



***Environmental
Planning
Commission***

***Agenda Number: 02
Project Number: 1008444
Case #s: 10EPC-40044
03 February 2011***

Supplemental Staff Report

<i>Agent</i>	COA, Planning Department
<i>Applicant</i>	City of Albuquerque
<i>Request</i>	Recommend Adoption of the Volcano Cliffs Sector Development Plan
<i>Legal Description</i>	See attached map
<i>Location</i>	Area boundaries are the Petroglyph National Monument on the east, south and west and Paseo Del Norte to the north.
<i>Size</i>	Approximately 2,327 acres
<i>Existing Zoning</i>	R1, RD, RO-20, A1 (Bernalillo County), SU1 for Major Public Open Space
<i>Proposed Zoning</i>	New zones: SU-2 VC Village Center, SU-2 VC Neighborhood Mixed Use, SU-2 VC Urban Residential, SU-2 VC Large Lot, SU-2 VC Rural Residential. General Design Regulations and Development Standards are associated to varying degrees with all properties within the Volcano Cliffs SDP boundary.

Staff Recommendation

That an EPC recommendation of APPROVAL be forwarded to the City Council, based on the Findings beginning on Page 4 and subject to the Conditions beginning on Page 8.

***Staff Planner
Petra Morris, Planner***

Summary of Analysis

This third EPC Hearing for the Volcano Cliffs Sector Development Plan (SDP) is a continuance from November 4, 2010. A redline version of the draft plan that includes the conditions recommended by staff in November and some minor changes and adjustments since then has been produced to aid the EPC's review of the draft plan. This redline version was printed for the EPC and made available in electronic form on the Planning Department web page for the plan.

The Volcano Cliffs SDP covers 2,327 acres of land and contains goals and policies related to Transportation, the Environment /Open Space and Land Use. The Land Use chapter adopts zoning and general regulations to guide future development within the area. The policies and regulations in the plan were developed to reflect the Vision and Guiding Principles in the plan, as well as implementing the proposed policies of the Volcano Mesa Community amendment to the WSSP.

Since the November 4, 2010 EPC hearing Planning Staff has continued to meet with community members, property owners, commissioners and agency staff. Planning Staff produced and added to the table of written comments received and corresponding staff responses. Based on all the input received at and since the previous hearing, this staff report discusses the proposals and offers proposed amendments to the Volcano Cliffs SDP in the form of Conditions of Approval.

The Planning Department requests that the Environmental Planning Commission recommend to City Council approval of the Volcano Cliffs SDP.

This supplemental staff report should be read in conjunction with the September 2, 2010 and November 4, 2010 staff reports.



City Departments and other interested agencies reviewed this application from 08/02/2010 to 08/13/2010 with additional review after November 4, 2010. Agency comments and those from interested parties were used in the preparation of this report and are found in the attached spreadsheet.

BACKGROUND

A second EPC hearing to consider the Volcano Cliffs SDP took place on 04 November 2010 where additional public comment was taken. The November 2010 staff report addresses comments and proposed changes to the Volcano Cliffs SDP. The EPC deferred the request and directed staff to create a redline version of the SDP to show where and how recommended conditions of approval would fit into the draft plan. Planning Department staff and Council Services staff have created this revised document and have used the time to continue to receive and respond to comments.

Since the November hearing Planning Staff met with community members, property owners, legal staff, Transportation staff and Parks and Open Space staff. Additional comments were received from the public. All comments and letters received subsequent to the November 4, 2010 hearing (and received prior to the issuance of this staff report) are attached to this supplemental staff report. In this staff report all comments received to date are addressed. A spreadsheet was created where each comment is entered into the table and addressed individually (see the attached). The responses to each comment have generated the conditions found in this supplemental staff report.

CHANGES SINCE 04 NOVEMBER 2010

The following changes are in addition to those found in the September 2nd and November 4th Staff Reports.

As stated above, the Volcano Cliffs Sector Development Plan (VCSDP) has been revised to show redline edits that reflect the conditions from the November 2010 staff report (Recommended Conditions 1 – 145). Several minor changes, including formatting, spelling and grammar issues, are addressed in a new set of recommended conditions (Recommended Conditions 146 – 221). These new, recommended conditions are shown in the redline version as blue text. The new recommended conditions make reference to pages from both the July 2010 draft (JD) and from the February 2011 redline version (RL). These page references are shown as, for example, “JR-37/RL-46” which means the change is for page 37 in the July 2010 draft and for page 46 in the February 2011 redline version.

The new conditions include cleaning up the acknowledgement page, clarifying the titles of some chapters, and comparing existing zoning to the proposed zoning (uses, densities, locations, relation to sustainable growth). Other notable, recommended changes include expanded discussion of plan rankings (JD-6/RL-7), and the strengthening and clarifying of policy language for open space, trails, and conservation development (JD-29/RL-23). The SU-2 designation for the proposed zoning categories has been added throughout the draft plan. Specific changes to proposed regulations are intended to make them more clear to readers and implementable by property owners and reviewing staff (JD-35/RL-43).

Additional changes include clarifications about the interface of the VCSDP and the Northwest Mesa Escarpment Plan boundaries and standards (JD-48/RL-58). Changes are proposed to the General

standards to give more specificity where appropriate (JD-46/RL-55). Some of the changes are the result of suggestions from interested parties concerned with open space and views.

The reader is encouraged to review all of the specific, recommended changes in the redline version of the plan.

CONCLUSIONS

The Volcano Cliffs SDP covers 2,327 acres of land and contains updated goals and policies related to Transportation, the Environment /Open Space and Land Use. The Zoning and General Standards chapter adopts zoning and general regulations to guide future development within the area. The policies and regulations in the plan were developed to reflect the Vision and Guiding Principles in the plan, as well as implementing the policies of the Volcano Mesa Community amendment to the WSSP.

Since the November 2010 EPC Hearing, Planning and Council staff and consultants have conducted additional analysis and propose revisions and changes that address comments, concerns and issues that were raised by the Commission, property owners and the public. These changes are detailed in the February 2011 redline version of the plan and reflected in the recommended conditions.

The Planning Department requests an Environmental Planning Commission (EPC) recommendation to City Council to approve the Volcano Cliffs Sector Development Plan.

FINDINGS – 10EPC 40044, 03 February 2011, Volcano Cliffs Sector Development Plan

1. The Volcano Cliffs Sector Development Plan (VCSDP) is a Rank III plan that covers an area of approximately 2,327 acres. The plan boundaries are the Petroglyph National Monument on the east, south and west and Paseo Del Norte to the north.
2. This plan is one of three distinct but related sector development plans intended to guide future development in the larger Volcano Mesa Community. The other two plans are the Volcano Heights and Volcano Trails Sector Development Plans. The three plans share similar policy underpinnings that are included in a companion amendment to the Rank II, West Side Strategic Plan (WSSP).
3. Volcano Cliffs Sector Development Plan currently contains R1, RD, RO-20, A1 County, SU1 for Major Public Open Space and proposes SU-2 VC Village Center, SU-2 VC Neighborhood Mixed Use, SU-2 VC Urban Residential, SU-2 VC Large Lot, SU-2 VC Rural Residential, as well as General Design Regulations are associated to varying degrees with all properties within the Volcano Cliffs SDP boundary.
4. The Volcano Cliffs Sector Development Plan supports the following goals and policies in the Albuquerque/Bernalillo County Comprehensive Plan:
 - a. Policies II.B.5.c, e, f, g, i, k, m, n: through the proposed Neighborhood Activity Center for the Village Center, the mix of uses proposed in order to provide neighborhood services and retail in specific locations in the Volcano Cliffs area, the clustering of homes in the SU2 VC Rural Residential zone, the proposed treatment for the arroyos and zoning regulations that ensure development will not be visually intrusive- restrictions on height, color and reflectivity;
 - b. Policies II.B.1.c, f, j: through the location of the least intense zoning adjacent to Major Public Open Space and the General Standards that address colors, heights, reflectivity and fencing adjacent to the Petroglyph National Monument. Also through the designation of existing and future single loaded streets as scenic corridors, and the provision of trails;
 - c. Policy II.B.7: Goal: through the designation of the Volcano Cliffs Village Center as a Neighborhood Activity Center;
 - d. Policy II.C.6.c: through the language in General Standards that address archeological sites;
 - e. Policies II.C.9.b, c, e: through the proposed zoning, the proposed arroyo treatments, the proposed road network, and the proposed Neighborhood Activity Center, and through the employment opportunities provided by the Village Center;

-
- f. Policies II.D.6. a, g: through the small business and employment opportunities provided by the mixed use areas and the Village Center.
 5. The Volcano Cliffs Sector Development Plan supports the following policies in the Westside Strategic Plan:
 - a. Policy 1.1 through the high density, and non residential uses to be located in proposed nodes;
 - b. Policy 1.9 through the location of a Neighborhood Activity Center in the Village Center of Volcano Cliffs;
 - c. Policy 1.16 through the location of the Volcano Cliffs Neighborhood Activity Center on a minor arterial, Universe.
 6. The Volcano Cliffs Sector Development Plan supports the following policies in the Northwest Mesa Escarpment Plan Policies 12, 20, and 21 through the Zoning and General Standards in the Volcano Cliffs SDP, written to avoid visually intrusive development. The proposed trail network and scenic corridors for the Volcano Cliffs area support policy 23.
 7. The Volcano Cliffs Sector Development Plan supports the Proposed Trails Map on page 22 and the intent of the Rank II Trails and Bikeways Facility Plan through the expansion of the trail network in this area.
 8. The Volcano Cliffs Sector Development Plan supports the Rank II Facility Plan for Electric Service Transmission and Subtransmission Facilities, through the addition of language provided by PNM to address the address utility easements, landscaping and access to public utility facilities.
 9. The Volcano Cliffs Sector Development Plan supports the Rank II City of Albuquerque Major Public Open Space Facility Plan policies B2-G, B2-K, C-3 and Figure 4-1 through the policies found in Chapter 3 that address the environment and open space and the design and zoning regulations that ensure appropriate transitions from developed areas to open space.
 10. The Volcano Cliffs Sector Development Plan supports the Rank II Facility Plan for Arroyos: Multiple Use of Albuquerque's Arroyos and their Floodplains policies II.B. Drainage 1, II.B. Multiple Use 1, II.C.2, II.C.3, II.D.2, II.F.4 through the proposed treatment for arroyos, the design standards in the plan and the opportunity for trails along arroyos provided in Policy 1 of Chapter 3 and the following eight sub policies.
 11. The Volcano Cliffs Sector Development Plan is justified per Resolution 270-1980. The proposed zoning is more advantageous to the community because it furthers applicable goals and policies in

the Comprehensive Plan, the WSSP and the NWMEP. The proposed zoning is designed to create a healthy community that contains a mix of uses, is transit accessible, bicycle friendly, and encourages pedestrian activity. The proposed zoning meets R270-1980 criteria as follows:

- A. The zone changes proposed by the Volcano Cliffs SDP are consistent with furthering the health, safety, morals and general welfare of the city. The purpose of the SDP is to ensure that as the area develops it is development that furthers the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan and other applicable plans- in this case the WSSP and the NWMEP. The plan proposes residential, commercial, office and service uses, in pattern designed to support transit.

