

CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE LAND USE FACILITATION PROGRAM PROJECT MEETING REPORT

Project #: 1005541

Property Description/Address: North I-25 Sector Development Project

Sector Plan Boundaries are the Sandia Reservation to the North, the North Diversion Channel to the West, Paseo del Norte to the South, and Louisiana Blvd. to the East.

Date Submitted: April 4, 2008

Submitted By: Kathleen Oweegon & Diane Grover

Meeting Date/Time: April 2, 2008 6:00-8:45

Meeting Location: Balloon Fiesta Museum

Facilitator: Kathleen Oweegon

Co-facilitator: Diane Grover, Marsha Kellogg

Parties:

- **Applicant (COA)**
 - ❖ Chris Hyer
- **Agent (HDR)**
 - ❖ Steve Schnell
- **Wildflower Area N.A.**
 - ❖ Larry Caudill
- **La Cueva Oeste HOA**
 - ❖ Patricia Herrera
 - ❖ Charlie Zumwalt
- **West La Cueva N.A.**
 - ❖ Jim Myers
 - ❖ Mima Gimmel
 - ❖ Peggy Neff
 - ❖ Thurman Suillo (sp?)
 - ❖ Stephanie O'Connell
 - ❖ Ross Dimmick
- **Consensus Planning**
 - ❖ Jim Strozier
- **Albuquerque Public Schools**
 - ❖ Betty King
- **NAIOP**
 - ❖ Lynne Anderson
- **Zephyr Design**
 - ❖ Judy Suiter
- **UDC**
 - ❖ Jim Trump
- **M&W**
 - ❖ Dave Hill

- **CBRE**
 - ❖ Dan Newman
 - ❖ Jim Smith
- **Dekker/Perich/Sabatini**
 - ❖ Chris Gunning
- **CB Commercial**
 - ❖ Bill Adams
- **Hope School**
 - ❖ Jim Tate

- **D8C**
 - ❖ Don Couchman
 - ❖ Darlene Couchman
- **Balloon Fiesta**
 - ❖ Paul Smith
- **PNM**
 - ❖ Robert Jarrett
- **Cauwels & Stuve**
 - ❖ Steve Cauwels
- **City Council**
 - ❖ Diana Trujeque (assistant to Councilman Brad Winter)
- **Other**
 - ❖ Keith Meyer - Broker
 - ❖ Calvin King (with 2 others) - Carmel
 - ❖ Sandra Mobly - homeowner (no association named)
 - ❖ Sandi Walker - homeowner (no association named)
 - ❖ Sharon Cilenti - homeowner (no association named)
 - ❖ Tracie O'Geary - observer/facilitator candidate
 - ❖ Elaine Schumacher - no affiliation given
 - ❖ Jim Schumacher - no affiliation given
 - ❖ Joan March - no affiliation given
 - ❖ Stuart Christianson - no affiliation given

Background/Meeting Summary:

At the onset of the meeting Chris Hyer announced that he would be seeking a deferral on this Sector Plan next week, and that the new Study Session date would be May 8, 2008. The time for the start of the Study Session is in question, as it may be moved up to 1:30. Chris will make sure that an email announcement of the time, once decided, will be sent to meeting attendees.

Steve Schnell from HDR presented the March, 2008 draft of the I-25 Sector Plan in a power point presentation. This presentation is available on the City website and can be viewed at <http://www.cabq.gov/planning/advance/pdf/northi25slideshowmar.pdf>. Sector Plan Boundaries are the Sandia Reservation to the North, the North Diversion Channel to the West, Paseo del Norte to the South, and Louisiana Blvd. to the East. One objective of the Plan is to create a regional employment center. The Journal Center to the South is now 95% filled and the City would like to create some extension to the Journal Center. The other objectives are to control encroachment of single family residences into the area and to find a balance between existing land uses and future uses. Transition areas are a concern; and the overall intent is to create a vision for the area.

