



**Environmental
Planning
Commission**

**Agenda Number: 4
Project Number: 1006864
Case #: 13EPC-40115
July 11, 2013**

Supplemental 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 Petroglyph National Monument.
Size	Approximately 285 acres
Zoning	SU-2 for PDA (Planned Development Area)

Staff Recommendation

APPROVAL of Case #13EPC-40115, based on the Findings beginning on p. 15 and subject to the Conditions of Approval beginning on p. 21.

Staff Planners

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

Summary of Analysis

This request for a site development plan for subdivision with design standards for Tracts N-2 & M, Watershed subdivision, was heard on June 13, 2013 and deferred for 30 days. This allowed time for the applicant to provide additional information and work toward addressing applicable regulations, agency comments and public concerns. Some agencies submitted revised comments.

Ten tracts are proposed for development of single-family homes with parks and a private clubhouse. Tracts B-1 and B-2 would have an active-adult, gated subdivision.

A facilitated meeting was held on May 21, 2013. There is general support for the single-family home use, but concern about gates, mass grading, relationship with the Monument and arroyo, and water resources.

Staff finds that clarification has been provided for many, but not all, outstanding items. Monument access, grading/fugitive dust and development process need further clarification. Staff recommends approval subject to conditions, which are needed for consistency and to create a clear process for future submittals.



City Departments and other interested agencies reviewed this application from 4/29/2013 to 5/10/2013. Updated agency comments used in the preparation of this report begin on Page 27.

I. OVERVIEW

Deferral

This request for a site development plan for subdivision with design standards was heard at the June 13, 2013 Environmental Planning Commission (EPC) hearing and deferred for 30 days (see attachment).

At the public hearing, the following significant issues came to the forefront: grading treatment of the site, especially the topographically sensitive areas; access points to the Petroglyph National Monument; a perimeter trail and its public or private designation; treatment of the Mirehaven Arroyo; the review and approval process for future site development plans; and the need for clarity in the design standards. These are discussed in this supplemental Staff report.

Request

This request pertains to Tracts N-2 and M, Watershed subdivision, 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 subject site is zoned SU-2 for PDA (Planned Development Area).

The applicant proposes to subdivide the approximately (\approx) 285 acre subject site into ten tracts (Tracts A – F and three private open space, or OS, tracts). Tracts A – E are designated for single-family homes. Tract F would have a proposed private club house; the two O.S. tracts would serve as private drainage/trail corridors. Tracts A, B-1 and B-2 are intended for senior (“active adult”) housing. Tracts A, B and C abut the Petroglyph National Monument.

The proposed design standards would apply to all 285 acres. Delegation of future subdivision plats and site development plans for building permit to the Development Review Board (DRB) is requested. 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), which was approved in 2008.

EPC Role, Context, History & Background, Transportation System, Traffic Impact Study (TIS), and Public Facilities/Community Services

» Please see p. 2-6 of the original Staff report (see attachment).

II. SIGNIFICANT ISSUES (from the June 13, 2013 hearing)

Topography, Grading & Fugitive Dust

Slopes and terrain changes characterize the subject site; the most notable slopes are found close to the Monument. The subject site generally slopes from west to east. Slopes along the western border range from 5% to 15%. The hilly portion near the SW corner and northern border has slopes of 15% and greater. These landforms should be considered an amenity. Preserving them would also help integrate the development with the surrounding open space areas, including the Petroglyph National Monument.

Soils are primarily loamy fine sand, which is highly-permeable and very likely to become blowing soil, or “fugitive dust”, which is already common in this area in its undeveloped state.

With the proposed mass grading, and given the soil type, the likelihood of blowing soil depositing 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. Mitigation needed is directly related to approach: mass grading would create more fugitive dust than would developing the land with consideration for its natural topographic features. Integrating the topography, treating as an asset and altering it as little as possible would be beneficial for the public and the developer in the long run.

Members of the public have expressed concern about sand storms and want mitigation measures required for this development (see attachments in the original Staff report). A Surface Disturbance Permit from the Air Quality Division of the Environmental Health Department is required, as is the use of Reasonably Available Control Measures (RACT) for resulting fugitive dust. These are mentioned in the revised design standards. A proposed condition of approval has been crafted to address phasing of grading so that large expanses are not graded but left undeveloped.

Drainage System & Water Resources

The subject site is part of a larger natural drainage system that generally drains from west to east. Runoff is intended to go through the existing Stormcloud subdivision and become part of the Ladera Pond system. The revised design standards mention that no run-off from the project would go to the Petroglyph National Monument. However, it is unclear how the border is to be graded.

By agreement with the Albuquerque-Bernalillo County Water Utility Authority (ABCWUA) in June, 2011, Western Albuquerque Land Holdings (WALH) has the finalized, 2007 Development Agreement. The City well/pumpstation/water treatment facility north of the subject site will provide water utility service, though it must do so in phases as specified in the Agreement.

There is public concern regarding availability of water to serve an additional ≈ 950 homes in the area. Nearby residents have mentioned problems with water availability and pressure (see attachments to original Staff report).

Petroglyph National Monument- Access & Connectivity

Two potential trail access points, subject to National Park Service (NPS) approval, are shown. One is near the site’s NW corner and the other near its NE corner. Staff’s understanding is that the NPS will only allow access to the National Monument if the access is public since the Monument is a public resource. However, it’s unclear from the site development plan (Sheet 1) if the access points are proposed to be public or private. Recent NPS comments indicate that they would like vehicular access from the NE access point and a small parking area (see Agency Comments of this report).

Three trailhead parks are shown. These would be private. Other details are unknown. Trails are shown along most of the site’s western side, along the Mirehaven Arroyo and along the northern side. These would also be private. However, it’s unclear if a trail along the northern side would need to be publicly accessible if the entrance near the site’s NW corner is public.

The Mirehaven Arroyo- Treatment & Connectivity

Public concern was expressed regarding how the Arroyo would be treated. The design standards now specify that the bottom would not be concreted (see Drainage standards), though drop structures would be used in places. The sides would be stabilized with rip-rap.

A perimeter trail is shown along both sides of the Arroyo. The northern trail would not connect to a roadway and would go under the future bridge. This trail would be private. The southern trail would connect to Roadway A and would go over the future bridge. It appears that the trails would be private, because the intent is to keep the Arroyo privately accessible only.

Clarity & Review Process

Well-defined, specific design standards are important to create consistent expectations and clarity for review of future development, especially for large sites such as this. Numerous Goals and policies from seven adopted, ranked plans apply. Regulations for the Northwest Mesa Escarpment Plan (NWMEP) Impact Area also apply. This type of review is the purview of the EPC. The Development Review Board (DRB), as a technical body, relies on the EPC's work to ensure compliance with regulations and consistency with policies. The EPC makes planning decisions and the DRB carries them out.

For example, there is still a lack of clarity regarding how grading and retaining walls would work near the edge of the Monument and if it would comply with the Impact Area Regulations. Without guidance from the design standards, the DRB may not know how to proceed.

Staff finds that delegation of the EPC's approval authority for future development is not warranted at this time, though it could be in the future. One solution is that the first tract to develop adjacent to the Monument comes through the EPC process for review. This way, the public and agencies can be involved in the process and the EPC can review a "test case" to see how the design standards worked and or didn't work in their application. If the EPC finds that the "test case" result is satisfactory, it can choose at that time to delegate its approval authority to the DRB or to retain it and see another "test case."

