



Environmental Planning Commission

**Agenda Number: 3
Project Number: 1006864
Case #: 13EPC-40115
June 13, 2013**

Staff Report

Agent	Consensus Planning
Applicant	Pulte Homes
Request	Site Dev. Plan for Subdivision
Legal Description	Tracts N-2 & M, Watershed Subdivision
Location	Located north of 98 th St./Arroyo Vista Blvd. NW, west of Tierra Pintada Blvd., south and east of the Petro-glyph National Monument.
Size	Approximately 285 acres
Zoning	SU-2 for PDA (Planned Development Area)

Staff Recommendation

NO RECOMMENDATION for Case #13EPC-40115, based on forthcoming Findings.

Staff Planners

**Catalina Lehner, Senior Planner
Carrie Barkhurst, Planner**

Summary of Analysis

This request is for a site development plan for subdivision with design standards for Tracts N-2 & M, Watershed subdivision. The applicant intends to create eight tracts and develop single-family homes with parks and a community center. A portion would be an active adult, gated subdivision. The request would replace the 2008 EPC approval of the Watershed & Inspiration subdivisions.

The subject site is in the Developing Urban Area. The West Side Strategic Plan, Northwest Mesa Escarpment Plan, Facility Plan for Arroyos, Trails & Bikeways Facility Plan, the Westland Master and Sector Plans apply.

A facilitated meeting was held on May 21. There is general support for the single-family home use, but concern about the gates, mass grading, relationship with the Monument and the arroyo, and water resources. Staff is concerned about these, and also about insufficient information and instances of non-compliance with some applicable regulations and policies. There are also questions about the extent to which the agency comments have been addressed.



City Departments and other interested agencies reviewed this application from 4/29/2013 to 5/10/2013. Agency comments used in the preparation of this report begin on Page 42.

I. AREA CHARACTERISTICS AND ZONING HISTORY

Surrounding zoning, plan designations, and land uses:

	Zoning	Comprehensive Plan Area; Applicable Rank II & III Plans	Land Use
Site	SU-2 for PDA (Planned Development Area)	Developing Urban Westside Strategic Plan Facility Plan for Arroyos Trails & Bikeways Facility Plan Northwest Mesa Escarpment Plan Westland Sector Development Plan Westland Master Plan	Vacant
North	County A-1	Developing Urban Westside Strategic Plan Facility Plan for Arroyos Trails & Bikeways Facility Plan Northwest Mesa Escarpment Plan	Petroglyph National Monument
South	SU-2 for PDA SU-2 for R-LT	Developing Urban Westside Strategic Plan Facility Plan for Arroyos Trails & Bikeways Facility Plan Northwest Mesa Escarpment Plan Westland Sector Development Plan Westland Master Plan	Vacant, APS property Stormcloud subdivision, single-family homes
East	SU-2 for R-LT	Developing Urban Westside Strategic Plan Facility Plan for Arroyos Trails & Bikeways Facility Plan Northwest Mesa Escarpment Plan Westland Sector Development Plan Westland Master Plan	Stormcloud subdivision, single-family homes Vacant
West	County A-1	Developing Urban Westside Strategic Plan Facility Plan for Arroyos Trails & Bikeways Facility Plan Northwest Mesa Escarpment Plan Westland Sector Development Plan Westland Master Plan	Petroglyph National Monument

II. INTRODUCTION

Request

This request is for a site development plan for subdivision with design standards for Tracts N-2 and M, Watershed subdivision, zoned SU-2 for PDA (Planned Development Area) and located north of 98th St./Arroyo Vista Blvd. NW, west of Tierra Pintada Blvd., and south and east of the Petroglyph National Monument (the “subject site”).

The applicant proposes to subdivide the approximately (≈) 285 acre subject site into eight tracts (Tracts A – F and two O.S. Tracts). Tracts A – E are designated for single-family homes; Tract F is the site of a proposed private club house (labeled as “community center and ‘social lawn’/park”); and the two O.S., or “open space,” tracts would serve as private drainage/trail corridors. Tract B is intended for senior (“active adult”) housing. Three of the tracts (A, B and C) abut the Petroglyph National Monument.

Design standards are proposed and would apply to all 285 acres. Delegation of future subdivision plats and site development plans for building permit to the Development Review Board (DRB) appears to be requested, though it is unclear and the design standards may not contain sufficient guidance to warrant delegation. Further, the SU-2 for PDA zoning also requires “Planning Director approval for each new building addition, residential development area, planned development area, or major use of open space on any site in the SU-2 for PDA zone” (Westland Master Plan, p. 44-45). Clarification is needed regarding this procedural issue, and many others.

Staff understands that the applicant proposes to replace the previously approved site development plan for subdivision for the Watershed & Inspiration subdivisions (Project #1006864/07EPC-40065). Approved in 2008, this site development plan is still in effect and could be implemented. However, the current request is for the Watershed @ Estrella subdivision. (Note: the former Inspiration portion is the area of the future APS campus.) Many of the same, significant issues come to the forefront now: topography, grading, the arroyo, open space, connectivity and relationship to the National Monument.

Environmental Planning Commission (EPC) Role

The EPC is the final decision-making body for the request unless the EPC decision is appealed [Ref: §14-16-2-22(A)(1)], in which case the Land Use Hearing Officer (LUHO) will hear the request at another public hearing. If an EPC decision is appealed, then the LUHO will make a recommendation to the City Council and the Council will decide. The Council can accept or reject, in whole or in part, the LUHO’s recommendation.

Context

The Petroglyph National Monument lies to the north and west of the approximately 285 acre subject site. Tierra Pintada Blvd. NW runs along most of the site’s eastern side. East of this roadway is the Stormcloud subdivision, which consists of single-family homes. To the south is a portion of Tierra Pintada Blvd. NW and the future Albuquerque Public Schools (APS) educational complex (schools and stadium). The Mirehaven Arroyo, located north of the middle of the subject site, extends across the site and connects Tierra Pintada Blvd. NW to the Monument.

The subject site lies within the Developing Urban Area of the Comprehensive Plan. Other applicable Plans are the Westside Strategic Plan (WSSP), the Facility Plan for Arroyos (FPA), the Trails and Bikeways Facilities Plan, the Northwest Mesa Escarpment Plan (NWMEP), the Westland Master Plan (WMP) and the Western Albuquerque Land Holdings (WAHL) Sector Development Plan [formerly called the Westland Sector Development Plan (WSP)]. Portions of

the subject site are within the Impact and View areas of the NWMAP. The Mirehaven Arroyo, located near the subject site's northeast quadrant, is defined as an Urban Recreational Arroyo and is regulated by the Facilities Plan for Arroyos.

III. HISTORY & BACKGROUND

Early History

The subject site was part of the 82,000 acres that King Charles II gave to Duran y Chavez in the 1690s for assisting in the Pueblo Revolt. The land, west of the Rio Grande, became known as the Atrisco Land Grant. In 1848, New Mexico became a U.S. Territory. In 1905, Theodore Roosevelt recognized the validity of the Atrisco Land Grant and allowed Spanish settlers to retain their land. New Mexico became a state in 1912. In 1967, heirs of the Spanish settlers voted to form the Westland Development Co. Inc., a publicly held company created to manage the unoccupied land.

Recent History (see next section for Plan amendments)

Annexation: In April 1999, the Environmental Planning Commission (EPC) voted to recommend approval to the City Council for annexation of 1,732 acres of the Westland property (AX-99-2). The City Council subsequently annexed the area. This action allowed for implementation of the Westland Master Plan (SPR-96-2) and established zoning based on the Westland Sector Plan (Z-99-8).

The Residential Resort: In July 2000, the EPC approved a site development for subdivision and a site development plan for building permit for the Residential/Resort (RR) zone area (Project #1000416). The site development plan for subdivision created twenty-one parcels, eight for a golf course, clubhouse and maintenance building, and thirteen for single-family residential development. The site development plan for building permit was only for the golf course (no buildings).

In August 2000, the heirs of the Westland stockholders appealed the EPC's decision. They claimed that the EPC abused its discretion by not taking into account impacts to the water supply and for not keeping the public informed regarding water management issues. On October 2, 2000, City Council heard the appeal and denied it by a 7-2 vote. Though approved, the site development plans expired pursuant to Zoning Code §14-16-3-11 since no development occurred on the site within seven years of the approval.

Land Sale: In December 2006, SunCal Companies, the largest community developer in the western United States at the time, purchased 57,000 acres from the Westland Development Company (WDC), Inc. Eighty-eight percent of the Westland shareholders agreed to sell their shares. SunCal was required to give \$1 million a year to the Atrisco Heritage Foundation. In January 2007, 2,500 shareholders who opposed the sale of their land sought to invalidate the Westland heirs' vote. The heirs filed a class-action lawsuit, claiming that the voting was tainted. However, SunCal retained a clean title to the land.

Watershed and Inspiration: SunCal applied for a site development plan for subdivision with design standards for Tracts M, N and P, known as the Watershed and Inspiration Subdivisions (Project #1006864, 07EPC-40065), originally to be heard at EPC in conjunction with Project # 1000570 (see section below) in November 2007. However, the applicant decided to revise the request. Several deferrals occurred.

In December 2008, the EPC approved the request. The site development plan for subdivision, for \approx 500 acres, established detailed design standards for a high-quality residential community of \approx 1,500 homes with varying lot sizes and many amenities. However, since SunCal went bankrupt, this (and other) property has since been acquired by a brokerage firm and subsequently sold off. A company known as Western Albuquerque Land Holdings (WAHL), LLC, based in Phoenix, acquired much of the Westland land and is not interested in developing the subject site using the existing, approved site development plan for subdivision for Project #1006864.

Westland Plan Amendments

Town Center Relocation, etc.: In February 2006, the WDC applied for a Westland Sector Plan (WSP) amendment and a zone map amendment (Project #1000570, 07EPC-40071/06EPC-00139/06EPC-00141/07EPC-50069). The applicant proposed a zone change from a combination of SU-2/RLT, SU-2/R-2, SU-2/O-1, SU-2/OS and SU-2/Town Center to “SU-2 for Town Center (TC) and SU-2 for Town Center Village (TCV)”. The effect was to locate the Town Center (SU-2/TC zone) closer to Interstate-40, create the TCV zone and place residential zones closer to the Monument. The Westside Strategic Plan, Westland Master Plan and the Westland Sector Plan were correspondingly amended.

Project #1000570 was deferred several times for various reasons. In approximately February 2007, ownership of the land shifted to SunCal, which deferred the project again due to transportation issues and possible additional land purchases. In December 2007, the EPC recommended approval of Project #1000570 to City Council. Council Bill Nos. R-08-58, R-08-59 and R-08-60 contain the amendments and are found in the front of the Westland Master Plan.

Albuquerque Public Schools (APS) Amendments: In July 2012, the EPC voted to forward an approval recommendation to the City Council regarding amendments to the Westland Master Plan (WMP) and Westland Sector Plan (WSP) (Project #1000570/12EPC-40028/40029). The subject site was \approx 1,700 acres and included the Watershed subdivision. The Council approved the proposal via Council Bill No. R-12-80, which is found at the beginning of the WMP. Note that the WSP is renamed and is now Appendix A of the WMP, though it still consists of two maps.

Though primarily to respond to future development plans for an education complex, athletic fields and a regional park, the amendments also modified land uses, changed densities, changed acreages and revised certain Plan concepts. The new land use categories of E (Education) and R (Recreation) were introduced. Changes were made to the SU-2/R-LT, SU-2/PDA, SU-2/TCV

and SU-2/TC zones. Associated changes to maps (land use and zoning), tables and notes were needed throughout the Plans to create internal consistency.

Transportation System

The Mid-Region Council of Governments (MRCOG) produces the Long Range Roadway System (LRRS) map, which identifies the functional classifications of roadways. The March 2010 version designates 98th St. NW/Arroyo Vista Blvd. as an urban minor arterial as it goes north from Interstate 40. At the intersection with Ladera Dr., Arroyo Vista Blvd. becomes an urban collector and Ladera Dr. continues as an urban minor arterial. Tierra Pintada Blvd. NW is designated an urban collector at this time, though this would likely change in the future (see below).

The Comprehensive Plan designates Unser Blvd., which is about a mile east of the subject site, as an Express Corridor. The Westland Master Plan shows two types of roadways: principal arterial and minor arterial (p. 84). The right-of-way widths are 180 feet and 152 feet, respectively.

Trails/Bikeways: A bicycle lane is shown (see AGIS map viewer) along 98th St. NW/Arroyo Vista Blvd. until it reaches the intersection with Tierra Pintada Blvd. NW, where the bicycle lane turns eastward and continues along Tierra Pintada Blvd. NW. A multiple-use trail is shown on 98th St. NW/Arroyo Vista Blvd. between Ladera Dr. and Tierra Pintada Blvd. NW. The trail and the bicycle lane continue eastward along Ladera Dr. A multi-use trail also runs along Unser Blvd., further east of the subject site. There are multiple undesignated trails in the Petroglyph National Monument.

Transit: The subject site is not served by Transit. The closest bus line runs along Unser Blvd., approximately 1 mile east, though it's hard to reach due to poor connectivity in the area. Route 94-Unser Blvd. Commuter, runs twice a day during the work week and stops at Ladera Dr. Route 92- Taylor Ranch Express also stops at Ladera Rd. and has a similar schedule.

Traffic Impact Study (TIS)

A new TIS was not required for this request. The "Watershed and Inspiration Subdivision TIS" was completed on October 2007 and contained the subject site. However, a trip generation comparison was required (see attachment). The trip generation table (see attachment) shows a comparison of traffic volumes generated by the former Watershed subdivision and the proposed Watershed at Estrella subdivision.

The original Watershed proposed 1,094 dwelling units (DUs) maximum and produced a 24-hour, two-way traffic volume of 8,118 trips. The current request is for 950 DU maximum, with a volume of 5,838- which results in 2,280 fewer vehicle trips per 24 hour period than the original request. The difference is because 144 fewer dwelling units are proposed and some is senior (active adult) housing, and it's assumed that fewer vehicle trips will occur.