- B. The proposed zoning changes will provide the area with stability. Much of the Volcano Cliffs SDP is zoned RD. RD allows a range of densities and uses with no requirement for coordination and/ or planning. The proposed zoning for the SDP is designed to reflect the platting, the unique location of the area, the road network and conditions and to bring neighborhood services and retail to the Volcano Cliffs area. The proposed zoning is designed to ensure that non residential uses, mixed use, multifamily residential, townhouses, and single family uses all develop in a pattern and location that are supportive of creating a stable built environment.

- C. The proposed Volcano Cliffs SDP supports applicable goals and policies in the Comprehensive Plan, Westside Strategic Plan, the Northwest Mesa Escarpment Plan, the Trails and Bikeways Facility Plan, the Facility Plan for Electric Service, and the Facility Plan for Arroyos as outlined in previous findings 4 - 10.

- D. The existing zoning is inappropriate because:
 - 1. Not applicable;

 - 2. The U.S. Congress created the Petroglyph National Monument after the establishment of the existing zoning. The proposed zoning responds to and endeavors to minimize adverse impacts on the Petroglyph National Monument while allowing private property to be developed; and

 - 3. The proposed zoning would be more advantageous to the community because it furthers applicable goals and policies in the Comprehensive Plan, the WSSP and the NWMEP. The proposed zoning is designed to create a healthy community that contains a mix of uses, is transit accessible, bicycle friendly, and encourages pedestrian activity. Please see preceding analysis.

- E. The proposed zoning does not contain uses that would be harmful to adjacent properties, neighbors or the community. Where residential and commercial properties are adjacent, the height of the non residential zone is required to step down. Per the Zone Code, non-residential properties are required to buffer residential properties when they meet.

- F. None of the Plan's zone changes require major capital expenditures.

- G. The cost of land is not discussed in the Plan.

- H. The location of mixed use and higher density residential zoning is related to the vision proposed for the whole Volcano Mesa area.

- I. The proposed zone changes will create spot zones that are justified as follows:
 - 1. The proposed zoning clearly facilitates realization of the Comprehensive Plan, the West Side Strategic Plan and the Northwest Mesa Escarpment Plan as detailed above in the response to R-270-1980, Section 1.C.; and

 - 2. The proposed zoning and their individual, component regulations within the plan area and the plan area itself are different from surrounding land. The proposed locations of zone boundaries create differences between adjacent lands and zones as well as differences between zones within the plan area. The proposed zoning categories establish and facilitate transitions between adjacent zones within the plan area and where adjacent to existing zoning. Even where residential and non-residential zoning abut or are adjacent, there are specific requirements for height transitions within the more intense zone category so as to maximize compatibility with the less intense zone category.

- J. The proposed zone changes will create strip zones that are justified as follows:
 - 1. The proposed zoning clearly facilitates realization of the Comprehensive Plan, the West Side Strategic Plan and the Northwest Mesa Escarpment Plan as detailed above in the response to R-270-1980, Section 1.C.; and

 - 2. The proposed zoning and their individual, component regulations within the plan area and the plan area itself are different from surrounding land. The proposed locations of zone boundaries create differences between adjacent lands and zones as well as differences between zones within the plan area. The proposed zoning categories establish and facilitate transitions between adjacent zones within the plan area and where adjacent to existing zoning. Even where residential and non-residential zoning abut or are adjacent, there are specific requirements for height transitions within the more intense zone category so as to

maximize compatibility with the less intense zone category. Furthermore, the location of many of the “strip zones” is in response to traffic potentials on established, but not yet fully developed arterial corridors, such as Paseo del Norte and Unser Boulevard.

12. The Environmental Planning Commission has reviewed the Volcano Cliffs Sector Development Plan and received presentations and testimony from Planning staff, commenting City departments and other agencies, property owners, interested parties, and the general public at three separate, public hearings on 02 September 2010, 04 November 2010, and 03 February 2011.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION – 10EPC 40044, 03 February 2011

That the EPC forward a recommendation of APPROVAL of 10EPC 40044, the Volcano Cliffs Sector Development Plan, be forwarded to the City Council, based on the preceding Findings and subject to the following Conditions.

STAFF RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS FOR OF APPROVAL- Project # 1008444 10EPC 40044, 03 February 2011

1. 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. [1]
2. 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." [3]
3. Throughout the Plan, replace all references to "City of Albuquerque Water Conservation Office" with "Albuquerque Bernalillo County Water Utility Authority". [7]
4. VCSDP, pg. 34, Permitted Uses, 1., new word and new sentence:
 - a. “A minor second dwelling unit up to 650 square feet shall be permitted except in the front yard.” [8]
5. VCSDP, pg. 36, Permitted Uses, 1., new word and new sentence:
 - a. “A minor second dwelling unit up to 650 square feet shall be permitted except in the front yard.” [8]
6. VCSDP, pg. 38, Permitted Uses, 1., new word and new sentence:
 - a. “A minor second dwelling unit up to 650 square feet shall be permitted except in the front yard.” [8]
7. VCSDP, pg. 40, Permitted Uses, 1., new word and new sentence:

-
- a. "A minor second dwelling unit up to 650 square feet shall be permitted except in the front yard." [8]
 8. VCSDP, pg. 42, Permitted Uses, 1., new word and new sentence:
 - a. "A minor second dwelling unit up to 650 square feet shall be permitted except in the front yard." [8]
 9. The phrase "Town Center" shall be removed from Exhibits 1, 4, 7. [9]
 10. Verify the appropriate use of "should" versus "shall" throughout the Plan and revise as necessary. [11]
 11. 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. [30]
 12. On page 2 of the VCSDP, Exhibit 1, Add new labels and pattern designations for "Petroglyph National Monument" and "Major Public Open Space". [33]
 13. 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." [34]
 14. 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. [35]
 15. On page 3 of the VCSDP, in the last paragraph, delete "more than 7,000" and insert in lieu thereof "10,000". [36]
 16. On page 4 of the VCSDP, amend Exhibit 2 as follows:
 - 1) label the Petroglyph National Monument and Southern Geologic Window; [37]
 - 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; [37]
 - 3) provide map key for light green colored area depicting Boca Negra Dam/Park; [37]
 - 4) update the aerial photograph to a 2010 photograph to show existing conditions in the area. [37]
 17. On page 5 of the VCSDP, in the first sentence, add "upon annexation" after "was zoned". [38]
 18. Reformat Chapter 1 in outline format so that different sections can be easily referenced by section letter/number. [39]
 19. 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." [41]
 20. 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..." [42]
 21. On page 16 of the VCSDP, re-label the exhibit "Exhibit 5, Volcano Cliffs Road Network". [43]
 22. On page 14 of the VCSDP, in the second sentence under Policy 1, add "and offer redundancy" after "more direct". [44]

23. 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." [45]
24. On page 14 of the VCSDP, amend the first sentence under Policy 1 as follows: "An interconnected network should form a hierarchical network and should distribute traffic among multiple routes..." [46]
25. 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." [47]
26. 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. [48]
27. 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. [49]
28. 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. [50]
29. 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. [52]
30. 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. [53]
31. 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. [56]
32. On page 14 of the VCSDP in Policy 4.a "Pedestrian Crosswalks" in the first sentence delete "provided" and insert in lieu thereof "considered". [57]
33. 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. [60]
34. 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." [62]
35. On page 18 of the VCSDP, change the title of Policy 6 from "Local street design" to "Street Cross Sections and Design." [63]

36. 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. [64]
37. 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. [65]
38. 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. [66]
39. 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. [67]
40. On page 20 of the VCSDP, in the second line of a.i, insert a space between "a" and "density". [69]
41. On page 21 of the VCSDP, section "e", add a period after the title "Street Lighting." [71]
42. 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. [72]
43. On page 24 of the VCSDP, insert a new map that shows the arroyos and drainage described in the text in Policy 1. [79]
44. 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". [80]
45. 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." [81]
46. On page 25 of the VCSPD, insert a diagram that shows the difference between prudent line treatment and improved naturalistic channel treatment. [82]
47. 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." [85]
48. 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". [86]
49. 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. [88]
50. 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." [92]
51. 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. [93]

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. [93]

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, where possible. [93]

Policy 3.3 *Mitigate rainwater run-off from development.* The City of Albuquerque and AMAFCA should develop standards to mitigate the impact of run-off on Major Public Open Space and the Monument. The National Park Service has a policy of no developed flows in the Monument, and all development plans should address how flows will be mitigated. Standards should be developed (or project-specific studies may be requested) for roadway and development projects. Features to be considered include: piping to maintain natural flows, energy dissipating rockery, swales, drywells and other infiltration features. Rainwater features should have a natural appearance. [93]

Policy 3.4 *Encourage rainwater catchments systems in order to protect Major Public Open Space and the Monument while supplementing the area's water supply.* Rainwater catchments systems should be utilized on all developed sites to mitigate or minimize any developed flows onto Major Public Open Space or the Monument. Cisterns and rainwater catchments 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." [93]

52. 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..." [94]
53. 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". [95]
54. On page 28 of the VCSDP, #2 under Park Development Guidelines, in the second sentence, replace "should" with "could". [96]
55. 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." [97]
56. 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." [98]
57. On page 29 of the VCSDP, in the first sentence in #4 Conservation Easement, insert a space between "property" and "that". [99]

58. On page 29 of the VCSDP, in #1 under Policy 5, add "and runoff modification" after "Rainwater" in the first sentence. [100]
59. 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." [101]
60. On page 29 of the VCSDP, in the second paragraph under #4 Conservation Easements, change "rarely" to "need not". [102]
61. 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..." [103]
62. On page 32 of the VCSDP, delete the subsection called "Zoning" and insert in lieu thereof the following:

Zones

The Volcano Cliffs Sector Development Plan contains five Special Use (SU-2) zones to guide future development in a manner that conserves the area's unique cultural and natural features while encouraging development patterns that provide for long-term and high-quality development. Each SU-2 zone establishes regulatory standards for things like permissive uses, setback requirements, and heights that are specific to the lots contained within that zone. [108]

General Standards

The General Standards section of the Volcano Cliffs Sector Development Plan contains additional standards that apply across different zones. All properties within the VCSDP must comply with the provisions of the General Standards section, as applicable. [108]

Development Process

Unless otherwise stated, all development that complies with the zoning regulations and all applicable General Standards may proceed directly to Building Permit. [108]

Deviations: Unless otherwise restricted within this Plan, deviations from dimensional standards shall be handled as follows:

Minor: Deviations from any dimensional standard of up to 10% may be approved by the Planning Director or his/his designee.