Another possible solution is for the EPC to delegate its approval authority to the Planning Director and his/her designee, which would be an EPC Staff planner. Doing so, however, would not allow for discussion in a public forum and could make it more difficult for the public and agency representatives to participate in the process. At this time, there is still some public and agency concern, especially regarding tracts adjacent to the Monument.

Albuquerque Comprehensive Zoning Code

» Please see p. 6-7 of the original Staff report (see attachment).

III. 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 Westland Master Plan (WMP) states that the average density of the SU-2 PDA zone shall be 4.0 du/acre (p.39). The proposed densities comply when taken as a whole, even though 4.1 DU/ac is proposed for Tract B-2.

Relationship to Petroglyph National Monument

A mostly single-loaded street is shown along the Monument's western and northern boundaries, though this may be illustrative (see Sheet 3). In some places, homes back up to the monument and the roadway turns to purposefully include the homes between it and the Monument. This leaves little room for a trail and could result in yard-walls facing the Monument. The design standards specify that houses may be adjacent to the border for 30% of its length. This means that the remainder, 70%, would be single-loaded streets. This is a partially single-loaded street. The open feeling of the area and views to the Monument could be compromised.

A buffer of varying shape and an undulating street could help provide visual relief. 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 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 could damage the natural environment and adversely impact a variety of wildlife. It is possible to preserve the designated floodplain area and integrate it into the development, which 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 does not show proposed contour lines on the Grading & Drainage plan. It is unknown how finished grades would differ from the existing grade. Mass-grading without regard to natural features is likely. 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. The transition slopes, which would be privately-maintained, could 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 (width is unspecified), information regarding internal connectivity and connectivity to the surrounding area is insufficient. The perimeter wall along Tierra Pintada Blvd. could complicate connection to the public street system and make utilitarian walking, bicycling and transit usage difficult for residents within these walls.

Though not prohibited, gated communities are “strongly discouraged” on the Westside according to the Westside Strategic Plan (Policy 4.6.c). The gating could result in de facto privatized access to this portion of the Monument and the Mirehaven Arroyo.

Water Availability

Some 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 3 is reviewed here)

The subject site consists of Tracts M and N-2, Watershed subdivision (\approx 285 acres). The proposed site development plan for subdivision would create ten new tracts: six large residential tracts (A, B-1, B-2, C, D and E), one for a private clubhouse and park (Tract F), two for “open space,” and one designated as the Mirehaven Arroyo. Design standards are also proposed (see analysis below).

The proposed site development plan for subdivision addresses the required elements and complies with the definition of a site development plan for subdivision (Zoning Code §14-16-1-5).

Revisions made since the prior version of the site development plan are basically two types: changes to tracts (acreage, unit caps and densities), and other changes.

Changes to Tracts

- i) For Tract A, the unit cap is now 195 (was 185) and the density is now 3.8 (was 3.6)
- ii) Tract B is divided into Tract B-1 and Tract B-2. Acreage is changed from 98.2 total to 98.8 and the unit cap, which was 380, is now 370. The density for Tract B-1 is 3.6 DU/ac. For Tract B-2, it's 4.1 DU/ac.
- iii) For Tract C, density is 3.8 (was 3.7) and acreage was reduced to 20.8 (was 21.6)
- iv) Tract D is shown as 47.7 ac (was 48.4) and density was increased to 3.9 DU/ac (was 3.6). The unit cap is now 185 (was 175)
- v) For Tract E, the density decreased to 3.5 (was 3.7), the unit cap is now 120 (was 130) and the acreage changed from 35.5 to 33.8.
- vi) The parcel boundary for Tract F was moved from the centerline of the roadway to the edge of the tract.

Other Changes (to map portion)

- vii) Potential trail access points are now shown near the site's NW corner and NE corner.
- viii) The buffer label now states that some portions would be 25 feet, though generally it's 50 feet.
- ix) The connection across the arroyo shall be coordinated with AMAFCA.

- x) The label “private open space” is added to the two linear park/drainage easements.
- xi) One of the linear parks/drainage easements is slightly larger.
- xii) The flood plain easement and the PUE along Tierra Pintada Blvd. are now labeled.
- xiii) Shading is now used to identify the gated entries.

Other Changes (to narrative portion)

- xiv) Added statement that development in the NWMEP area shall be subject to the Design Overlay Zone regulations.
- xv) Clarification added that accessory structures are allowed and that a conditional use permit is required for accessory dwelling units.
- xvi) The sentence regarding consistency of subsequent subdivision plats with the proposed site development plan was removed (from General Note 1).
- xvii) A General Note 2 is added re: process, and states that future site development plans for subdivision shall be delegated to the Planning Director and that an EPC staff planner shall perform an analysis.

Anaylsis (main site development plan for subdivision)

In general, the revisions result in improved clarity, especially regarding what land is intended to be private. One of the linear parks is not behind a gate and could be public, especially since it would provide residents of Tracts D and E a non-vehicular way to get to Tierra Pintada Blvd. Another access point between here and the intersection with Roadway A would improve access and circulation.

The applicant is not requesting delegation of the EPC’s approval authority to the DRB. Rather, the applicant wants future site development plans for subdivision to be reviewed by the Planning Director and his/her designee. An EPC planner would perform a “design review analysis.” The process for subsequent site development plans for building permit, if any, is not addressed. With this scenario, review of a proposed site development plan for subdivision against applicable regulations and the design standards would not occur in a public forum and there would be no notification of potentially interested parties.

Staff recommends, as a result of discussion at the June hearing, that tracts adjacent to the National Monument return to the EPC for review of the future site development plans for subdivision. This would allow the next phase of the project to be considered in a public forum. The EPC is the appropriate forum for discussion regarding regulations and design standards, since these are planning issues and not the type of technical issues that the DRB usually handles. At the time of the first submittal, the EPC can choose, at a public hearing, to delegate approval authority for additional future site development plans for subdivision to administrative and DRB review.

C) Design Standards- Sheets 2 through 6 (Version 3 is reviewed here)

Note: This review focuses on revisions made since last month that result in v. 3 of the site development plan. For analysis of v. 2, please refer to the original Staff report beginning on p. 32.

» For an explanation of design standards' purpose and content, please see p. 6-7 of the original Staff report (see attachment).

Introduction & 1. Density and Minimum Lot Area

The primary goal for Watershed is still to provide “lifestyle choices” in two separate communities, one for “active adults” and another for “traditional, mixed generation” families. A reference to the Northwest Mesa Escarpment Plan (NWMEP) was added. Major amendments would still go to the EPC. Minimum lot area is now referenced to properties zoned SU-2 for PDA that will be developed with houses. Starting in this section, the “community center” is now referred to as the “private clubhouse.”

Minor amendments to this site development plan for subdivision are still proposed for administrative approval. It would be ideal to have a distinct Process section, which would provide clarity and ease of future review. This section could be at the beginning (preferably) or at the end of the proposed design standards.

Though the proposed design standards demonstrate improved sensitivity to the Petroglyph National Monument, opportunities for improvement remain. For example, homes could be built as close as 35 feet from the Monument boundary. Mass grading of highly sloped areas would also be insensitive to the Monument and the area's natural topography (see also Section VI of the original Staff 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 as valuable amenities.

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 and that light pole height is measured from top to grade.