Public Facilities/Community Services

Schools: Currently, Painted Sky Elementary School, Jimmy Carter Middle School and West Mesa High School serve the area. However, in the future the Albuquerque Public Schools (APS) Education Campus, adjacent south of the subject site, will serve the area.

Police: The Westside Area Command provides police coverage.

Fire: Fire station 14, at 517 98th St. SW, is located about 2 miles from the subject site.

Please also refer to the Public Facilities Map (see attachment).

IV. ANALYSIS - Albuquerque Comprehensive Zoning Code

Definitions (§14-16-1-5)

MASTER DEVELOPMENT PLAN. A plan meeting the requirements of a site development plan for subdivision; showing general building and parking locations; and specifying design requirements for buildings, landscaping, lighting and signage.

SETBACK. The shortest distance between a structure and a lot line or future street line.

SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR SUBDIVISION. An accurate plan at a scale of at least 1 inch to 100 feet which covers at least one lot and specifies: the site, proposed use, pedestrian and vehicular ingress and egress, any internal circulation requirements and, for each lot, maximum building height, minimum building setback, and maximum total dwelling units and/or nonresidential uses' maximum floor area ratio (see also Master Development Plan).

Zoning

The subject site is zoned SU-2 for Planned Development Area (PDA), a zone established with the City approval of the Westland Master Plan (WMP) in 2000. The SU-2 for PDA zone "provides suitable sites for a mix of residential uses which are *special because of the relationship of this property to Petroglyph National Monument.*"

This zone, as established by this Plan, provides suitable sites for a wide range of residential densities, schools, active and passive recreational uses (parks, trails, community centers, etc.)" (WMP, p. 44). Uses are those allowed permissively in the RT zone.

Building height up to 40 feet is allowed, except within the View and Impact areas of the Northwest Mesa Escarpment Plan. The minimum lot size is 3,200 square feet per dwelling unit, with a minimum lot width of 32 feet. Off-street parking is as regulated by the City Zoning Code.

Analysis: What distinguishes the SU-2 for PDA zone from others is that it is intended to provide for "a mix of residential uses" and that the uses are "*special because of the relationship of this property to Petroglyph National Monument.*" The current request does not provide a mix of residential uses. The densities would be similar and the uses homogeneous. The relationship to the National Monument is not taken into consideration to the extent that it could be in the proposed design standards (see Section VIII of this report).

Two of the proposed housing types show an accessory building. The R-T zone does not allow accessory dwelling units permissively. However, R-1 conditional uses are allowed conditionally in the R-T zone, and “accessory living quarters” is a conditional use in the R-1 zone. Therefore, a conditional use permit would be needed to allow accessory living quarters in the R-T zone, which the SU-2 for PDA zone references.

Process: The approval process established by the WMP is that a “site plan and landscape plan shall be approved by the City Planning Director for each new building addition, residential development area, planned development area, or major use of open space on any site in the SU-2 for PDA zone. The Planning Director shall use the following procedures in reviewing site development plans:

1. No Site Development Plan shall be approved in the SU-2 for PDA zone without a copy of notice of approval from the Design Review Committee.
2. Site Development Standards. Site plans for property in the area zoned SU-2 for PDA zone shall meet the intent of the design guidelines section of the Westland Master Plan.
3. Specific sign regulations for each development shall be established in the site development plan. The general principals guiding signage within the SU-2 for PDA zone should follow C-1 sign controls, or as determined by an approved site development plan.”

The proposed site plan for subdivision does not specify these zoning regulations, which should be included on Sheet 1. The approval process for individual residential development areas, as specified above, should be mentioned on Sheet 1 and described in detail in a “process” section of the design standards, for clarity and consistency.

V. ANALYSIS - APPLICABLE PLANS, POLICIES, & REGULATIONS

A) Albuquerque / Bernalillo County Comprehensive Plan

The subject site is located in an area that the Albuquerque/Bernalillo County Comprehensive Plan has designated as Developing Urban. The Comprehensive Plan goal of Developing and Established Urban Areas is “to create a quality urban environment which perpetuates the tradition of identifiable, individual but integrated communities within the metropolitan area and which offers variety and maximum choice in housing, transportation, work areas and life styles, while creating a visually pleasing built environment.” Applicable policies include:

Land Use Policies

Policy II.B.5d: The location, intensity, and design of new development shall respect existing neighborhood values, natural environmental conditions and carrying capacities, scenic resources, and resources of other social, cultural, recreational concern.

Overall, the request does not further Policy II.B.5d-neighborhood/environmental/resources. The homogeneous density, including an area with hilly terrain near the open space, would generally not respect natural environmental conditions.

The Street Design Standards indicate that the boundary with the National Monument would predominantly consist of a single-loaded street; however, houses would be allowed in certain locations and would abut the Monument boundary. It is unknown how many, or where, these houses would be, because the submittal does not have design standard language that details location or spacing of homes along the Monument boundary. CMU yard walls could be visible from the Monument. Placing these homes between the roadway and the monument could impact this recreational and cultural resource, which is public. This would not respect scenic resources.

Though neighbors are generally supportive of the residential use, they have serious concerns about water availability. It is unknown if this amount of development can be accommodated given the area's carrying capacity and the forthcoming development of an APS school campus and regional park.

Policy II.B.5e: New growth shall be accommodated through development in areas where vacant land is contiguous to existing or programmed urban facilities and services and where the integrity of existing neighborhoods can be ensured.

The request partially furthers Policy II.B.5e-urban facilities/ neighborhood integrity. Urban infrastructure and services exist in the area. However, there is concern that the request, which would result in approximately 950 additional households, would strain the existing water and sewer systems and that capacity would be insufficient. Existing neighborhoods could be adversely impacted. Staff does not know if a water availability statement has been issued for this site.

Policy II.B.5f: Clustering of homes to provide larger shared open space areas and housing oriented towards pedestrian or bikeways is encouraged.

The request partially furthers Policy II.B.5f-clustering/ped-bikeway orientation. The SPS proposes two large "open space" tracts and a "Community Center & Social Lawn/Park" tract. There is an additional private pocket park identified in each of the 5 residential tracts. However, the design standards do not address the concept of cluster development or illustrate clustered development in the detailed drawings.

While internal multi-use trails are proposed, the front yard setbacks and the design of the garages do not encourage housing that is oriented towards pedestrian or bikeways. The tracts could be gated, so it could be difficult to access the trails. Wall entries are not included.

Policy II.B.5g: Development shall be carefully designed to conform to topographical features and include trail corridors in the development where appropriate.

Policy II.B.5g-development/topo features/trails is partially furthered. The proposed SPS does not address conformance to topographical features. Trail corridors are proposed, but connectivity is lacking and could be improved.

Policy II.B.5k: Land adjacent to arterial streets shall be planned to minimize harmful effects of traffic; livability and safety of established residential neighborhoods shall be protected in transportation planning and operation.

The request partially furthers Policy II.B.5k-land adjacent to arterial streets. Residential development is proposed adjacent to a large arterial street, Tierra Pintada Blvd. All proposed streets are indicated as local streets. At this stage it is unclear if harmful effects of traffic would be minimized. A TIS update was provided.

Policy II.B.5m: Urban and site design which maintains and enhances unique vistas and improves the quality of the visual environment shall be encouraged.

The request does not further Policy II.B.5m-vistas/visual environment. Views have not been adequately discussed in the SPS and no analysis is offered. There are no standards to ensure that unique vistas would be maintained and that the visual environment would be improved, especially because some homes could contrast markedly with the surrounding visual environment near the Monument boundary.

C. Environmental Protection & Heritage Conservation

1. Air Quality Policies

Policy II.C.1b: 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.

The request does not further Policy II.C.1b-balanced land use/transportation system. Overall the proposed development is auto-centric, characterized by long expanses of walls and wide arterial boulevards. The single-family residential use is homogenous and commercial services are not available within walking distance (1/4-1/2 mile is typically considered walkable distance). The uses and design of the development would make driving the only viable option for most residents, who would have to walk approximately 2 miles on average to the nearest commercial services.

8. Developed Landscape Policies

Policy II.C.8d: Landscaping shall be encouraged within public and private right-of-ways to control water erosion and dust, and create a pleasing visual environment; native vegetation should be used where appropriate.

The request does not further Policy II.C.8d. The design standards only mention compliance with the street tree ordinance and do not address shrubs and ground-cover in the public right-of-way. More information is needed, though a well landscaped streetscape is shown as illustrative.

The standards require that all plant materials be selected from the WMP Design Guidelines Plant List, which identifies appropriate plant species, many of which are native vegetation.

The request does not address landscaping to control dust and erosion in this sloping development.

Policy II.C.8e: In highly scenic areas, development design and materials shall be in harmony with the landscape. Building siting shall minimize alteration of existing vegetation and topography and minimize visibility of structures in scenic vista areas.

The request does not further Policy II.C.8e. Beyond requiring screening of utility infrastructure, the proposed design standards do not ensure that development in this highly scenic area would harmonize with the existing landscape or that visibility of structures would be minimized. Alteration of existing vegetation and topography would not be minimized either because the subject site could be mass-graded. Scenic vistas into and out of the National Monument should be addressed.

4. Noise Goal

The Goal is to protect the public health and welfare and enhance the quality of life by reducing noise and by preventing new land use/noise conflicts.

The request partially furthers the noise Goal. The request would locate approximately 950 high-end homes on the subject site. About half of them could be considered close enough to the future APS campus, which will include a stadium. A land use/noise conflict is likely, especially since the stadium is for large, regional events and loudspeakers would be involved. The City has no jurisdiction over APS, so the noise would not be controllable. The proposed development, though, does not proposed any uses that would produce noise beyond the usual residential level.

D. Community Resource Management

2. Water Management Goal and Policies

The Goal is efficient water management and use.

Overall, the request partially furthers the intent of the Water Management Goal. Preservation of the Mirehaven arroyo and use of mostly xeric plant materials (as described in the WMP) will contribute to efficient water management. However, the proposed design standards do not comprehensively address water management in this area with limited water supply.

Policy II.D.2a: Measures shall be adopted to discourage wasteful water uses, such as extensive landscape-water runoff to uncultivated areas.

The request generally furthers Policy II.D.2a. Most of the WMP designated plants are xeric, and plant spacing will be based on xeric principles. This policy could be furthered if a design standard was added regarding inverted crowns where street medians are present and/or curb cuts in the medians and curbs to harvest rainwater into the landscaped areas.

Policy II.D.2b: Maximum absorption of precipitation shall be encouraged through retention of natural arroyos and other means of runoff conservation within the context of overall water resource management.

The request partially furthers Policy II.D.2b. Water management is especially important in this area because of the limited water supply. Many of the proposed plants are low-water users. However, the request does not specifically mention runoff conservation techniques in the context of the development and does not comprehensively address water management techniques, but mentions that the Mirehaven Arroyo will be maintained in a partially natural state with stabilized banks, drop structures, and with a soft (natural) bottom.

5. Transportation and Transit Goal

The Goal is to develop corridors, both streets and adjacent land uses that provide a balanced circulation system through efficient placement of employment and services, and encouragement of bicycling, walking, and use of transit/paratransit as alternatives to automobile travel, while providing sufficient roadway capacity to meet mobility and access needs.

The request partially furthers the Transportation and Transit Goal. The request aims to encourage walking and bicycling within the development, but does not create a balanced overall circulation system because no employment or services are placed within convenient walking distance and there is no mix of land uses. Also, the gates and lack of wall openings would make it difficult to bike, walk or use future transit connections. Roadway capacity is sufficient in the area.

Open Space Goal & Policy

The Goal is to provide visual relief from urbanization and to offer opportunities for education, recreation, cultural activities, and conservation of natural resources by setting aside Major Public Open Space, parks, trail corridors, and open areas throughout the Comprehensive Plan area.

The request partially furthers the Open Space Goal. The request includes parks of varying sizes and one large open space area (Mirehaven Arroyo). Two open space corridors are proposed, but both end at streets and do not connect to each other, thus precluding the provision of functional wildlife corridors.

Policy II.B.1f: A multi-purpose network of open areas and trail corridors along arroyos and appropriate ditches shall be created. Trail corridors shall be acquired, regulated, or appropriately managed to protect natural features, views, drainage and other functions or to link other areas within the Open Space network.

The request partially furthers Policy II.B.1f- open areas/trail corridors. Though multi-use trails are proposed, the standards don't provide sufficient detail to know if the trail corridors along the Mirehaven Arroyo would protect natural features, view and drainage and how they would link to the Monument open space.

Housing Goal

The Goal is to increase the supply of affordable housing; conserve and improve the quality of housing; ameliorate the problems of homelessness, overcrowding, and displacement of low income residents; and assure against discrimination in the provision of housing.

The request partially furthers the Housing Goal. Though more quality housing would be built on the Westside, without a specific provision for affordability there is no guarantee that a certain amount of housing units would be affordable. Also, the lots would be larger than the lots in the nearby Stormcloud subdivision; generally, larger lots are less likely to be affordable. Though affordable housing is required in the Westland Master Plan area, the proposed SPS does not address it.

B) WEST SIDE STRATEGIC PLAN (WSSP) (RANK II)

The West Side Strategic Plan (WSSP) was first adopted in 1997 and amended several times since then (2002, 2005, 2008, 2009 and 2011). The WSSP area encompasses over 96,000 acres of land, or approximately 150 square miles. Specific boundaries are shown on p.2 of the Plan.

The first amendments, in 2002, included changes to policies and activity center boundaries. A relevant amendment occurred in 2008, when the WSSP was amended to move the Westland Town Center close to Interstate 40 (Enactment R02008-075). The *Southwest Albuquerque Strategic Action Plan (SWASAP)* became part of the WSSP in 2009 (Enactment R-2009-035).