A major point of concern was the height overlay issue, which was clarified early in the meeting. Chris Hyer stressed that when property within this plan is developed, the developer will have the choice of either developing in accordance to the uses allowed under the existing zoning or developing in accordance to the uses allowed in the Land Use District Overlay. This was a fact that numerous meeting attendees were unclear on at the onset of the meeting, and that Chris felt was misunderstood at the last EPC meeting. This clarification seemed to calm concerns of many of the meeting attendees.

Other concerns included:

- confusion of neighbors with regards to zoning allowances and restrictions;
- the effect of increase in residential uses on the school system;
- traffic needs such as signals and traffic calming measures, and
- a desire for continuation of site by site considerations.

Many attendees expressed appreciation of the fact that the City is working with individuals on a site by site basis, and encouraged more of the same. Chris indicated that while this is not the easiest way to proceed, it seemed to achieve the best result.

Outcome:

Areas of Agreement:

- No universal areas of agreement were clearly defined as such.
- A neighbor from Wildflower NA expressed approval of this project overall, with some residual concern about traffic impacts on his neighborhood.
- A representative of NAIOP felt that the clarification about the overlay enforcement would alleviate the concerns of many NAIOP members, and agreed to share that clarification with them.

Unresolved Issues, Interests and Concerns:

- Traffic issues (need to go back to Traffic Engineering) - see items (5) (o-r) below
- In the area West of I-25 North of San Diego there is the potential to go to 5 stories; C-1 would be 2 stories or 26'; IP allows 120 feet (existing zoning). *Peggy stated that the NA would stand against the height overlay zone in this case.*

Key Points:

- Many were not clear at the onset of the meeting about the zoning overlay enforcement. There was a lessening of tension in the room when this point was clarified.

Meeting Specifics:

- 1) Land Use Plan
 - a) Low/Medium Density Residential refers to existing single family homes
 - b) High Density Residential refers to Multi-Family Homes
 - c) Neighborhood Commercial is the transition area between the single family units and the rest of the plan area
 - i) Pedestrian friendly
 - ii) Restaurants and retail
 - iii) Buffer between existing residential and remainder of plan area
 - d) Regional Commercial area is along I-25 and at Paseo del Norte and Alameda intersections, plus planned extension of San Diego across I-25 for large scale, big box retail (Commercial overlay i.e. Blue Cross, Blue Shield)
 - e) Commerce
 - f) Manufacturing in the Southwest Corner (i.e. General Mills Plant)
 - g) Recreational/open space (Balloon Fiesta Park and the area South of Alameda)
- 2) Community Design Plan
 - a) Lack of design standards was an issue at a previous meeting
 - b) Attendees wanted stricter regulations
 - i) Maintenance of medians
 - ii) Preservation of views
 - c) Objective – to come up with unifying design guidelines.
 - d) 4 main categories
 - i) Site design
 - (1) Views and orientation of buildings and how they relate to each other
 - (2) Building orientation and relation to open space and configurations
 - (3) Pedestrian and bicycle circulation

