

CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE LAND USE FACILITATION PROGRAM PROJECT MEETING REPORT

Project #: 1007237

Property Description/Address: 1307 John St SE, Lot 10, Block J Eastern Addition

Date Submitted: July 30, 2008

Submitted By: Diane Grover

Meeting Date/Time: July 29, 2008

Meeting Location: John Marshall Military Service Center, 1500 Walter SE

Facilitator: Diane Grover

Parties:

Alejandro Gonzalez, Mohab LLC, Applicant
Alex Vasquez, Partner/associate

and

South Broadway N.A. (SBN)

Note: Individual names and affiliations can be found at the end of this report.

Background/Meeting Summary:

Applicant Alejandro Gonzalez requests a special exception to Section 14-16-2-11(A)(3) and South Broadway SDP, Page 45, 1.A.1.a: a Conditional Use to allow for a proposed apartment unit in an SU-2/M-R zone for property located at 1307 John Street SE. Alejandro requested a facilitated meeting with neighbors, to discuss changes made to his original request. Alejandro changed some of his plans based on prior conversations with members of the South Broadway Neighborhood Association, and wanted further discussion with the group.

Neighbors were concerned that the zoning application and the signage at the property indicated that the request was for apartments. They are opposed to additional rental property in an area where crime prevention and quality of life for neighbors, many of whom have lived in the area for 40-50 years, is a priority. They want to maintain the standards they have worked so hard to achieve. Alejandro assured neighbors that signage had been corrected the day prior to the meeting, and that he would be sure to clarify at the zoning hearing that he is proposing town homes which he intends to sell for home ownership. He indicated a willingness to require home ownership in Association by-laws and through use of CCNRs. He feels that by-laws are an expensive legal undertaking to change and would afford neighbors some measure of assurance. While neighbors appreciated that effort, they felt by-laws are easily changed by people who are financially motivated to change them, and did not offer long term assurance.

While all were concerned with safety, crime mitigation, and the appropriateness of the project, and eventual marketability, neighbors and applicant disagreed on how to achieve these goals. The applicant views mid-density to higher density use as more desirable on the busy street. While neighbors agree with that concept on more visible street locations, they feel single family use to be more appropriate at this location.

Applicant and neighbors also disagreed on marketability, with applicant believing that a multi family unit would be more marketable at the site, and neighbors believing that a single family home would appeal more to potential buyers.

Outcome:

Areas of Agreement:

- Applicant agreed to utilize CPTED design guidelines in his project wherever possible

Unresolved Issues, Interests and Concerns:

- Neighbors and applicant have different views on the appropriateness of single family or multi family housing at the subject site
- Neighbors and applicant have opposing views on which type of housing would lead to better crime prevention and marketability.

Meeting Specifics:

- 1) Zoning Request
 - a) Current zoning allows proposed usage as a “conditional use”
 - b) “Conditional Use” requires hearing to review appropriateness of proposed use
 - c) Goal of hearing is to assure neighborhood conditions are not changed or damaged by the proposed project
- 2) Plans
 - a) 3 Unit Townhome
 - i) 630 sq’ per unit
 - ii) Units to be sold rather than rented
 - iii) Planning for LEEDS Certification
 - iv) Planning high design
 - v) Applicant believes building on busy intersection will deter crime at the property
 - vi) Expected to attract couples 25-30 years of age working downtown
 - (1) Sees gas prices as motivational towards inner city housing for downtown workforce
 - vii) Applicant sees proximity to Broadway and Avenida Cesar Chavez as a negative influence on marketability of a single family house on subject property
- 3) Lot
 - a) Applicant views lot as unique and challenging
 - i) Acknowledges has not yet met required tests to be accepted by City as exceptional
 - ii) Sees property as “landlocked” by Avenida Cesar Chavez and Bridge
 - iii) Lot backs up to two commercial properties
 - iv) Conducive to criminal activity, vagrancy in it’s undeveloped state

- b) Neighbors see lot as typical
 - i) Has not met City standards for exceptional
- 4) Building orientation
 - a) Applicant visualized units fronting Avenida Cesar Chavez
 - b) Neighbors want frontage on John Street

Jonathan Turner stated that if a property line is on a street, property fronts that street; if property lines are on multiple streets, the owner can choose. He also stated that facing Avenida Cesar Chavez would require a deceleration lane and work costing approximately \$100,000. He sees fronting on John to be the only viable solution.