Full cut-off fixtures are required in the NWMEP Impact Area: “light fixtures shall be of a type that throws light downward and have baffles, hoods or diffusers...” (p. 61). The proposed standards do not address this, but refer to “shielded source” lighting which doesn't necessarily project light downward the way full cut-off fixtures do.

3. Parking & Parking Lot Standards

This section was moved and used to be Section 9. No significant revisions.

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 Private Clubhouse). The WMP also requires landscape islands for every 10 parking spaces.

Standard B would allow more parking than what the Zoning Code's parking regulations require as a minimum. The "outdoor recreation" and general retail categories specify 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 1 space for every 160 feet of building square footage.

4. Utilities & Screening

This section was moved and used to be Section 10. No significant revisions. The WMP standard regarding cellular (wireless) antennae should be added (WMP, p. 88).

5. Signage

Four types of signs are still 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.

Formerly Section #4, there are a few changes. Specific sign design would be decided later, with future site development plans for subdivision. Signage totals were removed from the "conceptual signage locations" map and should be re-instated for clarity. Proposed are 2 Type A signs, 3 Type B signs, 12 Type C signs and 9 Type D signs. Four Neighborhood signs are concentrated along Tract C.

The proposed design standards would still allow signage that exceeds the signage sizes allowed in the NWMEP Design Overlay Zone (p. 78). Sign Type D is shown at entrances to the National Monument and Arroyo. Staff believes they are unnecessary, especially since they would only be seen by residents behind the gates where the Monument and Arroyo locations are obvious. Also, four Type D signs (12 sf) are proposed in the Impact Area, where they cannot exceed 6 sf of sign area.

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

NWMEP Policy 9 requires that development adjacent to public or private open space be designed to complement the open space. Clarification was provided that no gates or openings from private residences would go directly onto the Monument, and that rear and side yard walls would be staggered at least 3 feet for every two lots. Doing so would help avoid a "strictly linear corridor appearance." However, there is no mention of requiring "non-continuous, non-perimeter walls" for homes in the Impact Area (Regulation 9.2, NWMEP p. 54). This regulation requires that development of individual parcels not have a perimeter fence; rather, an internal privacy fence (not on the property lines) is allowed. Information regarding allowed colors and materials is now provided.

It's still unclear how any walls at the Private Clubhouse would be treated, or if any are intended. This sub-section needs to state that such walls would be compatible with building architecture, consistent with the WMP in terms of materials, color and any accenting. Language was added regarding Zoning Code regulations in §14-16-3-18(B), though it would be helpful to future reviewers to mention that these are design regulations.

7. Sidewalks, Trails & Pedestrian Crossings

Site development plans “shall include circulation diagrams that illustrate pedestrian circulation.” An overall one is included here, but diagrams will need to be provided for development of each subsequent Tract. Language was added to state that connections shall be made from neighborhoods to the community trail and sidewalk system (see Standard C). However, language in the introduction states that individual development phases “should” ensure such connectivity. This needs to be changed to “shall” for internal consistency. Also, four connection points between Tract D and Tract E were removed and should be re-instated to facilitate connectivity.

The proposed sidewalk width is the standard 4 feet. Language was added to state that a sidewalk design variance would be needed for Roadways A and B, which have such sidewalk on one side of the street (less than standard DPM requirements). The following should be added to proposed standard B: sidewalks along collectors or major streets “or adjacent to solid walls” (WMP, p. 85).

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. 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

The linear parks and pocket parks would be private and HOA maintained. New language states that children’s play areas would be provided in the mixed-generation neighborhoods.

Mirehaven Arroyo (should be numbered as 9)

New language states that treatment for the Arroyo shall be to the satisfaction of AMAFCA, that bank stabilization would be required and that access would be restricted to community members only. What the stabilization would consist of is not specified, but should be at least repeated here or cross-referenced such as by “see also the Grading & Drainage Standards” (where this information is found).

There are plans to have the Arroyo’s flood-plain status removed through the LOMR process, which has not occurred as of this writing, in order to build in the area presently designated as a flood plain.

Petroglyph National Monument (should be numbered as 10)

Introductory language states that the edge treatment is intended to minimize development impact to the Monument, but now states that it’s also to provide visual surveillance. The sentence regarding a single-loaded street along the western and northern sides was removed. A “primarily single-loaded” street is now mentioned in Standard K. The buffer would still be a minimum of 25 feet and maximum of 50 feet.

The edge treatment diagram appears to be illustrative; what would be built could differ. Language was added to state that residential lots would abut no more than 30% of the Monument edge (\approx 23 houses). So, about a third of the edge of the Monument would have immediately-adjacent homes. If

this percentage is lower, development impact would be less. Fewer back yards would face the Monument and views from inside the Monument would be less affected.

11. Streets and Streetscapes

A standard was added to state that public streets would meet City DPM standards, except as noted, but that all streets would comply with the DPM single access criteria. It appears that most streets would be private, but this is unclear and responsibility for maintenance is unspecified, though the City does not maintain private streets. Staff's understanding is that even private streets have to be built according to DPM standards. The ten-foot wide community trail, which was shown on the Tierra Pintada Rd. detail, has been removed and replaced with a 6-foot wide community sidewalk.

New language states that a design variance to the DRB would be needed to allow for an 8 foot median in Roadway B, and that landscape maintenance with the City would be needed for Roadways A and B. Staff is not sure if this would be private or public. Coordination with the existing Stormcloud subdivision would be required as would coordination with Traffic Operations regarding any crosswalks in City ROW. A standard to address a minimum 10 foot landscape area between the back of curb and sidewalk, along all major arterials, is still needed (WMP, p. 85).

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 (DPM 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 should 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

Standards were added to address building height within the Impact Area and outside of it (Standards B and C). The WMP states that structure height "shall be measured from the established grade three feet from the structure to the highest point..." (p. 87). This should be added to this section for clarity. The height of the private clubhouse would not exceed the maximum allowed (40 feet).

Two housing types show an accessory building (casita) in front of the main building entrance. New language states that casitas in the front yard shall not block visibility of the main house entrance. Other new language specifies that roofs in the Impact Area shall be NWMEP approved colors and that dish antennae shall not be placed on roofs in the Impact Area (though they would probably be mounted to the side of the roofs).

The WMP states that placement and orientation of garages should be varied to lessen the visual impact of garage doors and provide variety and visual interest in the streetscape (see p. 78). More non-garage dominant options should be provided to further the intentions of the WMP design standards and 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 feature the house.

The applicant could create a “style book” of homes for the subject site. As a builder at Mesa del Sol, the applicant has already done this and developed homes that display architectural diversity and high-end features (Ref: Mesa del Sol Design Book). 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 active-adult portion of the style book. Higher-quality features would help create contextual sensitivity as well as clear expectations. This is particularly important because of adjacency to the Monument.

Landscape (number as 13)

The proposed landscaping standards were moved from Sheet 2 to allow for addition of a plant palette for the natural and private open space areas. This list is based on a list from City Parks Staff. New language states that residential lots shall have a limited amount of turf, though limited is not defined. Previously, for common areas, turf grass was not to be planted on slopes greater than 3:1. This has changed to slopes greater than 5:1. It’s unclear why. The grass is intended to be “drought tolerant grass species,” though at least some examples (ex. “such as....”) are needed for clarity. Turf grasses should be specified as drought-tolerant.

