

Comment #	Page #	Topic	Comment / Question / Request	Source	No Change	Change	Condition	Finding
1	2	Los Duranes History	Add additional content that reinforces the identity of the area and some narrative to interpret the maps showing the neighborhood's land use trends [full comments are in May 5, 2011 staff report]	COA Historic Preservation			P. 2 Los Duranes History - Replace existing section with proposed text and photos (see Exhibit A)	
2	12	Existing Zoning Map	Indicate that the zoning of the lot at the northeast corner of Montoya St. and I-40 is R-1; add full descriptors to the two SU-1 zones.	Staff		For clarity.	P. 12 - Existing Zoning Map - show the zoning of the lot at the northeast corner of Montoya St. and I-40 as R-1; insert "private" before "School" on the SU-1 zone on Gabaldon Rd; add "O-1 permissive uses" on the SU-1 zone on the west side of Rio Grande Blvd.	
3	15	Acequias	Correction: the named acequias including associated easements may not be owned in fee simple by MRGCD, but are facilities where MRGCD has, at minimum, an agreement for maintenance and access.	Staff / MRGCD		Add the language in the comment and from further discussion with MRGCD for more accuracy.	P. 15 Rio Grande Bosque and Acequias, 2nd paragraph, replace penultimate sentence with "The named ditches/acequias, laterals and drains, including associated easements, are facilities where MRGCD has, at minimum, an agreement for maintenance and access. They may not be owned in fee simple by MRGCD." In last sentence, replace "are" with "may be".	
4	15	Rio Grande Bosque & Acequias	The Riverside and Albuquerque Drains are Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District's (MRGCD) facilities and are not under AMAFCA's jurisdiction. The drains and laterals are used for irrigation and are under MRGCD's jurisdiction, although AMAFCA and the City use some of them for drainage outfalls, including the Alameda Drain. AMAFCA is working on an MOU with the City DMD for a restudy of the Alameda Drain (Note: a short segment of this drain is in the SE part of the plan area near I-40)	AMAFCA		Add the additional information.	P. 15 Rio Grande Bosque and Acequias - Add at the end of the section: "The Riverside and Albuquerque Drains west of the plan area are MRGCD facilities. Although the named drains and ditches within the plan area are primarily irrigation facilities, AMAFCA and the City of Albuquerque also use some of them, including the Alameda Drain, for drainage outfalls."	
5	18	Architectural History and Building Fabric	Add content about the architectural evolution of area, information on the two registered historic buildings and the original plaza, an assessment of current conditions of the properties from the 1979 historic building inventory, and improved descriptions of vernacular buildings [full comments are in May 5, 2011 staff report]	COA Historic Preservation		Add the proposed language to provide more information on the registered buildings, the architectural evolution of the neighborhood and representative examples of buildings. These provide more background and justification for the regulatory section and other implementation	P. 18 Architectural History and Building Fabric - Replace existing section with proposed text and photos (see Exhibit B)	

Comment #	Page #	Topic	Comment / Question / Request	Source	No Change	Change	Condition	Finding
6	36	new	Add a background section on electric service including map of existing facilities	PNM (revised comments dated 5/31/11)		strategies in the plan. Correct an omission.	P. 36 - Insert an additional section on Utilities and include text (Exhibit C: introduction, existing conditions and utility easements) and the map of electric facilities provided by PNM	
7	36	new	Add proposed text on existing drainage conditions	City Engineer/Hydrology			P. 36 – Insert an additional section on Drainage (see Exhibit I)	
8	39, 40, 43, 45, 90, 92, 94, 98	Implementation Strategies & Matrix	See comments from Bernalillo County beginning p. 39 of the May 5, 2011 staff report.	Bernalillo County		Make changes specified by Bernalillo County.	P. 39, 40, 43, 45 Implementation Strategies & P. 90, 92, 94, 98 Implementation Matrix - amend as specified by Bernalillo County (Exhibit D)	
9	39, 90	2. Housing strategies	Strengthen the language of Strategy #4...add the word "adequate" to read "installing adequate doors and locks"	APD			P. 39 & 90 - 2. Housing, Strategy #4 - amend to read: "...installing adequate doors and locks..."	
10	40	3. Streets, Sidewalks and Trails strategies	School routes will need to be identified in order to establish safety routes.	City Engineer/Transportation	Implied in Strategy #2 under Streets, Sidewalks and Trails.			
11	40, 92	3. Streets, Sidewalks and Trails strategies	If streets, sidewalks and trails are designated and encouraged by signage for pedestrian friendly access, then they should be well lit and absent of natural surveillance obstacles	APD			P. 40 & 92, 3. Streets, Sidewalks and Trails - Add to Strategy #3: "Ensure pedestrian safety and security through adequate lighting and/or by encouraging opportunities for natural surveillance."	
12	41	3. Streets, Sidewalks and Trails strategies	Bike routes on narrow streets can be problematic; signage for shared bike and driving lane needs to be provided throughout the Los Duranes area.	City Engineer/Transportation	Will be provided by the city when the bike route is implemented. Covered by strategy #14, on p. 41 and in Matrix on p. 94			

Comment #	Page #	Topic	Comment / Question / Request	Source	No Change	Change	Condition	Finding
13	41, 87, 93	3. Streets, Sidewalks and Trails strategies, CIP projects	What is the level of service (LOS) at the intersection of Rio Grande and the cross streets? Will the dedication of extra right of way for roadway improvements (such as exclusive turning lanes) be required to maintain the current LOS at all signalized intersections?	City Engineer/Transportation	Existing signalized intersections on Rio Grande Blvd are at Floral Rd (3-way) and Indian School Rd. (3-way). (The signal just north of I-40 is outside the plan area.) The intersection at Indian School is addressed in Strategy #10 and CIP Project D. The issue of ROW dedication at either intersection would be addressed when development is proposed or the City undertakes road improvements.			
14	41, 93	3. Streets, Sidewalks and Trails strategies	Rio Grande Blvd south of Indian School Rd and Indian School Rd east of Rio Grande Blvd are designated Enhanced Transit Corridors. The LDSDP proposes zoning on Rio Grande Blvd that allows new development and redevelopment for commercial and/or residential (apartment) development that supports transit ridership. The existing transit service is a one-way loop service that does not provide an attractive alternative mode of travel for current and future residents, businesses and visitors.	Staff			P. 41 & 93 3. Streets, Sidewalks and Trails - Add a strategy #15 under Streets, Sidewalks & Trails to encourage an upgrade of the ABQ Ride #36 bus route to a 2-way service	
15	44	5. Community & Special Places strategies	Establish heritage or landmark tree preservation regulations, that also include any historic orchards.	EPC Commissioner	The community supports identifying and mapping heritage or landmark trees (strategy #2) but does not want to impose strict preservation requirements for trees on private property. The Los Duranes neighborhood association may support a voluntary protection program that includes replacing any heritage or landmark tree that is removed with a number of smaller trees according to certain criteria (e.g. 4 to 1, approved species, minimum caliper and/or height).			
16	45, 98	5. Community & Special Places strategies	Add a strategy #6 to update the Historic Building Inventory	COA Historic Preservation		Build on previous work completed in the neighborhood.	P. 45 & 98 5. Community & Special Places - Add a strategy #6 to update the 1979 Historic Building Inventory.	
17	45, 98	6. Neighborhood Safety & Crime Prevention goals	Add to Goal D....." and Target Hardening Strategies" which consists of reinforcing doors, windows and all access points into a building or property	APD		For completeness	P. 45 & 98 6. Neighborhood Safety & Crime Prevention - Add to Goal D....." and Target Hardening Strategies"	
18	45, 98	6. Neighborhood Safety & Crime Prevention strategies	Strategies #1-3: Pedestrian lighting should not conflict with tree plantings	APD		Maximize the effectiveness of public investment in safety improvements.	P. 45 & 98 6. Neighborhood Safety & Crime Prevention - Add "and do not conflict with trees" to Strategies #1, 2 & 3	

