

Volcano Heights Sector Development Plan

Focus Group Notes

8/23/11

Zoning

- Want to see more flexible zone lines.
- Extend Town Center 200 feet to the East to surround BRT corridor with more density.
- Neighborhood Center should increase in acreage (10 acres?).
- Transition zone on north needs to have the same height standard as development across the Heights boundary.
- Transition zone not needed abutting school/commercial property on the northern border.
- Want to see Transition zone neutered if zone changes happen adjacent outside the Plan boundary.
- Love the 15 foot height limit at Escarpment Transition.
- What is the origin of the 15 foot Impact Area along Paseo del Norte on the south boundary?
- Regional Center needs to be wider (+200 feet?).
- Want to see Regional Center in southwest quadrant of “loop road” south of Unser/Paseo intersection.
- North end of VHET @ Unser – look at existing development to the North to be consistent.
- Maps should include existing and planned development outside Plan area (i.e. Boulders).
- What types of retail will be allowed in all the mixed use zones? Liquor? Bars?
- Turn lanes, etc. may have an effect on setbacks, so zone widths may need to increase.
- Lots on Unser/Paseo to 10 feet below fill level. How measure heights? Approved Grade?

Streets/Transportation

- Love the single-loaded street along the Monument boundary. Want to see it include drainage function to protect Monument from runoff.
- Want to see Paseo/Unser designed for pedestrian access / walkability.
- Want to see lower speed limits on Paseo/Unser.
- Reduced traffic speed equates to more jobs. Want to see this area be a destination. Traffic delay would only amount to 45 seconds.
- Unser parkway needs to be designed to slow traffic.
- Let the regional street traffic flow.
- Want to see continuity of trails within and outside Plan area.
- Want to see other solutions (shuttles?) to get pedestrians safely around all quadrants.

- Want to see “right-in/right-out (RI/RO), Left-in only” as fallback position (vs. RI/RO)
- Want to see orange circles added ¼ miles from Paseo/Unser intersection (allowed by policy but NOT “on the books”)
- School access north of the Plan may not work with proposed RI/RO.
 - How could pedestrian access still be granted? Safe Unser crossing?
- How does Plan work with MRCOG mandate for 10% of river crossings provided by Transit by 20XX?
- Mandatory roads need to be linked to an infrastructure plan.
- MAC comparison for traffic needs to include commute times, not just traffic counts.
- Want to see east-west grand boulevard from 2010 draft with view toward Sandias.

Parks/OS

- Want to see WSSP Amendment policies about cultural/historical resources operationalized and linked to regulations.
- Want to see City fund Open Space purchasing.
- Love the rock outcropping dedications.
 - Want to see archaeological links to agricultural past saved in addition to rock outcropping.
 - Want to see rock outcroppings prioritized for saving as archaeological samples.
- Where are the planned parks?

Design Standards

- Building Design regulations should include architectural features to address the facing street.
- Building Design regulations should include requirements for preserving natural landscape.
- Sign regulations should prohibit LED signs.

Review Process

- Development threshold for DRB review should increase to 10 acres (from 5) to be the size of a property block.
- Want to see Neighborhood representative on the Review Team.
- Review Team should include a volcanologist and/or cultural anthropologist.
- Want to see a culturally sensitive architect on the Review Team.
- Want to see Review Team kept to fewer people (unwieldy with too many).
 - How much voice would each representative have?
- What about properties that are split into 2 zones and require 2 different approval processes?
- Don’t want to see citizens vs. staff on the Review Team in case they slow down streamlined approval.

- Review team with neighborhood rep would give the public a voice while still ensuring a development can be approved quickly if it complies with Plan requirements.
- Want to see Review Team with city staff only. City convenes relevant Team members based on proposed development project.

Heights/Bonus Criteria

- Worried about “horsetrading” of bonus criteria.
 - Will developers be forced into certain “options” because other developers haven’t chosen to provide those amenities? (i.e. transit shelters)
- Keep heights simple (easy to understand and implement)
- Want to see solar panels NOT count toward/against height limit.
- Bonus criteria should be for improvements on the property (vs. off-site).
- How will bonus criteria options be coordinated among property owners?
- How will heights be measured relative to fill? Unser and Paseo are up to 10 feet above grade – if adjacent property owners have to add fill to level their properties with the street, how will their heights be measured?

Fugitive Dust/Fill

- Fugitive dust needs to be addressed and minimized. Fill is a big problem linked to Unser/Paseo construction.
 - Want to see same language as Trails/Cliffs SDPs: grading permit only issued concurrently with building permit.
- Want Planning Team to talk with the City hydrologist to find a reasonable fill limit that’s “ground proofed.”

Implementation – Financial Tools

- What happens if property owners couldn’t pay debt service on a TIDD?