

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
1	All		Map of 115 line that bisects the area		Add in appendix.	In the VCSDP, add a new appendix containing a map provided by the Public Service Company of New Mexico that shows PNM's electric facilities in the area.
2	All		I would like to see a traffic study done, that looks at how much traffic each bridge ( Montano, Paseo Del Norte, and I-40) was designed to handle. I would also like to see how much traffic all the intersections, on both sides of the river, that lead to these river crossings, was designed to handled. How much traffic is traveling on each bridge and through these intersections today. How much traffic will there be in the future, at peak hours, as a result of Volcano Mesa and regional development.	These plans do not propose any additional residential development, which is the primary generator of traffic, than what is already permissive in the Volcano Mesa area under existing zoning. What these plans do is try to balance residential uses with opportunities to develop commercial/retail/employment uses in order to help with the east-west jobs-housing imbalance. Furthermore, the Volcano Heights SDP, in particular, promotes transit-oriented development, and all of the plans contain policies and regulations geared towards creating walkable, bikable environments so that residents in these areas do not need to be so auto-dependant.	Additional comments on this issue from MRCOG forthcoming.	
3	All		Add language in all three plans about utility easements, who pays for utility relocation, screening, safety clearances.		Addressed in a VTSDP condition. Add additional language to existing "Utilities" section in VCSDP.	On page 52 of the VCSDP, in section 14. Utilities, add the following new section after the first section called "Easements": "Clearance: All screening and vegetation surrounding ground-mounted transformers and utility pads shall allow 10 feet of clearance for access and to ensure the safety of the work crew and public during maintenance and repair."
4	All		Are there other plans that have to be considered other than the NWMEP and the WSSP?		Arroyo, MPOS, Bikeways, Electric Facilities. These will be addressed in the Staff Report.	

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
5	All		Consider adding 2-tier standards to all plans, modeled after La Cueva SDP, with requirements (shall) identified vs. preferred wishes ("should") likewise expressly identified as non-mandatory.	The plans are already set up this way but in a way that staff feels is more clear than the La Cueva SDP because it separates the "shoulds" (policies) from the "shalls" (regulations).	Staff will make sure that "should" vs. "shall" is consistent throughout the plans. (Addressed in a previous condition).	
6	All		We are requesting an open space corridor running from the Petroglyph Monument to the volcanoes. Perhaps it can go along side the drainage channel and hook up with the designated open space area.	The open space buffer, including the designation of 300'-wide arroyo corridors, in the 2006 Plan prompted lawsuits against the City that claimed "inverse condemnation" or taking all reasonable use of private property without proper compensation. The City currently does not have funding identified or secured that could be used to purchase properties atop the escarpment to create a buffer. However, should funding become available, Policy 2, Chapter 3, p. 27, VC, discusses the acquisition of properties suitable for Open Space acquisition.	The EPC may consider recommending to include a map in the WSSP amendment that would generally identify areas suitable for open space acquisition as identified by the City's Open Space Division should funding become available. (Addressed in a condition for the WSSP amendment).	On page 7 of the WSSP Amendment, add a reference at the end of Policy 3.102 to a new exhibit that shows "Land Suitable for Open Space Acquisition" as determined by the City's Open Space Division and should be added to this WSSP Amendment.
7	All		Change reference from "City of Albuquerque Water Conservation Office" to "Albuquerque Bernalillo County Water Utility Authority" throughout all plans.		Will change.	Throughout the Plan, replace all references to "City of Albuquerque Water Conservation Office" with "Albuquerque Bernalillo County Water Utility Authority".
8	All		Amend "accessory units" language to be clear that kitchens are allowed.		Will change.	See individual conditions in staff report.
9	All		Remove "Town Center" from all maps where Volcano Heights is shown.		Will make changes.	The phrase "Town Center" shall be removed from all maps. In VCSDP this is Exhibits 1, 4, 7. In VHSDP this is Exhibits 2, 5, 11, 12, and Appendix F. In VTSDP this is Exhibits 3, 4. In the WSSP amendment this is Exhibit 6 and 7.

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
10	All		Explain why there are different definitions of FAR in these plans. Why do these plans need a special definition of FAR?	Will provide explanation in staff report.		
11	All		General "should"/"shall" clean up			Verify the appropriate use of "should" versus "shall" throughout the Plan and revise as necessary.
12	All		Is there enough parking per residential unit? A minimum of 1/unit does not seem enough. Requiring enough interior storage in residential units would also allow use of garages for vehicles instead of personal item storage with cars relegated to driveways and streets.	The parking requirement is a MINIMUM. More off-street parking can be provided. Comp Plan: II.C.1.Policy c, II.C.1.Policy d, II.D.4.Policy f		
13	All		how do we prevent failed development like at Coors and Montano NW, where not only was the land razed then development abandoned, but also the contractor who razed the land took out more of the vegetation (cottonwood trees) than were specified in the plan? Or inconsiderate development, where in the open space on the volcano cliffs, adding utility access resulted in the destruction of a vast swath of the land that was left in its ugly uprooted state and no attempt was made at preservation or restoration? (Rock that was removed from the utility area was just pushed into or dumped on juniper trees unnecessarily, and then left that way.)	The City, and these SDPs, cannot control market forces and the pace and/or completion of private development projects. All three SDPs contain an appendix that deals with construction mitigation and revegetation and regulations related to grading, drainage, and the provision of landscaping, including trees.		

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
14	All		How do we get folks to comply with the letter and spirit of this development plan? And prevent situations like those we have with the Andalucia area?	Andalucia is not in a Sector Plan and, therefore, is not regulated by a special set of controls as will be these three plan areas. By virtue of being in SDP, these areas can be protected via tailored zoning and other regulations to ensure the preservation of the special character of these areas.		
15	All		View preservation needs more attention. The section about views in the 2006 plan was also taken out. The Volcanoes and Mesa top is a landmark of Albuquerque. The citizens of Albuquerque will miss seeing the natural view of the Volcanoes and mesa once all the development fills in. There needs to be consideration of views looking toward the Volcanoes from the city, and to provide quality views within the Plan Area. Building heights and the location of the buildings need to be re-examined. Color, reflectivity, designated view corridors along roadways and arroyos, also need to be part of the plan. Plan the development so that it is tiered down the slope of the mesa so that residents can have views. Consider toning down the street lights, and signage so that it is minimal and not flashy.	The view preservation language is in the West Side Strategic Amendment and provides the policy justification for the view preservation policies and standards in the VC and the VH. Location of the Major Activity Center, colors, reflectivity, heights, and density patterns are part of the view preservation strategy.		

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
16	All		(EPC)We do have concerns about transportation - what is going to happen downstream? You are going to have to increase transit. We are willing to support any adjustment to make it more accessible to people.	The roadway system in Volcano Mesa is a grid system where it is a requirement to create through connections to all streets. The purpose of designating the Major Activity Center is to reverse the jobs-housing imbalance and some of the traffic flows that currently flow out of the area. We are not increasing the number of dwelling units that are possible under the existing zoning. The same amount of traffic is generated through this planning effort as with the existing (already in place) zoning. Furthermore, the Volcano Heights SDP, in particular, promotes transit-oriented development, and all of the plans contain policies and regulations geared towards creating walkable, bikable environments so that residents in these areas do not need to be so auto-dependant.		
17	All		(EPC)Shine: you want to add view studies to the plan - has the staff rejected these proposals to your knowledge? Rene: they are focusing more on property owner concerns.	The WSSP amendment contains the view studies, which address views from both within and without.		
18	All		Would like a line-by-line comparison prepared. Has anyone done a line-by-line comparison with the NWMEP to determine where these plans are inconsistent with the new sector plans?	Additional analysis will be provided in supplementary staff report.		

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
19	All		R-270-1980. I believe you have misread "stability of zoning." The EPC has read it to mean how is the new zoning going to affect the stability of the existing zoning in the area, not whether the new zoning will create stability. The question is whether the new zoning will throw off the stability of zoning in other areas. That's how I read R-270-1980. The people to the north, and the people from all over the city, are relying on the R-D zoning and that there won't be 9-story buildings on the mesa. To me, this is a major issue in why the zone change should not be approved.	Per City legal staff, "stability of zoning" in R-270-1980 means that there is a preference for maintaining existing zoning when there is a consideration of whether a zone change is appropriate. This section means that there is a presumption in favor of existing zoning and places the burden on the applicant to justify the need for a zone change. Staff has provided a complete analysis of the VCSDP's and VTSDP's compliance with R-270-1980, including ample justifications in support of the proposed zone changes.		
20	All		(Verify that this is in the Plans): When any regs (height regs colors, etc) conflict with NWMEP, the NWMEP shall prevail.	The NWMEP does not always prevail.		

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
21	All		What about the traffic downstream that comes off the mesa? Montano Bridge, Paseo del Norte is already congested heavily. 140 and Unser is too. What do we do about that?	These plans do not propose any additional residential development, which is the primary generator of traffic, than what is already permissive in the Volcano Mesa area under existing zoning. What these plans do is try to balance residential uses with opportunities to develop commercial/retail/employment uses in order to help with the east-west jobs-housing imbalance. Furthermore, the Volcano Heights SDP, in particular, promotes transit-oriented development, and all of the plans contain policies and regulations geared towards creating walkable, bikable environments so that residents in these areas do not need to be so auto-dependant.		
22	All		The views towards the mesa from the City of Albuquerque is just as important	All of the plans contain regulations for materials, colors, reflectivity, and lighting that are intended to help protect views from afar.		
23	All		Open space should not be on edges of development and the petroglyph national monument; they should be green space and open natural areas within Town Center or Housing Development	There are open space requirements in all of the Plans for both private and shared usable open space.		
24	All		There also needs to be another traffic study done, to analyse how much traffic will be traveling through the communities downstream. All the river crossings are at or overcapacity now. MRCOG knows we have a big problem.	We are not increasing the number of dwelling units that are possible under the existing zoning. The same amount of traffic is generated through this planning effort as with the existing (already in place) zoning.		
25	All		How many stories in a 35' building?	3 stories.		
26	All		How many stories in a 26' building?	2 stories.		

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
27	All		How many stories in a 18' building?	1 - 1 1/2 stories.		
28	All		Setbacks to alleys (rear or side) could be 0' throughout.	No room for utility infrastructure. We're requiring PNM to place utilities at rear, so rear setback is necessary even with alley.		
29	All		The general philosophy that led to urban densities (town center, village centers, mixed use) was based on it being a tradeoff for lower densities elsewhere in the planning area that would provide a higher protection of Petroglyph National Monument/City Open Space (ex. Additional buffer area, arroyos in natural state, lower density in West, development envelopes). Unfortunately, the densities have all remained in the plan and the majority of items to protect the ecology and cultural resources of PNM are deleted. This is an unfortunate outcome. All urban densities should be reconsidered or the aforementioned protections to this wilderness area should be restored.	The 2006 Plan was not realistic in its endeavor to force what was essentially a "Transfer of Development Rights" since it did not consider the large number of property owners and failed to provide an equitable distribution of benefits and restrictions (which resulted in an inverse condemnation lawsuit against the City). The new Plans acknowledge and respect the property rights of the many individual property owners within the area of the Plans while providing for orderly and coordinated development that balances the needs and rights of property owners with the desires of the community and City. Also, the statement "the densities have all remained in the plan" is not correct. In the western most area of the Volcano Cliffs Plan, the current zoning is R-D, which could allow upwards of 11 du/acre; the new SDP limits density in this area to 1 du/acre or up to 3 du/acre if development is clustered. (cont. below)		

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
				While this is more than the 2006 Plan's allowance of only 1 du/10 acres, it is significantly lower than what is presently allowed. Regarding the deletion of "items to protect the ecology and cultural resources of PNM," the only things that have been removed and reworked from the 2006 Plan are regulations that were unenforceable and/or constituted a "taking" (e.g., rezoning properties to Open Space or Parks without providing compensation for taking any reasonable use of the property by the property owner). All of the environment and open space policies and intents have remained in the new plans (see comparison of 2006 Plan and 2010 Plans).		
30	VC	1	Change "Volcano Heights Town Center SDP" to "Volcano Heights SDP" - take out "Town Center"		Will revise.	Throughout the VCSDP, wherever the phrase "Volcano Heights Town Center Sector Development Plan" appears, delete "Town Center". Wherever the acronym "VHTCSDP" appears, replace with acronym "VHSDP." Amend all maps accordingly.
31	VC	1	2 minor nits. Para. 3, end of line 1. Need a comma after the word small. Last line. What does "master" developed mean?	There is already a comma after "small." "Master developed" means planned, platted, and developed on a larger scale under single ownership.		
32	VC	2	Exhibit 1 - Map calls VH the VHTC		Will revise. (Addressed through another condition)	
33	VC	2	Exhibit 1 - Add green color to legend and say what it shows (Monument / MPOS)		Will revise; per Code Enforcement's comments, need to hatch rather than color code.	On page 2 of the VCSDP, Exhibit 1, G92. Add new labels and pattern designations for "Petroglyph National Monument" and "Major Public Open Space".

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
34	VC	3	First line under Guiding principles should read, Develop a flexible plan which encourages... Last 2 bullets need a Verb, eg., "Encourage" equitable.. and "Ensure" thoroughfares ... Next to last line in that section. developed by "applying" the Guiding... Plan Area. .end of 4th line ..set aside as "the" Petroglyph...	Staff does not think that all changes suggested are necessary but agrees to clarify/rewrite one bullet.	"Acquire MPOS in an equitable and timely fashion."	On page 3 of the VCSDP, replace the next-to-last bullet in the list of "Guiding Principles" with the following: "Acquire Major Public Open Space in an equitable and timely fashion."
35	VC	3	please add the phrase "and Major Public Open Space" to the bullet statement about respecting the unique location of the Plan area.		Yes, will add.	On page 3 of the VCSDP, in the fourth bullet in the list of "Guiding Principles" add "and Major Public Open Space" at the end.
36	VC	3	Plan Area: The area is surrounded by nearly 10,000 acres of open space.		Yes, will change.	On page 3 of the VCSDP, in the last paragraph, delete "more than 7,000" and insert in lieu thereof "10,000".
37	VC	4	Exhibit 2: Recommend labeling Petroglyph National Monument and Southern Geologic Window; add Open Space lands owned or under contract in the La Cuentista subdivision area; provide map key for light green colored area depicting Boca Negra Dam/Park.		Ok; okay for land owned already by MPOS - please provide map; ok.	On page 4 of the VCSDP, amend Exhibit 2 as follows: 1) label the Petroglyph National Monument and Southern Geologic Window; 2) add Major Public Open Space lands owned or under contract in the La Cuentista subdivision area per map provided by City Open Space division; 3) provide map key for light green colored area depicting Boca Negra Dam/Park; 4) update the aerial photograph to a 2010 photograph to show existing conditions in the area.
38	VC	5	Pre-Existing Platting: Indicate the year(s) that the platting and zoning occurred	Page 1, first sentence, talks about when area was platted and annexed.	Add "upon annexation" after "was zoned" in the first sentence.	On page 5 of the VCSDP, in the first sentence, add "upon annexation" after "was zoned".

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
39	VC	8	P8: & onward: Please list Goals in outline form: ie: A Transportation Goals; 1 Provide a choice... 2 Support an efficient...3 Connect... B Environment 1 Natural Resources a Establish interconnected... etc....		Okay, will reformat.	Reformat Chapter 1in outline format so that different sections can be easily referenced by section letter/number.
40	VC	8	Transportation Goals. 3rd line. What are "active uses"? Third Para, last line. ...in order for transit to draw closer to the performance of SOVs. ?? Next to last line. and be a comfortable place for neighbors to come together. Not sure I grasp the concept here. Why are neighbors getting together in the streets?	Streets are public spaces where, historically, much social interaction has taken place. This is a good thing.		

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
41	VC	9	VH consider adding a 3rd line under Natural Resources mirroring "respect culture and history..." per		Okay will add goal from VH on page 9 "Respect Albuquerque's culture and history..."	On page 9 of the VCSDP, delete the subsection headings called "Natural Resources" and "View and Cultural Resources". Add a new goal following the first goal as follows: "Respect Albuquerque's culture and history, both Hispanic and Native American, through contextually sensitive development of Volcano Cliffs. Volcano Mesa provides a unique portal to understand the rich interplay of cultures that is New Mexico. The stories of the meaning of this place to Native Americans can be told through living and visiting Volcano Cliffs and by the way we develop this special area. As such, Volcano Cliffs can be another entry point for all of Albuquerque into different and important perspectives on humanity's place on earth and our spiritual paths."
42	VC	10	Need to phrase different. "Establish the Village Center as a mixed-use NAC" Last paragraph - where is the Neighborhood Activity Center?		Will revise.	On page 10 of the VCSDP, amend the last goal on the page as follows: "Establish the Village Center as a mixed-use Neighborhood Activity Center..."
43	VC	14	Middle of 3rd para. Where is Exhibit 5 ?		Need to relabel map on page 16 "Exhibit 5" instead of "Exhibit 4".	On page 16 of the VCSDP, relabel the exhibit "Exhibit 5, Volcano Cliffs Road Network".
44	VC	14	Policy 1: 3rd line, after more direct add "& offer redundancy"		Okay, will add.	On page 14 of the VCSDP, in the second sentence under Policy 1, add "and offer redundancy" after "more direct".

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
45	VC	14	Policy 1: Ahead of Policy 2, consider adding policies for residential to foster no dead-ends or cul-de-sacs over 5? 7? houses / 100'? and multiple points of ingress / egress into neighborhoods.		Will add language at the end of Policy 1: Dead-end streets and cul-de-sacs are strongly discouraged.	On page 14 of the VCSDP, add the following sentence at the end of the first paragraph under Policy 1: "Dead-end streets and cul-de-sacs are strongly discouraged."
46	VC	14	Policy 1: An interconnected network (add): shall form an hierarchical network and should distribute ....		Will revise to be more descriptive with suggested language.	On page 14 of the VCSDP, amend the first sentence under Policy 1 as follows: "An interconnected network should form an hierarchical network and should distribute traffic among multiple routes..."
47	VC	14	Next to last sentence on the page is confusing. Need to re-write, maybe starting with, Providing alternate routes onto Unser and Paseo, traffic at these key intersections, which are beginning to fail, would be eased.		Yes, next to last sentence is a fragment and should be combined with previous sentence.	On page 14 of the VCSDP, rewrite the last "three" sentences in the paragraph, beginning with "In addition..." as follows: "In addition, the proposed access points facilitate access to transit and the proposed Transit Center, located in the Volcano Heights center, as well as easing traffic at key intersections such as Universe and Paseo del Norte, which are already starting to fail, by providing alternative routes onto Unser and Paseo del Norte. Proposed access points are shown on Exhibit 4, Volcano Mesa Road Network; these access locations are generally located to provide optimal connections to, from, and within the Volcano Mesa area and the Volcano Cliffs Sector Development Plan."

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
48	VC	15	Exhibit 4 - explain why only certain intersections are marked. Why isn't Rosa Parks and Rainbow marked?	The marked intersections are "proposed." Existing intersections are not marked.	Add "Proposed" to legend title, exhibit name, and before "Bus Rapid Transit" label in legend.	On page 15 of VCSDP insert "Proposed" before the exhibit name "Volcano Mesa Road Network". On page 15 of VCSDP insert "Proposed" before the title in the key "Volcano Mesa Road Network". On page 15 of VCSDP insert "Proposed" before the label "Bus Rapid Transit" in the legend.
49	VC	15	Exhibit 4 and Page 16, Exhibit 5: Label and/or provide different color for Major Public Open Space outside Petroglyph National Monument; add Open Space lands owned or under contract in the La Cuentista subdivision area.		Ok, will label; okay to add lands already owned but not under contract - please provide map.	On pages 15 and 16 of the VCSDP, amend Exhibits 4 and 5 as follows: Label Major Public Open Space lands outside of the Petroglyph National Monument; G94.
50	VC	15	Page 15, Exhibit 4, Volcano Mesa Road Network. Same issue regarding the limits of the frontage road along the southside of Paseo del Norte. See comments 4 and 20 above. Comment: Revise Exhibit 4 to show the full limits of the frontage road system that are proposed along Paseo del Norte. This same comment also applies to the exhibit on page 16.		Will make changes.	On pages 15 and 16 of the VCSDP, amend Exhibits 4 and 5 to show the full limits of the frontage road system that are proposed along Paseo del Norte.
51	VC	15	P15: similar to above remark: can Rosa Parks Rd be looped back to rejoin Rainbow? All roads should generally loop or connect.	Rosa Parks appears to already connect via alternate routes and cross streets.		