Major: Any deviation of 10-20% from any dimensional standard shall be reviewed by the EPC via the site development plan approval process; deviations of 20% or more are not allowed. In order for the EPC to grant the deviation(s) and approve the site development plan, the applicant must demonstrate that 1) the original standard(s) cannot be reasonably met without substantial hardship due to the uniqueness of the site, and 2) applicable goals and policies of the Volcano Cliffs Sector Development Plan are still met, even with the proposed deviation(s)." [108]

-
63. 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". [114]
 64. 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. [115]
 65. 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. [120]
 66. 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". [121]
 67. On page 34 of the VCSDP, in the section called "Permitted Uses," add a new exception #3 as follows and re-label subsections accordingly: "3. Drive-in restaurants are prohibited." [122]
 68. On page 34 of VCSDP at the header for the zone after "SU-2 Volcano Cliffs/VC" add "(VCVC)". [123]
 69. On page 34 of the VCSDP, in the section called "Mixed-Use Requirement," change #2 Residential to "maximum 30% of total development square footage." [124]
 70. 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%" [133]
 71. 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. [134]
 72. 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". [135]
 73. 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." [136]
 74. 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." [137]
 75. On page 36 of VCSDP at the header for the zone after "SU-2 Volcano Cliffs/MX" add "(VCMX)". [143]
 76. On page 36 of the VCSDP, in the section called "Development Densities", change #4.a to "Minimum: 8 du/acre". [144]
 77. 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. [145]
 78. 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". [146]

79. 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". [147]
80. 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." [148]
81. 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..." [153]
82. On page 38 of VCSDP at the header for the zone after "SU-2 Volcano Cliffs/UR" add "(VCUR)". [154]
83. On page 39 of the VCSDP, in the "Landscape Requirements" section, add a citation of the Zoning Code section number. [157]
84. 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". [158]
85. 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. [162]
86. On page 40 of VCSDP at the header for the zone after "SU-2 Volcano Cliffs/LL" add "(VCLL)". [163]
87. On page 41 of the VCSDP, in the "Landscape Requirements" section, add a citation of the Zoning Code section number to subsection 3 that references the Zoning Code. [167]
88. 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". [168]
89. 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". [170]
90. 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." [171]
91. On page 41 of the VCSDP in the "Building Articulation" section, subsection 3, delete "addition" and insert in lieu thereof "additional". [172]
92. 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". [175]
93. On page 42 of the VCSDP, Development Densities, 2. Maximum, replace with the following:
 2. Maximum: 1 du/gross acre. [176]
 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. [176]
 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. [176]

-
94. On page 42 of the VCSDP, Setback and Frontages, 1. Building setbacks: Delete b. and d. (PCD/Cluster setbacks) [176]
 95. On page 42 of VCSDP at the header for the zone after "SU-2 Volcano Cliffs/RR" add "(VCRR)". [177]
 96. 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". [179]
 97. 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." [180]
 98. 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." [183]
 99. On page 46 of the VCSDP, change "Policy 1" to "Standard 1". [184]
 100. 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. [185]
 101. On page 46 of the VCSDP, Policy 1.A, add "Major Public Open Space" after "Petroglyph National Monument" in the first sentence. [186]
 102. On page 47 of the VCSDP, remove "Albuquerque City Limit" from the legend. [188]
 103. 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. [189]
 104. On page 48 of the VCSDP, delete the last sentence from Policy 2.B.3 that reads "Flashing shall match roof or building color." [192]
 105. 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..." [193]
 106. On page 48 of the VCSDP, change "Policy 2" to "Standard 2". [195]
 107. 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. [196]
 108. On page 49 of the VCSDP, section #7. Entrances, Porches, Stoops & Vestibules, delete the redundant section heading. [206]
 109. 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 VHS DP.
[207]

110. 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." [208]
111. 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. [209]
112. On page 50 of the VCSDP, add another bullet to the list in section #12. Energy-Efficient Buildings as follows: "geothermal heating and cooling;". [214]
113. 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". [215]
114. 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. [216]
115. On page 50 of the VCSDP, delete "natural cross ventilation" from the bulleted list in section #12. Energy-Efficient Buildings. [217]
116. 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. [223]
117. 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." [224]
118. 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". [233]
119. 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." [234]
120. On page 52 of the VCSDP, delete section 3. Neighborhood Permit Parking. [235]
121. 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." [237]
122. 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." [238]

123. 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." [239]
124. On page 53 of the VCSDP, section 1.b, replace "be" with "use" and add "(not barbed)" after "post and wire". [241]
125. 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." [246]
126. 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." [247]
127. 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". [248]
128. On page 54 of the VCSDP, in section 8 "Rainwater Quality and Management" delete subsection 'c'. Re-letter subsequent sections accordingly. [249]
129. 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." [250]
130. 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. Insert the following to General Regulations C: "See the "How-To Guide to Xeriscaping" available at the following website - <http://www.abcwua.org/content/view/73/63/>." [255]
131. 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" [257]
132. 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". [258]
133. 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." [261]
134. 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." [262]
135. On page 66 of the VCSDP amend the Appendix D "Construction Mitigation" as follows: CM1: Insert "silt" after "temporary" in the first sentence.

- CM2: Delete all text and insert in lieu thereof "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." [264]
- CM6: delete "Volcano Heights Area Plan" and insert in lieu thereof "Volcano Cliffs Sector Development Plan". [264]
136. 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." [265]
137. On page 67 of VCSDP in the second sentence on the top of the page delete "will" and insert in lieu thereof "shall". [266]
138. 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..." [268]
139. Revise Chapter 2 - Transportation of the VCSDP to be regulatory. [269]
140. On pages 35, 37, 38, 40, and 42, add building placement diagrams to illustrate the setback and frontage requirements. [271]
141. 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. [272]
142. 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." [278]
143. 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." [278]
144. 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. " [279]
145. In all zones of VCSDP verify that the formatting of "minimum" dimensions is consistent and modify as necessary. [280]
146. On the cover page delete "Draft July 2010" and insert in lieu thereof "February 2011 Red-Line".
147. On the first page "Volcano Cliffs Sector Development Plan" after the cover page make the following changes:
- Under "City Council" delete "President" after Ken Sanchez
 - Under "City Council" after "Rey Garduno, District 6" insert "Vice-President"
 - Under "City Council" delete "Vice-President" after Trudy E. Jones
 - Under "City Council" after "Don Harris, District 9" insert "President"
 - After the header "City Staff" insert "& Technical Review Team"

- f. Under “City Staff” in the title for Michelle Ramirez delete “layout” and insert in lieu thereof “Layout”
 - g. Under “City Staff” add an ‘n’ at the end of “John Hartman” so that it reads: “John Hartmann”
 - h. Under “City Staff” move “John Hartmann” and “Christina Sandoval” after “James Lewis”
 - i. Make the header “Steering Committee” bold.
 - j. Under the header “Steering Committee” delete “Volcano Cliffs Property Owners Association Steering Committee”
 - k. Alphabetize by last name the members of the Steering Committee from David Heil through Howard Lederer.
148. Change the title for Chapter 4 from “Land Use & Design Regulations” to “Zoning & General Standards”. Make the appropriate changes throughout the Plan.
149. In the VCSDP plan, where “right of way” or “right-of-ways are found, delete and insert in lieu thereof “right-of-way” and/or “rights-of-way” as appropriate.
150. In VCSDP where “General Development Standards” is found, delete and insert in lieu thereof “General Standards”.
151. On page JD-3/RL-3 under the “Guiding Principles” section in the last principle, insert “Ensure walkable” before “thoroughfares in Volcano Cliffs” and delete “shall be walkable”.
152. On page JD-5/RL-5 insert two new paragraphs after the existing paragraph under the heading “Pre-existing Platting and Zoning” that read:
“This Plan changes zoning in Volcano Cliffs in order to protect the unique beauty and cultural significance of this area, as well as introduce a mix of retail, businesses, and other amenities to ensure quality of life for residents and neighbors. Without changing the average density of the area, the Plan lowers density on the majority of the acreage while concentrating density in mixed-use zones near proposed transit, retail, and services near a proposed Village Center.”
“This strategy intends to protect sensitive areas, preserve views, and improve quality of life for West Side residents through added jobs, services, and transit. Ideally, more residents using transit and shopping, playing, or working near home will help minimize the potential number of people needing to cross the Rio Grande on Albuquerque’s limited bridge roads and maximize opportunities for sustainable growth on the West Side.”
153. On page JD-6/RL-5 in the section “Water” in the first line delete “pre-2006” before “Albuquerque Bernalillo County Water Utility Authority” and delete “boundary” at the end of the first sentence. Delete the second sentence completely. In the third sentence delete “As such” and insert in lieu thereof “With the acquisition of New Mexico utilities in May 2009...”. Add a new sentence at the end of the paragraph that says “Any master planned system improvements must comply with the ABCWUA’s ordinances, resolutions, plans, and regulations.”
154. On page JD-6/RL-7 in the section “Regulatory Tool” before the existing paragraph insert the following text:
“The City of Albuquerque uses a system of ranked plans, starting with the Rank I Albuquerque / Bernalillo County Comprehensive Plan, which sets the vision, goals, and overall policies from a City- wide perspective. There are also lower-ranked plans that must

comply with the intent, policies, and goals of higher-ranked plans. Rank II Plans, such as the West Side Strategic Plan or the Arroyos Facility Plan, are exclusively policy documents that provide more detail and give more direction about large but distinct areas within Albuquerque. Rank III Plans, including Sector Development Plans (SDP) such as this Volcano Cliffs SDP, take the most detailed look at smaller areas and can include both policy (i.e. direction) and regulations (i.e. law). This Rank III VCSDP is intended to further and comply with the policies and intents of the following adopted plans:”

Insert the following Table 1 and renumber subsequent tables accordingly:

Relevant Ranked Plans	Area	Policy / Regulation
Rank I: Albuquerque / Bernalillo County Comprehensive Plan	Entire Albuquerque Area	Policy
Rank II: Area / Facility Plans <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • West Side Strategic Plan • Facility Plan for Arroyos • City of Albuquerque Major Public Open Space Facility Plan • Trails and Bikeways Facility Plan • Facility Plan for Electric Service Transmission and Subtransmission Facilities 	Relevant Albuquerque Areas, including Volcano Mesa	Policy
Rank III: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Northwest Mesa Escarpment Plan (NWMEP) 	Specific Area	Policy / Regulation

After the table, insert the following text:

“Because the VCSDP and the NWMEP are both Rank III plans with overlapping boundaries, where a policy or regulation conflicts, the most restrictive of the policy/regulation prevails, unless otherwise detailed in a plan. In areas with overlapping boundaries, where one plan is silent, the policies/regulations of the other plan prevail.”