The WSSP identifies 13 communities in established areas of the West Side, each with a unique identity and comprised of smaller neighborhood clusters. The subject site is located in the Westland North community, one of the largest in the Plan area, and lies approximately within the following boundaries: the Petroglyph National Monument to the north, Unser Boulevard to the east, I-40 to the south, and the eastern limit of Paseo del Volcan corridor to the west.

Community Concept Policies

WSSP Policy 1.1: Thirteen distinct communities, as shown on the Community Plan Map and described individually in this Plan, shall constitute the existing and future urban form of the West Side. Communities shall develop with areas of higher density (in Community and Neighborhood Centers), surrounded by areas of lower density. Bernalillo County and the City of Albuquerque Planning Commissions shall require that high density and non-residential development occur within Community and Neighborhood Centers. Low density residential development (typical 3-5 du/acre subdivisions, or large lot rural subdivisions) shall not be approved within the Centers.

The request generally furthers WSSP Policy 1.1. The subject site is located within the Westland North Community (WSSP, page 70) but not within a designated activity center. Average densities for the proposed residential project would be 4 du/acre, which is moderately low and therefore appropriate outside of designated activity centers.

WSSP Policy 2.5: When considering approval of subdivisions for residential development, the City Planning Department shall consider whether local public schools have sufficient capacity to support the increased number of homes.

The Planning Department is considering school capacity. The request would result in approx. 950 new households, most of which would impact the local school system. (380 homes are active adult and may or may not allow children). Comments from APS indicate that Painted Sky Elementary School and Jimmy Carter Middle School are exceeding capacity, while West Mesa High School currently has excess capacity. A future APS campus will develop adjacent SW of the subject site and will help ease school overcrowding. [informational]

WSSP Policy 3.81: The City of Albuquerque and Bernalillo County shall, through their land use and design decisions, minimize negative impacts upon the National Monument. The Park Service shall, through their actions, attempt to minimize their negative impacts on the City, County, and adjacent neighborhoods and landowners.

The EPC, acting for the City, will in this case make land use and design decisions regarding the request that will affect the National Monument. The WSSP states that the City shall minimize negative impacts, which in this case include impacts to natural resources and scenic resources, access to a public resource, and possibly cultural impacts. Another negative impact could be fugitive dust from mass-grading [informational]

WSSP Policy 4.6: The following design guideline sections shall become policies with the approval of this Plan: View Preservation; Views East of Coors Boulevard; Views to and from the Monument; Other Views; Height; Lighting; Vegetation; Overhead Utilities; Radio, TV, and Cellular Towers; Signs; Fences and Walls; and Additional Design Guideline Issues. It is recognized that additional Design Guidelines based on these and other applicable policies of the Plan shall be developed as follow-up work, and will be more complete than those included here. These policies were considered too critical to wait for additional planning efforts in the future.

“Views to and from the Monument” is a design guideline/policy of the WSSP and was considered “too critical” an issue to wait for future planning efforts. The request does not further WSSP Policy 4.6 because it does not adequately discuss views, especially those to and from the Monument.

WSSP Policy 4.6.a: Design subdivisions to provide an efficient circulation pattern for transit service.

WSSP Policy 4.6.b: Design subdivisions to provide safe, attractive and efficient patterns for pedestrians. Walking distances from residences within subdivisions to arterials, collectors, or streets with existing or proposed transit service should be kept to ¼ mile or less whenever possible.

The request does not further WSSP Policies 4.6.a and b. The proposed design standards provide little connectivity between tracts and would result in subdivisions that are gated and separated from the roadway by long expanses of walls, which would generally make it difficult for people to access future transit service (a & b). Most future residents of this large site would be over ¼ mile from Transit service (b).

WSSP Policy 4.6.c: Gated and/or walled communities and cul-de-sacs are strongly discouraged on the West Side. In rare instances when these design features are permitted, openings through perimeter walls and cul-de-sacs shall be provided every 600 feet so that pedestrians and bicyclists are provided direct access to transit service and other destinations.

WSSP Policy 4.6.e: Subdivisions shall be designed to provide multiple vehicular and pedestrian access points.

The request does not further WSSP Policies 4.6.c and e. All residential tracts would contain gated subdivisions. The design standards do not address openings through perimeter walls and would preclude direct access to transit service for pedestrians and bicyclists. The standards would not guarantee pedestrian and bicycle access to the National Monument and Mirehaven Arroyo.

WSSP Policy 4.6.d: Subdivisions shall be designed to avoid rear yard walls facing public streets.

The request does not further WSSP Policy 4.6.d. The proposed design standards would allow rear yards backing up to Tierra Pintada Blvd. and to any other public (and private) roadways.

WSSP Policy 4.10: It is important to promote and establish land uses and urban patterns whose design support bicycle and pedestrian travel, and public transportation, encourage ridership, enhance public mobility and promote alternatives to single occupant vehicle use.

The request does not further WSSP Policy 4.10. The proposed design standards do not contain language that would create land use patterns to support bicycle and pedestrian travel and promote alternatives to single occupancy vehicle usage. The standards do not address openings through perimeter walls and would preclude direct access to transit service for pedestrians and bicyclists.

C) FACILITY PLAN FOR ARROYOS (RANK II)

The Facility Plan for Arroyos (1986) establishes guidelines and procedures for implementing Comprehensive Plan goals in order to create a multi-purpose network of recreational trails and open space along arroyos (p.11). The Facility Plan for Arroyos (FPA) is a Rank II facility plan that designates some arroyos for further study and development as recreational corridors. An arroyo is defined as a “small, steep-sided watercourse or gulch with a nearly flat floor” (p.75).

The Mirehaven Arroyo runs west-east across a northern portion of the subject site and, specifically, is located near the subject site's northeastern corner. The FPA groups the Mirehaven Arroyo with the Ladera Arroyo and the Rinconada Arroyo; all originate above the ridge of the Escarpment and terminate at the Ladera Golf Course (p. 48).

The FPA classifies the Mirehaven Arroyo as an Urban Recreational Arroyo. Such arroyos are located in urbanized or developing areas. The FPA contains general policies for all arroyos and specific policies for Urban Recreational Arroyos. These policies, which address park and trail development, right-of-way, channel treatments and location of crossing structures, will also come into play when analyzing future site development plan submittals for portions of the subject site.

Urban Recreational Arroyos Policies

Policy 1: The City shall encourage the development of parks adjacent to the drainage channels of designated Urban Recreational Arroyos, and along segments of arroyos connecting significant activity areas.

The request partially furthers Policy 1. Tract F, the Community Center & Social Lawn/Park and two "private pocket parks" are proposed adjacent to the Urban Recreational Arroyo, but such parks are likely to be quite small and/or of questionable utility for preserving the arroyo.

Policy 2: A minimum fifteen foot easement on one side of the drainage channel is recommended to allow for trail development.

The request may further Policy 2. A proposed trail is shown along the north side and a portion of the south side of the Urban Recreational Arroyo. It appears that the Mirehaven Arroyo is on a separate tract, but it is unknown if the intent is to deed or dedicate this land to AMAFCA. No easement is indicated and the trail does not link back to the public right-of-way, which will limit its functionality.

Policy 4: The location of crossing structures shall be determined on a case-by-case basis according to the specific channel characteristics, the distance between the access points crossing the channel, and the identification of potential pedestrian desire-lines during the park design process.

The request partially furthers Policy 4. One street crossing of the Mirehaven Arroyo is proposed. The crossing would allow residents to access housing on the north side of the Mirehaven Arroyo. No information has been provided about the distance between the access points crossing the channel or the specific channel characteristics.

D) TRAILS & BIKEWAYS FACILITY PLAN (Rank II)

The Trails & Bikeways Facility Plan (TBFP) was adopted in July 1993 with an amendment made to the Bikeways Master Plan in November of 1996. The initial intent of the Plan was the implementation of an off-road recreational trail system. However, after public hearings in the

fall of 1990, the public strongly indicated a strong desire that the trail system function not only as a recreational network, but also as an alternative method of transportation. The major goals for the Trails & Bikeways Facility plan are to: secure a funding source; find an “administrative home” for the trails and bikeways; create a map of the proposed network; and develop policies for future trail and bikeway development and usage.

The TBFP identifies two different types of trails, Primary Trail and Secondary Trail, with distinct policies and recommendations that apply to the both types. The trails identified within the site are defined by the TBFP as secondary trails. The latest version of the Bikeways Master Plan map is found on page 21 of the Plan and their description found in Appendix A.

Goal 2: Accommodate the following users in the trail system recognizing that not all can be accommodated on every trail: cyclists (both mountain and touring), pedestrians, runners, equestrians, and the physically challenged.

The request partially furthers Goal 2. The intent of the trail system is to “lessen the need for vehicular use.” The Trails Design Standards indicate that pedestrians, runners, and bicyclists would be accommodated within the trail system. If a standard was included indicating that the trails would use Barrier-Free Design, physically challenged individuals would also be accommodated as trail users.

Goal 3: Develop strategies to mitigate between trail user types.

Goal 4: Develop a safe trail system.

The request does not address potential conflicts between trail user types and does not indicate whether equestrians would be accommodated. Striped centerlines or trail etiquette signage are strategies that could help minimize potential conflicts and help ensure a safe trail system. Trail safety is not addressed, either.

Goal 5: Facilitate commuter cycling.

The request does not further Goal 5. Though the one, major local street proposed is designed with a bicycle lane, it would not encourage commuter cycling unless connections are provided to existing facilities outside the subdivision. Further, the gated portions of the subdivisions and expanses of perimeter walls would reduce the amount of network connectivity in the area and make it harder to use non-vehicular transportation modes.

Goal 6: Provide amenities for the trail system.

The request does not address pedestrian or trail amenities such as trail signage, benches, shade structures and trash receptacles.

E) NORTHWEST MESA ESCARPMENT PLAN (RANK III)

The Northwest Mesa Escarpment Plan (NWMEP) was adopted by City Council on November 30, 1987. The Northwest Mesa Escarpment is a seventeen-mile long face of exposed volcanic basalt and associated soils approximately 50 to 200 feet high, which runs north-south along the northwest mesa. The NWMEP was created to maintain the volcanic escarpment as open space

for public health, welfare and safety reasons, as well as to define urban form and satisfy other open space needs.

The NWMEP contains a design overlay zone and is utilized as a tool to help preserve the Escarpment area. There are four distinct areas within the design overlay zone:

- The Escarpment Face
- The Impact Area
- The Conservation Area
- The View Area

The subject site, consisting of approximately 285 acres adjacent to Petroglyph National Monument, contains lands in the Impact Area and the View Area. Policies in the NWMEP include general regulations that apply in all three areas, View Area regulations and Impact Area regulations, the more stringent being the latter. Staff notes that NWMEP policies are regulations that the request must comply with, and finds the following policies relevant:

Regulations for the Entire Design Overlay Zone (p. 50)

Note: Though listed as “policies” in the text, the “Regulations for the Entire Design Overlay Zone” are considered regulations and treated as mandatory.

Policy 7: For property within the City of Albuquerque and Bernalillo County, a design overlay zone is established which covers the Conservation Area, the Impact Area and the View Area as shown on Map 10. All development within the Design Overlay Zone shall comply with the design regulations of this chapter. Variances other than those specifically allowed constitute plan amendments and must follow the standard plan amendment procedure. A request for amendment to the Plan may be processed simultaneously with a request for site plan approval. Site plan approval by either the City or County Planning Commission shall be conditional on Plan amendment approval by the City Council.

Policy 9: Development at the edge of public or private open space shall be designed to complement and enhance the open space.

The request does not comply with Policy 9. The proposed design standards do not adequately demonstrate how development at the edge of open space would be designed to complement and enhance it. The standards do not address visual integration with this unique context.

Policy 9.1: On-site open areas shall be designed to connect with adjacent public or private open space and to be visually integrated with the open space system. Orientation of the on-site open areas to the larger open space system is required. In mixed-use developments, lower densities and less intense uses shall border the open space and higher densities and more intense uses shall be placed away from the open space. Site plans shall allow for shifting excessive density to a part of the premises outside of the Conservation Area boundary, whenever flexible.

The request partially complies with Policy 9.1. In three locations along the Mirehaven Arroyo, on-site open space areas are connected with adjacent open space. However, the proposed open space system is fragmented and its component parts do not connect with each other. There are no design standards to indicate that each parcel's open space will be

oriented to the larger open space system. Therefore, overall, the open space areas do not connect sufficiently and would not create usable corridors for people and wildlife.

Policy 9.2: Where the adjacent land use requires visual privacy, non-continuous, non-perimeter walls may be constructed. Varied setbacks and landscaping are required. Platting of lots adjacent to the Conservation Area shall configure the perimeter facing the open space in order to avoid a strictly linear corridor appearance. Recommended fence materials include brick, stone, wood, stucco, over concrete block, or textured concrete masonry units.

The request does not comply with Policy 9.2. The proposed design standards do not provide for varied setbacks, do not require non-perimeter walls, do not address walls and/or fences and do not specify that areas adjacent to the Conservation Area will be treated any differently from other areas of the Westside.

Policy 9.3: Height of the walls and fences shall not exceed 6'0". Color of finish materials shall match Approved Color List (Appendix E).

The request partially complies with Policy 9.3. The proposed design standards do not address wall and/or fence colors. They do indicate the maximum fence/wall height is 6 feet.

Policy 9.5: Native or naturalized vegetation adjacent to the open space is required. Plant species shall be selected from the Plant Species List (Appendix D).

The request does not comply with Policy 9.5. The proposed design standards do not specify that native or naturalized vegetation would be provided adjacent to open space. A plant palette is not provided.

Policy 11: Any damage to the vegetation, slope, or placement of boulders due to or related to construction shall be mitigated.

The request does not comply with Policy 11. The proposed design standards minimally address grading, and slope treatment is a "should". Without specifics, it can be assumed that the subject site would be mass graded. Slope enhancements are mentioned, but would not be useful if no there are no slopes between rows of homes.