Comment #	Page #	Topic	Comment / Question / Request	Source	No Change	Change	Condition	Finding
19	46, 98	6. Neighborhood Safety & Crime Prevention strategies	Strategy #5 - add c) NW and Crime Free Multi-Housing (CFMH) Program, which is a residential CP program designed specifically for rental property; and d) Zoning, Housing Code and On-street Parking Violation Education, which is about recognizing different types of violations and the public entity that is responsible for responding to them--APD, City Zoning, etc....	APD		For completeness and to increase awareness of public education opportunities	P. 46 & 98 6. Neighborhood Safety & Crime Prevention - Strategy #5 - add c) NW and Crime Free Multi-Housing (CFMH) Program; and d) Zoning, Housing Code and On-street Parking Violation Education.	
20	48	Proposed Zoning Map	Extend the SU-2 / MUD 2 designation to the remainder of the contiguous block which contains the "Garcia Parcel" to eliminate a spot zone of MUD 1.	Jason Kent, P.C. letter dated 5/3/11 on behalf of Sheilah Garcia, Ed Garcia et al	The boundary between the proposed SU-2/MUD 2 and MUD 1 zones within this block corresponds to the boundary between the existing C-2 and C-1 zones that front Rio Grande Blvd. The proposed rezonings along Rio Grande Blvd (RGB) in the LDSDP reflect a consistent approach consisting of: MUD 2 for existing C-2; MUD 1 for existing C-1 or O-1 fronting on RGB; consideration of existing or previously approved use of the parcel; and consideration of ownership. The referenced premises, the "Garcia Parcel", extend to the northeast (see Exhibit E). If all the premises were included, this would significantly reduce the size of the remaining MUD 1 zone in this block to the point of non-viability. In addition, the proposed MUD 1 zone within the block is not a spot zone. MUD 1 is proposed across the street on the east side of RGB and on lots to the NE on San Venito. In addition, the mixed pattern of MUD-1 & MUD-2 zones is in keeping with the varied and eclectic character of the neighborhood.			
21	48	Proposed Zoning Map	Zone Lot A-1, Albert J Monte's Replat at 1300 Rio Grande Blvd (RGB) as SU-2/MUD 1 instead of MUD 2 for the following reasons: 1) to protect/preserve the remaining residential character of Lilac west of RGB; 2) the lot presently has no C-2 uses and MUD 1 zoning would not impact the uses and tenants; 3) the lot has never been used for C-2 uses; 4) there are no other SU-2/MUD 2 zones west of Rio Grande Blvd. [see letter for full text of comments]	Steven Williams (property-owner on Lilac opposite site) comments dated 4/30/11	SU-2/MUD 1 would be inconsistent with the city's overall approach to the proposed zoning of properties along Rio Grande Blvd. (see above).			

Comment #	Page #	Topic	Comment / Question / Request	Source	No Change	Change	Condition	Finding
22	48	Proposed Zoning Map	Objects to rezoning of area along the east side of RGB/south of Indian School to C-2 because: it would be inconsistent with the residential/agricultural character of neighborhood; would increase traffic, noise and congestion; and thereby decrease quality of life for nearby residents. Most of this area is zoned residential or light commercial (C-1). [see letter for full text of comments]	Patricia Allen letter dated 4/27/11	Two SU-2/MUD 2 zones are proposed on the east side of Rio Grande Blvd, that allow C-2 uses, in addition to C-1, O-1, senior housing and apartments. These correspond to parcels that include existing C-2 zoning. The remainder of the properties fronting the east side of Rio Grande Blvd in the plan area are zoned SU-2/MUD 1, which does not allow C-2 uses. The plan does not propose any rezoning that allows non-residential uses of higher intensity than the existing zoning. The SU-2/MUD 2 zone in fact places limits on two higher traffic-generating uses, drive-up restaurants and gas stations.			
23	48	Proposed Zoning Map	Opposes rezoning of properties along Rio Grande Blvd to allow C-2 uses because: it is inconsistent with the existing light commercial and small office character; it will negatively impact the overall residential and agricultural nature of the Los Duranes neighborhood; is contrary to the rural historic character of Los Duranes; is a departure from the concerns and goals articulated in the draft sector plan. Requests zoning for not greater than C-1 along Rio Grande Blvd. unless greater than C-1 was pre-existing. [see letter for full text of comments]	Darlene Anaya letter dated 4/25/11	The proposed zoning along Rio Grande Blvd. is not more intense than existing zoning. SU-2/MUD 2 zoning is proposed for properties fronting Rio Grande Blvd that include C-2 zoning. The most intense uses allowed in the new zoning are C-2.			
24	48	Proposed Zoning Map	Correct zoning of lots along the east side of Amado Rd. between Duranes Rd and Serna Rd to SU-2/RA-2.	Staff		Replace SU-2/R-2 with SU-2/RA-2 on subject lots.	P. 48 Proposed Zoning Map - correct zoning of lots along the east side of Amado Rd. between Duranes Rd and Serna Rd to SU-2/RA-2.	
25	48	Proposed Zoning Map	Clarify that the zoning of the lot at the northeast corner of Montoya St. and I-40 is SU-2/R-1	Staff		Revise map in the plan and have AGIS create a second map that will serve as the official zoning map.		
26	48	Proposed Zoning Map	The map should have parcel lines to determine the exact location of the zone line. Also, different colors should be used in case black and white copies are needed.	Zoning		Insert a second zoning map in the plan that will serve as the official zoning map	P. 48 Proposed Zoning Map - After p. 48 insert a second black and white zoning map in the plan to be created by AGIS that will serve as the official zoning map.	
27	48	Proposed Zoning Map	Add the descriptors to the two existing SU-1 zones, for clarity.				P. 48 Proposed Zoning Map - add "School & related facilities" after SU-1 to the label of the property on Gabaldon Rd. Add for O-1 permissive uses to the label of the property on the west side of Rio Grande Blvd.	

