

Volcano Heights SDP
Public Comments Spreadsheet
Index

Comments/Responses	Focus Group 8/23/11 Page #	Focus Group 9/14/11 Page #
Roads	2-4	16
Roads/Access		17-23
Roads/Cross Sections		24-26
Traffic Study		27
Character Zones	5-8	28-33
Building Design Standards	9	34-37
Site Development / Block Size		38-41
Use Table		42
Heights/Bonus Table	10	43-50
OS / Parks / Trails / Cultural Resources	11	51-52
Infrastructure	12	53
Review Process	13-14	54
Fugitive Dust	15	
Exising Land Use		54

Volcano Heights
Focus Group Comments

	M	N	O	P
1	Comment / Question / Request for Change	Change - NO	Change - YES	Explanation / Action
2	ROADS			
3	Slide 17 – Mandatory Streets. It looks like there is a trail along the north side of the road leading from the Petroglyph Monument Parkway through the traffic circle, across Unser and Paseo del Norte to Universe. Is that correct?	1		Correct. Plan seeks to connect footbridge over Paseo, along Monument edge, across top of Town Center, over Paseo & Unser to Universe and OS corridor in Volcano Trails to Northern Geologic Window
4	Slide 33 – How do “A” and “B” street designations interface with mandatory streets? Are all mandatory streets classified as “A” streets?		1	The A and B Streets are being differentiated by the street type plan for Mandatory Streets. Where non-mandatory streets will be added, regulations will require a percentage per project for A and B Streets. Currently, the only Mandatory B Streets are Paseo del Norte and Unser Boulevard.
5	Slide 34 / 35 – Is there a map of “A” and “B” locations? What is the current thinking regarding cross sections for Unser and Paseo del Norte? Does this change with the “A” and “B” classification? It seems like the current thought is that Unser and Paseo del Norte would provide limited “A” street access to the Regional Center which would have more auto oriented “B” streets. If so, do access roads with some parking still make sense as the most efficient use of ROW for Unser and Paseo del Norte to meet plan area access and through traffic needs for these roads?		1	Map pending. No change expected to cross sections for Unser or PdN. Plan will include the cross sections DMD is working from.
6	Slide 42 – Is the Petroglyph Monument Parkway single-loaded along the entire length or only for the portions that border the monument?	1		Park edge road is only required to be single-loaded where it abuts the Monument border.
7	Slide 18 – I assume “on the books” would be referring to the MRCOG access limitations. If so, the Unser Blvd. access limitations allow for a full intersection at a point approximately halfway between Paseo del Norte and Lillienthal (e.g. full intersection to Sundance Estates north of the plan boundary). This would correspond to the full intersection at Unser / Transit Road. What would be the process / timing to adopt the proposed changes? Prior to, concurrent with, or after adoption of the plan. The City would be the lead agency to propose the changes to MRCOG, correct?		1	Correct. There is 1 full intersection in an unspecified location between PdN and Lillienthal. As this Plan is proposing 2 full intersections within that same stretch, we have not mapped either of these as the one "on the books." The City (DMD) would ask for additional access after this Plan's adoption.

Volcano Heights
Focus Group Comments

	M	N	O	P
1	Comment / Question / Request for Change	Change - NO	Change - YES	Explanation / Action
8	What happened to the grand east/west boulevard that was to include central planting, wide streets, and walkways to preserve a view of the Sandias? (Exhibit 7 in July 2010 plan)		1	Mandatory road has been extended farther east. Will look again at this cross section based on this request. Medians can be incorporated into Mandatory Streets by developer when requested through minor modification. It is important to note that this will require additional ROW dedication and construction cost to be borne by the property owner and/or developer.
9	Love the single-loaded street along the Monument boundary. Want to see it include drainage function to protect Monument from runoff.		1	Revisions to cross sections pending.
10	Want to see Paseo/Unser designed for pedestrian access / walkability.	1		Plan is not changing the cross sections for Paseo or Unser, as these roads have been previously designed by DMD. Pedestrian walkability will be addressed pending the results of the traffic study and trail network planning efforts.
11	Want to see lower speed limits on Paseo/Unser.	1		While this Plan can include a policy about the speed limit and function of these roads to protect pedestrian safety and enhance retail sales, the Plan does not have the power to regulate speed limits.
12	Reduced traffic speed equates to more jobs. Want to see this area be a destination. Traffic delay would only amount to 45 seconds.	1		See response above.
13	Unser parkway needs to be designed to slow traffic.	1		See responses above.
14	Let the regional street traffic flow.	1		The Plan will attempt to balance the need for regional traffic flow with safe pedestrian access and local auto access to new developments. The Plan recognizes the limited-access, regional nature of Paseo del Norte and Unser Boulevard.
15	Want to see continuity of trails within and outside Plan area.		1	These planning efforts are expected in coming months.