Conservation and Impact Area Regulations

Policy 11.2: Prior to beginning construction, the property owner shall construct a temporary barricade at the site boundary adjacent to the Escarpment Face to protect it from heavy equipment. Alternatively, the property owner or contractor may elect to keep construction activities to a minimum of 20 feet from the Escarpment Face or survey boundary. Photographs of the site in its original condition shall be submitted with the application for building permit, subdivision and/or site development plan.

The request partially complies with Policy 11.2. The subject site is located mostly in the View Area, with a portion in the Impact Area. However, the applicant has not submitted photos of

the site in its original condition with this request. The photos would be required prior to issuing building permits for development of each Tract; this should be noted on the SPS.

Policy 11.7: For any construction within the Conservation and Impact Areas, the following applies in the selection of alignment and in site design:

a. Grading plans shall demonstrate that cut and fill has been kept to a minimum unless the excavation reduces the profile of construction in a way that materially improves the site plan. Generally, the overall topography of the site is not to be substantially altered.

The request does not comply with Policy 11.2. A portion of the subject site lies within the Impact Area and is therefore subject to Impact Area regulations. The proposed grading plan does not contain sufficient information regarding topography and does not demonstrate that cut and fill will be kept to a minimum.

Policy 11.8: Areas which are damaged or altered shall be restored through replacement of boulders to approximate the original location, angle and surface exposure. Revegetation to approximate original cover with appropriate native or naturalized plants as identified in Appendix D is required within 90 days of project completion. A variance may be granted if the type of vegetation or time of the year make revegetation within 90 days impossible. A warranty bond shall be required for three years after final planting to ensure successful revegetation.

The request does not comply with Policy 11.2. A portion of the subject site lies within the Impact Area and is therefore subject to Impact Area regulations. The proposed design standards do not indicate that revegetation will be undertaken to stabilize slopes and disturbed areas, and do not address revegetation in terms of grading.

Policy 12: Structures shall not block views of the Escarpment or visually contrast with the natural environment.

The request partially complies with Policy 12. Proposed structures in the Impact Area would comply with the NWMEP height restrictions. However, the request does not demonstrate that offsite view opportunities would be maximized. The request does not explicitly state that structures shall not block views of the Escarpment Area or demonstrate how they will not block the views. A views section would benefit the design standards. The example of structures proposed (sheet 7) would visually contrast with the natural environment.

Policy 12.1: Structure height shall not exceed 15'0". Up to 4' additional height for non-residential structures may be allowed by seeking a variance, in order to screen rooftop equipment. Residential structures further than 200'0" from the Escarpment Face on sites with gross residential densities less than one dwelling unit per acre may have a height of 26'0".

The request complies with Policy 12.1. Residential building heights in the Impact Area are proposed to not exceed the 15 foot height limitation of the Impact Area regulations.

Policy 12.3: The exterior surfaces of structures must be Approved Colors (Appendix E). Mechanical devices and vents on roofs are subject to this regulation. Trip material on façades constituting less than 20% of the façade's opaque surface may be any color.

The request partially complies with Policy 12.3. Proposed structures in the Impact Area are limited to a neutral, earth-toned palette. The design standards do not specify that the mechanical devices and roof vents must also be approved colors. More information is needed regarding the NWMEP approved exterior colors.

Policy 12.4: Glass on any façade shall not be reflective or mirror glass, this is, glass having greater than 15% average daylight exterior reflectance as published by the manufacturer.

The request complies with Policy 12.4. Proposed structures in the Impact Area are required to use clear, non-reflective glass.

Policy 12.5: No exposed roof-mounted heating or air-conditioning equipment shall be permitted. Roof mounted heating and air conditioning equipment shall be fully screened from views, both from the ground and from the escarpment. Screening materials shall be of Approved Colors (Appendix E).

The request complies with Policy 12.5. Proposed structures in the Impact Area would comply with this policy. Screening of roof-mounted equipment with materials that are the same as the primary building materials would be required.

Policy 13: Sites which cannot be set aside as open space, including recreational facilities, and sites adjacent to open space, shall have minimum visual impact.

The request partially complies with Policy 13. Proposed structures in the Impact Area would comply with the NWMEP height restrictions. However, the request does not explicitly state that structures shall have minimum visual impact or explain how they would have a minimum visual impact. A views section in the design standards could illustrate this.

Policy 13.1.b: A minimum of 20% of the parking lot area as defined by the outermost parking space edges shall be landscaped. The landscaping shall be native or naturalized species intended to minimize maintenance and harmonize with the existing vegetation and shall be from the Plant Species List in Appendix D. The minimum 20% landscaping must include:

- No more than 10 contiguous parking spaces without a landscaped separation at least 6' wide. Landscaped areas shall be placed randomly to produce an informal visual interruption of the parking areas.
- A landscaped strip between the parking lot and the escarpment with a minimum width of 6' which varies in width to avoid the appearance of a hard, straight line. Plant selections shall include sufficient shrubs or trees to provide a visual barrier.

The request does not comply with Policy 13.1.b. Parking lots in the Impact Area are likely to be located at the parks. The request mentions use of plants from the NWMEP in the

landscape section, but does not address parking lot landscaping in terms of amount, intent and the two bulleted points above.

Policy 13.1.c: There shall be wheel stops or curbs around all landscaped areas in order to protect landscaping from vehicles.

The request partially complies with Policy 13.1.c. There is a statement of general compliance on Sheet 5, but the design standards need to specify that wheel stops or curbs shall be around all landscaped areas.

Policy 13.1.d: Shrubs and trees shall be nursery grown. Nursery grown stock is required in order to prevent illegal removal of natural occurring vegetation from its existing location.

The request partially complies with Policy 13.1.d. There is a statement of general compliance on Sheet 5, but the design standards need to specify that shrubs and trees shall be nursery grown.

Policy 13.2.a: Plants selected for landscaping on privately or publicly owned land shall be selected from the Plant Species List (Appendix D). Landscaping plans shall indicate a pattern that does not obscure major public views of the escarpment as defined in this document.

The request partially complies with Policy 13.2.a. The design standards specify that plants shall be chosen from the WMP Design Guidelines, but should also mention the NWMEP Plant Species List (Appendix D).

Policy 13.3.a: Free-standing signs other than street signs, traffic signs or informational signs shall be limited to 6 square feet of sign area—except in areas zoned C-2, where free-standing signs shall be limited to monument signs 75 square feet in sign area—and be of a uniform material, style, and color to be determined by the Planning Department.

The request partially complies with Policy 13.3.a. Free-standing signs are limited to monument signs and would be a uniform style, but the three proposed sign sizes are larger than 6 square feet in area.

Policy 13.4.a: Site lighting- Height of luminaries shall not exceed 20'0".

The request complies with Policy 13.4.a. A design standard indicates that the maximum height of street lights shall be 20 feet, though it needs to say "from top to grade".

Policy 13.4.b: Site lighting- Light fixtures shall be of a type that throws light downward and have baffles, hoods, or diffusers so that any light point source is not directly visible from a distance greater than 1000 feet.

The request partially complies with Policy 13.4.b. The lighting section states that lights shall be shielded, but does not discuss how or deal with their visibility from a distance.

Regulations for Road, Utility, and Drainage Corridors within the Conservation and Impact Area

Policy 15: Public access and public facilities shall be compatible with the sensitive nature of the escarpment. Public access shall be at points which are least sensitive to use, whenever possible. Utilities and roads shall be limited to areas which are least sensitive to disturbance. Areas to be avoided, if at all possible, are Pierdras Marcadas Canyon, the point where the middle branch of the San Antonio crosses the escarpment, the Marsh Peninsula, Riconada Canyon, the escarpment South of Riconada Canyon and the Petroglyph Park.

The request does not comply with Policy 15. The abovementioned areas are avoided by roads and utilities in the request, but there are three trailhead locations to the National Monument. There is no demonstration that public access is at points which are least sensitive to use.

Policy 15.3: Street lighting- Height of luminaries shall not exceed 28'0".

The request complies with Policy 15.3. The proposed standards state that the maximum height of street lights shall be 20 feet.

Policy 15.3.b: Street lighting- Light fixtures shall be of a type that projects light downward and have baffles, hoods or diffusers so that any light point source is not directly visible from a distance greater than 100 feet.

The request partially complies with Policy 15.3.b. The proposed lighting section does not mention cut-off luminaries or light diffusion. However, a design standard indicates that generally "placement of fixtures and standards shall conform to state and local safety and illumination standards." An additional statement regarding the type of fixture is needed.

Policy 15.7: Natural contours of the land shall be taken into account in determining the placement of roads and utilities. Grading and filling of existing contours shall be kept to a minimum. It is recognized that retaining walls will be necessary in some cases, but facility designs shall minimize their height and insure that they blend visually with their surroundings. The maximum height allowed for a retaining wall designed to limit the width of a road corridor is 8'. Retaining walls must meet all other requirements in the design overlay zone with regard to color and materials.

The request does not comply with Policy 15.7. No design standards are proposed to ensure that natural contours of the land would be taken into account in determining placement of roads and utilities, and that development would "blend visually" with the surrounding landscape and keep grading and filling to a minimum. Though the design of Roadway A is shown so that each direction of the road is separated by a large median to accommodate a grade change (instead of relying on retaining walls), this is not articulated in the standards so cannot be ensured.

Policy 15.8: Where the road surface cannot be at grade with the prevailing adjacent contours, the exposed embankment must be stabilized. The covering of that stabilization shall be with a combination of basalt, earth, and vegetation that is in similar proportion to the surrounding portions of the escarpment.

The request partially complies with Policy 15.8. Typical street sections demonstrate landscaped medians that accommodate grade changes, though this needs to be articulated as written standards. However, there are no design standards that describe or regulate the type or extent of ground cover and landscaping.

Policy 19: Drainage facilities' design shall be sensitive to the character of the existing escarpment. Arroyo corridor and drainage management plans are the appropriate planning level for specific channel treatment recommendations for arroyos identified in the "Facility Plan for Arroyos".

The request generally complies with Policy 19. The Mirehaven Arroyo is designated as an Urban Recreational Arroyo. There is no specified treatment for this arroyo type, outside of dedicated parks. Because no dedicated parks are proposed along this arroyo, Policy 2 (FPA, p. 53) would not apply. The specific channel treatment to be implemented in this area has not been clearly identified, but should be addressed in the proposed standards.

View Area Regulations

Policy 20: The predominant colors used on structures within the view area shall blend with the natural colors of the mesa.

The request partially complies with Policy 20. Proposed colors for buildings in the View Area would be warm, desert earth tones and accents would be earth tones, but these need to be better defined in the standards, because colors such as pink, black and blue could also be considered "earth tones."

Policy 20.1: Predominant exterior surfaces of commercial and multi-family buildings shall be Approved Colors (Appendix E). Metal items such as vents, cooling units and other mechanical devices on roofs are subject to this regulation, as are fences. Dish antennae shall not be placed on roofs. Up to 20% of the opaque materials on any façade may be colors other than Approved Colors.

The request partially complies with Policy 20.1. The request indicates that the building materials are limited to warm, desert earth tone colors. Additional standards are needed to state that mechanical devices and fences shall also be colors on the NWMEP list, and that dish antennae shall not be placed on roofs.

Policy 20.2: Single family residential structures built in the View Area must be built with roofs that are Approved Colors.

The request partially complies with Policy 20.2. The request indicates that the building materials are limited to stucco and warm, desert earth tone colors. However, it does not state that roofs must be of NWMEP approved colors.

Policy 21.1: The height of structures within the View Area shall comply with the requirements of the Comprehensive City Zoning Code, except that no structure shall exceed 40'0" in height.

The request complies with Policy 21.1. The main SPS sheet (sheet 1) limits building height to 26 feet outside of the NWMEP Impact area, where building height is limited to 15 feet. The private community center (in the View Area) would be no greater than 40 feet tall.

E) WESTLAND SECTOR PLAN (RANK III)

The Westland Sector Plan (WSP), adopted in 1999 (Enactment No. 63-1999), consists of two maps: a land use map and a zoning map, which used to be on two, full-sized sheets. The WSP was amended in 2008 in conjunction with amendments to the Westland Master Plan (WMP) (Council Bills No. R-08-58, R-08-59 and R-08-60). These amendments changed zoning to SU-2/Town Center (TC) and SU-2/Town Center Village (TCV), relocated the community activity center, and correspondingly revised the land use and zoning maps.

The WSP was also amended in 2012 (Council Bill No. R-12-80) primarily to respond to the addition of Education (E) and Recreation (R) land use categories. With the 2012 amendments, the WSP became known as the Western Albuquerque Land Holdings (WAHL) Sector Plan and became Appendix A of the WMP.

The WSP establishes City zoning categories for approximately 1,700 acres and refers to the Westland Master Plan (WMP) for design guidelines and allowed uses. The WSP does not contain any goals or policies. However, the land use and process portions are relevant to the current request.

Sheet 2 of the WSP, the land use map, specifies the subject site's land use as "Residential- 4 DU/ac average". The arroyo is shown as "Open space/trails/drainage corridors". Sheet 1 of the WSP states that the SU-2 PDA zone requires an overall site development plan for subdivision and that future site development plans for building permit are delegated to the DRB. If no site development plan for subdivision exists, individual building plans shall be reviewed and approved by the EPC. It appears that there is a contradiction between this and zoning established in the Westland Master Plan (WMP). In addition, the sector plan states that phasing shall adhere to the Phasing Plan as illustrated by Exhibit 12 of the Westland Master Plan.

F) WESTLAND MASTER PLAN (RANK III)

The City adopted the Westland Master Plan (WMP) in 1998 to provide guidance for more detailed planning, zoning and platting actions within the designated plan boundaries. The Plan area includes approximately 6,424 acres and generally encompasses properties between the Petroglyph National Monument and Interstate 40, and between Unser Boulevard and a boundary line to the west of Paseo del Volcan. The WMP contains information regarding the area's physical characteristics and addresses land use, zoning, transportation and the development vision for the area.