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
52	VC	16	Exhibit 4 (to be changed to 5) - explain why only certain intersections are marked. Why isn't Rosa Parks and Rainbow marked?	The marked intersections are "proposed." Existing intersections are not marked.	Add "Proposed" to legend title, exhibit name, and before "Bus Rapid Transit" label in legend.	On page 16 of VCSDP insert "Proposed" before the exhibit name "Volcano Mesa Road Network". On page 16 of VCSDP insert "Proposed" before the title in the key "Volcano Mesa Road Network". On page 16 of VCSDP insert "Proposed" before the label "Bus Rapid Transit" in the legend.
53	VC	16	TRNA has always promoted single loaded streets along the Monument boundaries. It provides a nice transition between the development and the Monument. It also allows views to be enjoyed by everyone. We need to make sure this happens for all development boundaries next to the Monument		The map on page 16 of the VC is being amended to show that the vast majority of City Open Space and National Monument is bounded by a single-loaded street.	On pages 15 and 16 of VCSDP amend Exhibits 4 and 5 to show all single loaded streets that are already platted as Scenic Corridors.
54	VC	16	The plan shows a traffic light and full intersection for Kimmick. That is good. The width of Kimmick should be sized to accommodate commercial scale traffic counts. In fact, this volume of traffic is already there every day. Kimmick should also be shown as an important collector of traffic from the residential neighborhoods. The right-in, right-out for the other 2 Paseo access points should be workable.	Kimmick is already platted at 110', which is wide enough to accommodate a collector per regular City standards and the cross-sections proposed in the VC, which are advisory. Any expansion of the road would require a replatting and taking property that fronts Kimmick.		

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
55	VC	17	Policy 3: last sentence: consider requiring single-sided streets at last abutment to Monument; possible exception being at geologic window. This would create a public buffer, access and amenity in perpetuity. (consult too with NPS on this concept & test-map it).		The map on page 16 of the VC is being amended to show that the vast majority of City Open Space and National Monument is bounded by a single-loaded street. (Addressed in previous condition).	
56	VC	17	Add a sentence describing scenic corridors to policy 3		Will add.	On page 17 of the VCSDP, Policy 3, add a sentence that reads as follows: A scenic corridor is defined in this plan as a single loaded street that abuts open space lands such as the Petroglyph National Monument or an arroyo. The streets that are platted as single loaded at the time of the plan adoption are mapped in Exhibit 4 and 5, however future platting actions should increase this network.

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
57	VC	17	<p>Page 17, Policy 4.a. Pedestrian Crosswalks. The first sentence reads, "At-grade pedestrian crosswalks should be provided at signalized and unsignalized ("right-in, / right-out") intersections (except the intersections of Paseo del Norte and Unser). The word provided should be changed to considered. At this early stage of development without any detailed engineering design information, it's not possible to conclude that at-grade, unsignalized pedestrian crosswalks can be provided safely at all right-in/right-out intersections throughout the Plan.</p> <p>Comment: Change the word provided in the first sentence of policy 4.a. to considered.</p>		Will make changes.	On page 14 of the VCSDP in Policy 4.a "Pedestrian Crosswalks" in the first sentence delete "provided" and insert in lieu thereof "considered".
58	VC	17	<p>In general, many uses of word "should"; consider which are preferable, which are mandatory. Consider revising throughout to yield "shall" at many key parts</p>	Everything in this section should be "should" - this is a policy chapter, not regulatory.		
59	VC	17	<p>Third line from the bottom. Excessive street width has been identified as a ... Where has it been identified as the cause?</p>	It is a well-accepted position of traffic engineers that wide streets encourage higher speeds.		
60	VC	18	<p>at end of Policy 6, add "and are prohibited over 100' (or as you see fit, see remark at 3c above)</p>		Okay, will add.	On page 18 of the VCSDP, in the last sentence under Policy 6, add "and are prohibited over 100 feet" to the end of the sentence.

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
61	VC	18	Last line of d. ..large enough to accommodate parking and handle.... A diagram depicting this situation might be useful.		This section is being revised per comments from DMD Traffic Engineering.	
62	VC	18	Page 18, Policy 5.d. Circles. The section title Circles should be changed to Modern Roundabouts to be consistent with Standard 3.6.a.iv. on page 60 of the Volcano Heights SDP. Also, the first two words Traffic circles in the first sentence should be changed to Roundabouts. Comment: Revise the section title of standard 5.d. Circles on page 18 to read Modern Roundabout. Also, the first two words traffic circles in the first sentence should be changed to Roundabouts.		Will make changes.	On page 18 of the VCSDP, amend Policy 5.d as follows: "Modern Roundabouts. Roundabouts slow traffic while offering capacities for turning movements that usually exceed conventional 4-way intersection. Roundabouts can be small enough to be placed in the middle of typical intersections, or large enough to accommodate parking and handle complex intersection geometries."
63	VC	18	Page 18, Policy 6. Local street design. The policy title Local street design should be changed to Street Cross Sections. The cross sections shown on pages 19 and 20 include arterial and collector as well as local street sections. Comment: Change the title of Policy 6 to read Street Cross Sections.		Will make Changes.	On page 18 of the VCSDP, change the title of Policy 6 from "Local street design" to "Street Cross Sections and Design."

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
64	VC	18	<p>Page 18, Policy 6. Local street design. A key map for cross section locations similar to Exhibit 13 on page 50 of the Volcano Heights SDP should be added to the Volcano Cliffs SDP to provide the location information for figures 1 through 5 on page 19 and 20.</p> <p>Comment: Add a key map for cross section locations similar to Exhibit 13 on page 50 of the Volcano Heights SDP to the Volcano Cliffs SDP.</p>		Will make changes.	<p>On page 18 of the VCSDP, insert a map that corresponds to the cross sections shown in Figures 1-5 in Policy 6. This map should show the roadway segments within the VCSDP area to which the cross sections apply. Coordinate with DMD to develop this map.</p>
65	VC	19	<p>Page 19, figures 1 through 5. Universe Blvd is classified a minor arterial as designated on the Long Range Roadway System map. None of the cross sections shown on pages 19 and 20 appear to apply to Universe. A cross section similar to figure 6 on page 53 of the Volcano Heights SDP needs to be added to the Volcano Cliffs SDP.</p> <p>Comment: Add a cross section similar to figure 6 on page 53 of the Volcano Heights SDP to the cross sections shown in the Volcano Cliffs SDP.</p>		Will add diagram.	<p>On page 19 of the VCSDP, insert a new Figure 2 cross section for Universe Blvd., a minor arterial, that is the same as Cross Section 6 in the 2010 Draft VHSDP, page 53. Renumber figures accordingly.</p>

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
66	VC	19	<p>Page 19, figures 2 through 5. The 2.5 foot curb/gutter detail should be a standard dimension that appears on all cross sections shown on pages 19 and 20. Reference figure 1 for an example of an acceptable dimensioning scheme.</p> <p>Comment: Include the 2.5 foot curb/gutter width on all cross sections shown on pages 19 and 20.</p>		Will make changes in all diagrams to show 2.5 ft curb/gutter.	On pages 19 and 20 of the VCSDP, revise Figures 1-5 to show a 2.5' curb/gutter detail on both sides of the roadway cross sections.
67	VC	19	<p>Page 19, Figure 1. Add on-street bike lanes to Cross Section 1 to ensure connectivity between the existing segments of Unser south of Atrisco and the existing segments of Unser Blvd and Rainbow Blvd north of Paradise Blvd and Paseo del Norte, respectively. This addition is consistent with the adopted Long Range Bikeway System map.</p> <p>Comment: Add on-street bike lanes to Figure 1. The bike lane detail in the cross section should be similar to that shown in Cross Sections 1 and 2 on page 51 of the Volcano Heights SDP.</p>		Will make changes.	On page 19 of the VCSDP, add on-street bike lanes to the cross-section in Figure 1 in order to ensure connectivity between the existing segments of Unser south of Atrisco and the existing segments of Unser and Rainbow north of Paradise and Paseo del Norte, respectively, and to be consistent with the adopted Long-Range Bikeway System map.
68	VC	19	<p>Make it clear that these cross sections only apply within the Plan boundaries. Figure 1 - how does this cross section compare to current Unser?</p>	It is understood that what is contained in this Plan only applies to areas within the Plan's boundaries.		

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
69	VC	20	Second line of a. i. needs a space after the "a"		Okay, will make change.	On page 20 of the VCSDP, in the second line of a.i, insert a space between "a" and "density".
70	VC	20	Many uses of "should"; see general note 5 at top of this document...ie: b.i: sidewalks shall...	Everything in this section should be "should" - this is a policy chapter, not regulatory.		
71	VC	21	e. Redundant title.		Okay, will make change.	On page 21 of the VCSDP, section "e", add a period after the title "Street Lighting."
72	VC	21	? will soils / underlying basalt support street trees?		Staff has consulted the City Forester and will amend language, if needed, per his recommendations.	Work with the City Forester to clarify/specify the appropriate conditions needed for and process to follow to ensure successful tree growth in this area.
73	VC	21	d.i: street trees shall be placed.	Everything in this section should be "should" - this is a policy chapter, not regulatory.		
74	VC	21	e.i: light standards shall not exceed...	Everything in this section should be "should" - this is a policy chapter, not regulatory.		
75	VC	21	f: obstructions shall...	Everything in this section should be "should" - this is a policy chapter, not regulatory.		
76	VC	21	ii. last sentence. Replace the 2 "shoulds" with Shall?	No, this section is "policy" not "regulatory"; therefore, "shoulds" rather than "shalls" are used.		
77	VC	22	b: porous concrete (may) (is encouraged)...	Everything in this section should be "should" - this is a policy chapter, not regulatory.		
78	VC	22	c: commercial areas shall...	Everything in this section should be "should" - this is a policy chapter, not regulatory.		
79	VC	24	Policy 1: This section would benefit from a map showing the arroyos and drainage described in the text.		Yes, will have AGIS develop a map to insert here.	On page 24 of the VCSDP, insert a new map that shows the arroyos and drainage described in the text in Policy 1.

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
80	VC	24	Should/Should clean up in Policy 1.			On page 24 of the VCSDP, in Policy 1 titled "Arroyo Corridors Shall be Conserved as Natural Drainage" delete "Shall" and insert in lieu thereof "Should".
81	VC	25	b.ii: at end add language that the trails shall be open to the public for full, continuous and unimpeded travel (in some other areas of the city, fences etc block these suddenly).		Okay to add language but with "should" rather than "shall" since this is policy section.	On page 25 of the VCSDP, at the end of b.ii., add the following sentence: "Trails should be open to the public for full, continuous and unimpeded travel."
82	VC	25	Policy 1.1: This section would benefit from typical cross-sectional diagrams showing the difference between prudent line treatment and improved naturalistic channel treatment.		Yes, will add John Kelly diagram.	On page 25 of the VCSPD, insert a diagram that shows the difference between prudent line treatment and improved naturalistic channel treatment.
83	VC	25	Policy 1.1: a: change to shall	Everything in this section should be "should" - this is a policy chapter, not regulatory.		

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
84	VC	25	<p>The North Fork of the Boca Negra Wash is probably the most significant ecological and cultural element that has not been entirely protected in the Volcano Mesa area and which could be significantly altered as development in the area occurs. Fortunately, significant reaches of the North Fork are protected through the North Geologic Window and through the State/APS land. Yet just east, premature preliminary platting on either side of the next reach of the North Fork greatly threatens it. A regularized drainage channel was assumed by the plat, however such a treatment has not been approved to date by the flood control authority. (cont. below)</p>	<p>According to Planning's legal counsel, the City cannot replat private property without the owners' consent. The options for arroyo design were developed by AMAFCA and the City Hydrologist.</p>		

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
			<p>A regularized channel would significantly downgrade the ecological/cultural/recreational resources and would be less of an amenity for adjacent land owners. A regularized channel is incongruous with the retention of the North Fork in a natural state to the west. In order to preserve the entire reach of the North Fork of the Boca Negra Wash, I would recommend the City consider a replat of the parcels directly north and south of the North Fork of the Boca Negra. There are 18 acre lots (one-third acre in size) affected on the south. There are approximately 10 lots (1/2 acre and larger) that would be affected on the north. A replat may be the best course to take to deal with this unique situation and then this area would be able to meet objectives as outlined in a potential Desert Character Overlay District.</p>			
85	VC	26	<p>Policy 1.2: The last part of the sentence should state "...are allowed as approved by the Open Space Division.</p>		Okay, will change.	<p>On page 26 of the VCSDP, amend the text under Policy 1.2 as follows: "No development should be allowed within the setbacks of the North and Middle Forks of the Boca Negra Arroyo. Trails and other open space amenities are allowed as approved by the Open Space Division and in accordance with the Rank II Facility Plan for Arroyos."</p>

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
86	VC	26	Check with John Kelly that Policy 1.1b for the North Fork is also for the Middle Fork and therefore c,d can be deleted.		Will change.	On page 26 of the VCSDP delete Policy 1.1 c. and d. In Policy 1.1b on page 25 Insert "and Middle" after "North", such that the sentence reads "developed storm flows in the North and Middle Fork of the Boca Negra Arroyo".
87	VC	26	Policy 1.5.c: consider adding per 10b above: continuous trails along every arroyo (both sides?), open to the public.		Will make sure policy is consistent with Facility Plan for Arroyos and other applicable policies/plans. See staff report.	
88	VC	26	If Appendix E is intended to be mandatory, it should be in the text, not in an appendix.		Will reformat plan to pull Appendices into a new chapter so that it's clear that they are regulatory in nature.	Reformat Appendices A-E as a new Chapter 5 titled "General Regulations". "Appendix A - Definitions" will become "General Regulation A - Definitions"; "Appendix B - Approved Colors" will become "General Regulation B - Approved Colors" etc. Amend the Table of Contents accordingly and amend all existing reference to appendices throughout the VCSDP accordingly.
89	VC	26	Policy 1.2: add walls and fences may be only 42" high abutting the arroyos, and shifts in alignment are required so as not to present a single and continuous wall. Concept from NWMEP. (or add as Policy 3.3)	NWMEP prevails (Policy 9-3, page 54: Height of walls and fences shall not exceed 6' at the edge of public or private open space.). See language on page 25. Also the NWMEP does not contain regulations re: staggering. The Facility Plan for Arroyos does, but is policy, not regulatory.		
90	VC	26	Policy 1.3 add after safety or for preservation of cultural or archaeological sites.	Open Space division staff did not agree with this change.		

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
91	VC	27	<p>Policy 3.2: Rainwater catchment systems should be utilized on all developed sites to mitigate or minimize any developed flows onto Major Public Open Space or Petroglyph National Monument. Cisterns and rainwater catchment systems should be used to supplement the City water supply and can be used for onsite irrigation needs or toilet flushing needs in commercial and industrial buildings.</p>		<p>Add a new Policy 3.4 in this Chapter. (This comment addressed in another condition)</p>	
92	VC	27	<p>I still think more needs to be done to figure out how we are going to preserve the area around the escarpment, the arroyos and rock outcroppings. This is such a unique area. We will regret not coming up with a plan that preserves these features. In the past the funding sources came from the City, State, and Federal Government. We need to look at the city gross receipts tax, impact fees and also land dedications.</p>		<p>Will add language regarding possible funding sources.</p>	<p>On page 27 of the VCSDP, add the following at the end of Policy 2: "The possible funding sources include development Impact Fees for Open Space, the City's Capital Improvement Program, City Open Space Trade Lands, State of New Mexico and U.S. Government Capital Grants."</p>

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
93	VC	27	Policies 3 and 3.1: There is no accompanying text for these sections. Under Policy 3, language guiding the design of single loaded streets and buffers between development and MPOS should be incorporated into the Plan.		Will revise this section.	<p>“On page 27 of the VCSDP, delete Policy 3, Policy 3.1, and Policy 3.2 and insert in lieu thereof the following:  Policy 3: Encourage Mitigation of Area-Wide Development Impacts on Major Public Open Space and the Monument. A sensitive neighborhood edge treatment and transition to Major Public Open Space and the Monument should be established and should address issues including shared usable open space, scenic corridors (single-loaded streets), and rainwater mitigation. Policy 3.1 Encourage shared, usable open space and park development to connect to adjacent Major Public Open Space or the Monument. Where possible, shared useable open space and/or parks should connect to Major Public Open Space or the Monument. These connections are important for preserving wildlife corridors and encouraging active living. Policy 3.2 Encourage “Scenic Corridors,” or single-loaded streets, as the preferred edge to Major Public Open Space and the Monument. Single-loaded streets abutting Major Public Open Space lands and the Monument should be added as area roads are designed, whe</p>
94	VC	28	Parking- Parks has a policy of at least providing minimal on site parking for handicap parking.		Add language to acknowledge need for on-site handicap parking.	<p>On page 28 of the VCSDP, #5 under Park Development Guidelines, amend the second sentence as follows: "On site (off-street) parking, other than required minimum handicap parking, should be incorporated..."</p>

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
95	VC	28	Policy 4.3: At civic building, add, or amenity like bandshell, gazebo, amphitheater or similar structure.		Okay to add language.	On page 28 of the VCSDP, #3 under Park Development Guidelines, add "or amenity like bandshell, gazebo, amphitheater, or similar structure" after "A civic building".
96	VC	28	under Park Development Guidelines #2. change A community Park "should" include to "could" contain multiple sports fields....		Okay, will change.	On page 28 of the VCSDP, #2 under Park Development Guidelines, in the second sentence, replace "should" with "could".
97	VC	28	Village Plaza- identify this as privately owned and maintained.		Okay, will change.	On page 28 of the VCSDP, #3 under Park Development Guidelines, add the following sentence at the end of the section: "A Village Plaza is privately owned and maintained."
98	VC	29	Trails- Identify that if a trail is not on an approved City Plan such as the Trails and Bikeways Facility Master Plan the trail will be maintained by the private developer but will be required to be built to City Standards.		Okay, will add language.	On page 29 of the VCSDP, #3 Trails, add the following sentence after the first sentence: "If a trail is not on an approved City Plan, such as the Trails and Bikeways Facility Master Plan, the trail will be maintained by the private developer but will be required to be built to City Standards."
99	VC	29	4., line 2. need space between property and that		Okay, will make change.	On page 29 of the VCSDP, in the first sentence in #4 Conservation Easement, insert a space between "property" and "that".
100	VC	29	1 Drainage: rainwater (add) and runoff modification. Add cisterns to list at last line.	Last line language per City Hydrologist.	Will add "and runoff modification."	On page 29 of the VCSDP, in #1 under Policy 5, add "and runoff modification" after "Rainwater" in the first sentence.