Volcano Heights
Focus Group Comments

	M	N	O	P
1	Comment / Question / Request for Change	Change - NO	Change - YES	Explanation / Action
16	Want to see other solutions (shuttles?) to get pedestrians safely around all quadrants.	1		While this Plan can include a policy supporting alternative modes of safe circulation for pedestrians, it does not have the power to require shuttles. ABQ Ride has not had positive experiences of these shuttle circulators, so likely this kind of solution will need to be funded by a merchants' association or some other private entity.
17	Want to see "right-in/right-out (RI/RO), Left-in only" as fallback position (vs. RI/RO)	1	1	While this Plan can include a policy supporting RI/RO Left-in only as the fallback position, this decision is ultimately the purview of DMD in conjunction with the TCC.
18	Want to see orange circles added ¼ miles from Paseo/Unser intersection (allowed by policy but NOT "on the books")	1	1	These intersections allowed by policy can be added to the graphic, but it is important to note that they have NOT been approved by the TCC and are therefore not guaranteed entitlement to access.
19	School access north of the Plan may not work with proposed RI/RO.		1	Planning team will work with APS on this issue as part of the general planning effort to ensure safe pedestrian connectivity throughout the Plan area.
20	How could pedestrian access still be granted? Safe Unser crossing?		1	This planning effort is expected in coming months.
21	How does Plan work with MRCOG mandate for 10% of river crossings provided by Transit by 20XX?		1	This Plan generally supports this policy, but a more detailed analysis can be performed pending the outcome of the traffic study.
22	Mandatory roads need to be linked to an infrastructure plan.		1	This planning effort is expected in coming months.
23	MAC comparison for traffic needs to include commute times, not just traffic counts.	1		Planning team provided MAC comparisons at the request of neighbors wanting to have a sense of the impact of proposed development. The planning team does not expect to do more with MAC comparisons.
24	Want to see east-west grand boulevard from 2010 draft with view toward Sandias.		1	Mandatory road matching this description has been extended eastward based on this comment. Revisions to cross sections pending.

Volcano Heights
Focus Group Comments

	M	N	O	P
1	Comment / Question / Request for Change	Change - NO	Change - YES	Explanation / Action
25	CHARACTER ZONES			
26	Slide 14 – Character zone map should extend the Regional Center on the southern side of Unser Blvd from the SE corner of the Unser / Transit road to the blue Escarpment Transition zone. This location would be most favorable for auto oriented use to meet the needs of evening commuters residing north of the plan area. Autos leaving the transit center would have 1) right in access from the Transit Road and either 2a) right out to the Transit Road / right out to Unser northbound, or 2b) internal street connection to the Petroglyph Monument Parkway which would have right out access Unser Blvd. northbound.		1	Complete. Extended RC to this corner property.
27	Slide 15 – Would the Regional Center also include restaurants and lodging? Are there any existing areas in Albuquerque (e.g. ABQ Uptown) that would meet the requirements of the Regional Center character zone.		1	Yes. See Use Table. Illustrations/graphics pending.

Volcano Heights
Focus Group Comments

	M	N	O	P
1	Comment / Question / Request for Change	Change - NO	Change - YES	Explanation / Action
28	In the area of Unser south, why are some properties excluded from a Regional Center "pink" zone when the statement is that "land lining Paseo/Unser would have auto-friendly zoning? Same goes for Paseo from the intersection south. This seems quite arbitrary. It appears to be biased toward certain land owners!		1	Complete. Extended RC to 4th quadrant of PdN/Unser intersection. RC is not extended farther south and east in order to match land use in Volcano Cliffs to the south. RC is the least dense of all the non-Transition zones, so the idea is to minimize the amount of RC in Heights. Many of the uses permitted in RC are permitted in the other zones, as well, so the idea is not to limit uses but rather minimize the amount of land that can develop in a suburban rather than urban pattern. RC is appropriate along Unser & Paseo, but some transition from RC is needed between the Neighborhood Residential on the Plan's southern boundary, hence the VHMx proposed in that area. RC has been added to the "4th quadrant" of the Paseo/Unser intersection, and the width of RC has been increased based. Staff believes the current Zone proposal strikes a compromise between the Plan's intent and property owner feedback.
29	Page 12: zone sizes and locations: What is neighborhood center? The small area allotted to these is too small. They should be at least 10 acres.		1	Complete. NC sizes have been increased. NC allows more uses than straight MX with site development standards closer to Town Center to provide a sense of place to areas surrounded by straight MX and additional height.
30	Page 14: The yellow zones should have height restriction no less than the structures for which the transition is designed.	1		Other than the APS schools, which are exempt from City height limits, abutting properties north of Volcano Heights are limited to 26 feet.
31	Transition zone on north needs to have the same height standard as development across the Heights boundary.	1		See previous response.
32	North end of VHET @ Unser – look at existing development to the North to be consistent.	1		See previous response.