Comment #	Page #	Topic	Comment / Question / Request	Source	No Change	Change	Condition	Finding
28	48	Proposed Zoning Map	Opposed to rezoning of 2 lots north of APS charter Montessori School from RA-2 to SU-1 because: it is premature (lots are still vacant and could be sold to someone other than APS); and if /when development by APS occurs it would be exempt from city zoning standards anyway. [see three letters for full text]	Stewart et al email, Leslie Montano Thompson letter dated 4/20/11, Steering Committee letter dated 6/27/11		Staff considers it acceptable to change the zoning designation of the two lots to SU-2/RA-2, but recommends clarifying the extent of the APS property in the background section of the plan.	P. 48 Proposed Zoning Map - replace SU-1 with SU-2/RA-2 zoning on the two lots to the north of the developed School property (TRACTS B and C, LANDS OF CINDY CHAVEZ, UPC# 101205932935710153 & 101205930736010159) P. 9 Existing Land Use, Zoning & Development Patterns, p. 9, 4th paragraph, 2nd sentence - after SU-1 insert "for private school" 3rd sentence - put a period after "zoning district"; replace remaining text with "Both are now part of the Albuquerque Public Schools system."	
29	48	Proposed Zoning Map	Opposes SU-1 zoning (without a specific deScriptor) of 2 APS lots currently zoned RA-2 because many uses are possible that would have negative impacts on surrounding residential properties and families e.g. giant parking lot, adult entertainment, communication tower, substance abuse treatment center, park & ride	Leslie Montano Thompson letter dated 4/20/11		see above	see above	
30	49	Community Acequia map	The map on page 49 would probably be more effective if it wasn't an aerial map. The maps look as if they are providing too much information.	Zoning		Revise map in the plan and have AGIS create a second map that will serve as the official community acequias map. The cultural/historic sites do not belong on a map in this section of the plan because no zoning regulations for Los Duranes apply specifically to them.	P. 49 Community Acequias map - Revise to exclude cultural/historic sites and to correct errors in the acequia alignments. After p. 49, insert a second black & white map without aerial that will serve as the regulatory community acequias map.	
31	50	COA Zoning Districts	Provide the complete zoning designations (including descriptors) of the two existing SU-1 zones.	Staff			P. 50 COA Zoning Districts - In 1st paragraph, after "SU-1 zoning", insert an additional sentence "The SU-1 for Private School zone on Gabaldon Rd is rezoned SU-1 for School & related facilities to reflect its current status as an APS School. The SU-1 for O-1 permissive uses on the west side of Rio Grande Blvd. remains the same."	
32	50	COA Zoning Districts	Amend non-conformance use language if necessary to address the land use status of the San Jose Mission Church & related facility. The church and associated hall appear to be a non-conforming use that cannot become status-established, because the non-conforming status resulted from a text amendment to the Zoning Code.	Staff / Code Enforcement		Amended language forthcoming, if necessary.		
33	50	COA Zoning Districts (Subdivision)	Encourage that future lot splits reinforce traditional "lineas" pattern	EPC Commissioner			P. 50 COA Zoning Districts (Subdivision) - At end of paragraph beginning "The intent for residential development....", add "Future lot splits are encouraged to reinforce the traditional "lineas" pattern."	
34	50	COA Zoning Districts (Subdivision)	Supports encouraging that future lot splits reinforce traditional "lineas" pattern	SC letter of 6/27/11			see above	

Comment #	Page #	Topic	Comment / Question / Request	Source	No Change	Change	Condition	Finding
35	50	RA-1	Allow PCD in the RA-1 zone, under the same terms as SU-2/RA-2 and SU-2/R-1 zones	Jackie Fishman, Steering Committee (SC) member, letter dated 4/19/11		This would mean rezoning RA-1 to SU-2/RA-1. The existing RA-1 properties in the northwest part of the plan area are either developed or too small (less than 1 acre) to qualify for PCD as established in the plan area. The PCD would apply if existing buildings were razed and land was replatted into 1 acre or more, or if properties of this size in the county are annexed into the city as SU-2/RA-1.	P. 50 COA Zoning Districts - in the first paragraph delete "and for properties west...zoned RA-1". P. 51 - insert an additional zoning district: "SU-2/RA-1 - Design standards pertaining to use, Scale and mass amending RA-1 zoning district - The RA-1 zone pertains to properties west of Gabaldon Road annexed into the city in 1996 and any properties annexed into the city in the future zoned RA-1. The revised standards in the Los Duranes SU-2 zone are intended to ensure that new development respects the Scale and mass of the existing built environment and to encourage the preservation of visual and functional open space. City RA-1 with the following exceptions: (insert same text as in SU-2/RA-2)."	
36	51	Definitions	Add on-site ponding as a potential use of Private Commons Area (PCA)	Staff / City Hydrologist			P. 51 Definition of PCA - insert "on-site ponding, " after "landscaping. " .	
37	51	SU/RA-2	C. Setbacks 2.ii – Code Enforcement (CE) is opposed to the regulations suggested under front yard setbacks. The regulation that requires staff to conduct a field investigation to determine the front yard setbacks for the buildings on adjacent properties creates several issues. The inspector: will need to request from each of the property owners a copy of a certified survey to determine the exact location of the front property line; cannot determine exactly where the front property line is located by a visual inspection; will need to gain permission from each of the property owners to determine what the measurement is from the building to the front property line. The location of a property line in relation to the right-of-way varies in different locations throughout the city. The use of aerial maps cannot be used for this exact location because there is a margin of error with the maps. CE recommends this issue be studied within the scope of this project to determine ahead of time what the measurements will be at each block. This language cannot be enforced as proposed.	Zoning	The proposed regulation requires that the front setback be staggered relative to one adjoining property. The applicant is responsible for providing information that demonstrates compliance. Context-sensitive regulations have been adopted for other older areas of the city to ensure that infill development respects the character of the existing neighborhood (see Fourth Ward HOZ, North 4th Street Corridor Plan). In this case, the staggering is to maintain the varied pattern of development in Los Duranes.			