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
101	VC	29	Add Development Envelope to glossary.		Will add.	On page 57 of the VCSDP in Appendix A (which may become General Regulation A per a previous condition), add the following definition: "Development Envelope - the area in which buildings (including accessory structures), landscaping, construction activity, walls and fences, and recreational activities are permitted."
102	VC	29	4 Conservation Easements, 2nd paragraph, strike rarely and insert "need not". Native plants at last line: "shall"	Everything in this section should be "should" - this is a policy chapter, not regulations. The Plant List regulation is already contained in the General Standards section of the Plan.	Will change "rarely" to "need not."	On page 29 of the VCSDP, in the second paragraph under #4 Conservation Easements, change "rarely" to "need not".
103	VC	29	Policy 5 global paragraph: 4th line: Principles are methods that "must" or "shall" & strike the last line.		Will change to "should" - this is policy, not regulation. Will strike last line.	On page 29 of the VCSDP, in the second sentence in the paragraph under Policy 5, change "may" to "should". Also, delete the last sentence in that paragraph that begins "However..."
104	VC	29	5 development envelope: last line & onto next page repeats last line of 1 above.	Needs to be repeated. #1 deals with drainage in ROW, and #5 deals with rainwater on private property.		
105	VC	29	Conservation Easements: While apparently attractive as a less-than-fee-simple method of acquiring some development controls over property, conservation easements have not been used very extensively in the Bernalillo County area for anything other than agricultural land. In part, this is due to the need to have a land-managing entity, typically a non-profit, hold and administer the easement. In addition, some easements may have to be acquired for less than fee simple cost.	Open Space staff is not requesting a change, just providing comments		

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
106	VC	30	3rd line. Height limits and "see thru" capability should be mentioned here as well as later requirements sections.	Not necessary - this is a "policy" statement; specific requirements are addressed in the "regulatory" section of the Plan.		
107	VC	32	The Plan does not provide a process for special exceptions. Typically, if an applicant cannot meet the strict requirements of a sector plan, they can either request approval of "minor" amendments through the Planning Director or ZHE or more significant amendments through the EPC. I think a "relief valve" needs to be provided because it's been my experience that there are always extenuating circumstances that prevent strict compliance.		Staff agrees. Addressed in previous condition.	
108	VC	32	Add language to all plans that point the reader to the general standards after the zoning.		Will add appropriate language per comments.	See condition in staff report (Could not insert text into spreadsheet due to space limitations).
109	VC	32	Say upfront that only Chapter 4 is mandatory.	This has been addressed through the title name of each chapter ("Policies" vs. "Regulations") and is being clarified through clean-up of "should" vs. "shall" usage throughout plan.		
110	VC	33	Exhibit 6: Add Open Space lands owned or under contract in the La Cuentista subdivision area.		Okay to add Open Space lands owned. Need Open Space to provide map with these parcels. Also need to talk to Frances Pavich and make sure she's okay with this. (Addressed in another condition)	
111	VC	33	Exhibit 6 - add dark green for Monument/MPOS to the key		Will add. (Addressed in another condition)	
112	VC	33	Pg 33 should use patterns instead of colors as the plan usually gets copied in black and white		Will change. (Addressed in another condition)	

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
113	VC	33	Exhibit 6 - add a footnote that says that the area is undeveloped and roads shown on map have not been built yet	Page 1 of the Plan explains that the area, at the time of writing, is undeveloped. Exhibit 2 contains an aerial photograph that shows the undeveloped nature of the area. Page 5 also describes the undeveloped nature of the area.	Will provide updated (2010) aerial for Exhibit 2. (Addressed in another condition)	
114	VC	33	Exhibit 6 - first time you see the zoning map. Refer to Exhibit 6 earlier in the plan when talking about "Village Center" and other zoning-related matters.		Will revise.	On page 10 of the VCSDP, in the last goal on the page, add "(See Exhibit 6)" after "Neighborhood Activity Center" in the main goal statement. Similarly, on page 28 of the VCSDP, #3 Village Plaza, add "(See Exhibit 6)" after "Village Center".
115	VC	33	Exhibit 6 - move "VCMX" label in Unit 26 to the left so that it covers the orange area west of Kimmick too.		Will revise.	On page 33 of the VCSDP, revise Exhibit 6 in the following ways: 1) move the "VCMX" label at Kimmick & Paseo del Norte to the left so that it covers the orange area west of Kimmick, too; 2) change color coding to patterns that can be read in black and white; 3) add coding and labels for Major Public Open Space, Petroglyph National Monument, and Boca Negra Dam/Park; 4) add Major Public Open Space lands owned or under contract in the La Cuentista subdivision area per map provided by City Open Space division.
116	VC	33	label La Cuentista. Describe any special exceptions for it.	Description on page 32 is sufficient.		
117	VC	33	Explain in the staff report how zoning boundaries were decided. How were the boundaries of the zones arrived at?	Boundaries follow lot lines. Zones are "tiered" to create buffers between more intense and less intense zones. Will be explained in staff report.		

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
118	VC	33	<p>The original Volcano Cliffs Master Plan designated only 3 commercial centers and no strip commercial zoning for a 5 square mile area. The main one was to be at Atrisco (now Unser) and Montano. That area is already built out with residential, so now we are down to 2 commercial areas. These are about a mile apart as shown on the VOLCANO CLIFFS SECTOR DEVELOPMENT PLAN, JULY, 2010 presently under consideration. Because it is adjacent to Paseo Del Norte, the Unit 26 site would probably be built first. For the success of the entire Plan area, it is important that this commercial area be given its best chance for success: good access, the right zoning, and early development through the SAD process.</p>	<p>The UR zone in Unit 26 is designed to be a transition zone between MX and LL. Staff does not support changing the zoning from UR to MX. The existing zoning in this area is R-1, and a rezoning to UR represents a significant up zoning that is an appropriate level of development intensity. See Comp Plan: II.B.7.Policy f.</p>		
119	VC	33	<p>All of Unit 26, except for the small lots at the east end, should be zoned MX. That would give enough commercial to make this a viable center. IF it is a thriving commercial center, drivers will be taking a short cut at the right-in and right-out points through the UR zone at the west end. The residents there will not like that. They will move to have those points blocked, which will hinder the success of the commercial center</p>	<p>The UR zone in Unit 26 is designed to be a transition zone between MX and LL. Staff does not support changing the zoning from UR to MX. The existing zoning in this area is R-1, and a rezoning to UR represents a significant up zoning that is an appropriate level of development intensity. Furthermore, there are multiple, viable access points to the MX zoned area; Kimmick is the most direct route. Comp Plan: II.B.7.Policy f</p>		

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
120	VC	34	Mixed-Use Requirement #4 - is the Planning Director allowed to do that or does it violate the variance issue?		Change "10,000 sqft" to "1/2 acre" and delete last sentence of Mixed Use Req. #4.	On page 34 of the VCSDP, in the section called "Mixed-Use Requirement," delete "10,000 sqft" and insert in lieu thereof "1/2 acre". Also, delete the last sentence of #4 in this section.
121	VC	34	Densities: suggest strike max FAR; see general note 2		Ok to remove max FAR as height limitations will already restrict density.	On page 34 of the VCSDP, in the section called "Development Densities" delete "1.5 FAR" after "2. Maximum" and insert in lieu thereof "None".
122	VC	34	Permitted uses: consider prohibiting drive-in / drive-up at village center, like at other plans under consideration.	Drive-Ups are allowed in the C-1 zone for banks only. Staff thinks this use should remain permissive. Drive-Ups are allowed in the SU-1/MX zone but must comply with strict design regulations that would place the drive-up window at the rear of the property.	Staff agrees with regard to adding explicit prohibition of Drive-Ins.	On page 34 of the VCSDP, in the section called "Permitted Uses," add a new exception #3 as follows and relabel subsections accordingly: "3. Drive-in restaurants are prohibited."
123	VC	34	Add (VCVC) at the top.		Will add.	On page 34 of VCSDP at the header for the zone after "SU-2 Volcano Cliffs/VC" add "(VCVC)".
124	VC	34	Mixed use: Residential, suggest range of 20% min, 60% max.		Will revise to increase maximum to 30%. No minimum b/c want to allow 100% commercial development if desired.	On page 34 of the VCSDP, in the section called "Mixed-Use Requirement," change #2 Residential to "maximum 30% of total development square footage."
125	VC	34	Development Densities #4 - need to explain more clearly what "c" means, either in a footnote or text leading up to this; may want an illustration that shows what this means.	Code Enforcement staff understands what "gross developable area" means and does not feel that further explanation is necessary.		
126	VC	34	Development Process., 1. Why the DRB and not the EPC?	Because the regulations of the VC zone are already so prescriptive that site plan review by the EPC is not necessary.		

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
127	VC	34	Development process 1: 5 ac or greater I believe go to EPC city wide; this should be maintained.	The VCVC zone sets forth specific standards for building placement, articulation, landscaping, parking, and a maximum height of 35'. Staff does not feel that it is necessary for EPC to review a site plan for development in this zone since such prescriptive standards are already set forth. For any development proposal that would deviate by more than 10% from the prescriptive dimensional standards, EPC would have review authority.		
128	VC	34	Usable open space, after 1.a add: "plus" to make it clear it's both, not either-or.	This is already understood.		
129	VC	34	Development Process - don't agree with cutting EPC out of process. Don't know if it should hinge on 5 acres or more.	The zones in the VC set forth specific standards for building placement, articulation, landscaping, parking, and heights'. Staff does not feel that it is necessary for EPC to review individual development proposals that conform to the prescriptive standards that are set forth. For any development proposal that would deviate by more than 10% from the prescriptive dimensional standards, EPC would have review authority.		
130	VC	34	Pg 34 MU regs1 and 2 are contradictory	Staff does not believe there is a contradiction. Mixed-use reg.1 says minimum 40% commercial; reg.2 says maximum 20% residential. Other uses can make up the other 40%, or commercial can be increased to 80%.		
131	VC	34	Pg 34 usable open space number are very low compared to the Zoning Code 140 square feet verses 200 for an efficiency 250 for 2 bed room and 300 for 3 bedroom	This zone is intended to be an urban, higher-density zone that is more intensely developed. The MINIMUM amount of open space that has to be provided per unit is 140 sqft, 60 as private and 80 as shared.		
132	VC	35	and screened equipment is written twice on number 3		Change. (Addressed in another condition)	

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
133	VC	35	Parking: add item c: Non residential: code maximum plus 15% maximum.		Will add 1.c to say "Non-residential: Zoning Code minimum plus 10% maximum."	On page 35 of the VCSDP, amend the "Parking" section as follows: 1.b. "Non-residential minimum: 1/1000 sqft gross". Add 1.c. "Non-residential maximum: Zoning Code minimum plus 10%"
134	VC	35	Landscape requirements, reference Zoning Code for Plan section number 1 and 3		Will add citation.	On page 35 of the VCSDP, in the "Landscape Requirements" section, add a citation of the Zoning Code section number to subsections 1 and 3 that reference the Zoning Code.
135	VC	35	Add reference to Plant List A		Will add.	On page 35 of the VCSDP in the "Landscape Requirements" section #2 after "Plants shall be from" add "Plant List A and". Delete "See p. 55." and insert in lieu thereof "See General Standards for more information".
136	VC	35	Frontage, 3. last line and each future appearance. projections shall be a minimum of 8 feet above finish grade.		Will make change.	On page 35 of the VCSDP, in the section called "Setback and Frontage" amend the last sentence in #3 to read: "Over sidewalks, projections shall be a minimum of 8 feet above finish grade."
137	VC	35	Height. 3. Screened equipment may extend 10 feet beyond height limits. This seems a bit extensive. If change, do it all sections		Yes, this does seem excessive. Proposed change: change "screened equipment" to "elevator shaft" and reduce "screened equipment" height extension to 6'.	On page 35 of the VCSDP, in the section called "Height" amend #3 as follows: "3. Chimneys, cupolas, flagpoles, and elevator shafts may extend 10 feet beyond height limits. Screened equipment may extend 6 feet beyond height limits and shall be set back 15' from the facade."
138	VC	35	Height: 3: add clarification that screening for equipment must be set back from façade (ie:15') to prevent abuse = gaining height.		Yes, will make suggested change. (This is being addressed through another condition.)	

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
139	VC	35	Pg 35 no street side setbacks create potential traffic safety issues	If the concern is about maintaining a clear sight triangle, this will be achieved through sidewalk widths providing a buffer between building facades and the street. Also, the clear sight triangle provision of the Code of Ordinances (Section 8-2-2-15) still applies.		
140	VC	35	4. Should also allow 3 foot "decorative see thru wall"	Walls and fences are regulated in the "Landscape Requirements" section of this zone, which can be found later on the same page.		
141	VC	35	Setbacks - difference between 3 and 4?	#3 deals with encroachments into public/private ROW (i.e., the area beyond the property line). #4 deals with encroachments into the private front setback (i.e., the area between the property line and the building façade).		
142	VC	35	Setbacks - are there supposed to be maximums for side and rear?	No.		
143	VC	36	Add (VCMX) at the top		Will add.	On page 36 of VCSDP at the header for the zone after "SU-2 Volcano Cliffs/MX" add "(VCMX)".
144	VC	36	residential Density. No minimum density. Does that mean you could have 1 du/acre?	Single-Family Detached Development is prohibited in the VCMX zone.	Yes, agree we should add a minimum residential density to the MX zone of 8 du/acre.	On page 36 of the VCSDP, in the section called "Development Densities", change #4.a to "Minimum: 8 du/acre".

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
145	VC	37	SU-2 MX Building Height Restrictions: Buildings are allowed to attain a maximum of 35 feet for half of the footprint; the area within the Northwest Mesa Escarpment Plan (NMEP) View Area should be indicated on any maps or diagrams. It is Open Space Division's understanding throughout this and other associated draft plans that, in cases of any conflicting permissible heights, the NMEP height regulations would prevail. See comment below regarding page 48, General Design Standard Policy 2A.	The height restrictions of the SU-2/VCMX zone conform to the restrictions of the NWMEP. The "View" area of the NWMEP has a 40' height limit, and the max height allowed in any zone in the VC is 35'. In the VC and VTSDP, yes, NWMEP height restrictions prevail. However, in the VH, additional height allowances are proposed in support of the MAC designation; in the case of the VH, the NWMEP heights would NOT prevail over the VH.	Will add "Appendix E" from the VH which shows areas designated "Conservation," "Impact," and "View" per the NWMEP.	On page 46 of the VCSDP, insert the map contained in Appendix E of the 2010 Draft Volcano Heights SDP that shows the Northwest Mesa Escarpment Plan and Volcano Mesa boundaries as an Exhibit and renumber subsequent Exhibits accordingly.
146	VC	37	Pg 37 usable open space- see previous comment. Parking is 1/5th Zoning Code Landscape see previous comment	This zone is intended to be an urban, higher-density zone that is more intensely developed. The MINIMUM amount of open space that has to be provided per unit is 140 sqft, 60 as private and 80 as shared. Re: parking - these are minimums. More off-street parking can be provided if the development demands it.	Will add.	On page 37 of the VCSDP, in the "Landscape Requirements" section, add a citation of the Zoning Code section number in subsection 1 that refers to "city standard".
147	VC	37	Add reference to Plant List A		Will add.	On page 37 of the VCSDP in the "Landscape Requirements" section #2 after "Plants shall be from" add "Plant List A and". Delete "See p. 55." and insert in lieu thereof "See General Standards for more information".
148	VC	37	Frontage, 3. last line and each future appearance. projections shall be a minimum of 8 feet above finish grade.		Will make change.	On page 37 of the VCSDP, in the section called "Setback and Frontage" amend the last sentence in #3 to read: "Over sidewalks, projections shall be a minimum of 8 feet above finish grade."

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
149	VC	37	Same comment as P 35 re projections, front walls, and screened equipment.		Yes, this does seem excessive. Proposed change: change "screened equipment" to "elevator shaft" and reduce "screened equipment" height extension to 6'. (Addressed in another condition)	
150	VC	37	Should UR have a minimum density?	Yes UR needs to have a minimum density as this is intended to be an urban, higher density zone that is more intensely developed.		
151	VC	37	Articulation. Might want to add, if long expanse, articulation is required a minimum of every 40-50 feet	The intent of this regulation is to provide general guidance and standards but still allow flexibility and not be overly prescriptive.		
152	VC	37	Why no lot sizes for MX zone?	Lots in the MX zone are already platted, whereas the VCVC zone contains a large, unplatted lot for which limits are needed.		
153	VC	38	intent statement "urban residential areas provides" -- take off an extra s		Change.	In VCSDP on page 38 where it reads "SU-2 UR. Urban Residential" in the first sentence remove the 's' from "areas" so that it reads "Urban Residential area provides for a variety of urban housing types within a network of livable..."
154	VC	38	Add (VCUR) at the top		Will add.	On page 38 of VCSDP at the header for the zone after "SU-2 Volcano Cliffs/UR" add "(VCUR)".
155	VC	38	Pg 38 setbacks and frontage 1)d iii 8 foot setback may not leave proper backing distance.	Garages at the rear would only be possible with alley access; therefore, no setback is needed.		
156	VC	38	Parking. Is there a Max per unit?	No, a maximum parking allowance is not contemplated for the VCSDP.		
157	VC	39	Pg 39 height no minimum necessary. Landscape see first comment		Will add.	On page 39 of the VCSDP, in the "Landscape Requirements" section, add a citation of the Zoning Code section number.

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
158	VC	39	Add reference to Plant List A		Will add.	On page 39 of the VCSDP in the "Landscape Requirements" section #1 after "Plants shall be from" add "Plant List A and". Delete "See p. 55." and insert in lieu thereof "See General Standards for more information".
159	VC	39	Su-2 LC with R-1 parking of 1/ unit is low 2 would help prevent front yard parking. Possibly one per bedroom?	Parking requirement is a minimum. More off-street parking can be provided if desired by the owner/developer. The front-yard parking regulation of the ZC still applies (i.e., 14-16-2-6(F))		
160	VC	40	Also on page 40 there are the Setback and Frontage restrictions which are fine in general. However, for odd-size lots such as my own (has a narrow curb-side). In order to maintain the front setback maximum and the side setback minimums this could be an issue		Another condition addresses the process for requesting a deviation from dimensional standards. Minor (less than 10%): Planning Director. Major (10-20%): EPC.	
161	VC	40	Is there any possibility to get verbiage in the development plan to have an exception clause where a modified setback plan could be presented to the city for building plan approval with modified setbacks?		Another condition addresses the process for requesting a deviation from dimensional standards. Minor (less than 10%): Planning Director. Major (10-20%): EPC.	

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
162	VC	40	biggest concern was the verbiage on page 40 stating that multiple single family houses are permitted on a single lot. As an owner my concern would be that this will devalue other properties including my own with the thought that larger homes would be built on these larger size lots. I believe the development densities section on this page also states something similar with a "Maximum of 6 du / acre.		Delete #2 ("Multiple single family...") under Permitted Uses, VC, Page 40, LL zone	On page 40 of VCSDP under "Permitted Uses" delete subsection 2 "Multiple single family houses are permitted on a single lot" and renumber subsection 3 accordingly.
163	VC	40	Add (VCLL) at the top		Will add.	On page 40 of VCSDP at the header for the zone after "SU-2 Volcano Cliffs/LL" add "(VCLL)".
164	VC	40	Density. max 6du/ac yields 7000 sq ft/ lot. With open space, garage, porch etc, house footprint is good sized but not huge	Thank you for the comment		
165	VC	40	parking. 1/unit. Assuming 2 adults and 2 working children, all working in different parts of town. This won't compute	Off-street parking requirement is a MINIMUM. More parking can permissively be provided.		
166	VC	40	SU-2 Large Lot: As a general comment, it would seem that the designation "Large Lot" is somewhat of a misnomer, as there are lots of the same relatively small size in the SU-2 MX (Neighborhood Mixed Use) and the SU-2 VCUR (Urban Residential) zones as well	These lots are larger than typical R-1 lots.		
167	VC	41	#3 list zoning code section		Can make change.	On page 41 of the VCSDP, in the "Landscape Requirements" section, add a citation of the Zoning Code section number to subsection 3 that reference the Zoning Code.

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
168	VC	41	SU-22 LL Landscape Requirements: This section should utilize the text found later at page 53, rather than refer to the Zone Code.	The standards on page 53 already apply.	Landscape Requirement 3 should read "Heights per the City of Albuquerque Zoning Code."	On page 41 of the VCSDP in the "Landscape Requirements" section, subsection 3, insert "Heights" after the title "Walls and Fences" so that the sentence now reads "Walls and Fences: Heights per the City of Albuquerque Zoning Code".
169	VC	41	SU-2 LL Building Height Restrictions: Buildings are allowed to attain a maximum of 26 feet for half of the footprint; the area within the Northwest Mesa Escarpment Plan (NMEP) View Area should be indicated on any maps or diagrams. It is Open Space Division's understanding throughout this and other associated draft plans that, in cases of any conflicting permissible heights, the NMEP height regulations would prevail. See comment below regarding page 48, General Design Standard Policy 2A.	The height restrictions of the SU-2/VCLL zone conform to the restrictions of the NWMEP. The "View" area of the NWMEP has a 40' height limit, and the max height allowed in any zone in the VC is 35'.	Will add Appendix E from VHSDP that shows View, Impact, and Conservation areas to the General Standards section of the VCSDP. (Addressed in another condition)	
170	VC	41	Add reference to Plant List A		Will add.	On page 41 of the VCSDP in the "Landscape Requirements" section #2 in the second sentence after "are to be species and varieties from" add "Plant List A and". Delete "See p. 55." and insert in lieu thereof "See General Standards for more information".
171	VC	41	LL zone - add requirement for landscape plan for front yard to be submitted with building permit application		Will change.	On page 41 of the VCSDP, Landscape Requirements, add a new subsection 5 as follows: "5. A landscape plan for the front yard, meeting these Landscape Requirements and the General Standards, shall be submitted with building permit applications."