155. On page JD-8/RL-10 in the first paragraph, delete “Albuquerque Bernalillo Comprehensive Plan” and “the Westside Strategic Plan and the Northwest Mesa Escarpment Plan” and insert after “set forth in the” text to read “existing relevant ranked plans (See Table 1), as well as”.
156. On page JD-9/RL-11 under "Environment and Open Space Goals 1.", insert "Major Public Open Space" after Petroglyph National Monument.
157. On page JD-16/RL-28 delete Exhibit 5. Renumber subsequent exhibits accordingly.
158. On page JD-20/RL-33 under Policy 6 under “b. Sidewalk Locations” in subsections “i.” and “ii.” delete “2” and insert in lieu thereof “4” so that the sentences read “Where average densities exceed 4 units per gross acre...” and “Where average densities are less than 4 units per gross acre...” respectively.

159. On page JD-21/RL-34 under Policy 6 subsection “f. Above-Grade Obstructions” at the end of the sentence delete “should be minimized” and insert in lieu thereof “shall be placed so as to maintain continuous and uninterrupted pedestrian routes”. Delete subsection “i.” completely.
160. On page JD-21/RL-17, in Policy 1.1 subsection ii (now i), delete “The right of way right-of-way will be dedicated to the City in fee” and insert in lieu thereof “The City should seek the dedication of right-ofway in fee simple”.
- On page JD-25/RL-17 & 18 in Policy 1.1 b. delete subsection “i.” completely. Renumber subsequent sections accordingly. Also, at the end of the sentence for subsection “b” delete “two treatment options are allowed”. In subsection “ii” delete “In either case”. Insert subsection iii with text to read “Rank III Arroyo Corridor Plans should be prepared in coordination with AMAFCA for the North Fork and Middle Fork of the Boca Negra Arroyo, as recommended by the Rank II Facility Plan for Arroyos.”
161. On page JD-26/RL-18,19 in Policy 1.2 and 1.5 delete “setbacks” and insert in lieu thereof “drainage easements”.
162. On page JD-26/RL-19 delete the text under Policy 1.6 and insert in lieu thereof “Only bollard lighting should be used along streets that abut, are within 100 feet, or are within arroyo drainage easements and/or Open Space areas, buffers and/or setbacks.”
163. On page JD-27/RL-19 under Policy 1.7 delete the text for subsection “a.” and insert in lieu thereof “As new drainage easements are granted, AMAFCA should continue to assume responsibility for maintaining floodplains.”
164. On page JD-27/RL-20 delete the title for Policy 2 and insert in lieu thereof “Acquire land suitable for Major Public Open Space as funding becomes available”.
165. On page JD-28/RL-21 under Policy 4 subsection “Park Development Guidelines” number 1, add text at the end of the last sentence to read “in coordination with APS and AMAFCA”.
166. On page JD-29/RL-22 under Policy 5, renumber subsections to be letters versus numbers. Former subsection “1. Drainage” in line 1 after “Development Envelopes” insert “(see #e below)”.
167. On page JD-29/RL-23 under Policy 5 subsection “5. Development Envelope” (now “e. Development Envelope”) in the second line delete “restricted to the plants contained in Plant List B” and insert in lieu thereof “Plant Lists A and B”. Also, delete the third sentence completely which reads “Landscaping within the Development Envelope is allowed using Plant List B.”
168. On page JD-30/RL-23 under Policy 5 subsection “6. Clustering” delete the title and first two sentences. Insert in lieu thereof “6. Cluster Development. Cluster Development is a development design technique that concentrates buildings on a portion of the site to allow the remaining land to be used for recreation, open space, or preservation of sensitive land areas.” In the last three sentences, where the text reads “clustering” delete and insert in lieu thereof “Cluster Development”. In the last sentence of the second paragraph delete and insert in lieu thereof “Clustering of two or more Development Envelopes is encouraged within the SU-2/VCLL – Large Lot and SU-2/VCCR – Rural Residential zones.”
169. On page JD-32/RL-36 in the “Land Use and Design” chapter make the following changes in the first paragraph of the subsection “Volcano Cliffs Zoning Map”. In the first sentence delete “The” and insert in lieu thereof “This”. In the first sentence delete the title for Exhibit 6 “Proposed Zoning Map” and insert in lieu thereof “Zoning Established by the VCSDP”. In the

second sentence delete “designated” and insert in lieu thereof “rezoned”. In the third sentence before “General Development Standards” delete “same”. In the third sentence after “General Development Standards” and before “in this plan” insert “and General regulations” so that the second half of the sentence reads “and is subject to the General Development Standards and General Regulations in this plan.”

170. On page JD-32/RL-36 in the “Land Use and Design” chapter make the following changes in the second paragraph of the subsection “Volcano Cliffs Zoning Map”. In the first sentence delete “considering” and insert in lieu thereof “rezoning”. In the second sentence delete “remain” and insert in lieu thereof “shall be”. Add at the end of the last sentence, after “General Development Standards” insert “and General Regulations”.
171. On page JD-33/RL-40 delete the title for Exhibit 6 “Proposed Zoning Map” and insert in lieu thereof “Zoning Established by the VCSDP”. Make change, as appropriate, throughout the Plan.
172. On page JD-34/RL-41, in the “SU-2 VC. Village Center” description, insert “VC” before “VC” so that it reads “SU-2 VCVC. Village Center.”
173. On page JD-34/RL-41 in the VCVC zone, move the first column “Permitted Uses” to the middle column so that the zone description is the only text in the far left column.
174. In each zone category, under “Permitted Uses” subsection “1” delete and insert in lieu thereof “A minor second dwelling unit up to 650 square feet shall be permitted, except in the front yard”.
175. On page JD-35/RL-42 in the subsection “Setback and Frontage” after “a. Front Setback” insert “ and need not be continuous” so that it reads “10 feet maximum; however, 50% of the building frontage may be set back further than 10 feet to accommodate patios and courtyards and need not be continuous”.
176. On page JD-35/RL-42 in the subsection “Setback and Frontage” after “d. Residential garage setbacks” delete the rear setback requirement and insert in lieu thereof “no minimum”.
177. On page JD-35/RL-42 in the subsection “Setback and Frontage” in the last sentence of number 3 delete “more than” and insert in lieu thereof “a minimum of”
178. On page JD-35/RL-43 in the subsection “Setback and Frontage” delete 4 completely.
179. On page JD-36/RL-44, in the “SU-2 MX. Mixed Use” description, insert “VC” before “MX” so that it reads “SU-2 VCMX. Mixed Use.”
180. On page JD-37/RL-45 in the subsection “Setback and Frontage” after “d. Residential garage setbacks” delete the rear setback requirement and insert in lieu thereof “no minimum”.
181. On page JD-37/RL-46 in the zone VCMX in the subsection “Setback and Frontage” delete subsection 4 completely.
182. On page JD-38, in the “SU-2 UR. Urban Residential” description, insert “VC” before “UR” so that it reads “SU-2 VCUR. Urban Residential.”
183. On page JD-38/RL-47, in the SU-2 UR. Residential” description, insert “VC” before “UR” so that it reads “SU-2 VCUR. Urban Residential.”
184. On page JD-40/RL-49, in the “SU-2 LL. Large Lot” description, insert “VC” before “LL” so that it reads “SU-2 VCLL. Large Lot.”
185. On page JD-40/RL-49 in the “SU-2 LL. Large Lot” description, delete the first part of the description “Large Lot areas consist of single family homes on larger lots” and insert in lieu

thereof “Large Lot areas consist of single family homes on lots larger than typical single family developments...”

186. On page JD-42/RL-51 in the SU-2 RR. Rural Residential” description, insert “VC” before “RR” so that it reads “SU-2 VCRR. Rural Residential”.
187. On page JD-42/RL-51 under "Development Densities", after "if the dwelling units are clustered" add "on a minimum of 1 acre" so that the sentence reads "however, if the dwelling units are clustered on a minimum of 1 acre and develop as a Private Commons Development (PCD) per the Zoning Code, the maximum density is 3 du/gross acre." Renumber subsections to reflect addition of PCD maximums and minimums as the new #3.
188. On page JD-46/RL-55 in Policy 1 at the end of subsection 1 insert after “while Exhibit 7 shows the area designated Impact in the NWMEP.” after “Escarpment face”.
189. On page JD-48/RL-58 subsection “3. Arroyo Setbacks” delete Setbacks and insert in lieu thereof “Easements”. After “Boca Negra Arroyo” delete the rest of the sentence. Delete text starting “If the option of improved” so the sentence begins “Naturalistic”. Delete the “s” on “channels” and delete “is used, the.” The paragraph should now read:
“No development shall occur within the drainage right-of-way the North and the Middle Forks of the Boca Negra Arroyo. These drainage corridors shall remain as undisturbed desert with natural vegetation, rock formation, and drainage-ways intact. Naturalistic channel design shall retain as much undisturbed desert vegetation insofar as practicable. Streets shall be located outside of the drainage easement. There are no additional height restrictions for properties adjacent to arroyos; heights are per the zoning of the site.”
190. On page JD-48/RL-58 in Policy 2 at the end of subsection A insert the following:
“...unless otherwise stated in this Plan. Within applicable boundaries, where one plan is silent, the other prevails, unless otherwise stated in this Plan”.
191. On page JD-48/RL-59 in subsection “2. Massing and articulation” insert after “without a” text to read “change in material and/or” and delete everything in the sentence after “24 inches”.
192. On page JD-49/RL-61 in subsection “5. Residential Entry Doors” delete “including single family and townhouses”.
193. On page JD-49/RL-61 in subsection “9. Service Areas” amend the second and third sentence to read as follows: “They shall be located away from streets, recessed within the building envelope, and/or screened from view of streets and Major Public Open Space. Service areas recessed within the building envelope, facing streets, and/or Major Public Open Space shall not comprise more than 20% of a building’s linear frontage and shall be accompanied by roll-up doors.” Delete the last sentence completely.
194. On page JD-50/RL-61 in subsection “10. Commercial Signage” in the second sentence delete “and painted window signs, and signs painted on the exterior walls of buildings”.
195. On page JD-50/RL-62 in subsection “11. Equipment and Antennas” in the third sentence delete “views, both from the ground and from the Escarpment” and insert in lieu thereof “the adjacent rights-of-way”.
196. On page JD-50/RL-62 in subsection “12. Energy-Efficient Buildings” delete the first sentence “Buildings that are energy efficient are strongly encouraged”. At the end of the second sentence add “in order to ensure that buildings are energy-efficient”.