The WMP was amended in 2008 in conjunction with amendments to the Westland Sector Plan (WSP, see E above) (Council Bills No. R-08-58, R-08-59 and R-08-60). These amendments changed zoning to SU-2/Town Center (TC) and SU-2/Town Center Village (TCV), relocated the community activity center, and correspondingly revised the land use and zoning maps and relevant text. The WMP was also amended in 2012 (Council Bill No. R-12-80) primarily to

respond to the addition of Education (E) and Recreation (R) land use categories, and to correspondingly update related text, charts and maps in the body of the document.

The WMP includes a variety of land uses to take advantage of the area's regional importance and strategic location on Albuquerque's growing West Side. A variety of housing densities, commercial and employment centers, and open spaces are included in order to create a cohesive, master-planned community. Some design innovations to promote high-quality development are also included.

In order to determine if the current request will further, partially further, or not further the WMP, Staff identified sub-categories used in the Master Plan (Land Use, Residential, Open Space, etc.) and describes if the request is consistent with the intent and the purpose of the respective sub-categories.

Westland Master Plan Sub-Categories

Land Uses (p. 37)

The intent is to provide a mixed-use community for the Westland Plan Area where maximum opportunities for living, working, shopping, and playing will be offered.

Residential (p. 27 & p. 40)

The intent is to accommodate a broad socioeconomic range of future residents. Residential areas will provide opportunities for entry level housing. Large areas for future residential neighborhood development have been designated at a variety of densities. Each of these areas will incorporate a range of product types and densities, in addition to small-scale neighborhood commercial centers, schools, parks, churches, etc.

This request does not further the abovementioned intent of the WMP. The request includes residential uses, parks and a private community center, but would not likely provide opportunities for entry level housing and would not accommodate a broad socioeconomic range of residents. Slight variation in allowed densities, which range between 4 and 5 du/acre, would result in similar, homogeneous product type. Additional details in the design standards could lead to more consistency with this WMP intention.

In the event that this portion of the Master Plan area does not develop as a residential resort with associated recreational uses, the development of high-density apartment units within the SU-2 PDA zone shall be prohibited...A maximum density of 5.0 single-family units per acre will be allowed if the residential resort does not develop.

This request furthers the abovementioned intent of the WMP. The subject site will not develop as the Residential Resort originally envisioned and would not have clustered development around open space or embrace natural features. The maximum density allowed is 5.0 single-family units per acre.

Affordable Housing (p. 41)

The intent is that twenty percent of the housing units developed within the Master Plan area shall be affordable based on federally-established affordability criteria.

The request does not address affordable housing. Due to relatively low density and homogeneous product type, it is unlikely that the future homes would be considered affordable. Eventually, affordable housing will have to be accommodated somewhere within the Plan area.

Westland Master Plan Design Guidelines (p. 75 – 99)

The WMP recognizes the importance of design guidelines that promote and foster a sense of cohesiveness within the community (while remaining consistent with affordable housing efforts City-wide). The desired character of design features common to the community such as grading, landscape, signage, lighting, walls and architecture are expressed.

Staff has reviewed the WMP Design Guidelines to determine if they are addressed, should be addressed or don't apply to the current request. For brevity's sake, here Staff points out only the standards that are not (or inadequately) addressed and need to be incorporated into the proposed design standards.

- A. Site Design (p. 75): Since a primary focus in site design is creation of a pedestrian-oriented community, the proposed design standards need a section on Pedestrianism. Site development plans "shall include circulation diagrams that illustrate pedestrian circulation". An overall one is included here. These diagrams will need to be provided for development of each subsequent Tract.
1. Commercial and Industrial (p. 75): Add standards stating that "all buildings shall be oriented to pedestrian movement and the public right-of-way" (goes in Pedestrianism subsection) and "the use of front yard area for primary off-street parking is discouraged" (goes in Parking subsection) and "no refuse storage/collection areas will be allowed to be sited between any street or building front" (goes in Utilities subsection).
2. Residential (p. 78): Add a standard to address pedestrian connections between neighborhoods. Pedestrian openings at the ends of cul-de-sacs or openings in perimeter walls can achieve this.

A new sub-section is needed for yard setbacks, including garages. The intent is to avoid uniform front-yard setbacks, use knuckles or cul-de-sacs to add variety to the streetscape, and vary the placement and orientation of garages. Side-entry garages should be allowed, and no more than 3 houses in a row should have garages parallel to the street.

- C. Signage (p. 79): The signage drawings shall also delineate color, lettering and lighting.

Signage General Guidelines (p. 79-80): Several small standards regarding sign colors, contrast, typefaces, words, lettering and sign shape should be added. They could perhaps be made into a few standards.

Signage, 1. Commercial & Industrial (p. 80): No off-premise signs are permitted in the Westland Plan area. This needs to be added.

- D. Lighting, 1. Street Lighting (p. 81): Add that lighting “shall be concentrated at intersections and pedestrian crosswalks” and that lighting fixtures shall be “recessed or shielded.”
- D. Lighting, 3. Pedestrian Lighting (p. 81): Add that “bollard material and design shall be compatible with adjacent buildings.”
- E. Landscape & Streetscape (p. 82-83): Add that “Major arterials shall be landscaped with native species...” and that “Special attention shall be given to landscaping the major entries to the Westland Community.”
1. Streetscapes (p. 83): Streetscapes are not addressed in the proposed design standards, but should be. Streetscape amenities such as benches, bus shelters, bike racks and trash receptacles need to be provided and will contribute to the desired “high-end” development.
- A. Non-Residential Streetscape (p. 84-85): Add that sidewalks along arterials “or adjacent to solid walls” shall be a minimum of 6 feet wide. Also add that a “minimum landscaped area of 10 feet between the back of curb and sidewalk shall be provided along all major arterials” and that one street tree for every 30 linear feet shall be planted along public right-of-ways.
2. Parking Lots (p. 85-86): The proposed design standards need to include Parking Lots with the Parking sub-section and add the following: Parking lots shall be screened from view by a landscape strip, at least 10 feet wide, between the walls and public rights-of-way. Screening material shall be one or a combination of plant materials, walls or earthen berming and shall be at least 3 feet high. Lowering the grade of a parking lot should be allowed.

Parking lot trees need to be discussed here. Add that a landscape island shall be provided for every 10 parking spaces and that 75% of parking lot trees shall be deciduous.

- F. Architectural Styles (p. 86): The intent is to provide a “framework for high-quality design.” The statement that “building design shall be contextual to land forms” needs to be added to the proposed Architecture design standards.
2. Residential (p. 87): The intent is that individual dwellings be distinguishable from each other. Two standards need to be added to the proposed Architecture design standards. The label should be A. Views & Building Height. Residential structures outside of the NWMEP Impact Area shall not exceed 2 stories and 26 feet high. Details regarding how this is measured need to be added here. The second story needs to be set-back and limited to 65% of the building footprint.
3. Commercial & Industrial (p. 87): A couple of these standards should be added for the non-residential building, the Community Center. The building should be more horizontal than

vertical. Rooflines visible from the street should not run continuous for more than 50 feet and long, interrupted exterior walls should be avoided. Incorporating these standards will help ensure a “high-end” type of design.

4. Walls (p. 87-88): An intent statement regarding walls is needed and can be taken from the WMP: walls shall be an integrated part of site and building design. Also add that a wall’s style, materials and color shall be consistent with building architecture and address landscaping between the sidewalk and walls as a standard (it’s shown in a diagram).
5. Undesirable Design Elements (p. 88): Add that metal or aluminum siding is prohibited.
- G. Antenna and Towers (p. 88): Add the standard regarding cellular antennae (wireless facilities).
- H. Grading (p. 89): State that grading for new roads shall (not should) run with existing contours.
- K. Plant Palette (p. 90-99): The plant palette needs to be referenced and called out, with a page reference, in the proposed Landscape standards.

VI. CULTURAL RESOURCES/ARCHAEOLOGY

This area of the West Mesa, including the subject site, is known to contain archaeological resources (see “A Preliminary Evaluation of the Cultural Resources within the Westland Sector Plan in Bernalillo County, New Mexico. Location information is not provided”). In 1995, Westland conducted a preliminary archaeological investigation on a small number of randomly selected locations in the Westland Master Plan (WMP) area (WMP, p. 34). The WMP divides the Westland area into five archaeological zones (WMP, p. 33).

The New Mexico State Office of Historic Preservation (or SHPO) deals with cultural resource surveys. The City’s Archaeological Ordinance also applies. A cultural resource survey was conducted for WAHL by Marron & Associates (January 2013) for Tract M. Six archaeological sites were found, one of which is eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (see attachment). Documentation has not been received yet regarding Tract N-2, which apparently also contains cultural resources.

VII. NATURAL RESOURCE PLANNING & SUSTAINABILITY

Natural Resource Planning is a type of planning that incorporates the nature, environmental factors and sustainability into its practice. The approximately 285 acre subject site, adjacent south and east of the Petroglyph National Monument, is located in a unique environmental area. Therefore, careful and holistic consideration of water resources and drainage, topography and soils and grading and fugitive dust is warranted at this stage in the development process.

Drainage System & Water Resources

The subject site is part of a larger natural drainage system that generally drains from west to east. The Ladera Pond system, built to accommodate runoff from a 100 year flood, lies to the south. From the subject site, runoff is intended to go through the existing Stormcloud subdivision and become part of the Ladera Pond system, ending up at Ladera Golf Course. Ladera Golf Course is a playa, an area where water naturally collects.

The Albuquerque-Bernalillo County Water Utility Authority (ABCWUA) has a finalized development agreement with Westland Devco. (the “2007 Development Agreement”), which was assigned to Western Albuquerque Land Holdings (WALH) by agreement with the ABCWUA in June, 2011. The City well/pumpstation/water treatment facility north of the subject site will provide water utility service, though the service must be provided in phases as specified in the 2007 Development Agreement.

There is public concern regarding availability of water to serve the new, proposed \approx 950 homes. Nearby residents state that water resources in this area of the Westside are already insufficient, and that there are problems with water availability and pressure (see attachments).

Topography & Soils

The subject site generally slopes from west to east, and is relatively flat near the northwestern side (see WMP, p. 27, Exhibit 6- Elevation Study). Moving southward, the slopes become steeper and more pronounced, particularly near the southwestern corner which is quite hilly.

It follows that the subject site is characterized by slopes and terrain changes throughout, but mostly found relatively close to the Monument. The subject site’s western border is characterized by slopes ranging from 10 to 15%, with slopes of 5 to 10% in places (see WMP p. 28, Exhibit 7-Slope Study). The hilly portion near the site’s SW corner contains slopes of 15% and greater.

A unique geologic formation caused by lava flow, now inside the SE portion of the Petroglyph National Monument, pushed outward toward the subject site and created interesting landforms. These landforms should be considered an amenity and integrated into the proposed development rather than being mass-graded. Preserving them would also help integrate the development with the surrounding open space areas.

The soils in the area consist primarily of Bluepoint-Kokan and Bluepoint loamy fine sand (see WMP, p. 25- Soils Analysis). Both soil types are highly-permeable and very likely to erode and become blowing soil (WMP chart, p. 24). Blowing soil, often referred to as “fugitive dust”, is already common in this area in its undeveloped state, with natural vegetation.

Grading & Fugitive Dust

With the proposed mass grading of these soil types and destruction of topographical features, the likelihood of blowing soil depositing on the proposed development and existing developments nearby is high. Though mitigation measures during construction can provide

some relief, blowing soil/fugitive dust will only increase and should be taken into account now. Members of the public have expressed concern about sand storms and want mitigation (see attachments).

Albuquerque/Bernalillo County Air Quality Control Board (AQCB) Regulation 20.11.20 NMAC requires that, when an area greater than $\frac{3}{4}$ acre of soil will be disturbed, a Surface Disturbance Permit must be obtained from the Air Quality Division of the Environmental Health Department. Reasonably Available Control Measures (RACT) are required to control the fugitive dust resulting from the project. A Fugitive Dust Control Plan must be in place. Construction mitigation measures include watering, dust suppressants and traffic control.

Staff notes that the amount and extent of mitigation needed is directly related to the developer's approach to the subject site: mass grading of topographical features would create more fugitive dust in the short and long term than would developing the land with consideration for its natural topographic features. Integrating the development with topography, treating topography as an asset to the project and altering it as little as possible would be beneficial for both the public and the developer in the long run.

VIII. ANALYSIS - SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR SUBDIVISION

A) Overall Analysis

The proposed densities, building heights, building setbacks, and established zoning would create a low-density neighborhood located next to the Petroglyph National Monument. The WMP states that the average density of the SU-2 PDA zone shall be 4.0 du/acre (p.39). The proposed densities comply.

Relationship to Petroglyph National Monument

The request shows single-loaded streets in select places along the Monument's western and southern boundaries. In others places, homes back up to the monument and the roadway turns either east or south to purposefully include the homes between them and the Monument. This leaves little room for a trail and could result in yard-walls facing the Monument. This is not a true single-loaded street, and there are no criteria to determine what proportion is actually single-loaded. The open feeling of the area and views to the Monument would be compromised.

A buffer of varying shape and an undulating street would help provide visual relief, as shown in the existing SPS. Staff and Monument representatives believe that the entire boundary of the Monument should be single-loaded streets, to preserve the openness and views and protect this public resource.

The Mirehaven Arroyo, Open Space

The current request shows channelization of the Mirehaven Arroyo and that a Letter of Map Revision (LOMR) will be applied for in the future. This is to allow mass grading of the floodplain area, which would damage the natural environment and adversely impact a variety of wildlife. It would be possible to preserve the designated floodplain area and integrate it into

the development, as is shown in the existing SPS. Preservation of this area would allow the arroyo to serve as a wildlife and pedestrian corridor. This type of functional open space would be a valuable asset to a future community, and future LOMRs would not be needed.