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
172	VC	41	3. See General Development Standards for additional articulation requirements.		Yes, need to change "addition" to "additional"	On page 41 of the VCSDP in the "Building Articulation" section, subsection 3, delete "addition" and insert in lieu thereof "additional".
173	VC	41	Pg 45 no landscaping requirement in residential	Should this be page 41 - VCLL zone? E156		
174	VC	42	2 list PCD section		Addressed in another condition.	
175	VC	42	in the intent statement of RR "encouraged to conserve" there is no space		Change.	On page 42 of the VCSDP, under heading SU-2/RR. Rural Residential, in the second sentence of italicized text, insert a space between "to" and "conserve".
176	VC	42	Where is the PCD in the Zoning Code? Drop a citation.		Need to revise this section to clarify PCD process and to create exception for lots under 1 acre platted prior to Plan adoption.	On page 42 of the VCSDP, Development Densities, 2. Maximum, replace with the following: "2. Maximum: 1 du/gross acre. 3. Maximum if developed as a clustered, Private Commons Development (PCD): 3 du/gross acre. Minimum lot size for PCD: 1 acre. Process and standards are as outlined in Zoning Code Section 14-16-3-16. 4. Lots less than 1 gross acre, platted prior to adoption of this plan may have 1 dwelling unit, regardless of size, but must be developed as per the RR zone regulations and the General Standards.  On page 42 of the VCSDP, Setback and Frontages, 1. Building setbacks: Delete b. and d. (PCD/Cluster setbacks)
177	VC	42	For every zone, at the top, add in parentheses the acronym for the zone (e.g., "VCVC")		Will add.	On page 42 of VCSDP at the header for the zone after "SU-2 Volcano Cliffs/RR" add "(VCRR)".

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
178	VC	43	SU-2 RR Building Height Restrictions: Buildings are allowed to attain a maximum of 26 feet for half of the footprint; the area within the Northwest Mesa Escarpment Plan (NMEP) View Area should be indicated on any maps or diagrams. It is Open Space Division's understanding throughout this and other associated draft plans that, in cases of any conflicting permissible heights, the NMEP height regulations would prevail. See comment below regarding page 48, General Design Standard Policy 2A.	The height restrictions of the SU-2/VCRR zone conform to the restrictions of the NWMEP. Exhibit 7 on page 47 of the VCSDP shows which lots are regulated by the 15' height limitation.	Will add Appendix E from VHSDP that shows View, Impact, and Conservation areas to the General Standards section of the VCSDP. (Addressed in another condition)	
179	VC	43	Add reference to Plant List A		Will add.	On page 43 of the VCSDP in the "Landscape Requirements" section #2 in the second sentence after "are to be species and varieties from" add "Plant List A and". Delete "See p. 55." and insert in lieu thereof "See General Standards for more information".
180	VC	43	RR zone - add requirement for landscape plan for front yard to be submitted with building permit application		Will change.	On page 43 of the VCSDP, Landscape Requirements, add a new subsection 5 as follows: "5. A landscape plan for the front yard, meeting these Landscape Requirements and the General Standards, shall be submitted with building permit applications."
181	VC	43	no landscape requirements	Should this be page 43 - VCRR zone? This Plan specifically intends to require a certain amount of landscaping for all properties, including single-family residential.		

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
182	VC	45	Unless the Northwest Mesa Escarpment Plan is going to be rewritten where this plan over laps colors must match what is written in the NWMEP including the requirements to go to EPC regarding development etc	The NWMEP is a Rank III plan, which is what the VCSDP is. The VCSDP does not have to "comply" with the NWMEP. It can set forth differing standards/processes from the NWMEP. With regard to the color requirements in the VCSDP, they are intended to prevail over the NWMEP's less clearly articulated approved colors for building.		
183	VC	46	Clean up language on VCSDP pg 46 where we quote the NWMEP		Change.	On page 46 of the VCSDP, amend section 2. Setbacks from the Escarpment Face as follows: "No structure shall be placed within 50 feet of the top of the base of the escarpment face, except fences shall be allowed at a distance of greater than 30 feet of the escarpment face. No irrigation systems, construction or alteration of the natural terrain shall occur within 50 feet of the top or base of the escarpment face. Any construction within the setback area shall be certified geotechnically sound by the City Engineer, so as not to cause a threat to the public safety."
184	VC	46	Change "Policy" to "Standard"		Will change.	On page 46 of the VCSDP, change "Policy 1" to "Standard 1".
185	VC	46	BOLD "Height restrictions"		Will revise.	On page 46 of the VCSDP, Policy 1.A.1, make the section title "1. Height restrictions for areas within 200 feet of the Escarpment Face" bold.

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
186	VC	46	Policy 1: Add the phrase "Major Public Open Space" following Petroglyph National Monument to both paragraphs under (A). Following 1., "height restrictions for areas within 200 of the escarpment face," there should be a new 2. that describes NMEP View Area regulations. Also regarding #2. Setbacks from the Escarpment Face: Make sure that these "setback" numbers (feet) coincide with the NMEP (starting on page 44).	Not all of the VC is within the "View" area - some areas are within the Conservation and Impact areas. The General Standards section of the VC applies "to all development" and, therefore, including language specific to the "View" area of the NWMEP would be inconsistent with the intent of the "General Standards." Furthermore, it is not standard to cite verbatim other Rank III plans within a Rank III plan; amendment of one will require amendment of the other. Yes, the setback numbers are the same as those in the NWMEP.	Yes, will add "MPOS" after "PNM".	On page 46 of the VCSDP, Policy 1.A, add "Major Public Open Space" after "Petroglyph National Monument" in the first sentence.
187	VC	47	Exhibit 7: The map key needs to be redone. Add two shades of green to the key (Petroglyph National Monument and 9% slope/escarpment face). Add NMEP View Area; delete Albuquerque city limit.		Will add the two shades of green and remove the Albuquerque City Limit. See new Appendix E. (Addressed in other conditions)	
188	VC	47	Exhibit 7 - remove city limit from legend		Will revise	On page 47 of the VCSDP, remove "Albuquerque City Limit" from the legend.
189	VC	47	add two (three?) tones of green to index & explain		Will revise.	On page 47 of the VCSDP, amend the legend in Exhibit 7 and provide labels that describe the three different shades of green in the map: darkest green is the Monument; middle shade of green is the Boca Negra Dam/Park; lightest shade of green is the Escarpment Face.
190	VC	47	(EPC)Need clarification and possible revision of the map on pg 47. Does the black line indicate that those properties are within the Monument Boundary?	The black line on this map, as explained on pg 46, is intended to show which lots are within 200 ft of the Escarpment Face and therefore restricted to a height limitation of 15 feet.		

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
191	VC	47	clarify whether this mapping vs. NWMEP controls w/ respect to escarpment buffer. (I suggest NWMEP).	This map was developed per the NWMEP regulation regarding the escarpment face. The NWMEP does not contain such a map. The intent of this map is to illustrate the NWMEP reg.		
192	VC	48	Suggest delete last sentence requiring matching flashing; a contrasting color trim can be good accent (see p38, item a).		Agree. Will delete.	On page 48 of the VCSDP, delete the last sentence from Policy 2.B.3 that reads "Flashing shall match roof or building color."
193	VC	48	Building design standards: add concrete, add rammed earth. After brick coping, add tile & similar durable trims. At Plain Block, allow it for up to (?40%?) of the wall, and be sure to allow honed, sandblasted, and other colored block.	Rammed earth is not usually an exterior finish. Trim finishes are encouraged but not exclusive of any particular material.	Need to revise.	On page 48 of the VCSDP, amend the first part of Policy 2.B.1 as follows: "Wall finishes are encouraged to be stucco, masonry, adobe, native stacked stone (or synthetic equivalent). Plain block, wood, and reflective panels shall not be used as an exterior finish..."
194	VC	48	Policy 2A: This statement, "Where the Volcano Cliffs Sector Development Plan and the Northwest Mesa Escarpment Plan conflict, the more restrictive regulation applies" should be repeated in every relevant preceding section! It would be useful to include the map provided as Appendix E (page 72) of the draft Volcano Heights Sector Development Plan to illustrate the NWMEP Impact and View areas.	These are general standards that apply to every zone. Not necessary to repeat.	Will add "Appendix E" from the VH which shows areas designated "Conservation," "Impact," and "View" per the NWMEP. (Addressed in another condition)	
195	VC	48	Change "Policy" to "Standard"		Will change	On page 48 of the VCSDP, change "Policy 2" to "Standard 2".
196	VC	48	Move subsection 8 "Color" to after subsection 3 "Roofs".		Will change.	On page 49 of the VCSDP under Policy 2 section B, change subsection "Color" from number 8 to number 4. Change subsequent subsection numbering accordingly.

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
197	VC	48	"Any construction within the setback..." - but earlier in that section you say "No structures..." within the setback. Need to clarify this.		Will delete "Fences shall not be allowed within 30 feet of the escarpment face." (Addressed in another condition)	
198	VC	48	Policy 1.3 Arroyo setbacks: add requirement for small walls to arroyos (see my comment 11)		Will make sure regulation is consistent with Facility Plan for Arroyos and other applicable policies/plans. Addressed in staff report.	
199	VC	48	Policy 2. B. 3rd line. What does materials shall extend around exterior corners at least 1 foot, mean??	This is to provide visual continuity around corners.		
200	VC	48	Massing and Articulation. Suggest 60 feet be changed to 40 or 50 feet.	Staff thinks 60' is appropriate. The General Building Design Standards for non-residential in the ZC only requires articulation every 100'.		
201	VC	48	Policy 2 General Design Standards: However, regional styles of architecture are not encouraged (conflicts with earlier general statements; see for example pages 3, 6, 9, and 10)—only trims and exterior finishes. Are pitched roofs discouraged except those on Northern New Mexico style buildings ?	Previous language is policy. This plan does not wish to regulate architectural style, only encourage.		
202	VC	48	Roofs: EPC has repeatedly wrestled with "reflective" language: are all metal roofs prohibited? Dull finish galvanized ("bare metal" look OK or not? Green, blue, red metal OK or not?). Consider coordination with NWMEP and Dep't recommendations.	Metal roofs are not prohibited; reflectivity is regulated, as is color. Green, blue, and red are not permitted exterior finish colors in the Volcano Plans. Regarding relationship to / coordination with NWMEP, the approved colors in the Volcano Plans supplant the outdated color list in the NWMEP, Appendix E.		

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
203	VC	48	3. area agreed upon- by whom and prudent line- see page?	AMAFCA and the property owners would be the parties who need to agree upon the prudent line.		
204	VC	48	Policy 2.A conflicts with plans see previous comment	This language is designed to generally address potential conflicts between the two plans and how they are to be resolved without having to identify individual conflict points. Conflicts, if they exist, could vary on a lot-by-lot basis.		
205	VC	49	4: Garages should not exceed (insert %). Consider a table like other two plans.		Need to revise. See revised Garage reg in VH and VTSDP. (Addressed in another condition)	
206	VC	49	7. Title is redundant		Okay, will make change.	On page 49 of the VCSDP, section #7. Entrances, Porches, Stoops & Vestibules, delete the redundant section heading.
207	VC	49	Pg 49 Garages shall not exceed the residential façade in width?		This section is being revised to include the table from the VHSDP/VTSDP with regard to residential garages and their allowable widths.	On page 49 of the VCSDP, delete section #4. Residential Garages and insert in lieu thereof the following: "4. Residential Garages. Garages shall not dominate the front façade. Street fronting garages shall be per the requirements of Table 1. Garages shall not exceed 50% of the total front facade. Three-car garages are not permitted on lots less than 50 feet wide. Three-car garages on lots greater than 50 feet wide shall have third garage set back a minimum of 3 feet from the primary garage facade. See Table 1 for additional garage requirements." Insert Table 3 and Garage Type Diagrams found on pages 38-39 of the 2010 Draft VHSDP.

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
208	VC	49	define veranda stoop etc		Will add.	In the "Definitions" section of the VCSDP, add the following definitions: "Stoop: A stoop is a frontage with the first story elevated from the sidewalk sufficiently to secure privacy for the windows. The entrance is an exterior stair and landing and may be covered by an overhang, awning or canopy. The stair may be perpendicular or parallel to the sidewalk. This type of frontage is recommended for residential uses and when used for commercial uses shall be accompanied by a ramp. Per a City Encroachment Agreement, a stoop may encroach into the R.O.W. when the facade is placed at the edge of the pedestrian realm." and "Veranda: A roofed, open gallery or balcony extending along the outside of a building and which is designed for outdoor living."
209	VC	49	Residential Entry doors, revise to permit a front porch with a front door at 90o to the porch, slightly more private but still "towards" the street.		Will revise per suggestion.	On page 49 of the VCSDP, revise #5 Residential Entry Doors by adding "or at 90 degrees to a front porch" to the end of the sentence.
210	VC	49	Regulating window depth on several thousand homes? Not going to work	This, along with all of the other regulations in the plan, will be reviewed during the building permit process.		
211	VC	49	Windows: change 1-1/2" setback to 3"; the 1-1/2" dimension allows windows to be essentially "pasted on" the façade, rather than slightly recessed as is the planning intention here.	The dimension given is a minimum.		
212	VC	49	Color, last line, add "or material".	This is already understood.		

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
213	VC	49	any color?	Yes. In fact, the NWMEP allows up to 20%, so the VC is more restrictive and will prevail.		
214	VC	50	Energy efficient buildings: Last bullet p 51, consider adding geothermal heating & cooling.		Okay to add.	On page 50 of the VCSDP, add another bullet to the list in section #12. Energy-Efficient Buildings as follows: "geothermal heating and cooling;"
215	VC	50	Energy efficient buildings: First bullet change out fluorescent for "low energy consumptive lighting for at least 80% of fixtures. There are LEDs and others which use low energy. Also, a single fluorescent strip (say under a countertop) would qualify a building under the current wording.		Will revise.	On page 50 of the VCSDP, delete "fluorescent lighting" from the bulleted list in section #12. Energy-Efficient Buildings and insert in lieu thereof "low-energy consumptive lighting for at least 80% of fixtures".
216	VC	50	Energy efficient buildings: Bullets 4 & 5, after Passive, add in "or Active"		Will revise.	On page 50 of the VCSDP, section #12. Energy-Efficient Buildings, add "or active" after "passive" in the 5th and 6th bullets on the list.
217	VC	50	Energy efficient buildings: Strike natural cross-ventilation; any building with operable windows could be said to qualify.		Yes, delete.	On page 50 of the VCSDP, delete "natural cross ventilation" from the bulleted list in section #12. Energy-Efficient Buildings.
218	VC	50	c. electronic display panels not signs. Also commercial signs how does this relate to the zone code-are they supplementary/	These regulations would be in place of the standard ZC regs for commercial signage. These regs have been tailored to the special conditions of the Volcano Cliffs area. The recently-completed Electronic Signs Task Force has recommended referring to these signs as "signs" rather than "panels."		

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
219	VC	50	Pg 50 limiting letter height on signs will be an issue for merchants and they will want variances.	Letter heights on signs are restricted in other plans (La Cueva, for example, limits lettering on building-mounted signs to 24") and there is a process via which an exception can be requested. This regulation supports one of the "Guiding Principles" of the Plan - "Ensure good quality development" (p.3) - and ensures appropriately-scaled signage that is compatible with the neighborhood-serving commercial/retail areas for the Plan.		
220	VC	51	2) contradictory to plan 1/1000 (parking structures?)		13.2.i should be deleted. (Addressed in another condition)	
221	VC	51	cite zone code on off street, are there conflicts with the zone code?		Need to delete 13.2.i, since each zone specifies parking requirements. (Addressed in another condition)	
222	VC	51	should or shall on dimensions, relationship to zone code?		Need to make dimensions consistent with ZC. (Addressed in another condition)	
223	VC	51	parking 1300 feet is a long way for a senior reduce this? Off street parking guidelines replace with requirements	Staff thinks the existing language is fine. Parking reductions are commonly used in areas near transit facilities and walkable urban neighborhoods. The reductions are not mandatory.	Will replace "guidelines" with "requirements".	On page 51 of the VCSDP, amend the heading of section 13.2 by replacing "guidelines" with "requirements" and deleting the sentence "The following Off-Street parking guidelines are adopted." Also, delete section 13.2.i in its entirety and renumber subsequent sections accordingly.
224	VC	51	Parking space size req'ts (ie 9') exceed City Zone Code.		Will revise to be consistent with ZC.	On page 51 of the VCSDP, delete all of the text after 13.2.iii. Parking Dimensions - On-Site and insert in lieu thereof, "Per the Zoning Code definition for "Parking Space, Automobile and Light Truck."
225	VC	51	13.2.i: add that parking for non-residential uses may not exceed 115% of Zone Code req'ts	Section 13.2.i is being deleted per another condition.		

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
226	VC	51	iii should not be allowed to overhang landscaping	This section has been revised to be per the Zoning Code.		
227	VC	51	Second bullet, top of page. The visual and acoustic impact of wind and/or photovoltaic generation is horrendous. Can you imagine the visual impact from the Petroglyphs? As obvious from the community opposition in N. NM, this is not popular. Similar and significant opposition exists in England.	This is not required; it is one of many options. If one were to choose to include photovoltaics or wind generation in their development, the equipment would still have to comply with height and other limiting regulations.		
228	VC	51	Parking. 1. iv. 1300 feet to a transit stop is four football fields, or 1/4 mile. I would imagine Seniors would not be able to do so	Staff thinks the existing language is fine. Parking reductions are commonly used in areas near transit facilities and walkable urban neighborhoods. The reductions are not mandatory.		
229	VC	51	wind generation	This is not required; it is one of many options. If one were to choose to include photovoltaics or wind generation in their development, the equipment would still have to comply with height and other limiting regulations.		
230	VC	51	Pg 51 13) 1. a 5000 square foot building with on 5 parking spaces required and 20% reduction = 4 spaces? Family Dollar with 4 parking spaces. There are more employees than parking spaces.	The parking requirement is a MINIMUM. More off-street parking can be provided. The reduction is not a requirement but "may be taken." The intent of the lower parking requirement is to allow flexibility for the many different uses that may develop in the area over time and to not require this sensitive area to be over-parked.		

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
231	VC	51	2 same thing	The parking requirement is a MINIMUM. More off-street parking can be provided. The reduction is not a requirement but "may be taken." The intent of the lower parking requirement is to allow flexibility for the many different uses that may develop in the area over time and to not require this sensitive area to be over-parked.		
232	VC	51	3 parking reduction for reduced parking is redundant potentially 30% reduction for parking that is already 1/5th of Zoning Code.	The parking requirement is a MINIMUM. More off-street parking can be provided. The reduction is not a requirement but "may be taken." The intent of the lower parking requirement is to allow flexibility for the many different uses that may develop in the area over time and to not require this sensitive area to be over-parked.		
233	VC	52	pg 52 iv city forester states code required 36 square feet is too small to support a tree 5x5 is on 25 square feet		Agree, this should be increased to 6x6 or minimum 36 sqft.	On page 52 of the VCSDP, section 13.2.iv, delete "approximately 5 feet x 5 feet" and insert in lieu thereof "a minimum of 6 feet x 6 feet or a minimum of 36 square feet total".
234	VC	52	iv. 3rd line from top. I would suggest changing 260 ft to maybe 150 feet?		Change last sentence in 13.2. iv. (Page 52) to: "Parking areas shall be visually and functionally segmented into smaller subareas separated by pedestrian walkways with adjacent landscaping, including shade trees planted at a minimum of 30' on-center. No single subarea shall exceed 150 parking spaces."	On page 52 of the VCSDP, delete the last sentence in section 13.2.iv and insert in lieu thereof "Parking areas shall be visually and functionally segmented into smaller subareas separated by pedestrian walkways with adjacent landscaping, including shade trees planted at a minimum of 30' on-center. No single subarea shall exceed 150 parking spaces."