The landscape standards mostly follow the Zoning Code. Breaking them out into sub-categories (Streetscape, Street Trees, Parks/Clubhouse Landscaping and Yards) would make them easier to use. For Street Trees, the brief list in the Westland Master Plan (p. 91) should be repeated here to assist future reviewers.

Grading and Surface Disturbance (should be numbered as 14)

Surface Disturbance was added to this section’s title and three standards were added to address fugitive dust (Standards I, J and K). Intent language was added to explain the intent for grading on the subject site, which is to generally lower the site (by mass-grading) so that building heights appear to be lower and views are maximized. Adequate dust control is a project goal.

The intent of the project is to provide grading that meets “the overall intent” of the NWMEP and the WMP. New Standard B addresses NWMEP Policy 11.7 regarding keeping cut and fill to a minimum. However, Policy 11.2 and Policy 11.8, regarding pre-construction requirements and damaged areas/re-vegetation, respectively, are not addressed (Note: these are regulations).

The area’s natural topography would not be incorporated into subsequent site development plans; the sentence regarding preservation and incorporation of topography and significant vegetation was removed. However, a standard was added (Standard B) to state that cut and fill would be kept to a minimum in the Impact Area as required.

Regarding fugitive dust mitigation, a standard is needed to state that a phasing plan will be developed to indicate the approximate order of the mass grading, and that no more than one tract will be mass graded at a time. Phasing the grading would help with dust control and address neighbors' concerns about dust in their homes and grading a site and leaving it undeveloped for a long time.

Drainage (should be numbered as 15)

Five new drainage standards were added. Introductory language states that the intent is to preserve the natural arroyo bottom, and that the arroyo treatment is to include drop structures instead of hard-lined concrete (though the drop structures will be concrete). It would facilitate usage of the standards to cross-reference the standards regarding the arroyo in the Mirehaven Arroyo sub-section (number as 9).

Existing drainage from the Monument would be allowed in a 50-foot buffer zone. Developed flows from the project, however, would not go into the Monument but would be directed to a small drainage canal.

D) Grading & Drainage Plan (Sheet 7)

» For an explanation of topography and narrative, please refer to p. 37 of the original Staff report (see attachment).

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). 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 extend the timeframes. Staff points out that, unless improvements are made to the drainage system, the area would still function as a floodplain.

Changes include the addition of flow numbers, storm drain sizes and a change in flow direction near the intersection of Tierra Pintada Blvd. and Roadway A. More detailed drainage reports for the tracts will be required at the subdivision platting stage.

Information about grading is limited to existing contour lines. Proposed contours are not shown, so it's still unclear what the finished elevations would be and how large a change they would be from existing grades.

E) Utility Plan (Sheet 8)

Changes to the utility plan are minor, and include showing the property line between Tracts B-1 and B-2. A symbol for this new line type needs to be added to the legend. The open space is now labeled as private, and the linear park between Tracts D and E was slightly enlarged. Acreage, unit caps and density were removed.

Cultural Resources/Archaeology and Natural Resource Planning & Sustainability

» Please see p. 28-30 of the original Staff report (see attachment).

V. AGENCY & NEIGHBORHOOD CONCERNS

Reviewing Agencies/Pre-Hearing Discussion

» Please see p. 38-39 of the original Staff report (see attachment).

Updates: Transportation Staff submitted revised comments (see attachment). Generally, comments that were addressed have been removed and there are far fewer proposed conditions. Language was added to state that any variances to DPM requirements must go through the standard deviation process.

National Park Service (NPS) staff also submitted revised comments. The primary concern at this point is the lack of vehicular access near the site's NE corner. Concerns about trail access on the western boundary and storm water drainage into the Monument have been addressed. There may be some confusion about access to the Mirehaven Arroyo access point. Staff understood that the NPS favors public access to a public resource, and that access would not be granted unless it is public. Clarification is needed.

Parks and Recreation Staff submitted updated comments that address trails, community, pedestrian circulation, streets, landscape, grading and surface disturbance and drainage. The main concern is that the proposed site plan for subdivision submittal offers very little detail for such a large and challenging site. Other concerns are that cut and fill could affect trail alignments, that proposed grades are not shown on the grading and drainage plan and that the use of the term "community" is confusing.

Comments from Open Space Staff raise several significant concerns, such as how would the perimeter trail interface with the drainage crossing and how much cut and fill would be required to create a safe pathway? It's not possible to tell if the perimeter path would work without a grading plan; proposed grading is not shown. Also, information about the arroyo bottom isn't consistent.

Hydrology Staff also submitted updated comments, which indicate that Hydrology wants to evaluate whether and how ponds should overflow into the roadway on a case-by-case basis. The comments note that pedestrian ways are usually not used as drainage ways, and asks how the diversion dike (see Sheet 6) would be incorporated into the development because a street and houses are shown there.

Neighborhood/Public

» Please see p. 39-40 of the original Staff report (see attachment).

Updates: As of this writing, no revised comments have been received from members of the public.

VI. CONCLUSION

This request 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 (the "subject site"), was deferred for 30 days at the June 13, 2013 EPC Hearing. This allowed time for the applicant to provide additional information and work toward addressing applicable regulations, agency comments and public concerns. The applicant proposes to create ten tracts and develop single-family homes, private parks, and a private clubhouse.

Supplemental Staff Report

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 (WMP), the Westland Sector Plan (WSP), 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. Revisions have improved the extent to which Goals and policies are furthered and improved compliance with regulations.

A facilitated meeting was held on May 21, 2013. There is general support for the single-family home use, but concerns were raised about the gates, mass grading, homogeneous development, relationship with the Monument, impacts to services in the area and water resources. Agency comments were extensive; many were addressed with the revisions, though some remain.

Well-defined, specific design standards are important to create consistent expectations and clarity for timely review of future development, especially for large sites such as this. Numerous Goals and policies from seven adopted plans apply, as do regulations for the NWMEP Impact Area.

Staff finds that delegation of the EPC's approval authority is not warranted at this time. The DRB is a technical body that relies on the EPC's work to ensure compliance with regulations and consistency with policies. Staff review would remove future development from a public process; there is still public and agency concern, especially regarding tracts adjacent to the Monument.

Staff recommends approval, subject to conditions.

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

***K. Carrie Barkhurst
Planner***

Notice of Decision cc list:

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

FINDINGS- Site Development Plan for Subdivision, 13EPC-40115- July 11, 2013

1. This request is for a site development plan for subdivision with design standards for Tracts N-2 and M, Watershed subdivision, an approximately 285 acre area located north of 98th Street/Arroyo Vista Boulevard NW, west of Tierra Pintada Boulevard, and south and east of the Petroglyph National Monument (the “subject site”).
2. The subject site is zoned SU-2 for PDA (Planned Development Area) pursuant to the Westland Sector Development Plan and Westland Master Plan. The SU-2 for PDA zone is intended to provide for “a mix of residential uses” that are “special because of the relationship of this property to Petroglyph National Monument.”
3. The proposed development consists of approximately 950 residential units with pocket parks and a private clubhouse. Approximately 565 units would be for an “active adult,” gated subdivision. The remainder would be non-gated subdivisions.
4. 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 Facilities Plan for Arroyos, the Trails & Bikeways Facilities Plan, the Western Albuquerque Land Holdings Sector Development Plan, the Westland Master Plan and the Northwest Mesa Escarpment Plan (NWMEP). The site is also within the boundaries of the Impact Area of the NWMEP Design Overlay Zone and is subject to the applicable design regulations.
5. The Albuquerque/Bernalillo County Comprehensive Plan, Westside Strategic Plan (WSSP), the Facilities Plan for Arroyos, the Trails & Bikeways Facilities Plan, the Western Albuquerque Land Holdings Sector Plan, the Westland Master Plan and the Northwest Mesa Escarpment Plan (NWMEP) and the City of Albuquerque Zoning Code are incorporated herein by reference and made part of the record for all purposes.
6. The request is generally consistent with the following Comprehensive Plan (CP), West Side Strategic Plan (WSSP), and Facility Plan for Arroyos (FPA) Goals and Policies:
 - A. CP Open Space Goal: Provide visual relief from urbanization and to offer opportunities for education, recreation, cultural activities, and conservation of natural resources - The request includes parks of varying sizes and one significant open space area (Mirehaven Arroyo). Three open space corridors are proposed that provide trail connections to the street networks. However, the open space corridors dead-end at streets and do not connect with each other, thus precluding the provision of functional wildlife corridors.
 - B. CP Policy II.B.5k: land adjacent to arterial streets - Residential development, consistent with the existing zoning, is proposed adjacent to a large arterial street, Tierra Pintada Blvd. All proposed streets are indicated as local streets. Bicycle facilities and trails have been provided, which improve transportation options.

- C. CP Policy II.B.5e: New growth contiguous to existing facilities and services - Urban infrastructure and services exist in the area. A water serviceability statement was issued by ABCWUA in 2012 and is currently being updated and there is an existing development agreement with the ABCWUA for all development within the Western Albuquerque Land Holdings Sector Development Plan.
- D. WSSP Policy 1.1: Communities shall develop with areas of higher density (in Community and Neighborhood Centers), surrounded by areas of lower density - 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 consistent with the zoning established in the WMP, and therefore, appropriate outside of designated activity centers.
- E. 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, a portion of which would not impact the local school system. (565 homes are active adult and will not allow children). A future APS campus will develop adjacent SW of the subject site and will help ease school overcrowding.
- F. 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 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. The applicant and agent have been working directly with National Park Service staff on concerns related to the Monument and have adequately addressed those concerns as indicated in correspondence provided to Planning staff. The proposed site plan provides for single family residential uses, a 50 foot buffer including a public trail along the northern boundary (within the Impact Area of the NWMEP), trails, and design standards ensuring compliance with the height and color restrictions (within the Impact Area of the NWMEP), from the NWMEP to mitigate potential negative impacts to the National Monument.
- G. FPA 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 - Tract F, the private Clubhouse & Social Lawn/Park, two “private pocket parks,” landscaping, and private trails are proposed adjacent to the Mirehaven Arroyo (Urban Recreational Arroyo). However, because the arroyo is within the gated subdivision, there is no potential to connect with significant activity areas.
- H. FPA Policy 4: The location of crossing structures shall be determined on a case-by-case basis according to the specific channel characteristics - One street crossing of the Mirehaven Arroyo is proposed. The crossing would allow vehicular, bicycle, and pedestrian residents to access lots on the north side of the Mirehaven Arroyo. Proposed crossings of the Mirehaven are within the jurisdiction of AMAFCA.

-
7. The request is partially inconsistent with the following Comprehensive Plan (CP), West Side Strategic Plan (WSSP), and Facility Plan for Arroyos (FPA) Goals and Policies:
 - A. CP Noise Goal: Enhance the quality of life by reducing noise and by preventing new land use/noise conflicts - The request would locate approximately 950 high-end homes on the subject site. About half of them may be impacted by the nearby APS campus and sports stadium. A land use/noise conflict is likely, especially since the stadium is for large regional events and loudspeakers would be involved. The proposed development, does not propose any uses that would produce noise beyond the usual residential level.
 - B. CP Housing Goal: Increase the supply of affordable housing; conserve and improve the quality of housing – Although provision of 20% affordable housing is required in the Westland Master Plan area, this project is not proposed to be developed with affordable housing. There is no information regarding variety in lot sizes, which could contribute to a range of housing options, thereby improving the affordability of certain houses.
 - C. CP Transportation and Transit Goal: Develop a balanced circulation system through efficient placement of employment and services, alternatives to automobile travel, and sufficient roadway capacity to meet mobility and access needs - The request aims to encourage walking and bicycling within the residential development, and there are 5 pedestrian connections provided to Tierra Pintada. However, much of the development is proposed to be low density and gated, which limits potential for alternatives to automobile travel. The existing zoning does not allow any employment or service uses. Roadway capacity is sufficient in the area.

 8. Through application of the recommended Conditions of Approval, the request could be generally consistent with the following Comprehensive Plan (CP), West Side Strategic Plan (WSSP), Facility Plan for Arroyos (FPA) Goals and Policies:
 - A. CP Policy II.B.1f: Open Areas and 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 - Multi-use trails are proposed along the development's entire north and west edges and between neighborhoods, and along the Mirehaven Arroyo (some are private and access-controlled and some may be semi-public). The Design Standards address the views to the Petroglyph National Monument from the development. The drainage section addresses bank stabilization that will protect natural features. Additional details are needed to explain how the trails would connect and function as a system.
 - B. CP Policy II.B.5f: Clustering of homes and housing oriented towards pedestrian and bikeways - The submittal proposes two large "open space" tracts and a "Private Clubhouse & Social Lawn/Park" tract. There are additional private pocket parks identified in the 5 residential tracts. There is insufficient information to know how housing will be oriented and if clustering is proposed.
 - C. CP Policy II.B.5g: Conformance to topographical features and trail corridors - The submittal addresses conformance to topographical features, but provides little information to understand how the proposed site topography will be addressed. Trail corridors are proposed, but connectivity could be improved.

-
- D. CP Water Management Goal: Efficient water management and use - Preservation of the Mirehaven arroyo with a soft/unlined bottom and the use of mostly xeric plant materials (as described in the WMP) will contribute to efficient water management. High water use turf will be limited, and water harvesting is encouraged. However, the proposed design standards do not comprehensively address water management in this area with limited water supply.
- E. Policy II.D.2a: Measures shall be adopted to discourage wasteful water uses, such as extensive landscape-water runoff to uncultivated areas - Most of the WMP designated plants are xeric, and plant spacing will be based on xeric principles. This policy could be more substantially furthered if a design standard was added regarding inverted crowns where street medians are present and/or if curb cuts are required in the medians and curbs to harvest rainwater into the landscaped areas.
- F. CP 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 - Water management is especially important in this area because of the limited water supply. Most 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 holistically address water management techniques. The Design Standards state that the Mirehaven Arroyo will be maintained in a partially natural state with stabilized banks, drop structures, and with a soft (natural) bottom.
- G. Goal 2 of the Trails and Bikeways Facility Plan: 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 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 some or all of the trails would use Barrier-Free Design, physically challenged individuals would also be accommodated as trail users.
9. The submittal complies with the following Impact Area Regulations of the Northwest Mesa Escarpment Plan:
- A. Regulation 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 proposed design standards address wall and/or fence colors, and indicate the maximum fence/wall height is 6 feet.
- B. Regulation 12.1: Structure height shall not exceed 15'0" - Residential building heights in the Impact Area are proposed to not exceed the 15-foot height limitation of the regulations.
- C. Regulation 12.4: Glass on any façade shall not be reflective or mirror glass - Proposed structures in the Impact Area are required to use clear, non-reflective glass.
- D. Regulation 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) - 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.