Volcano Heights
Focus Group Comments

	M	N	O	P
1	Comment / Question / Request for Change	Change - NO	Change - YES	Explanation / Action
33	Page 12: Blue zone, Escarpment Transition, for the land in the north-east of the rectangle on Unser to Paradise (see page 4 and 14) is incorrect. This area adjoins platted land to the north that has been excluded from the drawing. This land has already been zoned for big-box development and other projects. There is no escarpment there! I want all maps to go north to Paradise and show the entitlements already granted!	1		The project abutting Volcano Heights boundary to the north is a single-family development. The big box zoning is farther north and east. Staff agrees most maps should show more context of surrounding development.
34	Want to see more flexible zone lines.		1	Plan includes flexibility for zone changes within minor and major modifications. See Table 3.3.
35	Extend Town Center 200 feet to the East to surround BRT corridor with more density.		1	Graphic updated for 9/14/11 Focus Group.
36	Neighborhood Center should increase in acreage (10 acres?).		1	See previous response.
37	Transition zone not needed abutting school/commercial property on the northern border.	1		Considering the surrounding zoning, planning team does not want to "spot zone" this property MX.
38	Want to see Transition zone neutered if zone changes happen adjacent outside the Plan boundary.	1		Plan has no control over adjacent development; however, adjacent land is platted, zoned, and for the most part developed as single-family residential. Where land is currently vacant, it is unlikely to develop as non-residential, as it is surrounded by single-family residential.
39	Love the 15 foot height limit at Escarpment Transition.	1		Thank you for your comment.
40	What is the origin of the 15 foot Impact Area along Paseo del Norte on the south boundary?	1		Impact area has been mapped along Paseo since the NWMEP was adopted in 1989, presumably for view preservation. It may also relate to topography.
41	Regional Center needs to be wider (+200 feet?).		1	RC was increased to 400 feet on each side of the centerline of Unser or Paseo.
42	Want to see Regional Center in southwest quadrant of "loop road" south of Unser/Paseo intersection.		1	Graphic updated for 9/14/11 Focus Group.
43	Maps should include existing and planned development outside Plan area (i.e. Boulders).		1	Revised graphics pending.

Volcano Heights
Focus Group Comments

	M	N	O	P
1	Comment / Question / Request for Change	Change - NO	Change - YES	Explanation / Action
44	What types of retail will be allowed in all the mixed use zones? Liquor? Bars?	1		See Use Table.
45	Turn lanes, etc. may have an effect on setbacks, so zone widths may need to increase.		1	Details pending. Cross section revisions pending.
46	Lots on Unser/Paso to 10 feet below fill level. How measure heights? Approved Grade?	1		Yes, structure heights will be measured from approved grade.

Volcano Heights
Focus Group Comments

	M	N	O	P
1	Comment / Question / Request for Change	Change - NO	Change - YES	Explanation / Action
47	BUILDING DESIGN STANDARDS			
48	It is the wrong time and climate to clutter the plan with building design standards. These must be general at this time and comply with the "Design Review" at the time a project is hatched.	1		Developing design standards now is the trade-off for a speedy approval process later. Public input happens now during the development of the standards, which can then offer predictable and assured character for high-quality development that all can rely on.
49	Building Design regulations should include architectural features to address the facing street.	1		This element is being covered by requiring a range of high-quality building materials, encouraging colonnades and arches, etc., and requiring articulation of facades every thirty feet, for example. The Plan does not intend to require specific architectural elements. The Plan must allow some flexibility for future architectural design and desirable materials.
50	Building Design regulations should include requirements for preserving natural landscape.		1	OS Standards pending
51	Sign regulations should prohibit LED signs.		1	All new lighting must meet the New Mexico Night Sky Ordinance. The area will also have to comply with the Electronic Sign Ordinance, which prohibits LED signs along Unser Boulevard and sets other regulations about on-site and off-site electronic signs throughout the City. Staff intends to prohibit LED signs in Transition Zones.