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
235	VC	52	I disagree with permit parking (see V Trails remark 11b)		Staff agrees and recommends deleting #3 under "Parking Standards" on page 52. There is a standard City process to apply for neighborhood permit parking if a certain threshold is met. It is not necessary to exempt this area from that process as the likelihood of exaggerated numbers of non-residents parking is minimal.	On page 52 of the VCSDP, delete section 3. Neighborhood Permit Parking.
236	VC	52	v. line 2. Suggest changing 5 feet to 8 feet, if practical	Staff doesn't think it is necessary to increase this dimension.		
237	VC	53	4 site lighting at 1000 feet does not take into account grade changes- should match Zoning Code foot lamberts		Change to refer to Zoning Code standards.	On page 53 of the VCSDP, in section 4. Site Lighting, delete "so that no light point source should be visible from a distance greater than 1000 feet" and insert in lieu thereof "per the Zoning Code."
238	VC	53	3. c. Shared open space should be privately owned and maintained. Not sure what this means. Some explanation??		Combine 3.c on page 53 with 3.b. Also, change "shoulds" and "mays" to "shalls" in this section.	On page 53 of the VCSDP, delete 3.c and add the following sentence at the end of 3.b: "Shared Usable Open Space is privately owned and maintained, and my restrict use by non-residents."
239	VC	53	pg 53 1a wall height is measured from lowest grade if "improved grade" is use we would be measuring on the wrong side of the wall and the unimproved side could 19 feet or more tall.		Will clarify per Zoning Code 14-16-3-19.	On page 53 of the VCSDP, delete the last sentence in 1.a and insert in lieu thereof "Height shall be measured from the lower side within the required side or rear yard."
240	VC	53	Walls: b l'd advocate for lower walls & fences at junctures to public amenities		Will make sure regulation is consistent with Facility Plan for Arroyos and other applicable policies/plans. (Addressed in staff report)	

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
241	VC	53	landscape relation to zone code. 1.b adjacent to monument? Better to put in a number. Shall be coyote, shall use instead. Post and wire- specify not barbed wire and include in c as well.	Adjacency is an understood concept.	Will replace "be" with "use" and will add "(not barbed)"	On page 53 of the VCSDP, section 1.b, replace "be" with "use" and add "(not barbed)" after "post and wire".
242	VC	53	2. One tree per property, and one tree every 50 feet seems way too sparse.	There is a separate requirement for street trees that applies to any new development. This requirement is for on-site trees and establishes a minimum, not a maximum. Also, this requirement is in addition to the landscaping requirements for all properties it is not the only landscaping requirement. Furthermore, due to potential conflicts with utility easements, it is probably better to keep this as the minimum rather than increasing it.		
243	VC	53	c. make adobe, rammed earth permissive. See previous remarks on CMU (block).	This list does not limit material options except plain block is prohibited.		
244	VC	53	Consider adding language to prohibit walled communities. Review & clarify walls to various levels of public ROWs	Walled/gated communities already prohibited (see individual zones). Staff is unsure what the second part of the comment means but is happy to review if provided additional direction.		
245	VC	53	2 commercial development only?	These are general standards that apply to every zone, residential and commercial.		
246	VC	54	3rd line from top. 10 feet in height seems pretty excessive.		Add language to limit use of "Gateway Monuments" to commercial areas, in which case 10' is not too excessive and might actually be too restrictive.	On page 54 of the VCSDP, Replace title and first sentence with: "Gateway Monuments for Commercial Areas (VCVC, VCMX zones). Pillars or walls may be built at entry points to commercial areas and projects in the VCVC and VCMX zones."

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
247	VC	54	6. Archaeological Sites: Prior to issuance of building permit, all previously unstudied areas within the draft Sector Development Plan area should be surveyed for archaeological sites and a Certificate of No Effect or Certificate of Approval be obtained from the City Archaeologist per Section 14-16-3-20 of the City of Albuquerque Zone Code.		Quote this verbatim at the end of the paragraph.	On page 54 of the VCSDP, in section 6 "Archeological Sites" delete the last sentence "See section 14-6-3-20 of the City of Albuquerque Zone Code, the Albuquerque Archeological Ordinance" and insert in lieu thereof "Prior to issuance of building permit, all previously unstudied areas within the draft Sector Development Plan area should be surveyed for archaeological sites and a Certificate of No Effect or Certificate of Approval be obtained from the City Archaeologist per Section 14-16-3-20 of the City of Albuquerque Zone Code."
248	VC	54	Add reference to Appendix E		will add.	On page 54 of VCSDP in section 8 "Rainwater Quality and Management" at the end of the first paragraph after "and vegetated swales (in courtyards, street medians and planting strips)" insert "see Appendix E for more regulations".
249	VC	54	8b edit to read as one sentence. 8c is it a duplicate of a and b?		Will revise 8b (Addressed in a previous condition). Will delete 8.c	On page 54 of the VCSDP, in section 8 "Rainwater Quality and Management" delete subsection 'c'. Re-letter subsequent sections accordingly.
250	VC	54	8. b. second line. Incomplete sentence.		Yes, will combine with first sentence to eliminate fragment.	On page 54 of the VCSDP, rewrite section 8.b as follows: "For properties adjacent to arroyos, the Petroglyph National Monument, and Major Public Open Space, fencing shall be avoided, meaning that the bottom slopes of detention basins should be designed for safety."

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
251	VC	54	4th line. straw bale. hard to imagine the esthetics of a rotting hay bale. Maybe the rabbits will enjoy. I'll need convincing	This is optional.		
252	VC	54	pg 54 8 natural in appearance commercial only or residential too?	These are general standards that apply to every zone, residential and commercial.		
253	VC	55	move construction appendix into regs.		Will add language to clarify which Appendices are regulatory. (Addressed in a previous condition.)	
254	VC	55	Plant List B - where is it? Plant List A - is it mandatory? Why is it in an appendix?	Plant List B is separate list on page 55; Have addressed appendix concerns and moved the regulatory appendices into a new regulatory chapter. (Addressed in previous condition).	Will add reference to Plant List A in each zone category as appropriate. (Addressed in previous condition).	
255	VC	55	plant list b		Will include better citation.	On page 55 of the VCSDP, section 10.b. List B - Xeric Plant List, the sentence that begins "Contact the City of Albuquerque Water Conservation Office..." and insert in lieu thereof "Contact the Albuquerque Bernalillo County Water Utility Authority to obtain the most current information and see the "How-To Guide to Xeriscaping" available at the following website - <a href="http://www.abcwua.org/content/view/73/63/">http://www.abcwua.org/content/view/73/63/</a> ."
256	VC	55	There are two lists but I only find the Native list as Appendix C. Don't see Plant List B Xeric. Plant list B is referenced several times in the plan.	Plant List B is maintained by the City of Albuquerque Water Conservation Office. The list is occasionally updated and, therefore, is not included directly in the plan.	Will provide better citation and direction for finding Plant List B. (Addressed in previous condition).	
257	VC	57	Pg 57 Escarpment face area within 9% slope of ... ??		Clarify definition.	On page 57 of the VCSDP in Appendix A, after, "nine percent slope", add "of the Petroglyph National Monument" to the definition of "Escarpment Face"

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
258	VC	57	conservation development? Or developer?		Replace "proponent" with "component" and delete "real estate".	On page 57 of the VCSDP in Appendix A in the definition of "Conservation Development" delete "proponent" and insert in lieu thereof "component" and delete "real estate".
259	VC	57	Light reflective value- how will we measure that?	The Approved Colors in Appendix B contain the allowable colors with acceptable LRVs. There is no "measurement" that will need to be taken since Appendix B contains approved colors.		
260	VC	58	Private open space some would be good		Addressed in another condition.	
261	VC	58	Replace definition of Planned Community Development with definition of "Private Commons Development".		Will change.	On page 58 of the VCSDP, delete "Planned Community Development" and the definition that follows and insert in lieu thereof: "Private Commons Development - A residential development of at least two acres which meets the requirements of the Zoning Code for such development (see § 14-16-3-16); it may contain houses and townhouses on any size lot; it must include a Private Commons Area."
262	VC	58	Private Open Space. no spacing between words		Yes, will change.	On page 58 of VCSDP delete the definition for "Private Open Space" and insert in lieu thereof "A usable open space adjoining and directly accessible to a dwelling unit, reserved for the exclusive use of residents of the dwelling unit and their guests."

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
263	VC	60	Appendix B: expand color chart, at least to include El Rey Palomino, Sand, Driftwood, Adobe, Desert Rose, Navajo White. (alternatively, all but Denim, Dusk, Colonial White). Add comment to permit equivalents in synthetic stucco systems.	Original agreed upon color palette.		
264	VC	66	cm5 shall approximate- edit these cm6 volcano cliffs		The Construction Mitigation Appendix was reworted from the 2006 version in consultation with the property owners and the City Hydrologist, however the agreed upon and edited version was inadvertently left out in the drafts submitted to the EPC.	On page 66 of the VCSDP ammend the Appendix D "Construction Mitigation" as follows: CM1 Prior to beginning construction, the property owner shall construct a temporary [insert silt] fence at the site boundary... CM2 [delete CM2 and read as follows] Prior to beginning construction the property owner shall construct a temporary fence at the parcel boundary within the Rural Residential, and Large Lot Residential zones to protect the natural desertscape. CM6 delete "Volcano Heights" and insert in lieu thereof "Volcano Cliffs".

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
265	VC	67	<p>"Rainwater Design": There should be an additional policy addressing discharge of developed flows from newly constructed subdivisions into Petroglyph National Monument (please consult with National Park Service as to desired policy wording). Proposed future detention ponds adjacent to the Monument boundary should not be constructed by removal or excavation into the basalt bedrock; any such ponding should be evaluated for the possibility of unintended discharge seeping out of the face of the escarpment. See Appendix D of the draft Volcano Trails sector development plan for additional useful wording.</p>	<p>The NWMEP already restricts flows and discharge into the Monument. Appendix D in the VTSDP is almost exactly the same as Appendix E in the VC except with respect to language regarding arroyos, not detention ponds/escarpment face.</p>	<p>Create a new policy RDM-4 Add to VHSDP. Additionally, will add reference to Appendix E on page 54. (Addressed in another condition).</p>	<p>On page 67 of VCSDP insert new policy RDM-4 after policy RDM-3 that states "Proposed future detention ponds adjacent to the Monument boundary should not be constructed by removal or excavation into the basalt bedrock; any such ponding should be evaluated for the possibility of unintended discharge seeping out of the face of the escarpment."</p>
266	vc	67	<p>the design should retain rather than will.</p>		<p>Replace "will" with "shall" since this appendix is regulatory.</p>	<p>On page 67 of VCSDP in the second sentence on the top of the page delete "will" and insert in lieu thereof "shall".</p>
267	VC	73	<p>Wording from the VH was not corrected for the appendix D Construction Mitigation.</p>		<p>Staff will address. VC - page 66: CM 2 needs to be revised. VH - page 70: CM 2 needs to be revised. VT - page 38: CM 2 needs to be revised. (Addressed in a previous condition).</p>	

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
268	VC	18, 30, 57	Definitions now in appendix should be moved to Chapter 4 so that they are mandatory. "Clustering" definition in appendix different than on page 30. Some definitions not complete - "bulbout" p.18 and appendix. If you're going to have definitions in a glossary, don't define in text, too. Move definitions on page 18 into the appendix.	Staff believes it is okay to repeat the definition within the text in order to provide clarity so long as the definition within the text is the same as that in the Definitions section.	Will make sure that definitions within text are the same as those in Definitions section.	On page 30 of VCSDP section 6 delete "Clustering is the practice of bringing together two or more development envelopes" and insert in lieu thereof "Clustering is where a number of dwelling units are placed in closer proximity than usual, or are attached, with the purpose of retaining open space area". On page 57 of VCSDP for the definition of bulbouts, after "This is a traffic calming measure" insert "that will extend curbs and create parking lanes..."
269	VC	19-20	Please explain in staff report why transportation section is mandatory in one plan but not others. Do street cross sections differ from the Great Streets template and, if so, why? If they're illustrative, not mandatory, why do you need them at all?	The Great Streets Facility Plan has not been adopted by the City Council yet and is undergoing significant revision and refinement. The cross sections in the VCSDP are consistent with the intent of the GSFP to provide multi-modal roadways.	DMD has requested that this chapter be made regulatory.	Revise Chapter 2 - Transportation of the VCSDP to be regulatory.
270	VC	25-27	Mandatory or guidance? Written as mandatory "shalls" but called "policy" so suggests it's not regulatory.	Everything in this section should be "should" - this is a policy chapter, not regulations.	Will make sure language is consistent for regulatory vs. policy. (Addressed in previous condition).	
271	VC	31-44	Land Use Design and Regulations: We recommend using diagrams, sketches, drawings, and color swatches as utilized in the Volcano Trails draft sector development plan throughout this section. Their use in the Volcano Trails draft plan was very beneficial to illustrate the concepts to the reader.		Will add diagrams.	On pages 35, 37, 38, 40, and 42, add building placement diagrams to illustrate the setback and frontage requirements.

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
272	VC	34 and 36	1. The SU-2/VC and SU-2 MX require sites less than 5 acres to be "reviewed and approved by the Planning Director or his/her designee prior to issuance of any permits." The words, "site development plan(s)" should be inserted to indicate what needs to be reviewed and approved. Also, I'm not real clear on what is meant by "approval by the Planning Director". What is the process?		Will revise.	On pages 34 and 36 of the VCSDP, in the "Development Process" section, clarify the process for approving permits for developments less than 5 acres.
273	VC	45-55	General Standards: It would improve the readability of the draft plan to have the section on general standards precede the sections governing each of the specific zones. Otherwise, the reader encounters the zone-specific regulations first and is left to determine if there are any overriding regulations that apply to all zones.		Staff thinks the best way to handle/clarify this issue is to add language at the beginning of the Zoning Chapter of each Plan that specifically refers the reader to the General Standards and the General Regulations of the Plan. (Addressed in previous condition).	
274	VC		(EPC)Just a quick clarifying point - there is an existing road already along the escarpment and the watershed areas would be purchased by the SAD.		Staff will provide a map. (Addressed in previous condition).	
275	VC		(EPC)The previous plan tried to link up open spaces. The two major arroyos provided a connection. This map (the green open space map) is not brought forward in the 2010 plans.		The EPC may consider recommending to include a map in the WSSP amendment that would generally identify areas suitable for open space acquisition as identified by the City's Open Space Division should funding become available. (Addressed in a condition in the WSSP staff report)	

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
276	VC		We are hikers, mountain bike riders, dog walkers, runners, etc., who seek the open space access for recreational and cultural experiences.	The open space buffer, including the designation of 300'-wide arroyo corridors, in the 2006 Plan prompted lawsuits against the City that claimed "inverse condemnation" or taking all reasonable use of private property without proper compensation. The City currently does not have funding identified or secured that could be used to purchase properties atop the escarpment to create a buffer. However, should funding become available, Policy 2, Chapter 3, p. 27, VC, discusses the acquisition of properties suitable for Open Space acquisition.	The EPC may consider recommending to include a map in the WSSP amendment that would generally identify areas suitable for open space acquisition as identified by the City's Open Space Division should funding become available. (Addressed in a condition in the WSSP staff report)	
277	VC		We need an open space buffer along the escarpment with a trail. We also need single loaded streets along the Monument Boundaries.		The map on page 16 of the VC is being amended to show that the vast majority of City Open Space and National Monument is bounded by a single-loaded street. (Addressed in previous condition).	
278	VC		The SU-2/UR, LL, and RR zones do not describe a development process.	Page 63 of 110	Will add language.	<p>On page 41 of the VCSDP, LL, add the following new section:  Review Process:  No extraordinary review necessary if LL standards and General Standards are met.</p> <p>On page 43 of the VCSDP, RR, add the following new section:  Review Process:  No extraordinary review necessary if RR standards and General Standards are met. Private Commons Development (PCD) requires DRB review and approval as outlined in Zoning Code Section 14-16-3-16.</p>

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
279	VC		Add language to Hydrology policies (VC SDP) to use traditional permaculture strategies/designs for the naturalistic channels (e.g. slow down water with several smaller structures (gabions) rather than fewer, larger structures.		Will add policy.	On page 26 of the VCSDP, add a new Policy 1.3 d as follows: "Traditional permaculture strategies and designs should be considered for naturalized channels. Designs and strategies include but are not limited to gabions, and multiple smaller structures rather fewer, larger structures. "
280	VC		Setbacks 1 - need to be consistent in way you handle setback minimums - sometimes "no minimum" sometimes "0 feet minimum"		Will revise.	In all zones of VCSDP verify that the formatting of "minimum" dimensions is consistent and modify as necessary.
281	VC		(EPC)Is the facility plan for arroyos pertinent to consideration for these cases?		Yes, this will be addressed in the second staff report. (Addressed in a previous condition).	
282	VC		Height maximums - word "adjacent" has been construed by the Commission to be a distance that might be very large, not just right across street. Might want to say "abutting and lots across the street"	This is a commonly-used term in the Zoning Code that Code Enforcement staff is familiar with and able to enforce consistently.		
283	VC		would any high rise apartments be permitted?	no, 35' is the highest building height in the VCSDP		
284	VC		spot zone, and strip zone justification, need more analysis.	Will provide additional analysis in supplementary staff report.		

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
285	VC		Add ZC Section citations to Permitted Uses (e.g., 14-16-3-22 for SU-1/MX). Explain in staff report which FBZs have been incorporated and why and which ones haven't been used and why.	It is not standard procedure in Sector Plans to add ZC citations because those citations may change over time. Code Enforcement and Planning staff are comfortable with the existing citation and do not feel that additional citation of the SU-1/MX zone is necessary. Regarding the select use of Form-Based Zones in the VCSDP, there are 5 FBZs. 4 of the 5 are not appropriate for use in this Plan: the TOD-MAC is to be used in Major Activity Centers; the TOD-COM is to be used in Community Activity Centers; the ID zone is for infill development; the PND (Planned Neighborhood Development) zone assumes consolidated ownership in development. The last FBZ - the MX zone is a permitted use in both the VCVC and VCMX zones of the VCSDP.		
286	VC		"Ernest and Stella Lujan own Lot 12 in Unit 10 located in the Volcano Cliffs Sector Development Plan. The lot is "land-locked" and we request that access easements to our property be clearly indicated, preferably in the maps which are a part of the development plan. We plan to build on our lot and are eager to participate in an SAD. We wish to avoid any legal or physical constraints in accessing our property."	There are a number of parcels that are "land-locked" in certain Units in Volcano Cliffs. Access easements should be addressed in individual deeds. This is not an issue that this SDP can address.		

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
287	VC		"I am a land investor in Unit 11 and, even though I live in California, I have followed events involving Volcano Cliffs for years. I am gratified by the excellent job that Dave Heil and the committee have done over the years to get us to this place. I heartily support the new sector plan and I am confident that it will support all of the standards that the city has established for growth. Albuquerque is a great city and will prosper in the future with controlled growth. I want Volcano Cliffs to be a significant part of this growth. Please support this plan."	Thank you for your comment.		
288	VC		I do support the VCPOA plan	Thank you for your comment.		
289	VC		I'd hate to see more residential development come too close to the edge of the Petroglyphs along the west mesa ridge,	Development in the area above the Escarpment Face is already regulated by the NWMEP and the existing R-1 zoning. What is meant by "too close"? We agree that there should not be residential development "too close" to the Escarpment face which is why there is language prohibiting structures 50 feet away from the escarpment edge.		
290	VC		At the August 26 meeting, the AMAFCA Board of Directors agreed to accept maintenance of the drainage function of the North Fork and Middle Fork of the Boca Negra Arroyo through the typical Turnkey Agreement process.	Thank you for your comment.		

