail bonds operations are not appropriate.
- Re: 10th & Tijeras/10th: This is four blocks from city hall; HDA is appropriate in that location. The residential-commercial (RC) or office-residential (OR) would be hard to finance in that location.
- The zoning change from R4-R2 changed the tax valuation.
- When will these new recommendations be made?
- The DNA Sector Development Plan has been deferred long enough. When will the plan be done?
- Re: bail bonds: Could distance & other regulations be changed before the plan is passed?

- Bail bonds operations are licensed by the state, can operate anywhere they want to. The existing regulations would apply in any office zone.
- The two areas in question at this meeting are very different. The area near 7th & Tijeras is downtown; the area west and north of 10th & Tijeras is a neighborhood. The latter area needs to be split east/west between MR and SF. There is a significant difference of feeling between those two blocks on Tijeras.
- Re: West of 10th: The south side should be more public, the north side more SF.
- Nothing in the plan is truly SF—there are a number of garage conversions and mother-in-law apartments, which ruin the neighborhood.
- Would new commercial uses allow coffee shops, etc.? A coffee shop on 10th & Kent would be nice to walk to.
- The HDA zone would allow some commercial development.
- The area around 12th & Kent is residential; all property west of 10th should be MR.
- I have a concern about changing existing RC to SF when the affected property owners are not here.
- The Tijeras block could be SF or MR. The office has been there since the 1920s; we have accepted it. The vacant lot is zoned residential and has an illegal parking lot and one empty office building.
- The parking lot is not illegal. (This was a counterpoint to the previous comment.)
- (There are a variety of opinions west of 10th.)
- Question: If the area west of 10th was zoned residential, would existing businesses be grandfathered in?
- Is there a height restriction on apartments?
- If you want to sell your house, you want higher zoning.
- What is the recommendation re: paid parking in OR? I have a lot at Tijeras and Keleher.
- The 909 apartments are currently zoned HDA and the proposal is to make them MR. What does MR allow? How would redevelopment of the property be affected with regard to HDA vs. MR?
- Suggestion: have handouts at the November 30 meeting.
- Can these people (attending) give addresses? If they're not in neighborhood, it's not fair.
- Bail bond is not a separate use in city zoning.
- The draft Sector Development Plan does propose defining bail bonds. Please see the memo (from Council Services).