197. On page JD-53/RL-66 in section “C. Landscape Design Standards” subsection “1. Walls & Fences” amend the “Materials and Design” section so that it reads as follows: “c. Design and Prohibited Materials. The end of walls shall have a pier or pilaster that is at least 12 inches in width to give a substantial appearance. Exposed or plain block, including all colors, is not allowed for site walls. Stucco and concrete shall have an integral color. Wood board, cyclone, chain-link, and razor-wire fencing are prohibited”.
198. On page JD-53/RL-66 subsection “2. On-Lot Trees” at the end of the paragraph delete “or less”.
199. On page JD-54/RL-67 in subsection “7.Grading” add an additional sentence at the end of the text as follows “Bikeways and other amenities within the right-of-way shall be provided in such a way as to minimize the extent of disturbance to slopes and vegetation and the need for cut and fill”.
200. On page JD-55/RL-69 in subsection “b. List B – Xeric Plant List” insert after “most current information” text to read “(see contact information provided in General Regulation C).” and delete the rest of the paragraph.
201. On page JD-57/RL-72 in Appendix A (now, General Regulation A) for definition “Articulated Crosswalks,” delete “that contains” and insert in lieu thereof “with.”
202. On page JD-57/RL-72 in Appendix A (now, General Regulation A), for definition “Clustering Development,” delete the existing definition and insert in lieu thereof “Cluster Development is a design technique that concentrates buildings on a portion of the site to allow the remaining land to be used for recreation, open space, or preservation of sensitive land areas.” Additionally, remove the “ing” ending from “Clustering Development” so that it reads “Cluster Development.”
203. On page JD-57/RL-72 in Appendix A (now, General Regulation A), for definition “Great Streets,” in the second sentence, after “The Facility Plan” and before “...establishes standards,” add the following: “under revision but not yet adopted.”
204. On page JD-57/RL-72 in Appendix A (now, General Regulation A), for definition “Light Reflective Value (LRV),” remove “that is,” so the sentence reads as follows: “A measurement that expresses the percentage of light reflected from a surface.”
205. On page JD-57/RL-73 in Appendix A (now, General Regulation A), for definition “Neighborhood Activity Center,” delete the last sentence, which reads “Too numerous to indicate on the following map, Neighborhood Activity Centers should be specifically located and mapped in the course of smaller area planning.”
206. On page JD-57/RL-73 in Appendix A (now, General Regulation A), for definition “Offset Intersections,” amend the definition to read: “A 4-leg intersection where opposing approaches do not line up with each other.”
207. On page JD-57/RL-73 in Appendix A (now, General Regulation A), for definition “Open Space,” remove the word “which” and insert in lieu thereof “that,” so the sentence reads “Ground area that satisfies visual and psychological needs...”
208. On page JD-58/RL-73 in Appendix A (now, General Regulation A), for definition “Shared Usable Open Space,” in the first sentence, remove the phrase “in relation to which it serves to” and insert in lieu thereof “that,” and add an “s” to the word “provide,” so that the

sentence reads as follows: “An area on the same lot with a dwelling that permanently provides light and air, as well as...”

209. On page JD-58/RL-73 in Appendix A (now, General Regulation A), delete the definition for Major Public Open Space and insert in lieu thereof: "Major Public Open Space areas are purchased fee simple by the City or they are lands dedicated to the City or other public agency. They may be jointly managed by the City and some other public agency (e.g. National Park Service, AMAFCA). These lands, primarily undeveloped, are managed to retain and enhance either their natural values or archaeological resources. They include major landforms, natural resource areas, and arroyos in the Sandia, Manzanita and Manzano Mountains; the Rio Grande Bosque; and the volcanic cinder cones.
210. On page JD-58/RL-74 in Appendix A (now, General Regulation A), for definition “Pedestrian-scaled Buildings”, make the following changes: In the first sentence, after “such as,” add a colon. In the same sentence, within the parenthesized section, remove “e.g.,” and after the phrase “larger buildings,” delete “which” and insert in lieu thereof “that.” In the last sentence, delete “which are,” so the sentence reads: “These features are all generally smaller in scale than those primarily intended to accommodate automobile traffic.”
211. On page JD-58/RL-73 in Appendix A (now, General Regulation A), delete the definition for Petroglyph National Monument and insert in lieu thereof: "The Petroglyph National Monument protects a variety of cultural and natural resources including volcanoes, lava flows, geologic windows, archaeological sites, and an estimated 24,000 carved images. The Petroglyph National Monument includes lands that are federal, state, and city-owned."
212. On page JD-58/RL-74 in Appendix A (now, General Regulation A), between the definitions for “Public Improvement District (PID)” and “Right-of-Way (ROW),” add the following new definition: “Ranked Plan – a hierarchical system of adopted plans used by the City of Albuquerque to ensure that all plans follow the same vision and policies found in the Rank I Albuquerque/Bernalillo County Comprehensive Plan. Rank II plans set policy for large but distinct areas within the City. Rank III plans are for smaller areas and can contain both policy (i.e. guidance) and regulation (i.e. law), per Zoning Code Section 14-13-2-1.”
213. On page JD-60/RL-76 in Appendix B (now General Regulation B), delete paragraphs 3, 4 and 5, which begin “Light and color...,” “At the same time...,” and “The third consideration...,” respectively.
214. On page JD-65/RL-81 in General Regulation C, add text in new column to read:
“Xeric Plant List B
A list of official xeric or low-water plant species periodically updated by the Albuquerque Bernalillo County Water Utility Authority (ABCWUA). To obtain the most current information, contact ABCWUA:
Telephone: 505-842-WATR
Website: <http://www.abcwua.org/pdfs/xeriplantlist.pdf>
For additional information, see ABCWUA’s “How-To Guide to Xeriscaping:
<http://www.abcwua.org/content/view/73/63/>”
215. On page JD-66/RL-82 in Appendix D (now General Regulation D), amend “Policy CM-1” to read as follows: “Prior to beginning construction, the property owner shall construct a temporary silt fence at the site boundary adjacent to sensitive lands (i.e. the Escarpment Buffer,

Major Open Space Area, archeological site, or public or private conservation area to be maintained in its natural desertscape) to effectively protect them from heavy equipment and vehicles. Photographs of the site in its original condition shall be submitted with the application for building permit, and subdivision and/or site development plan.”

216. On page JD-66/RL-83 in Appendix D (now General Regulation D), for “Policy CM-5” make the following changes: In the first sentence, delete “be to the,” so the sentence reads as follows: “Replacement of boulders shall approximate the original location...” In the third sentence, delete “variance” and insert in lieu thereof “deviation.”
217. On page JD-66/RL-83 in Appendix D (now General Regulation D), for “Policy CM-6,” in the first sentence, delete “which” and insert in lieu thereof “that,” so the passage reads “damaged areas that lie within...”
218. On page JD-66/RL-83 in Appendix D (now General Regulation D), for “Policy CM-7,” delete “which” and insert in lieu thereof “that,” so the passage reads “Existing cuts that are used as trail locations...”
219. On page JD-67/RL-84 in Appendix E (now General Regulation E), for “Policy RDM-1,” make the following changes: In the third paragraph of the definition, delete “which” and insert in lieu thereof “that,” so the passage reads “Use of materials in treated channels that blend with the...” In the fourth paragraph, delete “which” and insert in lieu thereof “that,” so the passage reads “...through stabilization techniques that are consistent with the visual character...”
220. On page JD-67/RL-84 in Appendix E (now General Regulation E), for “Policy RDM-2,” make the following changes: In the first sentence, delete “the,” so the passage reads “Developed flows shall be managed to minimize their impact on open space...” In the second sentence, delete “should” and insert in lieu thereof “shall,” so the passage reads “The potential impacts of water retention shall be thoroughly studied...”
221. On page JD-67/RL-84 in Appendix E (now General Regulation E), for “Policy RDM-3,” make the following changes: In the first sentence, delete “the,” so the passage reads “Within large areas of open space...” Amend the second sentence to read “The impact of check dams as a method of controlling flows shall be thoroughly studied before use.”
-

***Petra Morris
Planner***

Attachments

Attachment 1. Spreadsheet of comments and staff responses.

**Spreadsheet of Comments
Prior to the November 4, 2010 EPC
Hearing**

	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).	
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 Andalusia area?	Andalusia 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.		
21	All	VCSDP Comments about that?	What about the traffic downstream that comes off the mesa? Montano Bridge, Paseo del Norte is already congested heavily. I40 and Unser is too. What do we do	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.		

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
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.		
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.		

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
29	All		<p>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.</p>	<p>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)</p>		
				<p>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).</p>		

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
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".
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".

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
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".
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 1 in 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	consider adding a 3rd line under Natural Resources mirroring "respect culture and history..." per VH		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.
61	VC	18	<p>Last line of d. ..large enough to accommodate parking and handle.... A diagram depicting this situation might be useful.</p>		This section is being revised per comments from DMD Traffic Engineering.	

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
62	VC	18	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>		Will make changes.	<p>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."</p>
63	VC	18	<p>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.</p> <p>Comment: Change the title of Policy 6 to read Street Cross Sections.</p>		Will make Changes.	<p>On page 18 of the VCSDP, change the title of Policy 6 from "Local street design" to "Street Cross Sections and Design."</p>

	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.		
69	VC	20	<p>Second line of a. i. needs a space after the "a"</p>		Okay, will make change.	On page 20 of the VCSDP, in the second line of a.i, insert a space between "a" and "density"

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
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.
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".

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
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.		
84	VC	25	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)	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.		

	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	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.		Add a new Policy 3.4 in this Chapter. (This comment addressed in another condition)	
92	VC	27	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.		Will add language regarding possible funding sources.	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."