-
- E. Regulation 13.4.a: Site lighting- Height of luminaries shall not exceed 20'0" - A design standard indicates that the maximum height of street lights shall be 20 feet
 - F. Regulation 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.
 - G. Regulation 13: Sites which cannot be set aside as open space, including recreational facilities, and sites adjacent to open space, shall have minimum visual impact - Proposed structures in the Impact Area would comply with the NWMEP height restrictions. A view section is provided in the design standards.
 - H. Regulation 13.1.c: There shall be wheel stops or curbs around all landscaped areas in order to protect landscaping from vehicles - There is a statement of general compliance on Sheet 5 with the parking regulations contained in the Zoning Code.
 - I. Regulation 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 - Parks and Recreation Department provided the applicant with a preferred list of plant materials for the naturalized and private open space areas.
 - J. Regulation 13.4.b: 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 lighting section states that lights shall be shielded.
 - K. Regulation 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 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.
10. Through application of the recommended Conditions of Approval, the request could comply with the following Impact Area Regulations of the Northwest Mesa Escarpment Plan:
- A. Regulation 9.1: Development at the edge of public or private open space shall be designed to complement and enhance the open space. 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 three locations along the Mirehaven Arroyo, on-site open space areas are connected with adjacent open space. The proposed density is 3.34 du/ac, lower than the allowed 4 du/ac, which will provide greater protection to the natural features and the Monument. 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. Overall, the open space areas do not connect sufficiently and may not create usable corridors for people and wildlife.

-
- B. Regulation 9.2: Where the adjacent land use requires visual privacy, non-continuous, non-perimeter walls may be constructed. The request indicates the residential perimeter walls will be off-set every 3 lots, but the standard does not require that the properties have non-perimeter walls.
 - C. Regulation 12: Structures shall not block views of the Escarpment or visually contrast with the natural environment - Proposed structures in the Impact Area would comply with the NWMEP height restrictions and are limited to 15 feet in height. However, the request does not demonstrate that offsite view opportunities would be maximized. The example of structures proposed (sheet 7) would visually contrast with the natural environment.
 - D. Regulation 12.3: The exterior surfaces of structures must be Approved Colors (Appendix E) - Proposed structures in the Impact Area are limited to a neutral, earth-toned palette, including the mechanical devices and roof vents. More information is needed regarding the specific NWMEP approved exterior colors.
 - E. Regulation 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 - Free-standing signs are limited to monument signs and would be a uniform style, but the four proposed sign sizes are larger than 6 sf in area.
 - F. Regulation 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 proposed lighting section requires that all light fixtures be shielded-source and respect Night Skies. A design standard indicates that generally “placement of fixtures and standards shall conform to state and local safety and illumination standards.” The proposed standards do not address this, but refer to “shielded source” lighting which doesn’t necessarily project light downward the way full cut-off fixtures do.
 - G. Regulation 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 - Typical street sections demonstrate landscaped medians that accommodate grade changes, though this needs to be articulated as written standards. There are no design standards that describe or regulate the type or extent of ground cover and landscaping.
11. A facilitated meeting was held on May 21, 2013. Though there is general support for the single-family home use, there is concern about the gates, mass grading, homogeneous development, relationship with the Monument, impacts to services in the area, and water resources.
 12. At this time, the proposed design standards do not contain sufficient information to ensure full compliance with applicable regulations and consistency with applicable Goals and policies. The application of Conditions of Approval would improve the extent to which regulations are complied with and Goals and policies furthered.
 13. Though the process of addressing agency comments has not been fully completed, the applicant is working toward addressing the comments. However, those comments that remain unaddressed can be fulfilled through Conditions of Approval.

14. Any access to the Petroglyph National Monument shall be contingent on approval from the National Park Service. It has been determined that the National Park Service cannot allow a private-only or exclusionary access to Petroglyph National Monument. This shall be added to Section 10, Petroglyph National Monument.
15. Specific details regarding how the Petroglyph National Monument boundary is to be treated have not yet been provided, including the extent of cut and fill, the maximum height of a series of retaining walls, the treatment of drainage corridors, and the design of the each parcel's required non-perimeter walls (see NWMEP page 54). Because of the environmental, cultural, topographical, and visual sensitivity of this area, it is warranted that the EPC retain its approval authority of future site development plans of land adjacent to the Petroglyph National Monument until the EPC determines that delegation is warranted.
16. The proposed design standards do not contain sufficient information to warrant delegation of the EPC's approval authority to the Development Review Board (DRB). As a technical body, the DRB relies on the work of the EPC to ensure compliance with regulations and consistency with Goals and policies. At this time, the submittal provides insufficient guidance for future reviewers and developers with clear, consistent expectations. It is warranted that the EPC retain its approval authority of future site development plans until the EPC determines that delegation is warranted.

RECOMMENDATION - 13EPC-40115, July 11, 2013

APPROVAL of 13EPC-40115, a site development plan for subdivision with design standards for Tracts N-2 and M, Watershed subdivision, approximately 285 acres, located north of 98th Street/Arroyo Vista Boulevard NW, west of Tierra Pintada Boulevard, and south and east of the Petroglyph National Monument, zoned SU-2 for PDA, based on the preceding Findings and subject to the following Conditions of Approval.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL – 13EPC-40115 – June 13, 2012 – Site Development Plan for Subdivision

1. The EPC delegates final sign-off authority of this site development plan to the Development Review Board (DRB). The DRB is responsible for ensuring that all EPC Conditions have been satisfied and that other applicable City requirements have been met. A letter shall accompany the submittal, specifying all modifications that have been made to the site plan since the EPC hearing, including how the site plan has been modified to meet each of the EPC conditions. Unauthorized changes to this site plan, including before or after DRB final sign-off, may result in forfeiture of approvals.
2. Prior to application submittal to the DRB, the applicant shall meet with the staff planner(s) to ensure that all conditions of approval are met.

-
3. A Process section shall be added to the design standards and General Note 2 shall be revised to state:
 - A. The first tract to develop adjacent to the Petroglyph National Monument shall return to the EPC for review of the Site Development Plan for Subdivision. At that time, the EPC can choose to delegate future site development plans for subdivision to administrative review or to retain its approval authority and review a subsequent submittal. Administrative review would consist of the Planning Director or her/his designee, and an EPC staff planner, performing a design review analysis with each site development plan for subdivision for the proposed tracts to ensure compliance with applicable rules, regulations, standards, and policies prior to submittal to the DRB.
 - B. The City shall consult with the National Park Service and Parks and Recreation prior to approval of development adjacent to the Petroglyph National Monument.

 4. The Required Information narrative section, Sheet 1, shall be revised as follows:

Revise the second sentence of the subsection entitled “The Site” to indicate that the subject site is within the boundaries of the listed plans and subject to the regulations of those Plans.

 5. Lighting, Utilities & Screening: The language from the WMP regarding antennas and towers (see p. 88) shall be added as a standard to the Utilities section.

 6. Signage:
 - A. A standard shall be added to state that signage in the NWMEP Impact Area cannot exceed 6 square feet of sign face area (NWMEP, p. 61).
 - B. The illustration for prototypical Facilities Sign Type D, when located in the Impact Area, shall be revised correspondingly.