Comment #	Page #	Topic	Comment / Question / Request	Source	No Change	Change	Condition	Finding
38	51	SU-2/Acequia protection	Is the 15 ft setback from the centerline of acequia meant to apply to walls and fences? (They are considered structures per the ZC)	Zoning		The community's intent is for the setback to apply to accessory structures, but not walls and fences. Some acequias are small, on private property, and within a 10 ft wide PUE. Requiring a fence or wall to be placed 15 ft from the centerline of such acequias would limit the property-owner's private use of their land, for example a strip of land up to 20 ft wide.	P. 51 Acequia protection - insert "excluding walls and fences" after "All structures".	
39	51	SU-2/Acequia protection	Acequias, laterals and drains are different types of facilities with different purposes and rights-of-way or access requirements needed to maintain and operate those facilities. A setback of 15 feet from the centerline of a ditch might not provide adequate, or severely constrain, access for the MRGCD to maintain and operate those ditches.	MRGCD			P. 51 - Acequia Protection - Insert a new 1. with: "MRGCD facilities: All structures excluding walls and fences must be set back a minimum of 15 feet from the outer edge of the MRGCD's right-of-way for that facility, OR 15 feet from the outer edge of the MRGCD's maintenance access as determined by the MRGCD." Renumber 1 as 2 and amend to read: "All structures.....from the centerline of any other ditch designated on the LDSDP(Figure U, p. 49)."	
40	51	Zoning and Development Regulations	Add regulations for access and maintenance of electrical utilities	PNM		Alert property-owners and developers at an early stage of PNM's requirements. Encourage ways of mitigating the visual impact of transformers.	P. 51 after Acequia Protection regulations, insert proposed language (see Exhibit C.b.), including the addition "Non-permanent use of clearance, such as for parking, is permitted. Aesthetic improvements are encouraged to minimize the visual impact of ground-mounted utility equipment."	
41	51 - 64	All SU-2 zoning districts	Add a requirement to the Design Standards for each Zoning District that "Storm runoff will not be increased. Non-building areas will be depressed to pond runoff to balance the effect of added impervious area." where it does not contradict land use-related sections of the Plan.	City Engineer/Hydrology	The addition is unnecessary because development must already comply with the city's Drainage Ordinance, which includes this requirement.			
42	51 - 64	Zoning & Development Regs	The names of the zoning districts are long and not user-friendly	EPC Commissioner		Staff proposes deleting LDSDP in the names of the zoning districts and general regulations. SU-2 already indicates that the districts are within a specific sector plan area.	P. 51 - 64 Zoning Districts - delete "LDSDP" before names of all zoning districts.	

Comment #	Page #	Topic	Comment / Question / Request	Source	No Change	Change	Condition	Finding
43	51, 54	SU-2/RA-2 & R-1	Front setbacks - supports additional design regulation that requires varied setbacks for lots within new subdivisions, such as a variation of at least 5 ft for adjacent structures within subdivisions of 5 houses or greater.	Steering Committee letter of 6/27/11		While regulations are proposed to ensure articulation of townhouse developments in the SU-2/R-LT and R-T zones, none calls for variation within a conventional subdivision of detached houses in the SU-2/RA-2 & R-1 zones. Staff considers that additional language is appropriate.	P. 52 SU-2/RA-2 C.2. Staggered front setback - In ii) add at end "The staggering requirement shall apply to residences fronting the same street in new subdivision developments of 5 or more houses." P. 54 SU-2/R-1 D.1 Front setback - Add "In subdivisions developments of 5 or more houses, front setbacks shall have a minimum 6 ft set back or set forward from front facade of principal residence located on one adjoining property fronting the same street."	
44	51, 59	SU-2/Acequia protection, SU-2/PCD	If SU-2/ Acequia Protection and SU-2/PCD Regulations are intended to be general regulations, they should be listed after all the zoning districts and identified as general regulations, instead of SU-2.	Zoning		Make change, and add (or amend) page references in individual zoning districts to the applicable general regulations.	P. 51 SU-2/Acequia Protection - move to a new subsection entitled "General Regulations" after p. 66 and delete SU-2. P. 59 SU-2/PCD Regulations - move to General Regulations and delete SU-2. Also, add or amend page references in individual zoning districts to the applicable general regulations.	
45	52, 54, 55, 56	PCD	Allow PCD in all residential and mixed use zones, and without specifying a minimum lot size	EPC Commissioner	On smaller lots, could create a situation where the PCA does not meet the intent of a PCD in Los Duranes, that is to provide visual as well as functional open space.			
46	52, 54, 55, 56, 57	SU-2/RA-2, SU-2/R-1, SU-2/R-2, SU-2/R-LT, SU-2/R-T	Garage setback. - The language regarding garages that face the street needs to be clarified. Does this pertain to the garage doors or the garage itself?	Zoning			P. 52 SU-2/RA-2 C.3, P. 54 SU-2/R-1 & P. 55 SU-2/R-2 D.2, P. 56 SU-2/R-LT D., P. 57 SU-2/R-T C. - replace with "Garages that have doors facing the street shall be setback not less than 20' from the street."	
47	52, 54, 55, 56, 57	SU-2/RA-2, SU-2/R-1, SU-2/R-2, SU-2/R-LT, SU-2/R-T	Driveways - Are driveways supposed to be 20 in width or length?	Zoning			P. 52 SU-2/RA-2 D., P. 54 SU-2/R-1 & P. 55 SU-2/R-2 E., P. 56 SU-2/R-LT F., P. 57 SU-2/R-T E. - at end of sentence, insert "in length".	
48	54, 55	SU-2/R-1 & SU-2/R-2	Frontage - The Code Enforcement Division is opposed to the suggested language under frontage [in the April 2011 and the December 2010 drafts]. This division is unable to determine what the frontage measurements will be for the two adjoining properties.	Zoning	see below	see below	P. 54 SU-2/R-1 & P. 55 SU-2/R-2 C. Frontage 1. replace with "The front facade of new structures shall not exceed the average width of principal structures on lots within 300 ft in both directions measured from both corners of the lot line that abuts the primary public right-of-way by more than 20%." Insert associated diagram from the December 2010 draft LDSDP (Exhibit F)	see below
49	54, 55	SU-2/R-1, SU-2/R-2	Reinstate the setback and frontage standards from the Dec 2010 draft Los Duranes SDP in SU-2/R-1 and SU-2/R-2	J Fishman on behalf of Steering Committee at 5/5/11 hearing	see below	see below	see below	see below