	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.	"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
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.	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..."

	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	32 of 106	Change. (Addressed in another condition)	Printed 1/28/2011

	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 VCVV 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 I'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."
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.		

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
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 - Xerix 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 - http://www.abcwua.org/content/view/73/63/ ."
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"
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".

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
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."
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.		

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
264	VC	66	cm5 shall approximate- edit these cm6 volcano cliffs		The Construction Mitigation Appendix was reworded 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 amend 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".
265	VC	67	"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.	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.	Create a new policy RDM-4 Add to VHSDP. Additionally, will add reference to Appendix E on page 54. (Addressed in another condition).	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."

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
266	vc	67	the design should retain rather than will.		Replace "will" with "shall" since this appendix is regulatory.	On page 67 of VCSDP in the second sentence on the top of the page delete "will" and insert in lieu thereof "shall".
267	VC	73	Wording from the VH was not corrected for the appendix D Construction Mitigation.		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).	
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).	

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
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.
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).	

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
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)	
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).	

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
278	VC		The SU-2/UR, LL, and RR zones do not describe a development process.		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>
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).	

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
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.		
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.		

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
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.		
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.		

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
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.		
291	VC		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.	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.		

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
292	VC		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.	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.		
293	VC		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.	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.		

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
294	VC		<p>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		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.	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.		
296	VC		(EPC)Need additional buffer along the escarpment	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.		

	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. Renummer 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	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.	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.		
325	vt	6	Fill in the number of dwelling units expected under the current zoning		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 6 of the VTSDP, insert missing information to be provided by The Trails.

	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).
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.

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
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.
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".

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
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.		
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."

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
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"
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."

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
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.		
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.		

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
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.
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".

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
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."
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.	

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
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 planed 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-".
377	VT	25	Heights & Setbacks. 2a 10 ft seems a bit too high		Yes, this does seem excessive. Proposed change: change "screened equipment" to "elevators 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.		

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
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."
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.		Willl 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'.		

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
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.		
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.	

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
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.	
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.		

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
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."
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".

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
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"
405	VT	33	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.	Integral stucco was part of the original plan requirements.		

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
406	VT	33	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.	Original agreed upon color palette.		
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.	"On page 12 of the VTSDP, add the following new section as section 2 and renumber subsequent sections accordingly: 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."
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.		

	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</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>sentance. 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</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	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? Comment: Revise Policy 3.111.d to acknowledge the need for		Will revise.	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."
437	W SS P	15	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.		Will have AGIS provide a map to include in WSSP amendment. Will also provide this map during the presentation at EPC.	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. Renummer subsequent exhibits accordingly.

	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	WSSP		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.		

**SUPPLEMENTAL SPREADSHEET
OF COMMENTS RECEIVED AFTER
NOVEMBER 4, 2010 EPC HEARING**

Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
		Jolene Wolfley: Phoenix Desert Character Overlay District	Without knowing the zoning, legal, ownership, and platting history of the "Desert Overlay District" area of Phoenix, it is not possible to be able to accurately compare that area to the Volcano Cliffs area and know whether any of its regulations are applicable, transferable, or logical.		
		Jolene Wolfley: Nov. 1, Additional Comments on the Volcano Mesa Sector Plans	See attached responses.		
		Linda Thal	Staff has requested a 60-deferral of the Volcano Heights SDP in order to further assess and analyze the regulations of the plan and their potential impact.		
		Kurt Anschuetz	Staff has requested a 60-deferral of the Volcano Heights SDP in order to further assess and analyze the regulations of the plan and their potential impact.		
VC	39	Frances Pavich: Requests that the height limit in the VCUR zone for the area along Paseo del Norte be increased to 36' for the northern most 200' of lot depth.		Agree to change to max. 35' (which is the max. in the VCSDP, not 36') because of adjacency to Paseo del Norte and the proposed Volcano Heights Town Center.	On page 39 of the VCSDP, add a new section 1.b in the "Height" section as follows and reletter subsequent section accordingly: "b. For areas within 200' of the northern boundary line of the Volcano Cliffs Sector Development Plan, the maximum building height is 35 feet."
VC	67	Petroglyph National Monument: 1) Recommend that storm water detention ponds be fully lined.		Will add language.	On page 67 of the VCSDP, Appendix E, Rainwater Design & Management Standards, add the following new sentence at the end of Policy RDM-2: "Rainwater detention ponds shall be fully lined."
VC	46	Petroglyph National Monument: 2) No exception to the 15' height limit in the NWMEP.		Will add language.	On page 46 of the VCSDP, in Policy 1.1, which begins 'Height restrictions for areas within 200 feet...', add a new second sentence as follows: "There shall be no exceptions to the 15'0" height limit."

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
	VC	15/ 16	Petroglyph National Monument: 3) Favoring single loaded streets.		Addressed in previously-proposed condition. See condition #30 in the VCSDP Supplemental Staff Report.	
	W SS P		Petroglyph National Monument: 4) See Chapters 2 and 3 [from the 2006 Plan] included in any new revisions.	These sections from the 2006 Plan have been retained in the WSSP Amendment.		
			Rene' Horvath: Traffic	A complete Traffic Operations Assessment was completed by Kimley-Horn & Associates for the 2006 Plan. This TOA compared Levels of Service for the 2006 "Base Plan" vs. the "Town Center Concept Plan" and developed street cross sections to complement and accommodate the development envisioned in the Town Center Concept Plan. The 2010 Plans follow the same "Town Center" scenario used to develop the 2006 Plan. We will be asking Kimley-Horn to review their TOA memo in light of the 2010 Plans and make revisions, if necessary.		
			Rene' Horvath: Town Center	Staff has requested a 60-deferral of the Volcano Heights SDP in order to further assess and analyze the regulations of the plan and their potential impact.		

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
			Rene' Horvath: Buffer	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. 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.		
			Rene' Horvath: Drainage	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.		
			Rene' Horvath: Single Loaded Streets		Addressed in previously-proposed condition. See condition #30 in the VCSDP Supplemental Staff Report.	

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
			Rene' Horvath: Arroyos	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.		
			Rene' Horvath: Large Lots	The public would not have to pay to build a water reservoir to serve the area; the SAD will. Water infrastructure is controlled by the ABCWUA, not the City or a SDP. No water infrastructure would be located on City Open Space.		
			Rene' Horvath: Views	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.		
			Rene' Horvath: Development Envelopes	The High Desert community is a covenants-controlled development. The City cannot create or enforce private covenants. In the 2010 VCSDP, development envelopes and conservation easements are encouraged but not required. There is no reason that development envelopes could not occur here voluntarily.		

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
			Rene' Horvath: Summary	The public investments that have already been made in this area – Unser, Paseo, schools – serve existing West Side residents, including Taylor Ranch, Ventana Ranch, and Paradise Hills. Many owners of property in the Volcano Mesa area have owned their land for decades and contributed to the tax base that helped provide said public improvements without direct benefit.		
			Albert Owen: Detention pond sites in SAD 228	This is not an issue that can be addressed by City staff or through this SDP process. This issue should be taken up directly with the VCPOA.		
			Lines 10 and 375 of the 10-29-10 Response Spreadsheet, ("Explain why there are different definitions of FAR in these plans. Why do these plans need a special definition of FAR?") replace content in "No Change/Change" columns with the following language (see next column):	The FAR is defined as "minus undevelopable areas" to encourage the preservation of rock outcroppings and to ensure that sites that include rock outcroppings and that develop without destroying them are not penalized by them.		
			Line 18, page 5 of 110, of the 10-29-10 Response Spreadsheet, instead of reading additional analysis will be provided in the supplementary staff report, it should read:	It is not possible to compare the plans in such a manner. Conflicts between the plans that are unforeseen now will most likely be unique to a site or development.		
			Line 89, page 25 of 110, of the 10-29-10 Response Spreadsheet, the NWMEP does require staggering in Policy 9-2, staff was mistaken on this. The NWMEP prevails, so staggering is already required. However, the EPC may wish to add a further condition that reads:			Language shall be added to the Volcano Cliffs SDP to require the staggering of walls, per the NWMEP.

	Plan	Page #	Comment / Question / Request for Change	No Change (+ explanation)	Change	Condition Language
			Line 117 of the 10-29-10 Response Spreadsheet, ("Explain in the staff report how zoning boundaries were decided. How were the boundaries of the zones arrived at?") replace content in "No Change" column with the following language (see next column):	The zones in the Volcano Cliffs plan are designed to reflect the platting of the area and to ensure transitions from one zone to the next. SU2 RR is proposed for the large platted lots that have a more rural character to the platting. SU2 LL follows the lots that are platted in a traditional residential pattern. SU2 UR is designed to transition from the between the less intense SU2 LL and the more intense mixed use zones. SU2 MX is designed to buffer the village center and Paseo Del Norte as well as provide opportunities for commercial and office uses to serve the residential neighborhoods. SU2 VC is the most intense zone, it is bounded on all sides by a road and has either SU2 UR or MX as a buffer to the SU2 LL.		
			Line 443 of the 10-29-10 Response Spreadsheet, request for comparison of different kinds of activity centers. Chart from the Comp. Plan was inadvertently not provided with supplemental staff report. Please find it attached.			

Date: January 18, 2010

To: Doug Peterson, Chair
Environmental Planning Commission

From: Jolene Wolfley, M.C.P
Planning Consultant 2006 Volcano Heights Sector Development Plan

RE: **Recommended Changes to Volcano Mesa Sector Plans with the Purpose of Protecting Petroglyph National Monument**

The Volcano Mesa has culturally and geologically rich lands of national and international significance that can anchor the economic development engine of the Westside. If new development is guided to be protective of these resources, all parties will benefit.

I provide specific changes to the Volcano Cliffs Sector Development Plan to make a harmonious transition between Petroglyph National Monument and private development. The treatments important to the edge of private development are:

- **streets as edge to open space**
- **single story heights**
- **native vegetation**
- **walls and fences, materials and setbacks**

These same treatments should be included in those developments edging PNM in the Volcano Trails and Volcano Heights Sector Development Plans.

Please note: I used Microsoft Word's editing tracker. If you view this document electronically, my proposed changes to the Sector Development Plan text are in red. If you view this document in hard copy, my changes will be text that is underlined. I provide the page numbers, headings, and relevant text where I propose changes.

Deleted: 1/18/2011

Proposed changes to the Volcano Cliffs Sector Development Plan

PAGE 9

Natural Resources

Establish an interconnected open space network that is comprised of park, arroyos, the Petroglyph National Monument, Major City Open Space and other minor open spaces.