Topography & Grading

The current request states that topography should be incorporated “whenever feasible”. Since there is not definition of where feasible locations are, the result is likely to be mass-grading without regard to natural features.

A concept called “slope enhancement”, or terracing, includes landscaping and stabilization as a way of working with the site’s topography rather than mass grading the entire site. “Transition slopes” can be used within and between residential areas to incorporate topography into the overall development instead of mass-grading. The transition slopes, which would be privately-maintained, would serve as visual open spaces and wildlife corridors.

Connectivity

Connectivity, circulation and the pedestrian environment are important considerations. Though the request proposes private trails along both sides of the arroyo, information regarding internal connectivity and connectivity to the surrounding area is insufficient. The perimeter wall along Tierra Pintada Blvd. would preclude connection to the public street system and make walking, bicycling and transit usage unlikely.

Though not prohibited, gated communities are “strongly discouraged” on the Westside according to the Westside Strategic Plan. The gating would result in lack of public access to this portion of the Monument and Arroyo.

Water Availability

Concern has been expressed about the availability of water resources to serve the approximately 950 future homes, clubhouse, “social lawn” and parks. Also, it is unclear if the proposed gated community would include water features and how much high water use turf would be included.

B) Overall Site Development Plan- Sheet 1 (Version 2 is reviewed here)

The subject site consists of Tracts M and N-2, Watershed subdivision. The proposed site development plan for subdivision for the ≈ 285 acres would establish nine new tracts as follows: five large residential tracts (A-E), one for a private community center and park (Tract F), two for “open space,” and one designated as the Mirehaven Arroyo (see Sheet 1 of the submittal). Design standards are also proposed.

Zoning Code §14-16-1-5, Definitions, defines a site development plan for subdivision:

“An accurate plan at a scale of at least 1 inch to 100 feet which covers at least one lot and specifies the site, proposed use, pedestrian and vehicular ingress and egress, any internal circulation requirements and, for each lot, maximum building height, minimum building

setback, and maximum total dwelling units and/or nonresidential uses' maximum floor area ratio.”

The proposed site development plan for subdivision addresses these minimal elements and therefore complies with this definition. Clarification regarding access and connectivity, especially with respect to gates, is needed. The symbol for entry is used five times, and sometimes is labeled as “gated”. It is unclear if the symbol means “gate” consistently. If so, gates are proposed at Tierra Pintada Blvd. and Roadway B, and Tierra Pintada Blvd. and Roadway A. Staff suggests a few minor clarifications and adding some notes.

C) Design Standards- Sheets 2 through 6

Purpose: The purpose of design standards is to provide guidance for a development to ensure that it will further applicable City goals, policies and regulations. Design standards also establish a framework to guide future site development plan submittals. The vision for a development is contained in the design standards; therefore, it is important to ensure that the vision is well articulated. Design standards need to be a stand-alone document and not rely only on cross-references to other documents and design standards. This will ensure clarity and consistent implementation.

Content: Design standards consist of several sections, typically the following or a combination thereof: Overall theme/Goal, particular Site Elements (such as views, heights, etc.), Pedestrians/Bicycles, Parking, Setbacks, Landscape, Lighting, Screening and/or Walls/Fences, Utilities, Signage, Building Elements, Architecture and Process.

The proposed design standards are found on Sheets 2 through 6. They are discussed below in the order presented, followed by Staff analysis.

Introduction & 1. Density and Minimum Lot Area

The primary goal for Watershed is to provide “lifestyle choices” in communities that feature parks, open space, trails and amenities and that are “sensitive to and complement the Petroglyph National Monument. However, little choice would be available. The development would be homogeneous and similar density and similar to many subdivisions in NW Albuquerque. The only choice is for active adults (seniors) who could live in the age-restricted development or one of the other developments that are not age-restricted.

Furthermore, as proposed the design standards would not be as sensitive to the National Monument as they could be. Homes would be built 25 feet from the Monument on a private, gated street. Mass grading of highly sloped areas would also be insensitive to the Monument or natural topography (see also Section VI of this report).

Due to this unique location, the subject site lends itself to a type of development like that of High Desert (located east of Tramway Blvd.), where natural topography and arroyos are preserved and integrated into the development. Individual lot development in High Desert is restricted to smaller building envelopes, which protects the natural vegetation and topography and creates a development that embraces its unique natural features.

The current request is intended to be for “high-end” homes, but with bigger building envelopes than in High Desert. The High Desert style of development would incorporate natural vegetation and topography much more than the request for a standard subdivision similar to development in the NW and SW parts of Albuquerque. The High Desert style would also align with the original intent of the WMP for a Residential Resort, which featured clustered development that embraced open space and natural features.

A separate “process” sub-section is needed for clarity and ease of future review. This could be at the beginning or at the end of the proposed design standards.

2. Lighting

The proposed lighting standards would generally ensure a uniform lighting program, but need to state that street lighting would be consistent throughout the subdivisions. Additional detail is needed to address full cut-off fixtures, distance that light escapes (NWMEP) and measurement from top to grade.

3. Landscape

The proposed landscaping standards mostly follow the Zoning Code. For clarity, the landscape standards need to be broken out into the following sub-categories: Streetscape, Street Trees, Parks/Community Center Landscaping, and Yard Landscaping. For Street Trees, the list in the Westland Master Plan (p. 91) should be repeated here to assist future reviewers. It’s a short list and addresses non-residential and residential areas.

An intent statement is needed in the introductory paragraph. The WMP explains xeric principles (p. 89) that should be duplicated here for consistency. Regarding turf, drought-tolerant turf grasses should be required; the WMP states that exotic species (such as Kentucky Blue) can be used sparingly (which needs to be defined). Also, Standards E, F, G and H, which apply to all sub-categories, should be listed following the intent language.

4. Signage

The proposed design standards would allow signage that exceeds the signage sizes allowed in the NWMEP Design Overlay Zone (p. 78). Four types of signs are shown: Type A is a community entry/wall sign, Type B is a secondary community entry sign (35 sf max), Type C is a neighborhood entry sign (18 sf max) and Type D is a facilities sign (12 sf max). All are monument type signs. A maximum sf is not given for Type A.

Sign Type D is shown at entrances to the National Monument. Staff believes they are not needed, especially since these would only be seen by people behind the gates. The Park Service may have their own type of trailhead/entrance signage, and that is sufficient.

Standards should be added to state that off-premise signs (WMP, p. 80) and portable signs (NWMEP, p. 78) are not allowed.

6. Walls/Fences (Note: 5. is not used)

This sub-section needs to state that it applies to residential and non-residential walls (which would be at the Community Center), and further state that such walls would be compatible with building architecture, consistent with the WMP. Consistent should be in terms of materials, color and any accenting. Intent language from the WMP (p. 87) needs to be added to the introductory paragraph.

The street light diagram (Sheet 2) shows landscaping between the sidewalk and wall; however, this needs to be written as a standard, especially since it's in the WMP (p. 87-88).

7. Sidewalks, Trails & Pedestrian Crossings

Site development plans "shall include circulation diagrams that illustrate pedestrian circulation". An overall one is included here. These diagrams will need to be provided for development of each subsequent Tract. Add the following to proposed standard B: sidewalks along collectors or major streets "or adjacent to solid walls" (WMP, p. 85). Standard E: state that it applies to the Community Center and does not apply to streets.

The proposed sidewalk width is 4 feet. Though standard, this is insufficient to create a "high-end" (better than average) walkable environment. The major arterial, Roadway A, has a sidewalk only on one side of the street, which is less than standard DPM requirements.

Minimum requirements for pedestrian access routes between lots are that they shall contain a minimum 6-foot wide path in a 12-foot wide space, shall meet ADA standards as required by law, and shall prevent vehicle entry. Access routes shall have no blind spots and access route exits shall be clearly visible from all points along the route. Pedestrian access routes longer than 120 feet shall be a minimum of 18 feet wide. (See 23.2.A.9.d.4. for exceptions.) DPM Note 12(1).

8. Parks & Common Areas

Standard A contains two concepts (parks/open space and houses) and should be broken into two. The linear drainage parks need to be shown on the Pedestrian Circulation diagram. The section shows that the linear parks all have trails, and locations of these drainage ways are already known. An acequia is also shown, but it's unclear why.

Mirehaven Arroyo: In the Mirehaven Arroyo sub-section, more detail is needed regarding arroyo treatment. What does it mean that the arroyo is to be preserved in a "naturalized (not natural) state"? Also, Staff believes that the portion of the arroyo preserved should correspond to the boundaries of the existing floodplain. Whether or not the floodplain designation is removed on paper, the arroyo would still function as a floodplain. The request would result in many homes built in a floodplain, which would be hazardous to public safety and welfare.

Petroglyph National Monument: The Petroglyph National Monument sub-section states that a single-loaded street would be provided, but the edge treatment diagram shows otherwise. For a street to be truly single-loaded, no lots would be shown adjacent to the National Monument.

Staff recommends deletion of proposed Standard H, which would allow a double-loaded street in certain locations. Homes would be built 25 feet from the Monument boundary. There is no need for this. Having standard sized subdivision lots (not even large, rural sized lots) next to the National Monument is undesirable and would adversely impact the view shed and openness of the area. The National Park Service favors a true, single-loaded street (see attachment).

9. Parking Standards

This sub-section needs to be “Parking Standards & Parking Lots” so that parking lots are addressed, especially since the WMP Design Guidelines discuss them (see p. 85 and 86, for example). Parking lot screening, with at least 10 foot buffer strips and screening material, such as plant materials, walls or berming, needs to be addressed (it would pertain to the Community Center). The WMP also requires landscape islands for every 10 parking spaces.

A standard is needed for each of these, especially because proposed standard B would allow more parking than the Zoning Code would. The “outdoor recreation” and general retail categories specify the rate of 1 space for every 200 feet of building square footage. The proposed minimum 75 parking spaces, related to a proposed 12,000 sf building, results in a rate of 1 space for every 160 feet of building square footage.

10. Utilities & Screening

The WMP standard regarding cellular (wireless) antennae should be added (WMP, p. 88). Language regarding undergrounding of all new electric distribution lines was removed, but perhaps should be re-instated.

11. Streets

This sub-section needs to be “Streets & Streetscape” so that streetscape is addressed, especially since the WMP Design Guidelines discuss streetscape (see p. 83 and 85, for example). Two standards need to be added: one to address streetscape amenities (p. 83) and the other to address a minimum 10 foot landscape area between the back of curb and sidewalk, along all major arterials (p. 85). Both would contribute to the “high-end” nature of the proposed development.

The centerlines of streets intersecting a major local street shall be a maximum of 850 feet apart provided additional pedestrian access routes to and from the Major Local Street are provided on the side(s) of the Major Local Street being considered for development. Section 2.A.9.d.

The Design Standards do not state if future homes adjacent to Roadways A and B would have front or rear yards facing the Major Local Street. The following notes shall be added to the site plan to cover both situations:

On the side(s) of the Major Local Street with front yards facing the street, pedestrian access routes to the Major Local Street shall be located a maximum distance of 500 feet on center.
DPM Section 2.A.9.d(3)

On the side(s) of the Major Local Street with rear yards facing the street, pedestrian access routes that are a minimum of 25 feet wide shall be located a maximum distance of 500 feet on center. Pedestrian access routes narrower than 25 feet wide shall be located a maximum distance of 300 feet on center. DPM Section 2.A.9.d(4).

12. Architecture

The introductory language needs to include WMP language regarding building forms and design: “Building design shall be contextual to land forms” (p. 86). The Views sub-section should be “Views & Building Height”, since height is typically discussed in architecture standards. Two WMP standards need to be added (p. 87): one regarding residential structure height and how it’s measured, and the other regarding the second story being not more than 65% of the building footprint and set back to eliminate the appearance of a two story wall. Metal and aluminum siding should be prohibited, consistent with the WMP (p. 88).

Building Types: The building types shown are front-loaded “snout” houses that typify standard subdivisions in the NW and SW parts of Town, and some could be located in any western city. The WMP states that placement and orientation of garages should be varied to lessen the visual impact of garage doors, and aims to provide variety and visual interest in the streetscape (p. 78).

More, non-garage dominant options should be provided not only to further the intentions of the WMP design standards (see p. 78), but to create the desired “high end” development. Many higher end subdivisions have side garages and feature the house itself; the two Territorial style homes shown approach this. The previously-approved SPS for the subject site included homes with side garages (Project #1006864/07EPC-40065).

Two housing types show an accessory building (casita) in front of the main building entrance. The result is a streetscape is dominated by garages and accessory buildings. Typically casitas are located at the rear of the property. At a minimum, the garage entrance should be relocated to the side of the main building, and the casita placed where the driveway is currently shown. This orientation would allow clear visibility to the entrances of both structures, and avoid an auto-dominant silhouette and contribute to a higher-end style of development.

Additional detail is needed, especially if the applicant desires delegation to the Development Review Board (DRB). The DRB will need clear parameters to operate with. Also (see below), the applicant already has worked out such details; these could be readily incorporated here (with a few modifications to address site specifics).

Style Book: The applicant could create a menu of such homes and include the Contemporary Southwestern and Spanish Eclectic styles, with the Territorial. As a builder at Mesa del Sol, the applicant has already developed homes based on a style book that shows prototypical homes that display architectural diversity and features that create high-end quality homes (Ref: Mesa del Sol Design Book). The same should be done for the subject site, to create clear expectations, consistency with intent and show sensitivity to the subject site’s unique environment.

Also, an active-adult community in Bernalillo has already been developed by the applicant. Housing types are known, and could be used as a starting point to create the adult portion of the style book. However, more than 9 housing types would be needed as well as higher-quality features to create contextual sensitivity as well as clear expectations. This is particularly important because of adjacency to the Monument.

13. Grading

The area's natural topography would not be incorporated into subsequent site development plans; the language says "should" and "when feasible" despite the SU-2 for PDA zoning that is intended to provide "for a mix of residential uses which are special because of the relationship of this property to Petroglyph National Monument." Mass-grading would not preserve the area's relationship to the Monument and would create a sharp contrast to it.