Comment #	Page #	Topic	Comment / Question / Request	Source	No Change	Change	Condition	Finding
50	54, 55	SU-2/R-1, SU-2/R-2	Front Setbacks – Code Enforcement (CE) is opposed to the regulations suggested under front yard setbacks [April 2011 and Dec 2010 drafts]. The regulation that requires staff to conduct a field investigation to determine the front yard setbacks for the buildings on adjacent properties creates several issues. The inspector will need to request from each of the property owners a copy of a certified survey to determine the exact location of the front property line; cannot determine exactly where the front property line is located by a visual inspection; will need to gain permission from each of the property owners to determine what the measurement is from the building to the front property line. The location of a property line in relation to the right-of-way varies in different locations throughout the city. The use of aerial maps cannot be used for this exact location because there is a margin of error with the maps. CE recommends this issue be studied within the scope of this project to determine ahead of time what the measurements will be at each block.	Zoning / Staff		While Code Enforcement objects to the proposed context-sensitive regulations, they are similar to existing city regulations in the adopted North 4th Street Corridor Plan and Fourth Ward HOZ. The applicant is responsible for providing the necessary measurements that demonstrate compliance with the regulations. In addition the regulations allow acceptable setbacks and frontages within a range, which provides some flexibility. However, staff recommends a minimum front setback.	P. 54 SU-2/R-1 & P. 55 SU-2/R-2 D. Setbacks 1. Front setback - replace with "The building setbacks shall be substantially...Add "Minimum setback is 10 ft." Insert associated diagram from the December 2010 draft LDSDP (Exhibit F)	The context-sensitive regulations for frontages and setbacks in the SU-2/R-1 and SU-2/R-2 zones are similar to regulations in adopted city plans, including the North 4th Street Corridor Plan (adopted 2010, see NMFID Infill District p. 48) and the Fourth Ward HOZ (adopted 2002, see D p. 20). They are appropriate for infill development in this historic neighborhood characterized by modestly scaled buildings.
51	55	COA Zoning Districts	List the zoning districts in the following manner to be consistent with how these zone categories are listed in the Zoning Code: SU-2/RA-2, SU-2/R-1, SU-2/R-LT, SU-2/R-T, SU-2/R-2, SU-2/MUD 1 and SU-2/MUD 2.	Zoning			P. 55 SU-2/R-2 - move this zoning district after SU-2/R-T.	
52	55	SU-2/R-2	Require that multi-family development be broken into separate buildings with a maximum length of 80 ft per building and a minimum separation of 15 ft between the buildings to allow for landscape, play areas, and common open space.	Steering Committee letter of 6/27/11		As stated in the introduction of the SU-2/R-2 section, this zoning district has deep tracts. Also, the frontages are typically narrow. Recent and proposed apartment developments on these tracts include long structures. Staff believes that the additional requirements proposed by the Steering Committee would ensure that future developments better fit the traditional smaller scale pattern in the neighborhood.	P. 55 SU-2/R-2 - Add "The maximum length of a building shall be 80 ft. The minimum distance between buildings shall be 15 ft."	
53	55, 56, 57	SU2-R-2, SU-2/R-LT, SU-2/RT	Revise the second story standard of 65% of the building footprint to 75% as it applies to townhouses and apartments, given the relatively small footprint of townhomes and to respond to construction limitations for stacked apartment units.	SC letter of 6/27/11		Staff agrees that the proposed revision is more reasonable for townhouses and apartments. Note that townhouses are also permissive in other residential zones if they are part of a PCD and the 75% should apply.	P. 55 SU-2/R-2, P. 56 SU-2/R-LT, P. 57 SU-2/R-LT, Height 2. Iii) replace 65% with 75%. P. 52 SU-2/RA-2, P. 54 SU-2/R-1 (and SU-2/RA-1 if recommended by EPC) Height 2.ii) - insert "except townhouses in a PCD shall be limited to 75% of ground floor footprint"	

Comment #	Page #	Topic	Comment / Question / Request	Source	No Change	Change	Condition	Finding
54	56	SU-2/R-LT	B. Height 2.ii. – indicates that apartments are allowed, however, the R-LT zone in the Zoning Code does not allow for apartments.	Zoning			P. 56 SU-2/R-LT - B.2. ii) delete "apartments".	
55	59	PCD	B. Density 1. – Does the calculation include or exclude streets?	Zoning		Normally this is not an issue, because a site proposed for a PCD does not include public or private streets. In certain circumstances, a site proposed as a PCD may include a private access easement. The corresponding paragraph in the PCD regulations of the Zoning Code (14-16-3-16 (B)) simply refers to "site area". Staff believes the intent of the plan is to base density on the same criterion as in the ZC and therefore the same language is proposed as a revision.	P. 59 PCDB.1. - delete "gross".	
56	59	PCD	C. This section references townhomes as permissive. The SU-2/R-1 zone will need to contain language to state that townhomes are allowed permissively or only in conjunction with a PCD.	Zoning		Make correction.	P. 52 SU-2/RA-2 & P. 54 SU-2/R-1 A. Permissive Uses - add a second sentence "Townhouses are permitted only in conjunction with a PCD." [If EPC recommends that RA-1 become SU-2/RA-1 with PCD per LDSDP regulations, include same language.]	
57	60	PCD	Add on-site ponding as a potential use of the PCA in a PCD	City Engineer/Hydrology			P. 60 F. PCA 2. - In first line, insert "on-site ponding," after "landscaping," Before last sentence, insert "Any ponding area in the PCA shall have a minimum of 75% live vegetative cover."	
58	60	PCD	Setbacks and Height standards - the massing and setback standards were intended to not only mitigate the impact of large buildings as they face a public street, but also the impact to adjacent neighbors that primarily live in one-story, modestly scaled structures.	Steering Committee letter of 6/27/11	See below			
59	60	PCDs	Why apply specific building setbacks and height to buildings in PCDs that are not on a public street	EPC Commissioner	To summarize a comparison of PCD regulations the in LDSDP with the Zoning Code: D. Front setback - same. Side setback - 10 ft instead of 5 ft. Rear setback - One setback for all house types rather than individual setbacks for different types. In addition, in the LDSDP: E.3 Height - additional setback only applies to frontage on public street. E.4 Area limit for second story is to ensure that new development fits with the traditionally modest scale and mass of homes in the neighborhood, and respects adjoining neighbors'			