 7. Sidewalks, Trails & Pedestrian Crossings:
 - A. A standard shall be added to address bicycles and bicycle trails and their connectivity between subdivisions.
 - B. A standard shall be added indicating that some or all of the trails would use Barrier-Free Design, physically challenged individuals would also be accommodated as trail users.
 - C. The four pedestrian access points between the linear park and Tract D, and the linear park and Tract E, shall be re-instated.
 - D. The following shall be added to Standard B: sidewalks adjacent to solid walls shall be a minimum of 6 feet in width (WMP, p. 85).
 - E. A standard shall be added that designates the perimeter trail along the NPS boundary as public if an access point to the Petroglyph National Monument is proposed within the project boundaries.

- F. A trail feasibility study shall be required prior to development of Tract A for the northern perimeter trail for public access to the Petroglyph National Monument and submitted to the City Parks and Recreation Department/Open Space Division and Petroglyph National Monument for review. The study shall consider existing soils, grade, and slope. If it is determined that this trail is not feasible, the applicant shall not be required or allowed to construct the trail or access to the Petroglyph National Monument. This shall be added to Section 10, Petroglyph National Monument.
8. The Walls/Fences Design Standards shall be revised as follows:
- A. The standards shall specify if there is a difference between the residential property perimeter fences and the gated subdivision perimeter fence.
 - B. A new standard shall be added for development in the Impact Area of the NWMEP that states: Development at the edge of public or private open space shall be designed to complement and enhance the open space. Where the adjacent land use requires visual privacy, non-continuous, non-perimeter walls may be constructed. Varied setbacks and landscaping are required, NWMEP Regulation 9.2.
9. The Architecture Design Standards shall be revised to state: The homes in the active adult tracts shall all be single-story (stated at the June hearing).
10. Streets & Streetscapes:
- A. The 10 foot trail along Tierra Pintada Blvd. shall be re-instated and the detail correspondingly revised.
 - B. Typical street sections demonstrate landscaped medians that accommodate grade changes, though this needs to be articulated as written standards. Design standards shall be added to describe or regulate the type or extent of ground cover and landscaping.
 - C. A standard shall be added that requires inverted crowns where street medians are present and/or if curb cuts are required in the medians and curbs to harvest rainwater into the landscaped areas.
11. The Landscape Design Standards shall be revised as follows:
- A. Landscape, Standard 13.D shall include reference to the linear open space parks and associated trails to be maintained by the HOA.
 - B. Landscape, Standard 13.J shall more precisely define the requirement for a “limited amount of turf area” with percentages or another measurable standard.

12. The Grading & Surface Disturbance Standards shall be revised as follows:
 - A. NWMEP Policy 11.2 and Policy 11.8, regarding pre-construction requirements and damaged areas/re-vegetation shall be included as standards.
 - B. A phasing plan shall be included to indicate the order in which the tracts are to be graded. Not more than one tract shall be mass graded at any given time.

13. Clarification & “Clean-Up”:
 - A. For clarity for future review, each illustration, plan, diagram or cross-section contained in the design standards shall be identified as either illustrative (conceptual) or as a standard (regulatory).
 - B. The landscaping standards shall be numbered as 13, with renumbering of subsequent sections.
 - C. Numbers shall be added to sections 9 and 10.
 - D. Sheet 1, Line 7: the term “private clubhouse” shall be used.
 - E. Utility Plan: Add a symbol for the new line type.

14. Conditions of Approval from Transit: Pedestrian access at intervals of 500 feet along the Tierra Pintada Blvd NW shall be provided to provide access to potential transit users. See DPM Section 2.A.9.d (4).

15. Conditions of Approval from the Open Space Division:
 - A. The boundary line of the gated community (i.e., the proposed location of the view fence) shall be shown on all sheets.
 - B. A small public parking area shall be provided for the north perimeter trail to avoid conflicts with residents. The location shall be shown on plan drawings.
 - C. Sections showing double-loaded street with housing and PETR boundary shall be included in drawings for full disclosure of intent.
 - D. Consistent information about intent for arroyo bottom, either “natural” and “allowed to degrade and drop” or containing “drop structures” that will “stabilize the bottom” shall be provided.

16. Conditions of Approval from the Parks & Recreation Department, Strategic Planning Division:
 - A. A public trailhead parking area shall be provided to prevent undue burden on existing and future neighbors.
 - B. The Parks and Recreation Department Strategic Planning and Design Division and Open Space Division recommend that additional continuing discussion with the Developer, Monument staff and City Staff to develop an agreement as to the treatment of the borders

-
- immediately adjacent the Monument including public access trail locations, grades, signage, trailheads/parking, walls and fences etc.
- C. The diagram (p. 3, item #7) showing “Pedestrian Circulation” shall be clarified as to which trails are public and which are private for the gated residents only.
 - D. A sentence shall be added to Section Eleven item H to state that “All landscaping along streets and medians is to be maintained by the HOA”.
 - E. The statement that “water harvesting techniques will try to be incorporated with future subdivision as possible” shall be replaced with “Water harvesting techniques will be implemented where possible”.
 - F. The Developer, the City and the National Monument Staff will continue to work together throughout the development build out to achieve appropriate and acceptable solutions.
17. Conditions of Approval from the National Park Service: Vehicular access at the northeastern corner of the proposed project (by the existing water tank with an existing gate) shall be provided for emergency services response in the event of an incident.
18. Conditions of Approval from the City Engineer:
- A. 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).
 - B. Site plan shall comply and be in accordance with DPM (Development Process Manual) and current ADA standards/ requirements. Any necessary variances must go through the standard variance process.
 - C. All easements, access agreements and property lines must be shown and labeled on Site Plan. Provide recording information.
 - D. Right-of-way dedication to the City of Albuquerque may be required at DRB.
 - E. 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.
 - F. The developer shall coordinate with the DMD to ensure that transportation infrastructure is provided as planned and included in the 2030 MTP.
19. Traffic Operations: A note shall be added to state the following: An analysis of the operation and mitigation necessary to return traffic operations to that of the no build condition at the Ladera and Unser Intersection is required. This analysis shall be performed and submitted to the City and NMDOT for review prior to the first subdivision plat approval by the DRB.

20. Conditions of Approval from AMAFCA:

- A. 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.
- B. 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.
- C. 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.

21. Conditions of Approval from the Public Service Company of New Mexico:

- A. 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.
- B. Any existing or proposed public utility easements are to be indicated on the site plan utility sheet prior to DRB review.

UPDATED AGENCY COMMENTS

(Note: based on v. 3 of the site development plan, June 24, 2013)

CITY ENGINEER

Transportation Development

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. Any necessary variances must go through the standard variance process.
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. Please “bullnose” the median ends to accommodate off tracking and fortify with solid concrete fill.
6. The geometry of the proposed roadways must follow the road classifications as outlined in the DPM
7. 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.
8. The developer shall coordinate with the DMD to ensure that transportation infrastructure is provided as planned and included in the 2030 MTP.
9. The Mirehaven Arroyos (A, B, &C) have been designated as an Urban Recreational Arroyo in the Rank 2 Facility Plan for Arroyos 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.
10. Are the private trails and community trails designed to be ADA accessible? Please clarify.