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
291	VC		<p>I reviewed the plan and it is a worthy plan for meeting owner needs and controlled community development. One thing I see is a picture of a nice Unser Blvd with median, pedestrian friendly controls, trees and sidewalk. What I see being constructed on the Mesa is an elevated highway that cuts access to pedestrians and divides the neighborhood like few I've seen anywhere in Albuquerque. It will also broadcast noise pollution throughout the area. The right of way offered a low route that would have naturally dampened the sound, but we now have just the opposite.</p>	<p>A SDP does not engineer the road; it provides the street section design that shows the various amenities and facilities of the right-of-way, as well as the access. Future impacts of noise pollution can be studied as they occur. What is currently being built is a 2-lane section of what will eventually be a 4-lane roadway with sidewalks and other amenities.</p>		
292	VC		<p>Are there aesthetic and noise abatement plans that I am unaware? If not, you may have ruined the opportunity for a peaceful, mixed use, pedestrian friendly neighborhood.</p>	<p>A SDP does not engineer the road; it provides the street section design that shows the various amenities and facilities of the right-of-way, as well as the access. Future impacts of noise pollution can be studied as they occur.</p>		

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
293	VC		<p>The drainage plans for Volcano cliffs show detention ponds immediately adjacent to the top of the escarpment. The drainage ponds are unacceptable. Detention ponds right on the edge of the escarpment will look cheap and degrading to park visitors. The City open space only buys land that is undisturbed. This is not what you call a sensitive design for the Monument or for a decent attractive development. There must be a better design that can be used.</p>	<p>There are no drainage plans in the VC. Drainage ponding sites have been shown on SAD maps developed by Wilson &amp; Co. for the VCPOA separate from the SDP process. Policy 3.2, Chapter 3, p. 27, VC "Mitigate rainwater run-off from development." Also, General Standards, Policy 1.A.2, requires all structures, which would include drainage ponds, to be set back 50' from the escarpment face. Page 54 of the General Standards, 8.d Rainwater Quality and Management. Also, Appendix E contains rainwater design and management standards.</p>		

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
294	VC		<p>Traffic congestion: Taylor Ranch has always been concerned about adding more traffic to our congested areas within the Taylor Ranch Community. The Volcano Mesa Plan area is land locked in order to protect the escarpment from any more encroachments of roads through Petroglyph National Monument. There is not a grid system that distributes traffic more evenly. There are only three major roadways that will be carrying traffic from the mesa top area to Montano, Paseo del Norte, and Unser. They all lead traffic through the Taylor Ranch community towards the river crossings. Roadway and intersections leading to the river crossings are now Over Capacity! There will have to be a huge investment of public funds to address the traffic situation and transportation needs for this area. MRCOG is looking at a BRT system for Paseo del Norte to help the situation. More needs to be done. We would like to have more discussion from the City on how they plan to resolve this issue.</p>	<p>The roadway system in Volcano Mesa actually IS a grid system where it is a requirement to create through connections to all streets. The purpose of designating the Major Activity Center is to reverse the jobs-housing imbalance and some of the traffic flows that currently flow out of the area. We are not increasing the number of dwelling units that are possible under the existing zoning. The same amount of traffic is generated through this planning effort as with the existing (already in place) zoning.</p>		

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
295	VC		<p>The arroyos in the 2006 Plan were to maintain their natural character. In order to do this, the arroyos would need a 300 ft. wide ROW buffer. The buffer also provided space for trails and wild life corridors. The wide width of the buffer allows the character of the arroyo to be preserved, providing a higher quality look to a developed area, in contrast to using concrete and other man made materials for the drainage channels. Developments in the foothills of the mountains have allowed their arroyos to remain natural. Please support the prudent line treatment.</p>	<p>A 300'-wide arroyo is not the only way to maintain the natural character of the arroyos. The current configuration of the arroyos (designed by AMAFCA in consultation with the City Hydrologist) does provide for open space/wildlife corridors and trails, while not obligating the City and/or AMAFCA to additional capital and maintenance expenditures that they cannot afford. The VC requires a naturalistic treatment of the arroyos. Furthermore, the 300'-wide requirement in the 2006 Plan was arbitrary and may not have been adequate to handle a prudent line treatment, according to AMAFCA.</p>		
296	VC		<p>(EPC)Need additional buffer along the escarpment</p>	<p>The open space buffer in the 2006 Plan prompted lawsuits against the City that claimed "inverse condemnation" or taking all reasonable use of private property without proper compensation. The City currently does not have funding identified or secured that could be use to purchase properties atop the escarpment to create a buffer. However, should funding become available, Policy 2, Chapter 3, p. 27, VC, discusses the acquisition of properties suitable for Open Space acquisition.</p>		

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
297	VC		(EPC)One of the questions related to the drainage is do we allow for a prudent line treatment or do we channel?	A 300'-wide arroyo is not the only way to maintain the natural character of the arroyos. The current configuration of the arroyos (designed by AMAFCA in consultation with the City Hydrologist) does provide for open space/wildlife corridors and trails, while not obligating the City and/or AMAFCA to additional capital and maintenance expenditures that they cannot afford. The VC requires a naturalistic treatment of the arroyos. Furthermore, the 300'-wide requirement in the 2006 Plan was arbitrary and may not have been adequate to handle a prudent line treatment, according to AMAFCA.		
298	VC		(EPC)Building heights were based on visual sensitivity analysis to put 18ft height limits	Building heights remain at 18' with an allowance of 26' for a maximum 50% of the building footprint to maintain the visual sensitivity.		
299	VC		(EPC)We need to replat the entire area or at least the areas that need a redesign.	It is not within the purview of the SDP process or within the authority of any governmental entity to require this.		
300	VC		(EPC)My concern has to do with water. I am concerned about having a population of 30,000 people of offices and businesses that we need to supply water to. Water usage is already very restrictive.	Water access and provision will be negotiated directly between property owners and the Water Utility Authority regardless of any planning efforts. The provision of water is outside the purview of a SDP.		
301	VC		(EPC)Engineers have determined that the middle fork would accommodate 150 feet and the north fork would be 160-200 feet.	Thank you for your comment.		

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
302	VC		(EPC)MX in unit 26 is more flexible for future opportunities.	The UR zone in Unit 26 is designed to be a transition zone between MX and LL. Staff does not support changing the zoning from UR to MX. The existing zoning in this area is R-1, and a rezoning to UR represents a significant up zoning that is an appropriate level of development intensity. See Comp Plan: II.B.7.Policy f.		
303	VC		(EPC)Highest priority is drainage. Land needs to be acquired to resolve drainage issues. If additional land is needed it needs to be addressed now. Concerned about the engineering solutions. Rate of flow and buffer that is set up must be reasonable. Right below the flow is an archeological sight that will have water rushing into it and will destroy it. We would like to be able to consult with Wilson and Co.	Staff agrees that the PNM should consult with the engineers to ensure protection of the Monument. There are no drainage plans in the VC. Drainage ponding sites have been shown on SAD maps developed by Wilson & Co. for the VCPOA separate from the SDP process. Policy 3.2, Chapter 3, p. 27, VC "Mitigate rainwater run-off from development." Also, General Standards, Policy 1.A.2, requires all structures, which would include drainage ponds, to be set back 50' from the escarpment face. Page 54 of the General Standards, 8.d Rainwater Quality and Management. Also, Appendix E contains rainwater design and management standards.		
304	VC		(EPC)Concerned about the buffer on the escarpment and thinks we should move the park further down to buffer the escarpment.	There is no designated park in this area, and the Plan cannot rezone land for "Park" use without providing immediate compensation to the property owner(s). This would most likely bring the City into another lawsuit.		
305	VC		(EPC)If there is any kind of construction going on it is likely to crack the basalt	It is unknown what will happen with any kind of development. These issues will have to be dealt with on a case-by-case basis.		

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
306	VC		(EPC)Send the planners to look at the feasibility of purchasing those lots at a fair market value. They are saying it is 15x the assessment.	The City currently does not have funds identified to purchase additional open space in this area. The VC in no way precludes the possibility of additional acquisition of open space as funds become available. The Open Space division must prioritize its acquisition list.		
307	VC		(EPC)We need more commercial areas. What we have is not enough. Unit 26 should be MX to give it best chance for success	The UR zone in Unit 26 is designed to be a transition zone between MX and LL. Staff does not support changing the zoning from UR to MX. The existing zoning in this area is R-1, and a rezoning to UR represents a significant up zoning that is an appropriate level of development intensity. Comp Plan: II.B.7.Policy f		
308	VC		(EPC)Unit 26 should be changed from VCUR to VCMX.	The UR zone in Unit 26 is designed to be a transition zone between MX and LL. Staff does not support changing the zoning from UR to MX. The existing zoning in this area is R-1, and a rezoning to UR represents a significant up zoning that is an appropriate level of development intensity.		
309	VC		(EPC)Siegel: Would you endorse changing these paragraphs to saying that no structure should be within 150 feet from the escarpment face?	Staff feels there might be a confusion between the definition of the escarpment face and the monument boundary. The NWMEP does not allow structures within 50' of the MONUMENT boundary. The VCSDP maintains this requirement. Staff feels that this issue is adequately addressed already.		
310	VC		Has the City Attorney said that the Air Quality study that's been done sufficient to comply with the court order?	A preliminary AQIA was completed for the 2010 plans and found that no further analysis was necessary. Furthermore, the AQIA requirements have been formally removed from the Zoning Code.		

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
311	VC		Don't agree with EPC being cut out of the approval process.	The zones in the VC set forth specific standards for building placement, articulation, landscaping, parking, and heights'. Staff does not feel that it is necessary for EPC to review individual development proposals that conform to the prescriptive standards that are set forth. For any development proposal that would deviate by more than 10% from the prescriptive dimensional standards, EPC would have review authority.		
312	VC		The drainage detention ponds along the escarpment are disruptive and ugly. We need a better system.	There are no drainage plans in the VC. Drainage ponding sites have been shown on SAD maps developed by Wilson & Co. for the VCPOA separate from the SDP process. Policy 3.2, Chapter 3, p. 27, VC "Mitigate rainwater run-off from development." Also, General Standards, Policy 1.A.2, requires all structures, which would include drainage ponds, to be set back 50' from the escarpment face. Page 54 of the General Standards, 8.d Rainwater Quality and Management. Also, Appendix E contains rainwater design and management standards.		
313	VC		What about the water?	Water access and provision will be negotiated directly between property owners and the Water Utility Authority regardless of any planning efforts. The provision of water is outside the purview of a SDP.		
314	VC		The Plan does not provide thresholds for "triggering" design compliance. Does this mean that all new development, no matter how insignificant, requires complete compliance with the design regulations?	All development in the area is new development and is significant and must comply with all regulations of the Plan.		

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
315	VC		(EPC)I would suggest doing some redesign (replat) to achieve an outcome that benefits both property owners and the general public.	It is not within the purview of the SDP process or within the authority of any governmental entity to require this.		
316	VT	2	Exhibit 2: Exempted area (on legend) nothing shown, and nothing appears to be exempted.		Upon review, staff does not feel that this exhibit is particularly informative and recommends deleting it.	In the VTSDP, delete Exhibit 2 on page 2 as well as all references to Exhibit 2. Renumber exhibits and references to exhibits accordingly.
317	VT	2	Correct the acreage for Volcano Trails plan area from 400 to 446		Will make change.	The acreage for the Volcano Trails Sector Development Plan on page 2, Plan Area shall read approximately 446 acres and not approximately 400.
318	VT	3	Exhibit 3: Legend Volcano Trails needs a color and color needs to be added surrounding this area.		Will revise; per Code Enforcement's comments, need to hatch rather than color code.	On page 3 of the VTSDP, Exhibit 3, add new labels and pattern designations for "Petroglyph National Monument" and "Major Public Open Space". Add patterns for all other categories in the legend.
319	VT	4	Page 4, Exhibit 4, The Road Network. Same issue regarding the limits of the frontage road along the south side of Paseo del Norte. See comment 4 above. Comment: Revise Exhibit 4 to show the full limits of the frontage road system that are proposed along Paseo del Norte.		Will clarify.	On pages 4 of the VTSDP, amend Exhibit 4 to show the full limits of the frontage road system that are proposed along Paseo del Norte.
320	VT	5	Open Space and Parks: Clarify that the existing acreage in the draft plan area is private open space and that the future dedication between Rainbow Blvd and the Northern Geologic Window is intended to be Major Public Open Space (see also map on page 13).		Need to revise Exhibit 5, which is a roadway map, to remove non-roadway features.	On page 5 of the VTSDP, change the base map in Exhibit 5 by removing open space, APS, and State of NM lands.

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
321	VT	5	aps language pending fill in; percent of completion of trails, number of acres of open space (xx)		Staff has requested this information from the developer of The Trails but has not received it as of 10-28-10. This information will be inserted via amendment at the City Council.	On page 5 of the VTSDP, insert missing information to be provided by The Trails.
322	VT	5	Page 5, Exhibit 5, Trails Roadway Network. This exhibit appears to only show facilities proposed in the roadway network and not the trails network. Comment: Revise the title of Exhibit 5 to read just Road Network similar to Exhibit 11 in the Volcano Heights SDP.		Will revise	On page 5 of VTSDP in the title for Exhibit 5 insert "Volcano" before "Trails".
323	VT	5	Page 5, New Exhibit 6: On-Street Bikeways Network. Add a new exhibit showing the On-Street Bikeway facilities proposed in the Volcano Trails SDP. An alternative is to reference the new bikeways facilities map we requested be added to the Volcano Heights SDP. See comment 7 above. Comment: Add a new Exhibit 6, On-Street Bikeways Network, showing the locations of on-street bicycle lanes and or routes within the Plan area. Consideration should be given to a consolidated On-Street bikeways and Trail facilities exhibit.		Will revise	On page 5 of the VTSDP, add a new Exhibit 6, On-Street Bikeways Network, showing the locations of on-street bicycle lanes and/or routes within the Plan area. Renumber and amend references to subsequent Exhibits accordingly.

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
324	VT	5	<p>Page 5, Transportation. The text of this paragraph should include a reference to the Volcano Heights SDP for more details on the cross sections for each of the proposed roadways. The alternative is to include the applicable cross section detail here also. A key map like Exhibit 13 in the Volcano Heights SDP needs to be added here for the applicable streets in this Plan such as Woodmont, Rainbow, Universe and others. Comment: Revise the Volcano Trails Plan accordingly.</p>	<p>It was never the intention of this plan to regulate street cross sections. All roads have been platted, designed, and/or built in this area except for local roads.</p>		
325	vt	6	<p>Fill in the number of dwelling units expected under the current zoning</p>		<p>Staff has requested this information from the developer of The Trails but has not received it as of 10-28-10. This information will be inserted via amendment at the City Council.</p>	<p>On page 6 of the VTSDP, insert missing information to be provided by The Trails.</p>

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
326	VT	9	Create Neighborhood Edge/Transitions from Open Space areas and the Petroglyph National Monument: Remove "buildings" from the first sentence: "Landscaping, buildings, and roads are transitions from Open Space and the Petroglyph National Monument to the built environment." Recommend changing the next sentence from "Roads or low density one story residential buildings shall abut the Open Space." to "Roads or other buffer areas shall be planned as a transition from Major Public Open Space to residential or commercial development."		Will make suggested changes.	On page 9 of the VTSDP, in the section called "Create Neighborhood Edge/Transitions from Open Space areas and the Petroglyph National Monument" amend the first two sentences as follows: "Landscaping and roads are transitions from open space and the Petroglyph National Monument to the built environment. Roads or other buffer areas should be planned as a transition from Major Public Open Space and the Monument to residential or commercial development."
327	VT	9	end quote after eyes on the street		Will revise.	On page 9 of VTSDP in the second sentence under goal "Create Healthy Residential Neighborhoods" add a close quotation mark after "street" and before "and".
328	VT	9	The last sentence in the last paragraph states that "Native vegetation should be used where ever landscaping is visible to the public." Will parks be required to follow this plant list, due to the high use of parks and the nature of activities some higher water use or non native plants are more appropriate for this type of development.	This is a policy statement and is not regulatory. However, if Parks staff feels that it would be useful to add language to clarify this, staff is happy to do so.		

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
329	VT	11	Village Center- if the park is smaller than 2 acres it will need to be privately owned and maintained.		Will add clarification.	On page 11 of the VTSDP, in the section called "SU-2 Trails/Village Center" insert the following after "small park": "(parks smaller than 2 acres shall be privately owned and maintained)".
330	VT	12	DELETE, p.12, SU-2/SU-1 for Open Space. Delete-Open Space areas are dedicated City property.		Ok to change	On page 12 of VTSDP after "SU-2/SU-1 for Open Space" delete "Open Space areas are dedicated City property".
331	VT	12	SU-2/SU-1 for Open Space: There already is a zoning designation called SU-1 for Major Public Open Space in the City of Albuquerque Zone Code.		Will revise.	On page 12 of VTSDP insert "Major Public" after "SU-2/SU-1 for" and before "Open Space".
332	VT	13	CHANGES, p. 13, Regulating Plan. Need to change SU-1 Open Space to SU-2 Trails Open Space - land is not dedicated to the City.		Ok to change	On page 13 of VTSDP in the legend for Exhibit 7 delete "SU-2/SU-1 for Open Space" and insert in lieu thereof "SU-2 Trails Open Space". Make the same change on the map where it says "SU-2/SU-1 Open Space".
333	VT	13	Map - add "SU-2" before or after "RD". SU-2/RD and SU-2/SU-1 MPOS is this the RD zone or the VTRD zone?	SU-2/RD is different from SU-2/VTRD zone	Yes, add SU-2 before RD on map.	On page 13 of the VTSDP in Exhibit 7 insert "SU-2" before "RD - Residential and Related Uses Zone, Developing Area" in the legend.
334	VT	14	Table 1. Need to add EPC if greater than 5 acres, plus same comment as 2 previous plans	Because the regulations of the zones are already so prescriptive that site plan review by the EPC is not necessary.		
335	VT	14	Table 1. In Development Approval Process column: Why would DRB approval be needed for most projects?	Infrastructure coordination, such as roads and utilities is needed.		
336	VT	14	Many smaller projects could be permissively streamlined & require no more oversight than any other small project in a SDP covered area; at Zoning & Bldg dept desk.	Infrastructure coordination, such as roads and utilities is needed.		

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
337	VT	14	Projects over some stipulated size perhaps need EPC or DRB approval.	Infrastructure coordination, such as roads and utilities is needed.		
338	VT	14	First row: Shopping Center sites now need EPC review & approval city-wide (over 5 acres, I believe – staff verify). This EPC approval process should be maintained so that these areas & these project types are treated same as all other areas.	The VTVC zone sets forth specific standards for building placement, articulation, landscaping, parking, and a maximum height of 35'. Staff does not feel that it is necessary for EPC to review a site plan for development in this zone since such prescriptive standards are already set forth. For any development proposal that would deviate by more than 10% from the prescriptive dimensional standards, EPC would have review authority.		
339	VT	14	cutting epc out of approval process	The zones in the VTSDP set forth specific standards for building placement, articulation, landscaping, parking, and heights'. Staff does not feel that it is necessary for EPC to review individual development proposals that conform to the prescriptive standards that are set forth. For any development proposal that would deviate by more than 10% from the prescriptive dimensional standards, EPC would have review authority.		
340	VT	15	DELETE, p.15, The Zones."THE SU-2 RD and SU-2/SU-1 Open Space zones are is regulated...		Ok to change	On page 15 of VTSDP in section 3 "The Zones" delete the last sentence which reads "The SU-2 RD and SU-2 SU-1 Open Space zones are regulated by the City Zoning Code with the following exceptions".
341	VT	15	EPC procedure and modification issue needs to be dealt with.		Will revise with legal staff.	See condition in staff report (Could not insert text into spreadsheet due to space limitations).

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
342	VT	15	"Previously Omitted Standards" - what does that section mean? Need to rework text to make it clear what you're talking about.		Will write language to clarify this section.	On page 15 of the VTSDP, rewrite the "Previously Omitted Standards" section to clarify what regulations prevail in Unit 2, Phase 1 of the Trails.
343	VT	15	Tract B, Cantata at The Trails, Unit 2, was approved for development of a 260 unit multifamily development based on the past Volcano Heights Sector development Plan, and was submitted and approved by the Development review Board, and under the approval 3 six-plex buildings were started and the Clubhouse. The Trails requests that the new sector plan adopt the approved plan, without revision, including all related entitlements.		Yes, language will be added stating that area is already located in the omitted area, all existing entitlements are in place. (Addressed in previous condition)	
344	VT	15	Table 2: Type of Modification C (other): modifications to non-dimensional standards should be broken into minor and non-minor, with non-minor going to EPC.	Staff considers all non-dimensional standards to be "minor" unless the modification relates to use, in which case the change is considered "major" and goes to the EPC. This Table is proposed to be removed and replaced with alternative language in another condition.		
345	VT	15	Unclear what "Special Rules" means.	Staff is unclear what is being referred to. With clarification, Staff will be happy to respond.		
346	VT	16	Dev. Densities - Min. Avg. is 20 du/acre?		Delete "Average"	On page 16 of VTSDP under the subheading "Development Densities/Intensities" 1.c.i and 1.c.ii delete the word "average".
347	VT	16	VTVC: remove 1.d "Gated and/or walled developments are prohibited"		Ok to change	On page 16 of the VTSDP in the section "Permitted Uses" delete 1.d "Gated and/or walled developments are prohibited" and re-letter subsequent sections accordingly.