Comment #	Page #	Topic	Comment / Question / Request	Source	No Change	Change	Condition	Finding
60	62	SU-2/MUD 1	A. Permissive and Conditional Uses. Does this mean that both permissive and conditional uses are allowed?	Zoning	enjoyment of their property. In conclusion, the proposed regulations are either no more complex or are justified by the unique conditions in Los Duranes.	Clarify that permissive uses in each category are permissive, and conditional uses are conditional, by separating them out.	P. 62 SU-2/MUD 1 - Split A. into two sections, A. Permissive Uses 1. Any or a mix of permissive uses...etc. and B. Conditional Uses. 1. Any or a mix of conditional uses...etc. Insert "Senior Housing Facility" in the new A. Realphabetize and amend the other paragraphs as needed. (See Exhibit G)	
61	62, 64	SU-2/MUD 1 & 2 (i.e. all zones fronting RGB)	Add language from the Rio Grande Blvd Corridor Plan (RGBCP) regulation 10.B about upper story setback from street and from residential properties	Staff		The plan currently references the setback regulation in the RGBCP, which is in the process of being updated. Inserting the specific language in the LDSDP will ensure that development in the mixed use zones along Rio Grande Blvd. will be in scale with the rest of the Los Duranes neighborhood, regardless of changes to the RGBCP. The plan includes similar limits on the upper story in the residential zones.	P. 62 SU-2/MUD 1, P. 64 SU-2/MUD 2, Height - add "Building facades on the street shall be one story. Any additional permitted stories shall be setback so that a line drawn from the first story roof line to the upper story roof line equals a 60 degree angle on sides of the building adjacent to the street or to residential properties. Building heights shall not exceed those allowed in the zone."	
62	62, 64	SU-2/MUD 1 & MUD 2	Drive-Up Service – The sentence that states, “Drive-up service windows shall be oriented away from pedestrian area,” should be clarified. Most areas could be argued as pedestrian areas. The sentence that begins with, “Screening shall be provided...” needs to be clarified. What specifically needs to be screened?	Zoning		Provide clarification for "pedestrian area". The plan already states that the screening is for drive-up service windows and queue lanes. However, following further discussion with Code Enforcement, an additional screening option is suggested.	P. 62 SU-2/MUD 1 A.1.ii (3) Design Standards for Drive-up Service Windows - line 4, after "pedestrian areas" insert ", such as sidewalks and plazas,". At end of paragraph, insert "Screening may also be provided by placing the drive-up service windows and/or queue lanes between two adjacent and parallel buildings." P. 64 & 65 SU-2/MUD 2 - under C-1 and C-2, add the same new text.	
63	63, 65	SU-2/MUD 1	Senior Housing Facility - The draft plan does not specify what standards apply to this use.	Staff		Correct the omission by including standards that are consistent with existing standards in the SU-2/MUD 1 and MUD zones or appropriate to this specific use.	P. 63 SU-2/MUD 1 & P. 65 SU-2/MUD 2, Senior Housing Facility - add "Height: pursuant to C-1 zone [insert same language as in comment 61]; Setback: pursuant to O-1 zone; Off-street parking: 1 space per dwelling unit or apartment, 1 space per 2 private or semi-private rooms".	
64	63, 65	SU-2/MUD 1 & MUD 2	The prohibition language of Drive-up service windows needs to be reworded. Is the intent to allow Drive-up service windows as provided in the C-1 zone?	Zoning		After discussion, Code Enforcement suggested incorporating prohibited uses as exceptions to permissive and conditional uses.	P. 63 SU-2/MUD 1 and 65 SU-2/MUD 2 - move and reword prohibited uses as exceptions to permissive or conditional uses.	

Comment #	Page #	Topic	Comment / Question / Request	Source	No Change	Change	Condition	Finding
65	63, 65	SU-2/MUD 1 & MUD 2	Add a definition of Senior Housing Facility. Also, language regarding Senior Housing Facility could fall under the description of a Community Residential Program (CRP), which is regulated with separation requirements from other CRPs and the number allowed per City Council district. The proposed language may allow a CRP under the Senior Housing Facility without the need to meet the other standards	Zoning		After discussion, Code Enforcement agreed a separate definition is not needed, but other clarifications are warranted within each zone.	P. 63 SU-2/MUD 1 and p. 65 SU2/MUD 2 Senior Housing Facility - After the 1st sentence, insert "The property shall be operated only as Housing for Older Persons' as defined in the Federal Housing for Older Persons Act (42U.S.S., para 3607(b)(2)) and uses will include related facilities." At the end, add "Facilities meeting the definition of a Community Residential Program cannot be included under the Senior Facility Housing use."	
66	63, 66	SU-2/MUD 1 & MUD 2	D. Approval Process – The words "...and a Site Development Plan for Building Permit,..." should be removed since Site Development Plan is already identified earlier in the sentence. Site Development Plan means for subdivision or for building permit. It is unclear as to why the words "... (as amended) are included in this section. The words "...as regulated by 14-16-3-11" does not address the procedure of how a site development plan is to be approved. It seems that the procedure section of 14-16-2-22 (with the exception of having the Development Review Board approve the site development plan) should be included to specify how one is approved or denied.	Code Enforcement		Clarify approval process. In further discussion, Code Enforcement also recommended including notification and amendment processes.	P. 63 SU-2/MUD 1 & P. 66 SU-2/MUD 2, Approval Process - Replace with "Development may only occur in conformance with a Site Development Plan for Building Permit, and a Site Development Plan for Subdivision if replatting is required and/or development will be phased. Site development plans shall be approved by the Development Review Board. The Planning Director may approve minor changes to an approved Site Development Plan, per the procedure in 14-16-2-22 (A)(6) except that major changes shall be approved by the Development Review Board rather than the Planning Commission."	
67	63, 66	SU-2/MUD 1 & MUD 2	C. Landscape buffer - add that it will be used for rainwater harvesting	City Hydrologist		Los Duranes is flat and the climate is arid, but with typically short, intense rainfall. Landscape buffers can be designed for rainwater harvesting, both for on-site detention and to supplement irrigation.	P. 63 SU-2/MUD 1 & P. 66 SU-2/MUD 2 - Special Buffer Landscaping/Screening - add "The special landscape buffer shall be used for rainwater harvesting."	
68	63, 75	SU-2/MUD 1 & MUD 2	R-G iv(4) Off-street Parking - (a) should have the word "studio" removed or defined.	Code Enforcement		Use "efficiency" since the term is defined in the city's Uniform Housing Code (14-3-1-4) and has the same meaning as "studio", i.e. one habitable room.	P. 63 SU-2/MUD 1 & P. 65 SU-2/MUD 2, R-G, Off-street Parking (a) - replace "studio" with "efficiency".	
69	64	SU-2/MUD 2	Clarify that the previously approved restaurant w/ drive-up service window at 1050 Rio Grande Blvd NW can be relocated within the Garcia Parcel. Otherwise, do not restrict the use in MUD 1 or MUD 2.	J. Kent/S Garcia et al letter of 5/3/11				