- (4) Internal vehicle circulation
- (5) Guidelines to address drive-up over-use
- ii) Building design includes
 - (1) Building principles
 - (2) Façade Treatments
 - (3) Building Roofs
 - (4) Permitted building materials
 - (5) Screening of undesirable materials
- iii) Signage
 - (1) Monument signs
 - (2) Building signs
- iv) Height overlay
 - (1) Most controversial element
 - (2) Goal is protection of existing single family areas and open space resources
 - (3) As now written, one can choose if using underlying zoning, in which case, there is no height overlay restriction. However, if one chooses to develop using the overlay standards, restrictions will apply.
 - (4) Intended to balance between existing uses and proposed uses
- 3) Transportation Plan
 - a) Address current lack of connectivity.
 - b) Traffic volume and speeds near residential neighborhoods
 - c) Truck traffic on Alameda
 - d) Cut through traffic through neighborhoods
 - e) High number of curb cuts
 - f) Some improvements requested by EPC
 - g) Extending San Diego
 - h) Extending San Mateo Drive South to new planned arterial
 - i) Sidewalk improvements were requested
 - j) Traffic signal proposed
 - k) Bike lanes proposed along Alameda
- 4) Open Space Plan
 - a) Goal – to protect and maintain high-quality, accessible, sufficient system of recreation facilities and sites to serve the plan area.
 - b) Utilize existing systems (i.e. Balloon Fiesta Park)
 - c) Protect existing arroyos
 - d) Address lack of connectivity
 - i) Bike lanes along Alameda
- 5) Neighbor concerns and comments
 - a) One neighbor stated that neighbors appreciate views and support height overlay zone
 - b) NAIOP has concerns about height restrictions effect on current property owners
 - i) Result in down zoning
 - ii) Decrease in property values
 - iii) Defeat the purpose of the sector plan’s goal to create an employment area like the Journal Center
 - iv) Limit types of businesses that would have lower square footage

Response from Chris: C1 zoning allows 26' height. Height overlay concept is an attempt to answer concerns of residents and Balloon Fiesta Park for vertical orientation. He stressed that if underlying zoning is used, there is no restriction and the overlay does not apply. Height overlay does not affect existing zoning. Chris feels this was misunderstood at the EPC hearing. The plan does not alter underlying zoning. They are adding overlay of allowable uses that are sector plan specific. Property owners want to maximize returns, with ventures other than warehouses and manufacturing plants. "We are trying to add to flexibility and support the comprehensive plan goal to create a better environment for the City"

Lynn stated that she was comfortable with the fact that if underlying zoning were used, there would be no height restriction. Lynn will convey this information to the people who requested she speak on behalf of the height issue.

- c) Some have desire for discussion of individual sites and believe that decisions should be made by the City on a site-by-site basis.

Response from Steve: Many sites were addressed site by site. "We talked to many landowners and tried to cater to their needs." He stated that they were site specific with regards to people who came to talk to them; they contacted others who did not respond, therefore were not taken into consideration.

- d) Building at Alameda and San Pedro is residential use and is going from 2 to 3 stories, which will affect the school zone. Neighbor does not want them to go commercial.

Response from Steve: "We have talked to landowners and expressed our concerns – that this is not consistent with the sector plan"

- e) How does the City expect us to read and understand the residential densities in the plan? How to neighbors know that a planned use would go against the sector plan?

Response from Chris: "I understand your concern. The Plan director or his designee has a staff member review plans administratively. This will be me once the plan is adopted. I will review them and make sure that uses in the neighborhood commercial overlay district will be consistent." He stated that one developer came in and wanted apartment buildings with 24 dwelling units per acre. Neighborhood Commercial does not allow strictly apartment building. His densities are higher and the City advised him that this was not the intent of the Sector Plan. "Your assurance is our administrative review and DRB review as well as zoning enforcement"

- f) Another site at Palomas and San Pedro requested 5 stories. The height overlay ruling would be 3 stories; underlying zoning is 2.

Response from Chris: This was a proposed hotel. Chris stated that they are still working on this. The site owner has been approached by a chain asking for a taller building. This came late to the process. City is trying to see if there is a way to accommodate this and is trying to make sure that everyone is comfortable as this moves forward to City adoption.

Peggy responded that her Neighborhood Association would be fine with this project.

- g) In the area West of I-25 North of San Diego there is the potential to go to 5 stories; C-1 would be 2 stories or 26'; IP allows 120 feet (existing zoning).

Response from Chris: If you use extended allowable uses, there is an overlay zone, which would be 52'. If they use underlying zoning they would be limited to Industrial Park and Office use at 120 feet. The intent was to look at I-25 and nodes at Paseo del Norte and Alameda and the San Diego fly-over. The intent is to back off in between nodes and have more intense usage at nodes.