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
348	VT	16	Development Densities: 1b suggest that you not list max FAR; any FAR ok as long as other height & setback req'ts are adhered to.		Ok to remove max FAR as height limitations will already restrict density.	On page 16 of the VTSDP, in the section called "Development Densities" delete "1.5 FAR" after "2. Maximum" and insert in lieu thereof "None".
349	VT	16	C.iii. "undevelopable land" is not customary in my experience & could become a loophole or a bone of contention; define this better or delete it. This comment holds true throughout all plans where this kind of language exists. It occurs at many places in calculations of FAR – and Zone Code definition of FAR does not make exceptions for "undevelopable land".		Will clarify.	On page 16 of the VTSDP in section 1. c.iii, and on pages 18 and 20 of the VTSDP in section 1.c under "Development Densities", add the following sentence after the first sentence: "Undevelopable land shall be defined as land that is not suitable for cut or fill and includes, but is not limited, to significant rock outcroppings as defined within this plan."
350	VT	16	Permitted. Signs. Same comment as other 2 Plans. How are you going to prevent a whole street of ugly 8 ft signs?	C-1 limits the number of free-standing signs to one per premise with at least 100' of street frontage.		
351	VT	16	Usable Open Space: 3. Plaza space seems small (less than 32'x32'. The plaza at old town is about 100' x 200' = ½ acre. Perhaps developments over X require truly significant open space like the Old Town Plaza, and smaller ones get smaller spaces. See also Zone Code 14-16-3-18 & articulate whether this SDP wants more or different regs.	This is a minimum and is per commercial development based on Section 14-16-3-18 (4) General Building and Site for Non-Residential Buildings, Public Space.		

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
352	VT	17	REMOVE, VC p. 17, Landscape Requirements 1. c. "...Walls may be up to 4 feet high within the front yard setback of residential buildings." REPLACE WITH "See General Requirements for additional wall regulations."		Ok to change	On page 17 of VTSDP in the section called "Landscape Requirements" 1. c. delete the last sentence "...Walls may be up to 4 feet high within the front yard setback of residential buildings." and insert in lieu thereof "See General Requirements for additional wall regulations."
353	VT	17	ADD, p. 17 Building Articulation "a. Transparency: At least 25% of the ground floor facade of street-facing elevations shall be comprised of windows and/or entrances. Ground level street facing facades that are not the primary entrances and are located on streets that are classified as Arterial or higher may utilized Window Cases located a minimum of 20 feet on center per City Planning Director approval. See General Standards for Window Case requirements."		Ok to change	On page 17 of VTSDP in the section called "Building Articulation" add to the end of section 1.a "Ground level street facing facades that are not the primary entrances and are located on streets that are classified as Arterial or higher may utilized Window Cases located a minimum of 20 feet on center per City Planning Director approval. See General Standards for Window Case requirements."
354	VT	17	Building needs to be shaded in gray in diagram.	Gray color is there, just doesn't print on certain printers.	Will revise; per Code Enforcement's comments, need to hatch rather than color code.	On page 17 of the VTSDP, "Building Placement Diagram", add pattern designations in addition to grayscale color.
355	VT	17	Height. Building Height is limited to 26 ft if adjacent to a neighborhood	The 35' max. requirement provides an appropriate transition/buffer between the residential zones (26') and more intense areas of the Town Center.		
356	VT	18	VTUR: remove 1.c "Gated and/or walled developments are prohibited"		Ok to change	On page 18 of the VTSDP in the section "Permitted Uses" delete 1.c "Gated and/or walled developments are prohibited"

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
357	VT	18	CHANGE, UR p. 18, Landscape Requirements d. Walls shall be per City Zoning Code §14-16-3-19. See General Requirements, Walls and Fences for exceptions.		Ok to change	On page 18 of the VTSDP in the section "Landscape Requirements" delete section "d." and insert in lieu thereof "d. Walls shall be per City Zoning Code §14-16-3-19. See General Requirements, Walls and Fences for exceptions."
358	VT	18	Allow higher density, attached family Town Home product in UR zone. The current criteria is appears to limit development to apartments or condominiums. Add allowance for attached multi-family Town Home lots with minimum sizes of 20' by 90', 1800 sqft. minimum lot area, an area similar in size to the planed condominiums.		Yes, town homes can added as an allowed use.	On page 18 of the VTSDP, in the "Permitted Uses" section, add "R-T" before "R-2". Add a new subsection 1.a as follows and renumber subsequent subsections accordingly: "a. R-T development requires a minimum lot size of 20' by 90'."
359	VT	18	Lot sizes. 1b. 3000 sq ft seems too small to be practical	This is a minimum.		
360	VT	20	VTSL: remove 1.c "Gated and/or walled developments are prohibited"		Ok to change	On page 20 of the VTSDP in the section "Permitted Uses" delete 1.c "Gated and/or walled developments are prohibited"
361	VT	20	CHANGE, SL p. 20, Landscape Requirements d. Walls shall be per City Zoning Code §14-16-3-19. See General Requirements, Walls and Fences for exceptions.		Ok to change	On page 20 of the VTSDP in the section "Landscape Requirements" delete section "c." and insert in lieu thereof "c. Walls shall be per City Zoning Code §14-16-3-19. See General Requirements, Walls and Fences for exceptions."
362	VT	20	Density 1a. Min 1.5 du/ac wonder what living in that 1/2 house would be like?	This is referring to gross acreage.		
363	VT	20	Allow smaller single family product within SL zone, with a minimum lot size of 40'x95', 3,800 sqft. minimum lot area	With an alley, minimum 3,000sf is allowed. This is to encourage the use of alleys.		

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
364	VT	21	Placement diagram. Is it feasible to enter the garage in the rear of a lot with alley if have only 5 ft setback?	setback is from the alley, Alley is 20 feet, with 5 feet on each side, alley width becomes 30'. Should be plenty of space to turn a vehicle.		
365	VT	22	Landscape Requirements: (and perhaps at p 20?): lots which have a back yard or side yard facing arroyos, public paths, public streets, parks, or open space (or monument) should have shorter fences, so as not to present a walled effect to passers-by or as a distant view from open spaces. See NWMEP for their rules on staggering walls & fences as well, & consider adopting or modifying those to fit these situations.	NWMEP prevails (Policy 9-3, page 54: Height of walls and fences shall not exceed 6' at the edge of public or private open space.). See language on page 25. Also the NWMEP does not contain regulations re: staggering. The Facility Plan for Arroyos does, but is policy, not regulatory.	Amending Landscape Design Standards in General Standards via another condition that will regulate height in sensitive areas.	
366	VT	22	VTML: remove 1.c "Gated and/or walled developments are prohibited"		Ok to change	On page 22 of the VTSDP in the section "Permitted Uses" delete 1.c "Gated and/or walled developments are prohibited"
367	VT	22	CHANGE, ML, p. 22, Landscape Requirements d. Walls shall be per City Zoning Code §14-16-3-19. See General Requirements, Walls and Fences for exceptions.		Ok to change	On page 22 of the VTSDP in the section "Landscape Requirements" delete section "c." and insert in lieu thereof "c. Walls shall be per City Zoning Code §14-16-3-19. See General Requirements, Walls and Fences for exceptions."
368	VT	22	Building Articulation - where is Unit 2, Tract 8?		will have AGIS locate on VT zone map. This is the property on south west corner of Woodmont and Universe, immediately north of the APS school site. According to AGIS and Bernalillo County this site is owned by Indus Development.	On page 13 of the VTSDP, amend Exhibit 7 to show where Unit 2, Tract 8 is located.

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
369	VT	22	Lot sizes: Should say "Lots within 200 feet"; b. should be "Lots more than 200 feet up to 500 feet"		Will revise.	On page 22 of VTSDP in the section called "Lot Sizes" delete "up to" in 1.a and insert in lieu thereof "within". In 1.b delete "within" and insert in lieu thereof "more than".
370	VT	22	Building Articulation - what about the Geologic Window? Do you want a limitation on buildings next to the Geologic Window as well?		Yes, will add "Monument"	On page 22 of the VTSDP in the section "Building Articulation" modify the second sentence in #1 so that it reads "In addition, on lots adjacent to the Northern Geologic Window, walls facing the Northern Geologic Window shall be view walls."
371	VT	22	Why don't you say limited to 1 unit/lot?	Already covered in the R-1 zone.		
372	VT	23	building placement diagram, permit zero setback to alleys.	No room for utility infrastructure.		
373	VT	24	Expressly say that the General Standards do not apply to the SU-2/RD zone.		Will add language.	On page 24 of the VTSDP, add a second sentence in the first paragraph on the page as follows: "The General Standards do not apply to properties zoned SU-2/RD."

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
374	VT	25	ADD to General Requirement UTILITIES Utility Easements shall be located in the public right of way or alleys. In order to facilitate pedestrian movement and maintain accessibility, Utility infrastructure, such as light poles, transformers, boxes and access panels shall not be located in the sidewalk or pedestrian realm. Transformer boxes and access panels are not permitted in the front setback in residential zones.		Ok to change	On page 25 of the VTSDP Under "General Requirements" add new Sub-section after "Heights and Setbacks" called "Utilities". Add the following text after "Utilities" "1. Utility Easements shall be located in the public right of way or alleys. In order to facilitate pedestrian movement and maintain accessibility, utility infrastructure, such as light poles, transformers, boxes and access panels shall not be located in the sidewalk or pedestrian realm. Transformer boxes and access panels are not permitted in the front setback in residential zones. 2. Clearance: All screening and vegetation surrounding ground-mounted transformers and utility pads shall allow 10 feet of clearance for access and to ensure the safety of the work crew and public during maintenance and repair."
375	VT	25	Explain special definition of FAR.		Will explain in Staff Report.	
376	VT	25	Revise page 25, paragraph c. Conservation of Petroglyphs, delete "Major rock outcrops that exceed 3 feet in heights and 6 feet in volume shall be conserved per 14 16 3 20". The Trails has prepared a master plan of the area and has included all significant rock outcroppings in planned and dedicated open space areas.		Will include definition of Rock Outcropping from WSSP Amendment.	On page 25 of VTSDP in the section "Heights and Setbacks" 2.c insert the following sentence "Generally a major rock outcropping shall be a portion of bedrock or other stratum protruding through the soil level at a minimum of 6 feet high or greater, contain more than 50% exposed basalt or rock and shall include native trees and/or native shrubs" after "Rock outcrops occur randomly throughout the Plan area." Delete "-volcanic knolls or hillocks-".

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
377	VT	25	Heights & Setbacks. 2a 10 ft seems a bit too high		Yes, this does seem excessive. Proposed change: change "screened equipment" to "elevator shaft" and reduce "screened equipment" height extension to 6'.	On page 25 of the VTSDP, in the section called "Height and Setbacks" amend #2.a as follows: "a. Chimneys, cupolas, flagpoles, and elevator shafts may extend 10 feet beyond height limits. Screened equipment may extend 6 feet beyond height limits and shall be set back 15' from the facade."
378	VT	25	2b 8 ft wall or fence facing streets or public ROW is too high. 6 max? Also, where is the articulation, texture.	City standards. Articulation is in landscape standards.		
379	VT	25	color, material etc of walls described?	City standards. Articulation is in landscape standards.		
380	VT	25	#1. What controls between ZC and other applicable plans?	The Zoning Code still applies unless something exceptional is called out in the plan. The reason that the NWMEP is specifically called out here is because it is another Rank III Plan.		
381	VT	26	Residential Garages. Last line. Does this mean the 2nd garage will have 1.5 feet articulation from 1st and 3rd garage? A diagram would be helpful.		Need to clarify by deleting "and each garage façade shall be set back a minimum of 3 feet from other garage facades."	On page 26 of the VTSDP, delete section "c. Residential Garages" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "c. Residential Garages. Garages shall not dominate the front façade. Street fronting garages shall be per the requirements of Table 1. Garages shall not exceed 50% of the total front facade. Three-car garages are not permitted on lots less than 50 feet wide. Three-car garages on lots greater than 50 feet wide shall have third garage set back a minimum of 3 feet from the primary garage facade. See Table 3 for additional garage requirements."

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
382	VT	26	GENERAL REQUIREMENTS MOVE, p. 26 Residential Garages to after h. Porches, Entrances and Stoops.		Ok to change	On page 26 of VTSDP move section "c. Residential Garages" to page 28 after "h. Entrances, Porches, Stoops and Vestibules". Re-letter preceding sections accordingly.
383	VT	26	ADD, Table 3 Garage Types. "NOTE 4: On streets designated Collector or lower, residential garages on corner lots shall be accessed from an alley or side street."		Ok to change	On page 26 of the VTSDP modify Table 3 to include "NOTE 4: On streets designated Collector or lower, residential garages on corner lots shall be accessed from an alley or side street."
384	VT	26	Building Design Standards: word "should" is not regulatory and ought to be replaced with "shall" generally.		Will correct. (Addressed in a previous condition).	
385	VT	26	c. add to first sentence: garages shall conform to Table 3. The written is difficult to follow even on multiple readings.		Will revise. (Addressed in a previous condition)	
386	VT	26	Massing and articulation, 1st line, I would prefer 50 ft rather than 60.	Staff thinks 60' is appropriate. The General Building Design Standards for non-residential in the ZC only requires articulation every 100'.		
387	VT	28	CHANGE, p. 28 , f. Window Cases. "Window Cases allow some flexibility to the transparency requirement for commercial uses. Window Cases have transparent fronts and are surface mounted or recessed shallow boxes which are a minimum of 3 feet wide by 5 feet tall. Window Cases shall contain display material at all times and shall not be backlit."		Ok to change	On page 28 of VTSDP delete entire section "f. Window Cases" and insert in lieu thereof "f. Window Cases. Window Cases allow some flexibility to the transparency requirement for commercial uses. Window Cases have transparent fronts and are surface mounted or recessed shallow boxes which are a minimum of 3 feet wide by 5 feet tall. Window Cases shall contain display material at all times and shall not be backlit."
388	VT	28	Roofs. What is Dimensional asphalt?	Dimensional asphalt has thickness like a roof tile rather than being flat.		

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
389	VT	29	Energy-Efficient Buildings. Last bullet, How do you do this for "residential buildings? Wind farms on the Escarpment or the Monument, or blocking views of either, would be a travesty, let alone the noise impact and bird kill. Also, not sure how pleasing the view from the Escarpment of windmill farms and roofs covered with photovoltaic stuff would be	This list represents all options, some may be more suitable for certain building types than others.		
390	VT	30	a. add stucco, synthetic stucco, concrete, rammed earth to permissive materials list. Not sure which material list, but the plan only calls out finishes, not construction methods so rammed earth might not be appropriate		Can add synthetic stucco and concrete. (Addressed in another condition)	
391	VT	30	There are multiple colors and finishes of smooth concrete blocks. These should generally be permitted, with only standard grey CMU proscribed (ie limited to 50% of wall area)		This section has been rewritten using the language from the VCSDP. Addressed in previous condition.	
392	VT	30	1a. add decorative, see thru, iron railing fence facing the street to the list.		This section has been rewritten using the language from the VCSDP. Addressed in previous condition.	
393	VT	30	Walls 1 (a): Recommend that walls adjacent to the Petroglyph National Monument boundary in the Northern Geologic Window use the landscape design standard from the draft Volcano Cliffs sector development plan (page 53, 1.b.): coyote fencing, post and wire, or view fencing.		This section has been rewritten using the language from the VCSDP. Addressed in previous condition.	

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
394	VT	30	Consider limiting language on wall heights where adjacent to public spaces of all kinds, to prevent walled communities, effectively lengthy wall-to-wall-to-wall stretches. Where back yards abut other back yards, this is not a concern of mine, only where they abut public realms.	"Walled developments" are not permitted in any of these plans.	Will replace Landscape Design Standard 1.a in VTSDP (p.30) with Landscape Design Standard 1 on page 53 of the VC. VC standard restricts height of all street-facing walls and fences to 36" and contains passive surveillance/transparency requirements.	See condition in staff report (Could not insert text into spreadsheet due to space limitations).
395	VT	30	1c. second line. Wouldn't 40 feet be better?		yes. 40' would be better	On page 30 of VTSDP under subsection "c. On-Lot Trees" in the second sentence delete "50" and insert in lieu thereof "40".
396	VT	30	Revise page 30; Landscape design Standards, paragraph g. Grading, to remove reference to "City Hydrologist" and replace with "City Engineer", as issues other than drainage and grading may impact fill heights, such as roadway design, sanitary sewer design, etc.	Language per City.		
397	VT	30	1d. Light should not bleed beyond the property line	The VTSDP must comply with Dark Skies Ordinance.		
398	VT	31	ADD, P. 31-h. Stormwater Quality & Management- Add to beginning of sentence-"where appropriate"		Ok to change	On page 31 VTSDP in Section "h. Storm Water Quality and Management" insert "Where appropriate," a the beginning of the first sentece, before "Development projects shall incorporate unobstrusive stor water features..."
399	VT	32	Revise page 32; #4, Off-site Open Space dedication requirement are met by proposed and existing public and private (HOA Owned and maintained) parks, opens space tracts and trails.		language can be modified.	On page 32 of the VTSDP, section "Usable Open Space Standards" revise #4 to read "4. Off-site Open Space dedication requirement are met by proposed and existing public and private (HOA Owned and maintained) parks, opens space tracts and trails."

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
400	VT	32	Usable open space. Add Portals		ok	On page 32 of the VTSDP section "Usable Open Space Standards" #1. add "portals" after "porch".
401	VT	32	Landscaping. 3rd line, 200 feet would be more appropriate.		ok, can reduce to 200.	On page 32 of the VTSDP section "Parking Standards" #3 "Landscaping" in the last sentence delete "260" and insert in lieu thereof "200".
402	VT	32	Permit Parking: I personally disagree with permit parking. I presently live near the Nature Center. No permit parking and no problems. Public uses the place heavily, and rightfully. I previously lived ½ block from the beach in California, and we had permit parking there. I disagreed with the permit parking; it is a privilege to live near to an amenity....and the streets are public and should be broadly available to the whole public.		Staff agrees and recommends deleting #4 under "Parking Standards" on page 32. There is a standard City process to apply for neighborhood permit parking if a certain threshold is met. It is not necessary to exempt this area from that process as the likelihood of exaggerated numbers of non-residents parking is minimal.	On page 32 of the VTSDP section "Parking Standards" delete #4 "Neighborhood Permit Parking".
403	VT	32	Parking dimensions differ from those in the rest of the City (see Zone Code). Suggest we stay with City Stds.		Staff agrees. Will change this to be consistent with ZC.	On page 32 of the VTSDP, delete all of the text after "1. Parking Dimensions - On-Site" and insert in lieu thereof, "Per the Zoning Code definition for "Parking Space, Automobile and Light Truck."
404	VT	33	Should be "Trails" not "Heights"		Will change.	On page 33 of the VTSDP delete "Heights" from the footer and insert in lieu thereof "Trails"

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
405	VT	33	<p>Page 33; allow painted stucco in addition to integral color stucco. Many production builders prefer painted stucco. Integral color stucco has some disadvantages that result in complaints by new home owners. Such disadvantages include difficulty in control of color uniformity, difficulty in matching stucco color for repairs, problems with changes in color due to changes in humidity. In some cases homeowners will elect to paint their stucco anyway. Painted stucco advantages include better quality control of paint, better ability to fix stucco and repaint to match existing stucco color. For the above reasons, over time, painted stucco has proven to be a better option for production builders.</p>	Integral stucco was part of the original plan requirements.		
406	VT	33	<p>Appendix A: expand color chart, at least to include El Rey Palomino, Sand, Driftwood, Adobe, Desert Rose, Navajo White. (alternatively, all but Denim, Dusk, Colonial White). Add comment to permit equivalents in synthetic stucco systems.</p>	Original agreed upon color palette.		