- 5) Neighborhood concerns
 - a) Signage had stated “Conditional use for Apartment Units”
 - i) Applicant stated that signage had been corrected on July 28, 2008
 - ii) Applicant will assure clarification at hearing
 - iii) Jonathan Turner from zoning indicated that Town Homes are frequently classified as apartments
 - b) Neighbors prefer single family home to multi-family
 - i) Believe higher density appropriate for transit corridors
 - ii) Feel additional units will diminish effective crime fighting
 - iii) Easier to address problems with 1 owner than with 3 owners
 - iv) Expect more units to lead to eventuality of rental use
 - (1) Applicant suggested 3 units would be more opportunity for owner occupation
 - v) Potential for criminal activity with 3 units
 - vi) Monitoring activity is more difficult with 3 units
 - vii) Neighbors view lot as undesirable for multiple units
 - viii) View busy and speeding traffic at Broadway and Cesar Chavez is negative factor
 - c) Home ownership
 - i) Neighbors see home ownership as highest choice within the Sector Plan and the Zoning Code
 - ii) Rental properties attract criminal element and activities
 - d) Subject property
 - i) Located in hard to see area
 - ii) Lies behind 2 commercial spaces
 - iii) Surveillance is important
 - iv) Neighbors see as undesirable location near Bridge
 - e) Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED)
 - i) Neighbors worked extensively with UNM School of Architecture and Planning to develop design concepts
 - (1) Participated in Charettes
 - (2) Diana Dorn-Jones will make CPTED design standards available to applicant
 - (3) Applicant indicated desire and willingness to adhere to standards as much as possible

Comments:

- Neighbors were pleased with Alejandro’s use of a licensed architect for his project

- Neighbors acknowledged that their past negative experiences with other developers have led them to be critical and focused and in need of protecting their property values
- Neighbors value longstanding property owners and feel that 630 sq' units do not promote long term home ownership

Action Plan:

- Applicant will proceed with August 12 Hearing

Action Items:

- Diana Dorn-Jones gave guidelines on CPTED to applicant for his review
- Applicant will review and apply as much as possible to his project

Application Hearing Details:

ZHE Application Hearing Details:

- 1) Hearing Scheduled for Tuesday, August 12, 2008
- 2) Hearing Details:
 - a) The Office of the Zoning Hearing Examiner conducts monthly quasi-judicial PUBLIC HEARINGS regarding Special Exceptions to the Zoning Code (Please refer to Section 14.16.4.2 of the Comprehensive City Zoning Code)
 - b) There are certain criteria that applicants must meet in order to obtain an approval of decision for their special exception request.
- 3) Hearing Process:
 - a) Comments from facilitated meetings will go into a report which goes to the Hearing Examiner
 - b) All interested parties may appear at the hearing and voice their opinions or submit written comments prior to the day of public hearing.
 - c) The Zoning Hearing Examiner will render a determination of approval, approval with conditions or denial within 15 days after the close of the public hearing
 - d) The determination can be appealed to the Board of Appeals

Any further questions or comments can be referred to:

Lucinda Montoya

934-3918

Lucindamontoya@cabq.gov

Names & Addresses of Attendees:

Diana Dorn-Jones	SBNA
Lory Smith	SBNA
Virginia L. Raybon	SBNA
Joan Jones	SBNA
Leslie Bailly	SBNA
Jonathon Turner	City of Albuquerque
Alex Vasquez	Partner
Alejandro Gonzales	Mohab LLC