Hydrology Development

1. Sheet 6.14.E. Hydrology provides the following comment on the portion of this paragraph where it states “...roadway where it will be allowed to pond and overflow into the roadway.” In general, the City prefers to not drain areas over the sidewalk, except for spillways. Please add to the end of the paragraph “Hydrology will evaluate whether and how ponds should overflow into the roadway on a case-by-case basis.”
2. Sheet 6.14.I Drainage ways are regularly used as pedestrian ways, but pedestrian ways are usually not used as drainage ways. A suggestion is to delete the words “pedestrian ways” from the sentence.
3. How will the diversion dike shown on Sheet 6 be incorporated into the development as a street and houses are shown in this area on Sheet 3 in the Petroglyph National Monument Edge Treatment detail? What are the estimated flows to be diverted and the height of the dike?

RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS FROM CITY ENGINEER

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. Any necessary variances must go through the standard variance process.
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. 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.
6. The developer shall coordinate with the DMD to ensure that transportation infrastructure is provided as planned and included in the 2030 MTP.

PARKS AND RECREATION

Strategic Planning and Design Division

1. TRAILS. A public accessible trail along the northern perimeter is may be an amenity for the greater Albuquerque community, if feasible given the topography and drainage issues, but a public trailhead parking area is recommended to prevent undue burden on the existing and future neighbors. This proposed public accessible trail could provide a pedestrian access point into the Monument near the Mirehaven Arroyo with PETR approval. Please see email dated July 1, 2013 from Joseph Sanchez, Superintendent of the Monument regarding the critical need for vehicle access to the northeast corner of the development near the water tank where an existing gate to the Monument is situated. As no private only or exclusionary access to Petroglyph National Monument will be allowed by the Monument, the western edge perimeter trail, if feasible given the topographical and drainage issues, will have no access points into the Monument. It will be a private trail for the gated community residents only. The initially proposed sites for public access to the Monument along the western boundary of the development are not acceptable due to extensive archaeological sites. In the future another public access may be situated at the water tank site northeast of the development and/or at the future APS site southwest of the development where a historic trail access exists, with approvals from NPS. The Parks and Recreation Department Strategic Planning and Design Division and Open Space Division recommend that additional continuing discussion with the Developer, Monument staff and City Staff to develop an agreement as to the treatment of the borders immediately adjacent the Monument including public access trail locations, grades, signage, trailheads/parking, walls and fences etc.
2. COMMUNITY. Throughout the Site Plan for Subdivision, the word “community” is used and it is not clear if the “community” amenity such as “community trail” is intended to refer to the gated community residents or all of the Watershed Subdivision “community”. It is confusing. In sections and plan views the term is used interchangeably so it is not clear what is public and what is private.

For example, the section on the Mirehaven Arroyo states that the “Access to the Mirehaven Arroyo shall be restricted to the residents of the community”. That would be “the residents of the *gated* community”? Another example, the private linear parks...”also serve as a recreational amenity for the “community” when in this case, some sections of the linear parks are for both the gated and non-gated residents as we understand from the illustration of “Pedestrian Circulation”. Please clarify.

3. PEDESTRIAN CIRCULATION. Page Three, item #7 the diagram showing “Pedestrian Circulation” is unclear as to what trails are public and what are private for the gated residents. Please clarify.
4. STREETS AND STREETSCAPES. Section Eleven item H, please add a sentence stating “All landscaping along streets and medians are to be maintained by the HOA”. Landscaping of medians and/or streetscapes by the Developer within the City ROW will require a Streetscape Agreement between the Developer and the City.
5. LANDSCAPE. Is there a percentage of minimum landscape coverage required? If so, please identify what percentage that would be.
6. GRADING AND SURFACE DISTURBANCE. Defer to Environmental Health on this section of the Plan regarding dust control. However, item B is vague as to how the minimum of cut and fill have been addressed and who determines that more cut and fill results in “construction materially (that) improves the site plan”? Our concern here has to do with the cut and fill solutions for home sites and roads potentially affecting the feasibility of a trail alignment.
7. DRAINAGE. Item D. We realize this is a difficult site with the Monument on two sides and steep slopes so that retaining walls will be or may be necessary in certain locations. We have concerns about terracing walls next to the Monument such as those in Watershed One development adjacent the Well Tank Site. Terracing walls should protect views of the Monument and view fences used as much as possible. Item H, please add “private” to ...parks...so that it is clear that it is “private open space” and “private parks”....
8. CONCEPTUAL GRADING AND DRAINAGE PLAN. The Diversion Bank proposed along the northwest boundary of the site appears to be in the approximate location of the proposed perimeter trail, housing, and a road. There is not enough information on this Plan which does not show proposed grades, only existing grades, to identify if there is a potential conflict that would preclude a trail in that location. Our Department supports and encourages water harvesting when possible. The statement that “water harvesting techniques will try to be incorporated with future subdivision as possible” is vague and non-committal. We would suggest “Water harvesting techniques will be implemented where possible”.

Overall Comment: We are concerned that this Plan is for a difficult site and of large scale with very little detail in this Site Plan for Subdivision submittal. In the absence of further EPC review of future phases of this development, the Administrative review/approval process as described on Sheet 1, General Note 2, should be flexible enough to permit additional consultation prior to an Administrative Approval in cases such as this development situated adjacent the Petroglyph National Monument. The City Parks and Recreation Department and, particularly the Open Space Division, has an ongoing partnership with the

National Monument. The City and the Department needs to respect and support the Monument's position on the treatment of the boundary with the Monument. As the level of detail in this initial submittal is not enough to review for approval of trails location, grades, walls, accesses, parking etc., the Developer, the City and the National Monument will need to continue to work together throughout the development build out to achieve appropriate and acceptable solutions.

Open Space Division

- A. Please show the boundary line of the gated community (i.e., the proposed location of the view fence) on all sheets.
- B. The west perimeter trail will require monitoring and protection from residents. If residents of the gated community begin encroaching on, or creating unofficial entrances to the PETR, the HOA should take financial responsibility for repairing fence along the boundary.
- C. Impossible to tell if the perimeter path along the west and north sides will work without a conceptual grading plan. "Grading and Drainage Plan" is merely a Drainage Plan; there is no proposed grading on it.
- D. A small public parking area is highly recommended for the north perimeter trail to avoid conflicts with residents. Please show location on plan drawings.
- E. How does the "Diversion Bank" relate to the street and houses? Where is the flowline in relation to developed areas, especially the perimeter trail?
- F. How does perimeter trail interface with the drainage crossing? How much fill will be required to create a safe path for the intended users?
- G. Typical sections on drawing should be labeled and referenced to the plan. Sections showing double-loaded street with housing and PETR boundary should be included in drawings for full disclosure of intent.
- H. Need consistent information about intent for arroyo bottom; either "natural" and "allowed to degrade and drop," or containing "drop structures" that will "stabilize the bottom."
- I. 1st sheet is inconsistent with the rest of the sheets and needs to be updated.

National Park Service (NPS)

The most recent version of the plan appears to address most of the significant concerns of the National Park Service:

- Resource protection by eliminating trail access on the western boundary of the proposed project and the National Monument;
- Public access (outside of the Monument boundary) to the Mirehaven Arroyo access point and;
- No storm water drainage into the Monument from anywhere in the adjacent development;

The primary concern at this point is the lack (according to the drawings) of vehicular access at the northeastern corner of the proposed project (by the existing water tank with an existing gate). The access is critical for emergency services response in the event of an incident. On sheet one of the newest set of plans, the trail is listed as "trail and pedestrian access." It is not included at all on the conceptual drawing on sheet three.