Comment #	Page #	Topic	Comment / Question / Request	Source	No Change	Change	Condition	Finding
70	64	SU-2/MUD 2	Prohibit large retail facility in this zone.	EPC Commissioner	None of the proposed SU-2/MUD 2 zones is sufficiently large to accommodate a Large Retail Facility (LRF) (see definition 14-16-1-5 and regulations 14-16-3-2 (D)). Essentially, it is a single tenant structure of at least 75,000 sf. The largest proposed MUD 2 zone is 3.7 acres or 161,172 sf. In recent years, national retailers have only developed single story retail of that size in Albuquerque. It is very unlikely that sufficient land could be assembled in Los Duranes, and rezoned, to accommodate an LRF and its associated access, circulation and parking. Note that zone changes and/or LRFs are subject to EPC, and in some cases City Council, review and approval (ref 14-16-4-3, 14-16-3-2(D)(4)).			
71	65	SU-2/MUD 2	Increase the residential density of the MUD 2 zone from R-G to R-2 to reflect the commercial intensity increase from MUD 1 to MUD 2, and to further increase access to transit. [see memo for full text]	Transit	The plan intent is to allow higher density uses in established commercial areas along Rio Grande Blvd. and decreasing densities toward the river. The residential density allowed in the mixed use zones is currently based on the RG zone, i.e. maximum 20 DUs/acre. However, the SU-2/R-2 zone west of the properties on Rio Grande Blvd allows a higher density of 30 DUs/acre maximum. Note that a C-1 and C-2 text amendment to allow higher density residential development, subject to specific criteria, was recommended for approval by the EPC to City Council. If approved, this could mean up to 50 DUs would be allowed in the SU-2/MUD 1 zone and no upper limit on the SU-2/MUD 2 zones, since they are within 660 ft of an enhanced transit corridor. To prevent potential confusion in the future and ensure a density that fits with the character of Los Duranes, staff recommends a maximum residential density of 30 DUs in the SU-2/MUD 2 zone and 20 DUs in the SU-2/MUD 1 zone.	The plan intent is to allow higher density uses in established commercial areas along Rio Grande Blvd. and decreasing densities toward the river. The residential density allowed in the mixed use zones is currently based on the RG zone, i.e. maximum 20 DUs/acre. However, the SU-2/R-2 zone west of the properties on Rio Grande Blvd allows a higher density of 30 DUs/acre maximum. Note that a C-1 and C-2 text amendment to allow higher density residential development, subject to specific criteria, was recommended for approval by the EPC to City Council. If approved, this could mean up to 50 DUs would be allowed in the SU-2/MUD 1 zone and no upper limit on the SU-2/MUD 2 zones, since they are within 660 ft of an enhanced transit corridor. To prevent potential confusion in the future and ensure a density that fits with the character of Los Duranes, staff recommends a maximum residential density of 30 DUs in the SU-2/MUD 2 zone and 20 DUs in the SU-2/MUD 1 zone.	P. 64 SU-2/MUD 2: 1 - insert before colon "and subject to a maximum residential density of 30 DUs/acre". 1 iv) change R-G to R-2. Amend (1) with the addition of "(a) Minimum 6' setback from ground floor frontage abutting SU-2/R-1 or SU-2/RA-2 zoned properties" (same as SU-2/R-2 zone). Retain (2), (3) and (4). Add (5) Ground floor entrances: (same language as in SU-2/R-2 zone). P. 62 SU-2/MUD 1 - same changes as above.	

Comment #	Page #	Topic	Comment / Question / Request	Source	No Change	Change	Condition	Finding
72	65	SU-2/MUD 2	Justify area for 36 ft building height based on broad, holistic criteria such as traffic patterns and noise levels.	EPC Commissioner		Consider traffic-related factors in amending the language, such as the distance to the existing signalized intersection at Floral/Rio Grande Blvd.	see below	see below
73	65	SU-2/MUD 2	Extend the 36' height limitation in MUD 2 to 500 ft north of I-40, as opposed to 300 ft, or do not downzone building height leaving it at current C-2/M-1 permissive height.	J. Kent/S Garcia et al letter of 5/3/11		Building height in C-2 is per O-1, which is 26 ft and allows for increase height if within 45 and 60 degree angle planes (see 14-16-2-15 (C)). M-1 permissive height is 36' and up to 120' if within 45 and 60 degree angle planes (see 14-16-2-20(C)). However, the RGBCP also controls height, through a setback for upper stories for development along Rio Grande Blvd. 36 ft is greater than the 26 ft allowed on parcels within the subject area that are currently zoned R-1. Given these facts, it is somewhat simplistic to call the proposed 36 ft building height within 300 ft of I-40 a "downzoned height".	see below	see below
74	65	SU-2/MUD 2	36 ft building height - Agree that the 300 ft proposed in the Plan seems somewhat arbitrary and support extending the area in which maximum building height of 36 ft within the MUD 2 zone to the center line of Floral as a compromise. Does not support the increased height within the MUD 1 zone.	SC letter of 6/27/11		Extending the centerline of Floral Rd. east to the subject zone corresponds to approximately 450 ft from the freeway off-ramp (see Exhibit H)	P. 64 - 65 SU-2/MUD 2, in all the listed zoning categories, (1) Height - replace "300 ft" with "450ft".	A building height of 36 feet in the SU-2/MUD 2 zone is appropriate in the area within 450 ft of Interstate 40, including the off-ramp, because the area is appropriate for somewhat higher buildings than the rest of Los Duranes: the adjacent I-40 freeway is elevated, the area does not abut other zones where houses are allowed, and the 450 ft distance demarcates an area level with the existing signalized intersection at Floral Rd and Rio Grande Blvd which can provide orderly and safer access for a greater intensity of use that may be associated with a higher building.
75	65	SU-2/MUD 2	Correct error: 36 ft building height near I-40 should apply to any allowed uses, not just C-2 uses	Staff		Make correction, and clarify in all the allowed use categories, including C-2, that the setback from Rio Grande Blvd. still applies.	P. 64 - 65 SU-2/MUD 2 - In O-1, C-1, R-2 (amended from R-G) , (1) Height insert after "Zone": "except within ' of Interstate 40, where height up to 36' is permitted". In C-2, move "except within ' of I-40...permitted" before "with setback....".	
76	65	SU-2/MUD 2	B. Prohibited Uses 1. - Adult Uses are already prohibited from this zone.	Code Enforcement		Adult uses are first permitted in the C-3 zone. The plan does not include any zoning district, including the SU-2/MUD 2 zone, in which these uses are allowed either permissively or conditionally.	P. 65 SU-2/MUD 2 - delete "adult establishments, adult store, adult material".	