Deleted: where possible

PAGE 25

Policy 1.1 Preserve natural drainage functions of arroyos.

b.i

The prudent line treatment.....Necessary utility easements may be granted across and along this prudent line dedication if they do not result in significant disturbance to the natural vegetation or compromise the prudent line treatment.

bii.

An improved naturalistic channel, shall include the channel cross section with meanders simulating a natural arroyo, plus two 15 foot wide maintenance accesses, along each side of the channel, one of which shall accommodate maintenance vehicles, plus a 40 foot wide open space buffer, that may be on a single side or split along both sides of the drainage corridor, all as approved by AMAFCA, the City Engineer, and the Planning Director. Side stabilization shall be naturally contoured and revegetated and use (1) stacked and/or minimally grouted basalt boulder grade control structures of no more than 3 foot in height and (2) basalt rip rap bank protection. The channel side slopes are 3:1 or flatter except at the grade control structures and crossing structures. Spaces between rocks are to be provided to accommodate small desert plants and shrubs. 100 year flow velocities are typically less than 10 feet per second throughout the channel, and typically less than 6 feet per second mid way between the grade control structures. After construction, the open space buffer, if disturbed, shall be revegetated with native plants from Plant List A (see Appendix C). Trails may be located coincident with the open space buffer and maintenance access areas. Utility easements may be collocated if they do not result in significant disturbance to the natural vegetation. The right of way will be dedicated to the City in fee, or as an Open Space/Public Access easement (or in combination thereof), with an overlying AMAFCA drainage easement.

Deleted: using

Deleted: grouted and/or

Deleted: , provided that t

Deleted: 4

Deleted: ,

Deleted: ; and reasonable upstream and downstream transition lengths at each) and

Deleted: The drainage right of way dedicated for this naturalistic channel shall include the channel cross section, plus two 15 foot wide maintenance accesses, along each side of the channel, one of which shall be gravel surfaced, plus a 40 foot wide open space buffer, that may be on a single side or split along both sides of the drainage corridor, all as approved by AMAFCA and the City Engineer.

Deleted: grass and shrub species indigenous to the area

Deleted: and utility easements

Deleted: ¶

Deleted: 1/18/2011

PAGE 26

c. For the Middle Fork of the Boca Negra Arroyo, new development shall maintain at least a 150 foot setback from the centerline of the arroyo. Where 50 percent or more of a lot is in this setback, the gross density allowable per acre in the setback area may be transferred to the non-required setback of the lot.

d. For the North Fork of the Boca Negra Arroyo, new platting shall maintain at least a 150 foot setback from the centerline of the arroyo. Existing platting less than one-third acre shall be exempt. For lots greater than one-third acre and where 50 percent or more of a lot is in this setback, the gross density allowable per acre in the setback area may be transferred to the non required setback of the lot.

PAGE 27

ADD New policy 3.1

Policy 3.1 The preferred transition from Petroglyph National Monument, Major Open Space, and arroyos is a street with a trail on the Open Space side. Requirements for fencing, landscaping, and heights are more restrictive if private development directly abuts these Open Space areas.

RENUMBER subsequent policies accordingly.

PAGE 28

Community Park....Where possible at least 50 percent of the Park's perimeter should front onto a public street.

Deleted: could

Deleted: 1/18/2011

PAGE 33

Exhibit 6, Volcano Cliffs Proposed Zoning

CHANGE VCMX zoning on parcels east of Rainbow to VCLL.

CHECK zoning against the Rainbow Village Concept drawing, p. 87 2006 Volcano Heights Plan.

SCALE BACK commercial zoning south of Paseo del Norte in order to maintain strong market for Town Center.

PAGE 36

Check maximum building height for urban residential

PAGE 40

SU-2 LL. Large Lot.

Development Densities:

Allowable development densities are as follows:

1. Minimum: None.
2. Maximum: 3 du/acre

Lots platted prior to approval of this Sector Development Plan are accepted up to 6 du/acre.

Deleted: 6

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5", First line: 0.04"

PAGE 41

Height:

1. Building height limits area as follows:

Minimum: None.

Maximum: 18 feet, however the height can be increased to 26 feet on a maximum of 50 % of the building footprint. The additional height shall be placed to be most protective of views to the mountains, volcanoes and open space lands.

2. Additional Height Requirements: See General Development Standards for additional height requirements, especially for property abutting Major Open Space

Deleted:

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5"

Building Articulation:

Landscape Requirements:

1. Minimum one tree and 40% vegetative cover in front of all single family lots.
2. Residential landscape by individual landowners shall require approximately 30% of the lot area to be private open space. Landscape plants used in private open space are to be species and varieties from Plant List A or B, see page 55. Xeriscaping must use a permeable weed barrier, not plastic, to optimize permeability. The private open space may include active utility easements and side yard utility easements that contain maintenance roads.

Deleted: 1/18/2011

3. Residential landscape by individual landowners directly abutting Petroglyph National Monument and Major Open Space shall require approximately 30% of the lot area to be natural private open space. Landscape plants used in natural private open space are to be species and varieties from Plant List A. Disturbances of the native vegetation to construct utilities is discouraged. If disturbance is necessary, the area will be restored with plants from Plant List A.

Deleted: ¶

3. Walls and Fences:

a. Walls and fences, where allowed, may be clad or plastered with stucco, adobe, brick, tile masonry, or native stone (or synthetic equivalent). Exposed plain block, including all colors, is not allowed for site walls. Stucco and concrete shall have an integral color. The end of walls shall have a pier or pilaster that is at least 12 inches in width, to give a substantial appearance. Post and wire, coyote, or view fencing are allowed. View fencing allows for a general sense of openness, visual transparency and passive surveillance while still maintaining perimeter security. Wood board, cyclone, chain-link and razor-wire fencing are prohibited.

Deleted: per the City of Albuquerque Zoning Code.

See General Development Standards for additional guidelines, particularly for lots abutting PNM or Major Open Space.

Deleted: ¶

PAGE 42

SU-2 RR. Rural Residential.

Development Densities:

Allowable development densities are as follows:

1. Minimum: None.
2. Maximum: 1 du/acre gross, however if the dwellings are clustered on a minimum of 4 acres and develop as a Private Commons Development (PCD) per the Zoning Code, the maximum density is 3 du/gross acre.

PAGE 43

Height:

1. Building height limits area as follows:
 - Minimum: None.
 - Maximum: 18 feet. If the lot is setback at least 500 feet from Major Open Space, the height can be increased to 26 feet on a maximum of 50 % of the building footprint. The additional height shall be placed to be most protective of views to the mountains, volcanoes and open space lands.

Deleted: however

Deleted: 1/18/2011

2. Additional Height Requirements: See General Development Standards for additional height requirements, especially for property abutting PNM and Major Open Space

Deleted: .

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5"

Landscape Requirements:

1. Minimum one native species tree and 40% vegetative cover in front of all single family lots.

2. Residential landscape by individual landowners shall require approximately 50% of the lot area to be natural private open space. The natural private open space should be land where the vegetative cover is undisturbed. Landscape plants used in private open space are to be species and varieties from Plant List A, see Appendix C. Landscape plans used in the private active yard are to be species and varieties from Plant List B, see page 55. Xeriscaping must use a permeable weed barrier, not plastic, to optimize permeability. The private open space may include active utility easements and side yard utility easements. Any disturbance of the natural landscape should be revegetated.

Deleted: 30%

Deleted: B

Deleted: page 55

Deleted: that contain maintenance roads.

3. Walls and Fences: See General Development Standards, particularly for lots abutting PNM and Major Open Space.

Deleted: Perimeter wall and fence heights shall be per the City of Albuquerque Zoning Code. Split rail, rail and post or similar view fencing in colors consistent with the approved Colors in Appendix B may be used for corrals or yards not on the perimeter of any conservation area or Major Public Open Space boundary.

Formatted: Indent: First line: 0"

PAGES 46-48

A. Building Heights and Setbacks. Building heights and setbacks shall be limited adjacent to the Escarpment Face, the Petroglyph National Monument, and arroyos in order to preserve views, reduce visual impact and minimize the environmental impacts of development. Building heights and setbacks shall be established by the zoning with the following exceptions:

Deleted: ¶

Edge condition requirements. For areas adjacent to the Escarpment Face, the Petroglyph National Monument, Major Open Space and arroyos the following requirements are established:

1. Height restrictions for areas within 500 feet of the Escarpment Face. Structure height shall not exceed 15 feet within 200 feet of the Escarpment Face per Policy 12-1 of the Northwest Mesa Escarpment Plan, see areas designated Impact, Heights shall not exceed 18 feet within 500 feet of the Escarpment Face. Exhibit 7, Volcano Mesa Escarpment Map shows the lots within 200 feet and 500 feet of the Escarpment Face.

Deleted: 200

Deleted: Per

Deleted: for those

Deleted: structure height shall not exceed 15'0". Exhibit 7, Volcano Mesa Escarpment Map shows the lots within 200 feet of the Escarpment Face.

(Add 500 feet line to Exhibit 7.)

Formatted: Font: Italic

2. Height restrictions for areas within 500 feet of Petroglyph National Monument (Federal or City-owned) including the Middle and North Geologic

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Font: Bold

Deleted: 1/18/2011

Windows. Heights shall not exceed 18 feet within 500 feet of a boundary with Petroglyph National Monument, including the Middle and North Geologic Windows.

Formatted: Font: Bold

3. Height restrictions for areas within 200 feet of arroyos. Heights shall not exceed 18 feet within 200 feet of the North and Middle Forks of the Boca Negra Arroyos or the Headwaters of the Piedras Marcadas Arroyo.

Formatted: Font: Bold

4. Street edge along Major Open Space (PNM and City-owned). The preferred transition from Major Open Space is a street with a trail on the Open Space side. This treatment shall be used for 80 percent of the lineal edge between Major Open Space and development for new subdivision platting. Where existing plats create lots abutting Major Open Space, i.e., the Escarpment Face and the North Fork of the Boca Negra Arroyo, the City should coordinate with property owners to replat lots and/or acquire additional land to allow a street edge. Street travel lanes and curbs shall be no closer than 50 feet to the edge of the Escarpment face or 30 feet to other areas of Major Open Space. Street construction must follow Appendix D, Construction Mitigation.

Formatted: Font: Bold

5. Setbacks from the Escarpment Face and the North Geologic Window (the most Sensitive Open Space Lands). Where private property abuts the Escarpment Face, structures shall be set back 30 feet from the property line. No irrigation systems, construction or alteration of the natural terrain shall occur within 20 feet of the property line. Fences (except post and wire) shall not be allowed within 20 feet of the property line. 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.