Peggy stated that the NA would stand against the height overlay zone in this case.

- h) Jim Strozier on behalf of Paul Cauwels (Cauwels and Stuve Realty and Development Advisors, LLC) raised concerns about specific heights. He stated an agreement was reached prior to this meeting with the Balloon Fiesta Park regarding step down heights of buildings from 72' to 52' and then to 39' from North to South. This avoids structures being non-conforming. They'd like to see this agreement recognized in the Sector Plan

Response from Chris: "Paul and his partner entered into an agreement with the Balloon Fiesta Park and property owners just South (Assisted Living Facility, Nursing Home and Molina Health Care Building) The request has been submitted and will be carried forward. We have a signed agreement from the parties and this should go forward without problem." Chris mentioned that looking at things from a site-specific perspective is not always the easiest course of action but it is the way to go.

- i) Paul stated that his building, which mirrors the Molina building, is at DRB now. The Assisted living facility has put up its remaining acreage for sale to the Balloon Fiesta Park. If the agreement is not accepted, he stated that attorneys will address this as a zone change... Currently the acreage is SU-1 for office and medical use, but he suggested uses may not be solely pursued. They would like a commercial designation to create jobs for the area rather than residential. He had concerns about ramifications in the event that the building should need to be replaced for any reason (giving the example of the building burning down). He wants to see the plan go forward and be finalized.

Response from Chris: "We will honor as much as we can of the agreement, although we don't have control over the City Council." They are trying to incorporate the agreement.

- j) Larry feels working closely with folks seems reasonable and fair. He hopes similar compromises can be made with others and salutes the City for their actions in this regard.

- k) Dan, a commercial real estate broker states they have been working in the area of economic development with Fidelity and Paychex. There are diminished resources for companies looking for sites. He encourages continued flexibility in working with people on a site by site basis to continue to allow higher density and create a buffer for viable commercial spaces. A denser population is needed to support businesses and higher occupancy transit. Other than warehouses, there is a need to provide for facilities like Blue Cross / Blue Shield and Molina. Allowing higher density along the freeway attracts businesses to the regional area and ties together the East and West ends of Albuquerque
- l) Growth of residential areas and the impact on schools
 - i) Boundary changes possible?

Response from Betty King, APS planner: School facility programs have been implemented and all residential developers pay a fee to the public schools since October, 2006. School fees go directly to the schools that they impact. The EPC process is to provide comments to the City to be used in their analysis. APS can't make specific commitments to areas about changing boundaries when there are new schools, or address population imbalances. At this time there is no reason to change La Cueva boundaries because it is growing at a stable rate and there is no immediate need, however we cannot commit to never changing those boundaries

- m) Capacity of the schools

EG Ross currently has 200 spaces available after Northstar took some of their students. Desert Ridge has 150 spaces available; La Cueva has 60

- n) Can a strategy be built in to the plan that zoning issues are paramount to neighbors when considering proposed residential development?

Response from Chris: Landowners want mixed- use developments. In order for commercial areas to work they need a 24/7 population - or at least an 8-5 population – to keep them in business. Businesses want a residential component. The City allowed for a residential area with a 2nd story (or more) allowable, although this will not actualize right away. Schools are looking closely at growth patterns in the sector plan area – how many units and what age groups will be anticipated. This will lead to decisions as to school capacities. There is frequent communication with the school system, but we can't predict the future.

- o) Neighborhood currently has two racetracks – one at San Mateo. A neighbor stated that the traffic engineer has indicated that stop signs do not control speed or traffic. Neighbors are concerned about San Mateo from Balloon Fiesta Drive to Alameda – a 1 mile stretch that passes 3 residential areas and has vehicles travelling up to 65 mph. Neighbors want the plan to deal with traffic calming on San Mateo and look at speed, traffic density and cut-through traffic.