The grading standards need to explain how the grading will comply with the criteria in the NWMEP and the WMP, especially given the vague introductory language (see above). Standard C needs to read that "grading for new roads shall run with the existing contours", as stated in the WMP (p. 89).

14. Drainage- OK

D) Grading & Drainage Plan (Sheet 7)

The grading and drainage plan is particularly important in this case. A flood plain extends approx. west-east across the subject site and includes the Mirehaven Arroyo. The applicant requested that the City submit a Letter of Map Revision (LOMR) to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). The map revision would remove the flood plain designation(s) from the subject site, making it no longer applicable. Then any future buildings would no longer be in a designated flood plain. FEMA takes about 90 days to respond to LOMR requests. They may have comments, which would further extend the timeframes.

Staff points out that, whether or not the LOMR is obtained and the floodplain is removed "on paper", the area would still function as a floodplain unless improvements are made to the drainage system. However, the National Monument is upstream and Staff is not aware of any plans to alter the Monument to reduce the arroyo's natural floodplain area.

Topography & Narrative: The subject site generally slopes from west to east, with slopes ranging from 4% to 15%. Four drainage basins (A-D) are shown. A diversion bank is proposed along part of the subject site's NW boundary with the National Monument, to prevent drainage onto the Monument and channel it into the Mirehaven Arroyo. It's unclear how the diversion bank would be constructed or where it would be in relation to future homes. It could serve to protect the monument at this location.

The drainage narrative indicates that the Mirehaven Arroyo would be treated. The banks would be stabilized, possibly with concrete, and the bottom left "soft". This is contrary to the intentions to leave the arroyo in a natural state. More information is needed.

E) Utility Plan (Sheet 8)

The utility plan shows existing water lines and sewer lines along Tierra Pintada Blvd. in existing easements. New lines are proposed along Roadways A and B. The water pressure zone boundary runs north-south along approx. the western third of the subject site.

IX. AGENCY & NEIGHBORHOOD CONCERNS

Reviewing Agencies/Pre-Hearing Discussion

City Departments and other agencies reviewed this application from 4/29/'13 to 5/10/'13. Extensive comments were received. Outstanding comments are summarized here by topic.

Transportation: Transportation Services commented regarding labeling and easements, dedication of right-of-way, various technical design standards and requirements, and compliance with the City's Development Process Manual (DPM). At least one design variance to the DPM is required - for providing only a single sidewalk along Roadway A instead of one on each side of the street. Another one may be required for the proposed median on Roadway B, which is less than required by the DPM.

Transportation Services also commented that local streets have a minimum pavement width of 32 feet. However, the WMP states "Pursuant to the condition placed on development within the Westland North Plan Area by the City Council, residential streets shall not be more than 32 feet in width." The local street width needs to be revised to be 32 feet, or a design variance to the DPM would be required.

Department of Municipal Development (DMD) Staff comment that the bicycle lanes along Tierra Pintada Blvd. need to be provided and lane widths need to be identified. Transit Department staff recommend pedestrian access at intervals of 500 feet along Tierra Pintada Blvd. to provide access for potential transit users. A design standard could address this recommendation.

The NMDOT does not support the proposed development as described in the submittal. The NMDOT requests a Traffic Impact Analysis to be completed prior to approval to determine any off site impacts to the adjacent state roadway system.

Another significant comment from Transportation Services is that the Mirehaven Arroyos are designated as Urban Recreational Arroyos, and should connect regional open space areas. Several policies regarding trail development, dedication of ROW, and crossing structures are cited. The Open Space Division commented that detail is insufficient for a site development plan for subdivision, and should include layouts of all roads, trails, and fences.

Grading and Drainage: Hydrology commented that the floodplain limits for the Mirehaven Arroyo needs to be shown. Also, the site plan is unclear if drainage ROW is to be dedicated, and if so, to whom. There is a question about the location of the linear park/drainage easement and a suggestion to realign with an existing arroyo. AMAFCA commented that any drainage improvements that will alter the easements will require a vacation action through the City DRB

and a quitclaim / release approval from the AMAFCA Board of Directors. Also, development of this subdivision will require a more detailed analysis of the Ladera Dam system capacity and possibly funding contribution to AMAFCA for upgrade of the dam.

Natural Environment: Hydrology noted that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is taking a larger role in the floodplain removal process because floodplains support a variety of wildlife. Grading a floodplain destroys the natural environment which has a negative impact on existing species. This results in a more difficult and longer approval process for Letter of Map Revision (LOMR) and Conditional Letter of Map Revision (CLOMR) requests. Hydrology will continue to support the CLOMR/LOMR process. Parks and Recreation and Open Space Division requested additional information about the treatment of Mirehaven Arroyo, and regarding plans to preserve natural vegetation during the construction process.

Parks and Petroglyph National Monument: Parks and Recreation has requested additional clarification regarding the maintenance of the pocket parks and linear parks and if they will be available to the public. A maintenance agreement is required for all streetscapes and medians.

Additional information is requested about the ownership, maintenance, and access to the “open space” tracts and the Mirehaven Arroyo. OSD encourages a single-loaded street along the entire boundary with the Petroglyph National Monument. A new conceptual diagram has been provided that shows a single-loaded street along much of the boundary, but not all. There are no standards that address the extent of the boundary that has single family residences abutting NPS land. They further explained a policy that private-only access points into the National Park are not accepted, and have stated that the access points within the gated community are not considered “public access points.” There is also concern about protection of existing native vegetation during construction if the intent is to preserve portions of the site as “naturalized.”

Albuquerque Public Schools (APS) commented that the elementary and middle schools are over capacity. Planning Staff notes that part of the development is designated for “Active Adults,” and this portion will likely have a nominal impact on school capacity.

The Public Service Company of New Mexico (PNM) commented that this project would impact electric substation capacity needs for the surrounding area. It is necessary for the developer to contact PNM’s New Service Delivery Department early in the process to coordinate electric service regarding the project to avoid potential delays in meeting in-service target dates. Other comments include showing public utility easements on the site plan and regarding screening of utility facilities. In a follow-up comment, PNM indicated that new electrical distribution lines will need to be placed underground.

Neighborhood/Public

The affected neighborhood organizations as cited by the Office of Neighborhood Coordination (ONC) are the Tres Volcanes Neighborhood Association (NA) and the Westside Coalition of NAs, which the applicant notified as required. The Petroglyph Homeowner Association (HOA) is also affected. Property owners within 100 feet of the subject site were also notified as required.

A facilitated meeting was held on May 21, 2013 (see attachment). Meeting participants were generally supportive of the request, but raised several important issues. Though participants thought that single-family homes are appropriate in the area, there was a uniform negative response to the gated community. Concerns were raised about validity of the traffic study, fugitive dust and phasing, “cookie-cutter” (homogeneous) development, impact to emergency services, water supply and capacity, and sewer capacity in the area.

The applicant met with the Petroglyph HOA Board of Directors on May 9, 2013. They generally support the request to develop single-family homes, but expressed concerns about transportation, water and sewer issues.

X. CONCLUSION

This request is for a site development plan for subdivision, with design standards, for an ≈285 acre site bounded by Arroyo Vista Blvd. NW, Tierra Pintada Dr. and the Petroglyph National Monument, zoned SU-2 for PDA (the “subject site”). The applicant proposes to create eight tracts and develop single-family homes, parks, and a private clubhouse.

The subject site lies within the boundaries of the Developing Urban area of the Comprehensive Plan. Additional applicable plans include the Westside Strategic Plan (WSSP), the Westland Master Plan, the Westland Sector Plan, the Northwest Mesa Escarpment Plan (NWMEP), the Trails and Bikeways Facility Plan, and the Facility Plan for Arroyos. Overall, the request partially furthers applicable Goals and policies, and conflicts with certain regulations in the NWMEP. Revisions are needed to improve the extent to which Goals, policies are furthered and regulations complied with.

A facilitated meeting was held on May 21, 2013. There is general support for the single-family home use, but concern about the gates, mass grading, homogeneous development, relationship with the Monument, impacts to services in the area and water resources. Staff is concerned about these, and also about instances of non-compliance with applicable regulations and finds that information is missing from the proposed site development plan.

Agency comments are extensive; it is unclear the extent to which they have been addressed.

Staff believes that additional information would allow for a more complete analysis regarding the extent to which the request furthers or is consistent with applicable Goals and policies, and complies with applicable regulations.

- Policies create context and set forth vision for an area; they are guidance for future development and are not considered to be mandatory.
- Regulations, including zoning established by the zoning code and through sector development plans, are mandatory and must be complied with.

In this request, the applicable NWMEP and WMP adopted certain policies and design guidelines as regulations. Where these development regulations are incorrectly titled “policies” in each plan, Staff has noted this in the Staff report.

Large sites such as this usually have more defined and refined design standards to offer clear guidance for future development. Numerous Goals and policies from seven adopted, ranked master plans apply and are important to create context and vision for an area. Additional specificity in the design standards could result in consistency and furthering of many more policies, and create clarity for review of future development.

Planning Staff defers to the EPC to determine if the request should be conditionally approved, deferred or denied. Findings and conditions to support each of these possible actions are forthcoming.

***Catalina Lehner, AICP
Senior Planner***

***K. Carrie Barkhurst
Planner***

Notice of Decision cc list:

Consensus Planning, Inc., 302 Eighth Street NW, Albuquerque, NM 87102

Attachments

CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE AGENCY COMMENTS

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Zoning Enforcement

Reviewed- No comments

Office of Neighborhood Coordination

Tres Volcanes NA (R); Westside Coalition of NA's

4/29/13 – Recommended for Facilitation – siw

4/29/13 – Assigned to David Gold - sdb

Long Range Planning – no comments received

CITY ENGINEER

Transportation Development

- The Developer is responsible for permanent improvements to the transportation facilities adjacent to the proposed site development plan, as may be required by the Development Review Board (DRB).
- Site plan shall comply and be in accordance with DPM (Development Process Manual) and current ADA standards/ requirements.
- All easements, access agreements and property lines must be shown and labeled on Site Plan. Provide recording information.
- Right-of-way dedication to the City of Albuquerque may be required at DRB.
- Per DPM, Table 23.2.1.B Note 3: A sidewalk variance must be requested for Roadway A to allow the proposed design of a single, meandering sidewalk.
- Per DPM, Table 23.2.1.B, a design variance must be requested for Major Local Street B to provide a median width less than 10 feet wide. The proposed pavement width of 20 feet on either side of the median does provide the minimum width for emergency vehicles so perhaps a variance will not be necessary.
- Current COA regulations prohibit striping of crosswalks within public ROW without signalization.
- The City does not support pedestrian crossings without signalization on private roads.
- Will the development need any exclusive turn lanes?
- Please “bullnose” the median ends to accommodate off tracking and fortify with solid concrete fill.
- The geometry of the proposed roadways must follow the road classifications as outlined in the DPM. A 20 foot minimum radius is required for all roadway design.

-
- Please clarify if the Development's street parking will be zoned P1 or P2.
 - The Local Residential Street Section View on sheet 6 of 7 proposes a pavement width of 26-32 feet. The DPM, Table 23.2.1.B, requires a minimum pavement width of 32 feet within the required 53 feet of public R.O.W. This requirement will also apply to local residential streets that are Easements based on the submittal statement "All streets within Watershed shall meet the City's DPM standards" under the street design section. The section of street adjacent to Special Land Use/Parks will require pavement width of 36 feet and 61 feet of R.O.W.
 - Please ensure sight line distances per DPM criteria are followed regarding road arrangements and designs.
 - Public ROW location for Primary Trails shall be as designated by the Long Range bikeway System Map and the Trails and Bikeways Facility Plan and shall be built in accordance with the standards detailed in the DPM.
 - Please comply with DPM's Single Access Criteria Ch 23, Sec. 5.E for Tract A and E.
 - The developer shall coordinate with the DMD to ensure that transportation infrastructure is provided as planned and included in the 2030 MTP.
 - This development area is governed by the policies and design guidelines in the Westland Master Plan, adopted by the COA as a Rank 3 Plan in 1998.
 - The Mirehaven Arroyos (A, B, &C) have been designated as an Urban Recreational Arroyo in the Rank 2 Facility Plan for Arroyos. This designation means that the Mirehaven Arroyo has the potential to connect residential areas to the Ladera Golf Course to the east. Specific policies for urban Recreational Arroyos that will be addressed for eventual subdivision approval include: Policy 1: Park and Trail Development, Policy 2: ROW and Policy 4: location of crossing structures.
 - Are the private trails and community trails designed to be ADA accessible? Please clarify.
 - Community entry walls and signs must not be located within R.O.W.

Hydrology Development

- The Mirehaven Arroyo is shown on the site plan. However, the limits of the floodplain are not. The width of the floodplain ranges from approximately 135 feet to 600 feet. It is an AO Zone 1 foot deep.
- The plan shall show the limits of the existing floodplain, the proposed floodplain limits and the AMAFCA floodplain easement. Will drainage ROW to be dedicated? Would this ROW be dedicated to AMAFCA?
- The US Fish and Wildlife Service is taking a larger role in the floodplain removal process as floodplains support a variety of wildlife. Grading a floodplain destroys the natural environment which has a negative impact on existing species. This results in a more difficult and longer approval process for Letter of Map Revision (LOMR) and

Conditional Letter of Map Revision (CLOMR) requests. Hydrology will continue to support the CLOMR/LOMR process.

- This brief history is mentioned to address the Mirehaven Arroyo Section and Plan View as shown on Sheet 5 of 7. Since a CLOMR has not been sent or approved by FEMA and indirectly by the US Fish and Wildlife Service, a note shall be added to the plan similar to “Proposed section and Plan views are for illustrative purposes only and may change based on requirements of the Federal Emergency Management Agency”
- The plan shall show the estimated water surface elevation in the Mirehaven Section.
- The purpose of the line type with three dots on Sheet 1 of 7 is not clear. Please add to the legend.
- Why doesn't the linear park/Drainage Easement terminate at the location of the 66" storm drain at the terminus of Gale Ct? In addition, there is an existing arroyo that drains to this point. Shouldn't this easement align more closely with the arroyo? This should result in less fill required to develop the site.
- The connection across the arroyo will require coordination with AMAFCA.