Volcano Heights
Focus Group Comments

	M	N	O	P
1	Comment / Question / Request for Change	Change - NO	Change - YES	Explanation / Action
52	HEIGHTS			
53	Where Unser/Paseo roads have been elevated by fill, cannot the adjacent lots be elevated toward road level? Should not building heights be measured from fill level? Nobody wants to be in the gully next to a road.	1		Decision can be made by each property owner. The Plan will have a goal to minimize the need for imported fill. Building Heights will be measured from "approved grades" not "natural grade." The Plan will also allow the opportunity to pull the building away from the road.
54	Slide 29 – What is the basis for “26 feet elsewhere by right”? I would propose 40 feet allowable with additional bonus criteria up to 65 feet in center zones. Bonus criteria should include employment criteria in all nontransition zones, not just in the Town Center.	1		Zoning code uses 26 feet as the base height in equivalent zones. Heights and bonus criteria are still under review.
55	Worried about “horse-trading” of bonus criteria. Will developers be forced into certain “options” because other developers haven’t chosen to provide those amenities? (i.e. transit shelters)		1	Bonus criteria under review; however, they should not be considered quota to be filled or horsetraded. They are menu options for each property owner.
56	Keep heights simple (easy to understand and implement)		1	Heights are under review. Bonus criteria are under review.
57	Want to see solar panels NOT count toward/against height limit.	1		Solar panels will not count toward height.
58	Bonus criteria should be for improvements on the property (vs. off-site).		1	Bonus criteria under review; however, the intention is to provide maximum flexibility for small and large property owners to develop.
59	How will bonus criteria options be coordinated among property owners?		1	The planning team is contemplating legal mechanisms for transfer of development rights and open space. Private mechanisms will also be highly encouraged, such as a master developer or master developer agreements among property owners.

Volcano Heights
Focus Group Comments

	M	N	O	P
1	Comment / Question / Request for Change	Change - NO	Change - YES	Explanation / Action
60	PARKS / OPEN SPACE			
61	Want to see WSSP Amendment policies about cultural/historical resources operationalized and linked to regulations.		1	These planning efforts are anticipated in the coming months. It is important to remember that policies have more flexibility to be broad, as they are considered guidance. Regulations have to be more circumspect as carrying the force of law versus guidance. This Plan must still comply with the goals and policies of the higher-ranked Plan.
62	Want to see City fund Open Space purchasing.		1	The planning team is working with OS division to prioritize land for purchase as Open Space; however, purchase of OS falls outside the purview of this Plan.
63	Love the rock outcropping dedications.		1	Thank you for your comment.
64	Want to see archaeological links to agricultural past saved in addition to rock outcropping.		1	The Plan are is covered by the City's Archaeological Ordinance. The Planning team is working with OS Division to identify significant areas that the City would prioritize for preservation.
65	Want to see rock outcroppings prioritized for saving as archaeological samples.		1	The Plan intends to incentivize rock outcropping preservation. The Planning team is working with OS division to map significant rock outcroppings.
66	Where are the planned parks?		1	Because of the surplus of parks and OS in the broader area, the fees collected via the current Impact Fee Ordinance in this area can only be used for maintenance of existing parks, not new parks. If property owners are willing to either dedicate land or build private parks, the Plan will gladly reflect those intentions.

Volcano Heights
Focus Group Comments

	M	N	O	P
1	Comment / Question / Request for Change	Change - NO	Change - YES	Explanation / Action
67	INFRASTRUCTURE / IMPLEMENTATION			
68	Slide 44 – Infrastructure will be key to the development of the area; however, infrastructure planning has bypassed the plan area for several years due in part to the lack defined alignments / construction of Paseo del Norte and Unser Blvd. The mandatory street network will add another needed level of definition to allow for infrastructure planning. I would like to see the City sponsor some level of “backbone” infrastructure planning for the area. This would ensure coordination of efforts with the City, the Water Authority, PNM , Gas Co., etc. Having a City supported “backbone” infrastructure plan could help to realize opportunities for infrastructure assistance as noted on slide 48.	1	1	The City is willing to lead some high-level planning and phasing efforts, but significant efforts will need to be coordinated among property owners to drive the detailed, master-planning level efforts.
69	Page 44: Infrastructure. The city should designate where the sewers and water lines will be installed so site development plans can be made.	1	1	Agreed. Plan will include preliminary infrastructure planning/phasing information.
70	What happens if property owners couldn't pay debt service on a TIDD?	1	1	Bonds wouldn't be issued until financial markets were comfortable that there was a reliable, proven stream of revenue (i.e. viable commercial business(es) creating an increment that can accumulate) to pay debt service on the bonds. And in any event the developers would be required to put the equivalent of 20% of the infrastructure cost into the project before they can be reimbursed.