Deleted: 2

Deleted: No s

Deleted: placed within

Deleted: 50

Deleted: of the top or the base of the escarpment face

Deleted: 30

Deleted: top or base of the escarpment face

Deleted: 30

Deleted: escarpment face

6. Setbacks from Other Lands of Petroglyph National Monument or Major Open Space. Where private property abuts other lands of Petroglyph National Monument or city-owned Major Open Space, structures shall be set back 20 feet from the property line. No irrigation systems, construction or alteration of the natural terrain shall occur within 20 feet of the property line. Fences (except post and wire) shall not be allowed within 20 feet of the property line.

7. Arroyo Setbacks. No development shall occur within the drainage right-of-way the North and the Middle Forks of the Boca Negra Arroyo or the area agreed upon as the prudent line treatment. These drainage corridors should remain as undisturbed desert with natural vegetation, rock formation, and drainage-ways intact. If the option of improved naturalistic channels is used, the design will retain as much undisturbed desert vegetation insofar as practicable. Streets should be located outside of the setback.

Deleted: ¶
¶
3

Deleted: There are no additional height restrictions for properties adjacent to arroyos, heights are per the zoning of the site.

8. Native vegetation (from Plant List A) should be used wherever landscaping is immediately adjacent to and visible to the Petroglyph National Monument.

Deleted: ¶

Deleted: 1/18/2011

PAGE 53

1 Walls and Fences.

b. Adjacency to Monument and City Open Space. Properties that are located adjacent to the Petroglyph National Monument and City Major Public Open Space are encouraged to have no perimeter fencing around individual lot lines or subdivisions. If fencing is used, it shall be post and wire. Wooden posts shall be 3-4 inches diameter, approximately 36 inches in height, and spaced about 15 feet apart. Wire shall be no more than 4 strands of non-barbed wire. Fencing or walls shall be setback at least 20 feet from the property line with PNM or Major Open Space.

c. Materials & Design. Allowed site walls may be clad or plastered with stucco, adobe, brick, tile masonry, or native stone (or synthetic equivalent). Exposed plain block, including all colors, is not allowed for site walls. Stucco and concrete shall have an integral color. The end of walls shall have a pier or pilaster that is at least 12 inches in width, to give a substantial appearance. Post and wire, coyote, or view fencing are allowed. View fencing allows for a general sense of openness, visual transparency and passive surveillance while still maintaining perimeter security. The view area should be the upper portion of the fence and at least one-third the height of the solid portion of the fence. Wood board, cyclone, chain-link and razor-wire fencing are prohibited.

Deleted: be coyote fencing, post and wire, or view fencing. View fencing allows for a general sense of openness, visual transparency and passive surveillance while still maintaining perimeter security.¶

Deleted: S

Deleted: or

PAGE 54

7. **Grading.** Cut and fill slopes shall be no steeper than 3:1 on average; and retaining walls shall not exceed 4 feet in height unless incorporated within a building's foundation, or unless approved by the City Hydrologist. Graded areas shall maintain the character of the natural terrain by varying gradients, undulating contours, and rounding the toe crest of any slope greater than 10 feet in height. Fill shall be limited to the minimum required for site development and drainage. Fill shall not exceed the existing highest natural grade point on site. The City Hydrologist and the Planning Director may jointly decide to allow fill up to 4 feet required for drainage. Height shall be measured from natural grade.

Deleted: , unless approved by the

Deleted: for

PAGE 55

ADD after last paragraph

Where landscaping follows the Plant List B, at least 50 percent of the landscaped area should be covered by live plants in contrast to rock.

Land disturbed in development shall be re-vegetated using the appropriate Plant List from Table 14.

ADD NEW SECTION after p. 55

SUBMITALL REQUIREMENTS.

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

A site analysis shall be required with any rezoning application or, if developing under existing zoning, with the development services preliminary submittal. The site analysis is a tool to assist in determining areas to be retained in a natural undisturbed state and areas that may most easily be developed, which include areas with minimal vegetation or previously graded areas. Areas proposed for development by the applicant are to be identified on the plans through use of concept diagrams. Similarly, areas to be maintained in an undisturbed state are also to be identified on all plans. Planning Department and Development Services Department staff shall review the applicant's proposal and approve or make modifications for approval with regard to conceptual construction areas, areas to remain undisturbed, and road corridors. The site analysis shall include a current aerial photo at a scale of one-inch equals one hundred feet, or as determined by staff, with the following information included on acetate or similar overlays:

- (1) Land contours at two-foot intervals or smallest interval available.
- (2) Arroyo corridors and preliminary hydrological information (cfs flows, onsite and off-site, and velocity).
- (3) Identify specimen plants and significant stands of vegetation.
- (4) Identify potential view corridors.
- (5) Identify potential development areas.
- (6) Identify potential street alignments.
- (7) Identify the one hundred year floodplain boundary as defined by the Federal Emergency Management Act (FEMA) and one hundred year twenty-four-hour flow boundaries for washes not addressed by FEMA.
- (8) Provide evidence of a record check through the New Mexico State Office of Archeology for archeological sites and identify if any. +1

Deleted: 1/18/2011

(9)

Provide a hydrology study to be reviewed by AMAFA or other consultant.

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

(10)

Identify and coordinate City trail locations using the City's recreational trails plan.

PAGE 58

Appendix A: Definitions

Major Public Open Space – major Public Open Space areas are purchased fee simple by the City or lands dedicated to the City or other public agency. They may be jointly managed by the City and some other public agency (e.g., National Park Service, AMAFCA). These lands, primarily undeveloped, are managed to retain and enhance either their natural values or archaeological resources. They include major landforms, natural resource areas, and arroyos in the Sandia, Manzanita, and Manzano Mountains; the Rio Grande Bosque, and the Petroglyph National Monument.

Deleted: usually

Deleted: t

Deleted: are

Deleted: the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District

Deleted: and

Deleted: volcanic cinder cones

Private Open Space – A usable open space adjoining and directly accessible to a dwelling unit, reserved for the exclusive use of the residents of the dwelling unit and their guests.

Natural Private Open Space – Private open space (see above) that is undisturbed by development and retains a native plant palette for the purpose of maintaining the natural character of an area.

Private Active Yard—In the Rural Residential Zone, the portion of the yard used for active private uses, usually fenced, that may be disturbed and use xeric vegetation for landscaping.

Shared Usable Open Space – An area on the same lot with a dwelling, in relation to which it serves to permanently provide light and air, as well as visual, psychological, and recreational needs for open space. Usable open space may include, but is not limited to, lawns, decorative plantings native plants, open balconies, covered patios open on at least two sides, walkways, active and passive recreational areas, fountains, swimming pools, wooded areas, and water courses. Usable open space does not include public right-of-way, parking lots, off street parking, driveways, or the private vehicular surfaces, or buildings other than swimming pool rooms. Such space shall be available for entry and use by the residents involved.

Petroglyph National Monument – The Petroglyph National Monument protects a variety of cultural and natural resources including volcanoes, lava flows, geologic windows, archeological sites, and an estimated 24,000 carved images. PNM includes lands that are federal, state and city-owned. The National Monument surrounds Volcano Mesa on the west, south, and east.

Deleted: ,

Renz-Whitmore Mikaela J.

From: Shair-Rosenfield, Kara
Sent: Wednesday, January 26, 2011 9:38 AM
To: Renz-Whitmore Mikaela J.
Subject: FW: Volcano Cliffs Prudent Line Treatment

FYI

From: Baca, Barbara C.
Sent: Tuesday, January 25, 2011 10:02 PM
To: Schmader, Matthew F.; Bingham, Brad L.; Westbrook, Sara; Morris, Petra A.; Shair-Rosenfield, Kara; Stover, Debbie L.
Cc: 'jlovato@amafca.org'; Brito, Russell D.
Subject: Re: Volcano Cliffs Prudent Line Treatment

All,
I concur. In our meeting today with the CAO, the City Hydrologist explained that a 160 foot corridor is needed to accomplish a safe and adequate drainage easement along La Boca Negra Arroyos in the Volcano Cliffs Sector Plans. I hope that we can agree that this is an appropriate width to indicate as drainage easement in the sector plans. Thank you.

Barbara

From: Schmader, Matthew F.
To: Bingham, Brad L.; Westbrook, Sara; Morris, Petra A.; Shair-Rosenfield, Kara; Baca, Barbara C.
Cc: 'Lovato, Jerry' <jlovato@amafca.org>; Brito, Russell D.
Sent: Tue Jan 25 16:24:00 2011
Subject: RE: Volcano Cliffs Prudent Line Treatment

Hello Brad,
You have explained vey well what I understand to be the limitations of a prudent line treatment along the Boca Negra arroyos. We will continue to work with City Hydrology, AMAFCA, and the landowners to find ways to preserve as much of the natural drainageways as possible.

Thank you,
Matt S.

From: Bingham, Brad L.
Sent: Tuesday, January 25, 2011 4:11 PM
To: Bingham, Brad L.; Westbrook, Sara; Morris, Petra A.; Shair-Rosenfield, Kara; Baca, Barbara C.
Cc: 'Lovato, Jerry'; Schmader, Matthew F.; Brito, Russell D.
Subject: RE: Volcano Cliffs Prudent Line Treatment

I was asked if AMAFCA, and Open Space was in agreement with this statement and my understanding is that they are. I have copied this email response to those folks hoping that if I am in error, to let me know.

From: Bingham, Brad L.

1/28/2011

Sent: Tuesday, January 25, 2011 9:51 AM
To: Westbrook, Sara; Morris, Petra A.; Shair-Rosenfield, Kara
Subject: Volcano Cliffs Prudent Line Treatment

The City Hydrologist has strong objections to any prudent line treatment of the Boca Negra Arroyos for the following reason:

The area has underground basalt layers of various depths, widths and fractures. The depth and breadth will have a major impact on the shape of the "channel" in the overlying sediment. If the depth to basalt is shallow, the channel will be wide. If it is deep, the channel will be narrower. In order to do a comprehensive study that will yield predictable results, an extensive (and costly) survey of the basalt will be needed. The end result will likely state that some structural measures will be needed to keep the arroyo in the easement and the cost of the study would be better spent improving the arroyo, especially if it needed anyway. There will be 2 major road crossings of this arroyo and it would not be economically feasible to span the entire easement; therefore a pier or piers will be installed in the arroyo and structural measures will be installed to protect these piers. The structural measures will need to extend both upstream and downstream and there will be little arroyo left to be "prudent".

I am not sure who else to send this to.

Brad