DEPARTMENT of MUNICIPAL DEVELOPMENT

Transportation Planning

- Per the Long Range Bike System, proposed bike lanes are to be installed along Tierra Pintada Blvd. from Arroyo Vista Blvd to Unser Blvd. Per the Site Development Plan, the section and plan view for Tierra Pintada Blvd. does not include bike lanes, only a 10' asphalt trail on the east side and a 6' sidewalk along the west side.
- Major Local Street A and Major Local Street B both include 6' bike lanes. Per the COA DPM, recommended minimum widths for bike lanes measured from painted edgeline to edge of gutter is 5 feet on roadways with posted speed limits of 40 mph or greater, and 4' on roadways with posted speed limits of 35 mph or less.
- The current roadway functional classification of Tierra Pintada Blvd. is urban collector. Per the Long Range Roadway System, Tierra Pintada Blvd. (shown as Old 98th) is identified as a proposed minor arterial. Typical section for Tierra Pintada Blvd. does not include lane widths.

Traffic Engineering Operations – no comments received

Street Maintenance – no comments received

RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS FROM CITY ENGINEER, MUNICIPAL DEVELOPMENT and NMDOT:

Conditions of approval for the proposed Site Development - Subdivision shall include:

1. The Developer is responsible for permanent improvements to the transportation facilities adjacent to the proposed site development plan, as may be required by the Development Review Board (DRB).

-
2. Site plan shall comply and be in accordance with DPM (Development Process Manual) and current ADA standards/ requirements.
 3. All easements, access agreements and property lines must be shown and labeled on Site Plan. Provide recording information.
 4. Right-of-way dedication to the City of Albuquerque may be required at DRB.
 5. Per DPM, Table 23.2.1.B Note 3: A sidewalk variance must be requested for Roadway A to allow the proposed design of a single, meandering sidewalk.
 6. Per DPM, Table 23.2.1.B, a design variance must be requested for Major Local Street B to provide a median width less than 10 feet wide
 7. Permission from City traffic engineer will be require on all striping of crosswalks within public ROW without signalization.
 8. Please “bullnose” the median ends to accommodate off tracking and fortify with solid concrete fill.
 9. The geometry of the proposed roadways must follow the road classifications as outlined in the DPM. A 20 foot minimum radius is required for all roadway design.
 10. Please clarify if the Development’s street parking will be zoned P1 or P2.
 11. The DPM, Table 23.2.1.B, requires a minimum pavement width of 32 feet within the required 53 feet of public R.O.W for local residential streets and a pavement width of 36 feet and 61 feet of R.O.W for sections of street adjacent to Special Land Use/Parks. Please address in street design section, sheet 6 of 7.
 12. Please ensure sight line distances per DPM criteria are followed regarding road arrangements and designs
 13. Public ROW location for Primary Trails shall be as designated by the Long Range bikeway System Map and the Trails and Bikeways Facility Plan and shall be built in accordance with the standards detailed in the DPM.
 14. Please comply with DPM’s Single Access Criteria Ch 23, Sec. 5.E for Tract A and E.
 15. The developer shall coordinate with the DMD to ensure that transportation infrastructure is provided as planned and included in the 2030 MTP.
 16. Community entry walls and signs must not be located within R.O.W.
 17. The plan shall show the limits of the existing floodplain, the proposed floodplain limits and the AMAFCA floodplain easement. Will drainage ROW to be dedicated? Would this ROW be dedicated to AMAFCA?
 18. A note shall be added to the plan similar to “Proposed section and Plan views are for illustrative purposes only and may change based on requirements of the Federal Emergency Management Agency”. See Comments for clarification.
 19. The plan shall show the estimated water surface elevation in the Mirehaven Section.

20. The purpose of the line type with three dots on Sheet 1 Of 7 is not clear. Please add to the legend.
21. Explain why the linear park/Drainage Easement does not terminate at the location of the 66" storm drain at the terminus of Gale Ct. In addition, there is an existing arroyo that drains to this point. Explain why this easement does not align more closely with the arroyo? See Comments for clarification.
22. The connection across the arroyo will require coordination with AMAFCA.
23. Provide documentation for non-compliance with the Long Range Bike System for Tierra Pintada Blvd.
24. Please label and dimension Tierra Pintada Blvd. typical roadway section.

WATER UTILITY AUTHORITY

Utility Services – no comments received

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH DEPARTMENT

Air Quality Division – no comments received

Environmental Services Division – no comments received

PARKS AND RECREATION

Planning and Design

Refer to Open Space Division comments regarding open space, Major Public Open Space and Petroglyph National Monument.

1. It is our understanding that all parks including “pocket parks” shall be Developer built and privately maintained by the HOA in perpetuity. Please add a note stating this to the Site Development Plan. It is unclear on Sheet 1 of 7 where the “Private Pocket Park” symbol illustrates a schematic location for the park but does “Private” mean privately maintained or private, not for use by the public? See comment #2.
2. Please clarify how public and private areas will function. Will parks in the “traditional, mixed generational community” be available to members of the public to use? Will trails throughout the two neighborhoods be open to the public for use and, if so, how will access to and/or through the gated adult community parks work?
3. It is our understanding that all streetscapes and medians, including those within City Right of Way are to be built by the Developer and maintained by the HOA in perpetuity. An Agreement for construction and maintenance with the City, Developer and HOA will be required prior to Plat Approval at DRB. Coordination with Stormcloud neighborhood and Watershed will be required to provide consistency with design and maintenance of the streetscapes and medians.

4. Please define “naturalized” state. The Open Space Division has outlined their interpretation of what naturalized means with respect to the natural drainageways and the Mirehaven Arroyo.
5. Please define “Social Lawn” on the Plan. Please define “buffer areas”. Will “Linear Park/Drainage ways” be privately maintained by the HOA as well?

Open Space Division

1. The plan, while acceptable for a bulk land plat, is not detailed enough to review properly as a Site Plan for Subdivision. The drawing should show the entire roadway system, trails, and fence lines. Cross-sections should be labeled and clearly referenced on plan drawings. Terms such as “Linear Park” and “Landscape Buffer” are vague and refer to indeterminate types of landscapes. Please define these landscape terms through the use of Typical Section drawings.
2. The plan must clearly specify whether “open space” is intended to be publicly dedicated Major Public Open Space (MPOS) or if it is intended to be privately-owned with the intent to provide general public access or limited access. All usage of the term “open space” should be clarified throughout the documents and plan sets.
3. The developer’s intent for the Mirehaven Arroyo is unclear. Open Space Division would prefer to receive the Mirehaven Arroyo as dedicated Major Public Open Space (similar to Calabacillas Arroyo, where OSD is the underlying property owner and AMAFCAS has overlying drainage easements). If the Mirehaven Arroyo is to be dedicated as MPOS, it must be protected in its natural state throughout the construction process. The property boundary must be clearly delineated on all construction drawings with a ‘Limits of Construction’ line, and also on the ground with a silt fence. If there are to be utilities crossing the arroyo, they should be combined into a single Public Utility Easement. Any damage to arroyo vegetation within the Open Space PUE must be mitigated. A revegetation plan will be required. If there is any damage to the Arroyo outside the PUE or within protected areas, OSD cannot accept the property.
4. Where any streets, public or private, abut the Petroglyph National Monument (PETR), OSD strongly recommends that these streets be single-loaded. We encourage that the entire boundary of the Monument be fronted by a single-loaded street; the plan contains no roadway network (see comment #1 above).
5. The developer’s intent for access to PETR is unclear. The National Park Service currently has a draft Visitor Use Plan under review that designates future access points. All access points to PETR, no matter what level (Major, Minor, or Neighborhood) shall be publicly accessible. Private-only access to public land is not acceptable. The plans should clearly indicate whether private parks and trails in Tracts C, D, and E will or will not be publicly accessible.
6. Sheet 2 of the plan set shows a “diversion bank.” The character and intent of this is not clear, but it appears to direct flows from private land onto PETR. No developed flows may be directed onto PETR. This sheet also shows several “offsite basins” with volume

calculations. Are these basins existing, natural landforms, or are they intended to receive developed flows onto the Monument?

7. Developer needs to be clear about what is meant by the terms “naturalized” and “landscape buffer.” If any lands are to be revegetated, the developer will need to provide a revegetation plan that includes irrigation. We are in a severe drought cycle, and normal revegetation procedures will not be effective. If revegetation is on land to dedicated as MPOS, OSD must review and approve the plan.
8. OSD encourages a meeting with the developer and/or the developer’s agent to discuss the above comments.

SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT DEPARTMENT

Refuse Division – no comments received

POLICE DEPARTMENT/Planning

This project is in the Northwest Area Command

- No Crime Prevention or CPTED comments concerning the proposed Site Development Plan for Subdivision request at the time.

FIRE DEPARTMENT/Planning – no comments received

TRANSIT DEPARTMENT

Project # 1006864 13EPC-40145 SITE DEVELOPMENT – SUBDIVISION. LOTS N-2 & M, WATERSHED SUBDIVISION ZONED SU-2 FOR PDA LOCATED ON TIERRA PINTADA BETWEEN ARROYO VISTA AND WEST CREEK. (284.4 ac) (H-8 &H-9)	Adjacent and nearby routes	None.
	Adjacent bus stops	None.
	Site plan requirements	
	Large site TDM suggestions	Transit may have future bus service once the West Side Sports Complex on the corner of Tierra Pintada Blvd NW and Arroyo Vista NW is completed. Transit would recommend placing bus stops at the intersection of Tierra Pintada Blvd NW and Arroyo Vista Blvd NW. In the Watershed Subdivision Transit recommends pedestrian access at intervals of 500 feet along the Tierra Pintada Blvd NW to provide access to potential transit users.
	Other information	None

COMMENTS FROM OTHER AGENCIES

BERNALILLO COUNTY – no comments received

NEW MEXICO DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Possible Impact NMDOT roadway(s): Interstate 40 and Unser Boulevard Interchange

Department Comments: The NMDOT does not support the proposed development described in the submittal. The NMDOT requests a Traffic Impact Analysis to be completed prior to approval to determine any off site impacts to the adjacent state roadway system.

ALBUQUERQUE METROPOLITAN ARROYO FLOOD CONTROL AUTHORITY

1. No objection to Site Plan for Subdivision.
2. Bank stabilization on the Mirehaven Arroyo will be required. This can be bank protection and drop structures backfilled with native material like what has been installed on the downstream section of the arroyo.
3. AMAFCA has Temporary Floodplain Easements on the Mirehaven Arroyo and the arroyo north of Arroyo Vista Boulevard. Any drainage improvements that will alter the easements will require a vacation action through the City DRB and a quitclaim / release approval from the AMAFCA Board of Directors.
4. The West I-40 Drainage Management Plan Update (2011) identifies a potential storage capacity deficiency in Ladera Dam 12. Development of this subdivision will require a more detailed analysis of the Ladera Dam system capacity and possibly funding contribution for upgrade of the dam.

ALBUQUERQUE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Watershed Subdivision, Lots N-2 and M, is located on Tierra Pintada between Arroyo Vista and West Creek. The owner of the above property requests approval of a Site Development Plan for Subdivision to allow for the development of 950 dwelling units at full build out. The applicant has been collaborating with Albuquerque Public Schools and has agreed to add a note to the proposed site plan to indicate, "Potential access to the proposed APS Elementary School."

Any residential development in this area will impact Painted Sky Elementary School, Jimmy Carter Middle School, and West Mesa High School. Currently, Painted Sky Elementary School and Jimmy Carter Middle School are exceeding capacity, while West Mesa High School currently has excess capacity.

Loc No	School	2012-13 40th Day	2012-13 Capacity	Space Available
275	Painted Sky ES	1028	1000	-28
445	Jimmy Carter MS	1233	1200	-33
570	West Mesa HS	1551	2000	449

To address overcrowding at schools, APS will explore various alternatives. A combination or all of the following options may be utilized to relieve overcrowded schools.

- Provide new capacity (long term solution)
 - o Construct new schools or additions
 - o Add portables

- o Use of non-classroom spaces for temporary classrooms
- o Lease facilities
- o Use other public facilities
- Improve facility efficiency (short term solution)
 - o Schedule Changes
 - Double sessions
 - Multi-track year-round
 - o Other
 - Float teachers (flex schedule)
- Shift students to Schools with Capacity (short term solution)
 - o Boundary Adjustments / Busing
 - o Grade reconfiguration
- Combination of above strategies

All planned additions to existing educational facilities are contingent upon taxpayer approval.

MID-REGION COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS – no comments received

MIDDLE RIO GRANDE CONSERVANCY DISTRICT – no comments received

PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF NEW MEXICO

1. This project will impact electric substation capacity needs for the surrounding area. It is necessary for the developer to contact PNM's New Service Delivery Department early in the process to coordinate electric service regarding the project to avoid potential delays in meeting in-service target dates.
2. It is the applicant's obligation to determine if existing utility easements cross the property and to abide by any conditions or terms of those easements.
3. Any existing or proposed public utility easements are to be indicated on the site plan utility sheet prior to DRB review.
4. On Sheet 5 of 7, under "UTILITIES and SCREENING", 2nd bullet, last line, please revise as follows:
"PNM's standard for electric distribution public utility easements is 10 feet in order to ensure adequate and safe clearances."
5. Screening should be designed to allow for access to utility facilities. All screening and vegetation surrounding ground-mounted transformers and utility pads are to allow 10 feet of clearance in front of the equipment door and 5-6 feet of clearance on the remaining three sides for safe operation, maintenance and repair purposes. Please refer to the PNM Electric Service Guide at www.pnm.com for specifications.