Comment #	Page #	Topic	Comment / Question / Request	Source	No Change	Change	Condition	Finding
77	66	SU-2/MUD 2	Clarify that the previously approved fueling station at 1050 Rio Grande Blvd NW can be relocated anywhere within the "Garcia Parcel" to allow future design flexibility. Otherwise, do not restrict fueling stations.	J. Kent/S Garcia et al letter of 5/3/11	No change is required, but an explanatory finding is recommended.			An existing or previously approved use for gasoline, oil and liquefied petroleum gas retailing in an SU-2/MUD 1 or MUD 2 zone may be moved from its previous location to another location within the same premises. Premises are as defined in the Zoning Code.
78	66	SU-2/MUD 2	Agree to support the location of the previously approved drive-up service window for restaurant to the area zoned MUD 2 only and the existing premise as defined by the Zoning Code, provided the drive up service window for restaurant complies with the design regulations in the draft plan and the RGBCP.	SC letter of 6/27/11		At the May 5, 2011 EPC hearing, the EPC discussed the possibility of including the Zoning Code definition of Premises in the LDSDP with interested parties from the neighborhood and with staff. However, staff has since clarified both the existing definition and how it relates to the potential relocation of the previously approved uses, in separate discussions with the property-owner and the Steering Committee. Staff believes a finding is acceptable and sufficient to address the issue. [14-16-1-5 Premises: Any lot or combination of contiguous lots held in single ownership, together with the development thereon; there may be multiple occupancy.]	A previously approved restaurant with a drive-up service window located in a SU-2/MUD 2 zone may be moved from its previous location to another location within the same premises zoned SU-2/MUD 2. Premises are as defined in the Zoning Code.	
79	66	SU-2/MUD 2	Clarify that the MUD 2 prohibition on commercial parking lots does not prohibit structured parking for authorized or paid use by on-site retail customers.	J. Kent/S Garcia et al letter of 5/3/11		Staff recommends adding a definition to the plan that addresses the issues relevant to the MUD 2 zone: 1) commercial use of parking and 2) the physical form of the parking. No such definition exists in the Zoning Code. The existing definition uses the term "lot" which suggests an area of land and does not commonly encompass a structure on an area of land.	P. 50 Definitions - Add " <i>Commercial parking facility</i> : An area of land or a structure used to provide parking, as a commercial enterprise, for four or more motor vehicles for a fee. Such parking is not primarily associated with any other use on the same site." P. 63 SU-2/MUD 1 & P. 66 SU-2/MUD 2 - Prohibited Uses: replace Commercial parking lot with "Commercial parking facility, as defined on p. 50."	The prohibition on commercial parking facilities in the SU-2/MUD 1 and SU-2/MUD 2 zones does not apply to parking structures, as long as their primary function is to provide parking for specific uses on the same site.
80	66	SU-2/MUD 2	The intent of the plan is to restrict the commercial aspect of parking lots, regardless of whether it is surface or structure parking. Not opposed to parking garage as long as it is related to a specific on-site use.	SC letter of 6/27/11	see above	see above	see above	see above
81	66	SU-2/MUD 2	Clarify that the prohibition on additional restaurant with drive-up service window does not apply to at least one additional coffee shop with drive-up service window within the Garcia Parcel. Otherwise, do not restrict the use in MUD 1 or MUD 2.	J. Kent/S Garcia et al letter of 5/3/11	see below	see above	see above	see above

Comment #	Page #	Topic	Comment / Question / Request	Source	No Change	Change	Condition	Finding
82	66	SU-2/MUD 2	While it is clear that the neighborhood Steering Committee wants to limit drive up service windows for restaurant and gas station, they agreed to make an exception for the two previously approved uses.	SC letter of 6/27/11	A coffee shop, like a restaurant, is considered a retail food & drink use under the Zoning Code. If combined with a drive-up service window it would be allowed under the provision that a previously approved drive-up restaurant is permitted. The additional drive-up service windows allowed in the SU-2/MUD 1 and MUD 2 zones are for bank and pharmacy. Allowing a second drive-up restaurant in addition to potential bank and pharmacy drive-ups would be counter to the general intent of the sector plan, which is to encourage commercial development that is attractive to pedestrians as well as motorists, and provides convivial centers of activity for residents and visitors.			
83	85	Street Standards - Gen'l	Add a finding in support of the proposed street sections	Jackie Fishman, resident & Steering Committee member, letter dated 4/19/11				Unlike the majority of Established Urban Areas of the city, the residential neighborhood of Los Duranes has developed over a two-century period to create a variety of lot sizes and configurations, and a unique network of narrow, winding streets, alleys, cul-de-sacs and pathways. These streets are one of the defining features of the development pattern in the sector development plan area. They are also considered to slow down traffic and contribute to improved road safety within the neighborhood. Protection of existing narrow streets is therefore warranted, and new residential streets will be built to specifications tailored to the character of the neighborhood, per street standards in the plan.
84	85	Street Standards - Gen'l	When a Private dirt/gravel road is turned Public will this trigger the "new residential street" criteria?	City Hydrologist				P. 85 Street Standards, at end of 1st sentence - insert "or private streets are converted to public streets"
85	86	Street Sections - 1	Specify usage of the 4 ft offset in Section 1 diagram	City Engineer/Transportation		Response forthcoming.		
86	86	Street Sections - 1	Define the maximum cross slopes of the roadway and label the alley gutter	City Engineer/Transportation		Response forthcoming.		
87	86	Street Sections - 1	replace 4' walkway with raised curbing and sidewalk	City Engineer/Transportation	This request would significantly undermine the intent of the street standards.			

Comment #	Page #	Topic	Comment / Question / Request	Source	No Change	Change	Condition	Finding
88	86	Street Sections - 2 & 3	Specify the minimum and maximum width and the maximum slope of swales. Define the maximum slopes on the roadway sections	City Engineer/Transportation & Hydrology		Response forthcoming.		
89	86	Street Sections - All	Provide 'No Parking' signs	City Engineer/Transportation		Response forthcoming.		
90	86	Street Sections - All	Verify that appropriate clear zones are being maintained for the design speed (see the Roadside Design Guide by AASHTO)	City Engineer/Transportation		Response forthcoming.		
91	86	Street Sections - All	Stripe all driving lanes to delineate traffic movement	City Engineer/Transportation		The proposed language, amended, would implement goal B and strategy #6 under Streets, Sidewalks and Trails (LDSDP, p. 39) for pedestrian safety reasons.	P. 86 Street Section 1 - add "Stripe boundary between travel lane and walkway."	
92	86	Street Sections - All	How will ADA accessibility be maintained throughout any new residential developments	City Engineer/Transportation		Response forthcoming.		
93	86	Street Sections - All	Travel lanes don't specify surface material (e.g. asphalt pavement). Rocks are shown in the swales, this should be specified or just "not dirt".	City Hydrologist		Response forthcoming.		
94	86	Street Sections - All	Dedicate one driving lane to a parking lane w/ pullouts	EPC Commissioner	The proposed standards accommodate two travel lanes. Parking pull-outs should not be necessary.			
95	86	Street Sections - Note 3	Contradicts the proposed sections concerning curbing within the City of Albuquerque limits. Please clarify	City Engineer/Transportation	This is a Bernalillo County matter.			
96	89	Implementation Matrix	Strategy #6 - National Night Out is first Tuesday of August each year	APD			P. 89 Implementation Matrix, strategy #6 - change timeframe to "Annually (first Tuesday of August)"	
97	All	All	Correct formatting, typos, numbering and other minor errors as appropriate.	Staff				A red-line version of the draft plan shall be included in the packet transmitted to City Council, incorporating all EPC-recommended changes to the plan, along with minor edits and corrections.
98	i	Acknowledgments	Board of County Commissioners: switch Chair and Vice-Chair	BC Planning		Correct error.		P. i Acknowledgments - Art De La Cruz - replace Chair with Vice-Chair; Maggie Hart Stebbins - replace Vice-Chair with Chair.