Response from Chris: Planners can't address speed with the plan but made recommendations for traffic calming studies in residential areas a part of the capital improvement plan.

- p) Left turn on Jefferson from San Diego

Response from Chris: "We're working on that"

- q) Peggy questions a light proposed at San Mateo and Palomas and another needed at Holly and San Pedro. Fees have been paid for Palomas, and Holly is supposed to be paid for by a new 5-story building. This needs to be part of the strategy.

Response from Chris: "I will talk to the City engineer and get him to respond back to Peggy. We can make recommendations in the plan for this and the truck restrictions Larry requested (although we cannot speak for the DOT)"

Steve Added: "We recommended a signal at Alameda and San Pedro"

- r) Larry requested that 25 mph speed limits on Balloon Fiesta Drive be continued, and for the Drive not to become a truck path.

Action Items:

- Chris Hyer will make sure an email announcement goes out to all meeting attendees detailing the meeting start time for the EPC Study Session on May 8, 2008.
- Chris will relay concerns about two proposed signals at San Mateo and Palomas and at Holly and San Pedro with the traffic engineer and have him respond back to Peggy

Application Process Details: This project will be heard in an EPC Study Session scheduled for May 8, 2008

1. Hearing Process:

- a. Comments from facilitated meetings will go into a report, which goes to the City Planner.
- b. City Planner includes facilitator report in recommendations.
- c. The Commission will make a decision and parties have 15 days to appeal the decision.

Names & Addresses of Attendees:

IMPORTANT NOTE: Several e-mail addresses were illegible. Some I guessed at. These are all noted below. If a recipient of this report knows the e-mail address of one of these individuals, please forward it to him/her.

- **Applicant (COA)**
 - ❖ Chris Hyer
- **Agent (HDR)**
 - ❖ Steve Schnell
- **Wildflower Area N.A.**
 - ❖ Larry Caudill
- **La Cueva Oeste HOA**
 - ❖ Patricia Herrera
 - ❖ Charlie Zumwalt
- **West La Cueva N.A.**
 - ❖ Jim Myers

- ❖ Mima Gimmel
- ❖ Peggy Neff
- ❖ Thurman Suillo (sp?)
- ❖ Stephanie O'Connell
- ❖ Ross Dimmick
- **Consensus Planning**
 - ❖ Jim Strozier
- **Albuquerque Public Schools**
 - ❖ Betty King
- **NAIOP**
 - ❖ Lynne Anderson
- **Zephyr Design**
 - ❖ Judy Suiter
- **UDC**
 - ❖ Jim Trump (e-mail address illegible)
- **M&W**
 - ❖ Dave Hill
- **CBRE**
 - ❖ Dan Newman (e-mail address illegible)
 - ❖ Jim Smith
- **Dekker/Perich/Sabatini**
 - ❖ Chris Gunning
- **CB Commercial**
 - ❖ Bill Adams
- **Hope School**
 - ❖ Jim Tate
- **D8C**
 - ❖ Don Couchman
 - ❖ Darlene Couchman
- **Balloon Fiesta**
 - ❖ Paul Smith
- **PNM**
 - ❖ Robert Jarrett
- **Cauwels & Stuve**
 - ❖ Steve Cauwels
- **City Council**
 - ❖ Diana Trujeque (assistant to Councilman Brad Winter)
- **Other**
 - ❖ Keith Meyer - Broker
 - ❖ Calvin King (with 2 others) - Carmel
 - ❖ Sandra Mobly - homeowner (no association named)
 - ❖ Sandi Walker - homeowner (no association named)
 - ❖ Sharon Cilenti - homeowner (no association named) (e-mail address illegible)
 - ❖ Tracie O'Geary - observer/facilitator candidate
 - ❖ Elaine Schumacher - no affiliation given
 - ❖ Jim Schumacher - no affiliation given
 - ❖ Joan March - no affiliation given
 - ❖ Stuart Christianson - no affiliation given