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
407	VT	24-23	It would improve the readability of the draft plan to have the section on general standards precede the sections governing each of the specific zones. Otherwise, the reader encounters the zone-specific regulations first and is left to determine if there are any overriding regulations that apply to all zones.		Staff thinks the best way to handle/clarify this issue is to add language at the beginning of the Zoning Chapter of each Plan that specifically refers the reader to the General Standards and the General Regulations of the Plan.	<p>“On page 12 of the VTSDP, add the following new section as section 2 and renumber subsequent sections accordingly:</p> <p>2. General Standards. The General Standards section of the Volcano Trails Sector Development Plan contains additional standards that apply across different zones. Properties zoned SU-2/VTVC, SU-2/VTUR, SU-2/VTSL, SU-2/VTML, and SU-2/VTRD must comply with the provisions of the General Standards section, as applicable.”</p>
408	VT	24-32	It would improve the readability of the draft plan to have the section on general standards precede the sections governing each of the specific zones. Otherwise, the reader encounters the zone-specific regulations first and is left to determine if there are any overriding regulations that apply to all zones.		Staff thinks the best way to handle/clarify this issue is to add language on page 12 that specifically refers the reader to the General Standards and the General Regulations of the Plan. (Addressed in a previous condition).	
409	VT	All Zones	Make sure diagrams and setback requirements are consistent		Will double check.	In the VTSDP verify accuracy of "Building Placement Diagrams" for each zone and modify as necessary.

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
410	VT		(EPC)Look around the geologic window and make sure the edge treatments are appropriate	Staff has worked to make sure edge treatments along the geologic window are appropriate with the following standards: P. 22, VT-ML, lot size requirements - 11,000 sq.ft. lots within 200' of monument, and 6,000 sq.ft. lots for 200'-500' from the monument. The ML zone is along all edges of the North Geologic Window in the VTSDP. In the ML zone, the height limit is 18' with an allowable 26' for up to 50% of the building footprint.	The EPC may consider recommending to include a map in the WSSP amendment that would generally identify areas suitable for open space acquisition as identified by the City's Open Space Division should funding become available. (Addressed in a previous condition).	
411	VT		No minimum vs. 0 minimum issue		Will revise.	In all zones of VTSDP verify that the formatting of "minimum" dimensions is consistent and modify as necessary.
412	VT		Include Tract 1, Unit 2 in the Volcano Trails Sector Development Plan (VTSDP), previously omitted from the sector plan. The Trails requests SU-2 for SL zoning.	This area can be rezoned with the plan, however, Trails must demonstrate ownership.		
413	VT		Allow additional options for front garage product in all zones. The current plan does not allow front oriented garages in the SL zone and discourages front oriented garages in ML zone. The restriction appears to be primarily to address the garage dominated facades that can occur with smaller lots and narrower buildings. The Trails requests and recommends allowing other options to address the issue. The Trails recommends limiting the building widths on SL to 30', which allows 10' of building for the entrance and porch, assuming a 2 car garage. (cont. below)	Staff has asked for supporting documentation to illustrate the garage design and language that Mr. Beltramo is requesting, however staff has not received such documentation. Without such supporting documentation staff is not convinced that the proposed changes would not result in a garage dominated front façade. The Volcano Trails SDP does not support front facades that are dominated by garages. Page 95 of 110		

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
			<p>Also proposed is the use of architectural treatments to diminish the effect of the garage and improve the overall community aesthetics. The Trails proposes using either a 2' depth shadow box of garage doors, or incorporating roof overhangs of 4' over garage areas, articulation of double garages as 2 separate garage doors, or a combination of the above. In addition The Trails proposes to restrict garage doors to be of the same color as the adjacent house, so as to de-emphasize the effect of garage doors. The combination of these added treatments in addition to the sector plan requirements for porches should adequately address the issue.</p>			

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
414	VT		I am writing to oppose further development near The Trails Community. First of all, there are no approaches to the community that can facilitate additional traffic. As you are aware, Unser Blvd., and Paseo del Norte are both single lane roads with heavy congestion during rush hours. Additionally, there is little in the way of basic supplies and services atop the West Mesa such as grocery stores, clinics, etc. The nearest grocery store, for example, is at the corner of Paseo del Norte and Golf Course Road. Such distances for basic services are a hardship for the elderly, handicapped and others who are often dependent on public transportation. There are also no pedestrian protective traffic signals for youngsters walking home from school, which can be a hazard should additional traffic evolve	Development can permissively occur throughout the Volcano Mesa area; these plans aim to shape future development that will better serve the West Side. Current zoning for the area is entirely residential (RD and R-1). The newly proposed zoning in the three Volcano SDPs would allow for the development of commercial and community-serving uses and offices to provide for much-needed West Side employment. The new plans also address the design of streets in order to provide adequate facilities for pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit-users in addition to motorists.		
415	VT		Include any adjacent, undeveloped tracts, not owned by The Trails into the sector plan. The Trails recommends SU-2 for SL zoning.	The sector plan can not rezone property outside of the boundaries of the plan, if properties are located inside the plan area then additional information is need.		
416	VT		Eliminate Park for Tract A, of Cantata at The Trails Unit 1. A 2 acre private park (HOA owned and maintained) is to be placed on Tract 1.	Park locations are not regulatory.		
417	VT		Eliminate TRD zone and use SU-2 for SL zone.	Staff is still in discussions with Trails about this issue.		

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
418	VT		Include multifamily housing Town House product in SL zone, with a minimum lot size of 35'x 95', 3,325 sqft. minimum lot area.	Small lot was not designed for attached townhouse uses, townhouse uses are allowed in UR zone.		
419	VT		Allow "Zero Lot line" option for all SL and ML zone, mainly to better accommodate rear garage option.	Staff has asked for supporting documentation to illustrate the garage design and language that Mr. Beltramo is requesting, however staff has not received such documentation. Without such supporting documentation staff is not sure that the request change to rear setback requirements is necessary.		
420	VT		Bernalillo County proposes a collector street be shown on the Roadway Network map in the sector plan, located approximately half way between PDN and the northern geologic window, and connecting Woodmont Ave. and City-County boundary. The sector plan map shows a dashed linear feature at this location but our records do not indicate existence of dedicated right-of-way.	A roadway along the boundary between UR and ML would be logical, but additional coordination between the County and the property owner is necessary before a provision can be considered to be added to the VTSDP.		
421	VT		Landscape 1a. Will 1 tree per lot front be adequate?	This is a minimum, and it is more than anywhere else in the city.		
422	VT		Change "Stormwater" to "Rainwater" throughout		Ok to change	In the VTSDP wherever "Stormwater" is used, delete and insert in lieu thereof "Rainwater".

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
423	W SS P	1	Did not say where in the WSSP - what page - the amendment is being included. Need to include quotation marks so that we know what exactly is being added and where.		Will specify on what page of the existing WSSP this amendment is being inserted.	On page 1 of the WSSP Amendment, insert at the very top of the page: "The amendment to the West Side Strategic Plan that follows shall be inserted after page 154 of the West Side Strategic Plan, at what is currently the end of Section 3 Specific Westside Communities, to continue after Policy 3.94." Renumber existing policies in the WSSP accordingly.
424	W SS P	2	Has anybody looked to see if there could be a MAC somewhere else on the West Side but not sitting on top of the mesa?	Staff will provide analysis of existing MACs on the west side and why the Volcano Heights area is an appropriate and necessary location for a MAC.	Add language to WSSP that describes need for MAC at this location.	See staff report. (Could not insert text and map into spreadsheet due to space limitations)
425	W SS P	2	What does the last sentence of the PID/SAD implementation mean?		Will clarify	On page 2 of the WSSP Amendment, in the section "PID/SAD Implementation" at the end of the sentence delete "established in the plans by State statute" and insert in lieu thereof "established in the Volcano Mesa plans as required by state statute and other provisions of state statute as appropriate."
426	W SS P	2	Citation of State Statute does not seem correct.		Will revise per City legal counsel.	On page 2 of the WSSP Amendment, Policy 3.98, Public Infrastructure Districts, amend the beginning of the first sentence as follows: "Public Improvement Districts (Sections 5-11-1 et seq. NMSA 1978)..."

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
427	W SS P	2	WSSP amendment needs to map a NAC for the Village Center in Volcano Cliffs.		WSSP amendment needs to map a NAC for the Village Center in Volcano Cliffs.	On page 2 of the WSSP Amendment, insert the following new Policy 3.97 and renumber subsequent policies accordingly: "Policy 3.97 Volcano Cliffs Neighborhood Activity Center. The Volcano Cliffs Village Center should be designated as a Neighborhood Activity Center. The Volcano Cliffs Village Center provides an opportunity to provide daily services, convenience goods and personal services to the residential area that surrounds it. It is centrally located to the Volcano Cliffs area, is located at the junction of a minor arterial (Universe) and a collector (Rosa Parks) and is therefore well placed to serve the community. The proximity of the area to the Volcano Vista High School and the Tony Hillerman Middle School also make this a logical location."
428	W SS P	2	Under the SAD explanation it says ".....SADs are set up to permit development in areas that have a large number of property owners, as is the case in Volcano Heights." I think it should read Volcano Cliffs		Yes, it should say "Volcano Cliffs" not "Heights".	On page 2 of the WSSP Amendment, in the section "Special Assessment Districts" in the second to last sentence delete "Heights" and insert in lieu thereof "Cliffs".

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
429	W SS P	4	Need to clarify that the language contained in the WSSP IS the visual sensitivity analysis. "The below visual sensitivity analysis of the Volcano Mesa area..." View Studies - first paragraph. What does last sentence mean? What is a visual sensitivity analysis?			On page 4 of the WSSP Amendment, delete the last sentence in the first paragraph in section 2. View Studies and insert in lieu thereof: "In recognition of the importance of views from afar, a Visual Sensitivity analysis, which depicts the Volcano Mesa area as viewed from distant points and that serves as the basis for the reflectivity and color standards in the Volcano Cliffs, Volcano Heights, and Volcano Trails Sector Development Plans, is included as Exhibit 3 and described below."
430	W SS P	8	Add language to WSSP for "Archaeological Research Design" to inform contract archaeologists that the west mesa should be viewed as a whole.		Will add.	On page 8 in the West Side Strategic Plan, Policy 3.108, add new paragraph c: "c. All archeological surveys should follow a general archaeological research design that treats the Volcano Mesa Community as a whole and not as disparate sites within the area. The Volcano Mesa Community should then be treated as an integral part of the larger west mesa, including the Petroglyph National Monument, its volcanoes and escarpment faces. The area is an archaeological landscape and data should be collected before it is lost to development. Special attention should be given to watersheds, watercourses, and adjacent lands that form cultural and spiritual linkages for past and present Native belief systems."

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
431	W SS P	9	<p>of the WSSP seems to ignore commercial development occurring on the west side. I'm not sure what may be going on at Double Eagle, but in Rio Rancho there is a new Presbyterian Hospital, Xray Associates facility, Hewlett Packard, UNM Hospital and maybe a sloar plant if that fairy tail every pans out that would be accessible from thsi area if Unser were completed from the Unser dog leg to Paradise Blvd. City and regional transportation planners are looking to the planned extensions of Unser and Paseo del Norte (PdN) to alleviate congestion on the West Side, although arterial connections will remain constrained at the Rio Grande and across the Monument escarpment. Near the Plan area, Albuquerque, Rio Rancho and Bernalillo County have approved many projects that are moving forward. Low density, single-family residences dominate nearly all of this new growth. Little employment growth has been planned, further contributing to an imbalance of jobs and housing on the West Side, and even greater pressures</p>		<p>Need to rework Section C of the WSSP completely. Move "Planned Roadway Improvements" and "Regional Impacts" sections to introduce Policy 3.109 and add language that relates these sections to access point recommendations and the MAC designation.</p>	<p>On page 9 of the WSSP Amendment, move the sections called "Planned Roadway Improvements" and "Regional Impacts" to directly before Policy 3.109 so that these sections are read as an introduction to / explanation of Policy 3.109. In the paragraph following Policy 3.109, amend the sentence that begins "While both roads are currently designated..." as follows: "While both roads are currently designated Limited Access Arterials, whose main function is to move traffic quickly and efficiently, these arterials must now provide access to and from adjacent neighborhoods as well as the Volcano Heights Sector Development Plan area in order to support the level of employment, commercial, and residential uses envisioned for the Volcano Heights Major Activity Center."</p>

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
432	W SS P	9	<p>Page 9, Policy 3.109. The second to the last sentence in the first paragraph reads, As well as easing traffic at key intersections such as Universe and Paseo del Norte which are already starting to fail by providing alternate routes onto Unser and Paseo del Norte. At present, there is no traffic data to substantiate this statement. Also, see comments 1 and 3 above.</p> <p>Comment: We request a copy of the Traffic Operations Analysis supporting these findings.</p>		Will remove sentence as it is unclear.	<p>On page 9 of the WSSP Amendment, in the section "Policy 3.109 The access points to Paseo del Norte and Unser, shown in Exhibit 6, Road Network Map should be adopted" delete the second to last sentence which reads "As well as easing traffic at key intersections such as Universe and Paseo del Norte which are already starting to fail by providing alternate routes onto Unser and Paseo del Norte".</p>

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
433	W SS P	10	<p>sentence. The last sentence reads, "Impacts of HOV/BRT lanes outside the Plan area should be studied by the Departments of Municipal Development and Transit to determine how best to integrate these lanes at Ouray and other key intersections east of the Escarpment". The suggestion that we validate the concept of implementing the HOV/BRT lanes proposed with this Plan at a later date after the Plan has been adopted is problematic. What if for some reason these off-site improvements on Paseo del Norte and Unser Blvd can not be made. How does that affect the viability of Plan? This is analogous to asking the EPC to approve a major development with the promise that the traffic study will be completed at a later date after the development has been approved. While this case is a little different, there should at least be a general understanding of the build versus no-build impacts at this time. This is the same comment as number 17 above.</p> <p>Comment: As part of the pending traffic operations analysis, provide</p>		Will delete this sentence.	On page 10 of the WSSP Amendment, delete the last sentence in recommendation "c" under Policy 3.110.

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
434	W SS P	11	<p>Page 11, Policy 3.111.d and e. Any proposals for changes to the bikeway network must be submitted to the Greater Albuquerque Bicycle Advisory Committee (GABAC) for review and comment prior to consideration for approval by the Albuquerque City Council. GABAC is the duly designated Council Committee responsible for commenting on bikeway matters. Comment: Request comments on proposals for changes to the bikeways network in the Plan area from the Greater Albuquerque Bicycle Advisory Committee (GABAC) prior to consideration for approval by the Albuquerque City Council.</p>		Will add condition.	Request comments on the proposals for changes to the bikeways network contained in Policy 3.111 of the WSSP Amendment from the Greater Albuquerque Bicycle Advisory Committee prior to consideration for approval by the Albuquerque City Council.
435	W SS P	11	<p>Page 11, Policy 3.111. An exhibit highlighting all changes in the designation of on-street bicycle lanes and trail facilities as currently shown on the adopted Long Range Bikeway System map needs to be added to this text amendment. Also see comment 7 and 18 above. Comment: Add an exhibit showing the proposed changes to the adopted Long Range Bikeway System map with the adoption of this text amendment.</p>		Will add exhibit.	On page 11 of the WSSP Amendment, add an exhibit within Policy 3.111 that shows the proposed changes to the adopted Long-Range Bikeway System map. Renumber exhibits accordingly.

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
436	W SS P	11	<p>opposes the recommendation of removing the on-street bicycle lanes from Unser Blvd north of Atrisco Drive (approximate northern limits of the existing bike lanes through the escarpment). As stated in comment 7 above, there needs to be an overall map of the Plan area (all three sector plans) showing the on-street bikeway system, and connections to the surrounding region. For example, if on-street bicycle lanes are not proposed along Unser Blvd as proposed in Policy 3.111.d, then how does the cyclist heading north on the existing Unser bikelane at Atrisco make the connection (without considerable out-of-direction travel) to the existing bicycle lanes on Unser Blvd north of Paradise Blvd. Also, if the town center is supposed to be served by all modes of travel in order to lessen the reliance on the private automobile, then why is one of the more effective modes of transportation being excluded from the Plan?</p> <p>Comment: Revise Policy 3.111.d to acknowledge the need for constructing on-street bicycle</p>		Will revise.	<p>On page 11 of the WSSP Amendment, amend Policy 3.111.d as follows: "A bike lane has been constructed on the ROW of Unser through the Escarpment. In addition to continuing on-street bike lanes on Unser to connect to existing bike lanes on Unser north of Paradise Blvd., a separate bike trail should be constructed for use by recreational cyclists as well as pedestrians."</p>
437	W SS P	15	<p>Provide a measurement of where the volcanoes are in relation to these boundaries. Where are the volcanoes in relation to these plans? Provide clearer orientation.</p>		<p>Will have AGIS provide a map to include in WSSP amendment. Will also provide this map during the presentation at EPC.</p>	<p>On page 15 of the WSSP Amendment, insert a new exhibit 2 that shows the relationship of the Volcano Mesa Area to the volcanoes and larger West Mesa Community. Renumber subsequent exhibits accordingly.</p>

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
438	W SS P	19	Page 19, Exhibit 6, Roadway Network Map. Same issue regarding the limits of the frontage road along the south side of Paseo del Norte. See comment 4 and 20 above. Comment: Revise Exhibit 6 to show the full limits of the frontage road system that are proposed along Paseo del Norte.			On page 19 of the WSSP Amendment, revise Exhibit 6, Roadway Network Map to show the full limits of the frontage road system proposed along Paseo del Norte.
439	W SS P		What is the relationship to pages 87-88 and pages 209-215 in the current WSSP?		The Volcano Mesa amendment is being added as an addendum to the WSSP. Will specify on what page of the existing WSSP this "reference" needs to be made. (Addressed in a previous condition).	
440	W SS P		Need an introductory paragraph: "The following is included in the WSSP at page ___" and then put quotation marks around everything that follows.		The Volcano Mesa amendment is being added as an addendum to the WSSP. Will specify on what page of the existing WSSP this "reference" needs to be made. (Addressed in a previous condition).	
441	W SS P		Exhibits are illegible. Enlarge and make more exhibits.		Will address	The graphics accompanying the amendment to the WSSP shall be amended and produced at a better resolution to make them legible.
442	W SS P		What is the relationship of PIDs and SADs to impact fees? Why isn't it discussed here?	Staff does not believe this needs to be discussed within the text of the WSSP Amendment. Impact fees are paid in SAD and PID areas. The SAD is for very specific on-site infrastructure, while the impact fees are for more general off site improvements.		

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
443	W SS P		Chart that compares MACs to CACs to NACs as to uses, height and density. Think there will be some consideration that there should be something less than a MAC, such as a CAC or a NAC. Are there use limitations for the different kinds of uses, height, densities in different kinds of activity centers?	This is already available in the Comp Plan. Will provide with staff report.		
444	W SS P		(EPC)I would like the planning process to really acknowledge that the west mesa already has a sense of place (referring to history)	The WSSP, page 3, talks about the unique portal into New Mexico's geological past. The purpose of these plans is to preserve the special and unique characteristics of the area, which is not currently under existing zoning and due to the lack of policy direction within the WSSP for the area. These plans and the WSSP are an important tool in ensuring the development of the area is respectful of and acknowledges the unique sense of place of the west mesa.		
445	W SS P		Process - to amend the WSSP, doesn't a bill have to be introduced first?	The Planning Department is authorized by the Zoning Code to introduce amendments to ranked plans.		

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
446	W SS P		Can PIDs and SADs be imposed on landowners without their consent? Can the funds be used for the same range of infrastructure as PIDs?	<p>In the case of a <u>PID</u>, a developer applies to the City for approval to create a PID, which is a separate legal entity overseen by a 5 member Board of Directors. As a prerequisite to the creation of a PID, evidence has to be submitted to the City of</p> <p>a. the UNANIMOUS CONSENT (see 6-9-3(B) ROA 1994) of all the owners of real property within the district to the creation of the PID; or</p> <p>b. by an election in which seventy five percent (75%) of registered voters in the proposed district plus non-resident owners of land (at 1 vote per 1/5th of an acre) approve formation (see 5-11-8 NMSA 1978). (cont. below)</p>		
				<p>Special Assessment Districts are districts that are formed at the discretion of the City Council, without the requirement for an election or unanimous consent of land owners. However, if 50% or more of the registered voters residing within the territory proposed to be included in the special assessment district, or the owners of 1/2 or more of the area of the land in the territory proposed to be included in the special assessment district, file written protests against the establishment of the special assessment district, the governing body must abandon the proposed establishment of the special assessment district.</p>		

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
447	W SS P		Was DMD involved in the drafting of the transportation standards in the WSSP amendment? Will they be reviewing this?	DMD was more involved in drafting of specific language in the VH. The language in the WSSP amendment is taken from the 2006 Plan. They have reviewed all three plans and the WSSP amendment and provided comments that have been incorporated as conditions.		