Volcano Heights
Focus Group Comments

	M	N	O	P
1	Comment / Question / Request for Change	Change - NO	Change - YES	Explanation / Action
71	REVIEW PROCESS			
72	Page 11: review team composition. Do not have any "other" as there is competition among groups, so this would be a major wrench in the gears. The review team can make a judgment, and if the property owner does not agree, he can appeal the decision to the EPC/City Council.	1		Composition will be at the discretion of the Planning Director to help with problem solving. The property owner will have the option to enter the EPC process or appeal to DRB.
73	Slide 11 – Who / what is the City Forester?	1		City staff member with oversight of "live" landscaping/ streetscaping.
74	Development threshold for DRB review should increase to 10 acres (from 5) to be the size of a property block.	1		More properties are 5 acres than 10 acres in Volcano Heights. The table has been edited so that 5 acres is included in the Administrative Review, but above 5 acres is subject to the more stringent review process.
75	Want to see Neighborhood representative on the Review Team. Would give the public a voice while still ensuring a development can be approved quickly if it complies with Plan requirements.	1		Composition will be at the discretion of the Planning Director to help with problem solving. Neighborhood interests should be involved during the drafting of the Plan so that their voice is included in the regulations. Development that complies with these regulations will not be required to provide public notice.
76	Don't want to see citizens vs. staff on the Review Team in case they slow down streamlined approval.	1		Composition will be at the discretion of the Planning Director. As this is a problem-solving body and not a quasi-judicial body, the property owner will have the option of appealing any Administrative decision to the DRB or entering the EPC process.
77	Review Team should include a volcanologist and/or cultural anthropologist.	1		Composition will be at the discretion of the Planning Director. Staff will consider adding policies recommending relevant members to be invited to be helpful to natural/cultural resource issues.
78	Want to see a culturally sensitive architect on the Review Team.	1		See response above.

Volcano Heights
Focus Group Comments

	M	N	O	P
1	Comment / Question / Request for Change	Change - NO	Change - YES	Explanation / Action
79	Want to see Review Team kept to fewer people (unwieldy with too many). How much voice would each representative have?	1		Composition will be at the discretion of the Planning Director. As this is a problem-solving body and not a quasi-judicial body, the property owner will have the option of appealing any Administrative decision to the DRB or entering the EPC process.
80	Want to see Review Team with city staff only. City convenes relevant Team members based on proposed development project.	1		See response above.
81	What about properties that are split into 2 zones and require 2 different approval processes?		1	Properties will require platting to develop. The expectation is that the plats would separate the zones. A development that includes multiple plats could be submitted/planned together, but the portions of the development within each zone would have to follow the regulations of that zone, in addition to the mandatory road regulations as applicable. Staff will need to add a requirement that in that case, the applicant would need to follow the more stringent of the 2 approval processes.

Volcano Heights
Focus Group Comments

	M	N	O	P
1	Comment / Question / Request for Change	Change - NO	Change - YES	Explanation / Action
82	FUGITIVE DUST			
83	Fugitive dust needs to be addressed and minimized. Fill is a big problem linked to Unser/Paseo construction. Want to see same language as Trails/Cliffs SDPs: grading permit only issued concurrently with building permit.	1	1	Staff intends to include the policy language limiting fill and the concurrent grading/building permit regulation.
84	Want Planning Team to talk with the City hydrologist to find a reasonable fill limit that's "ground proofed."	1	1	Staff will certainly work with the City hydrologist on fill regulations. Staff is currently not anticipating setting a fill limit but rather a policy that fill should be as minimal as possible, construction should be mitigated to reduce dust, etc. Staff is open to regulations that are legally enforceable and do not pose an undue burden on development potential in this area.

Volcano Heights
Focus Group Comments

	R	S	T	U
1	Comment / Question / Request for Change	Change - NO	Change - YES	Explanation / Action
2	ROADS			
3	Slide 17 – Mandatory Streets. Show/connect trail along the north side of the road leading from Monument Parkway through TC, across Unser and Paseo del Norte to Universe.		1	Map pending. Additional coordination with Parks/Os needed.
4	Do access roads with some parking still make sense as the most efficient use of ROW for Unser and PdN to meet plan area access and through traffic needs for these roads?	1		Current cross sections do not include frontage roads. Graphics pending. Non-mandatory local roads with some parking are envisioned to serve this purpose.
5	Mandatory Streets - mapping does not match concept for property lines and ownership.		1	Graphic pending to show property lines, zone lines, and problem areas. Plan gives flexibility to shift zone lines within a threshold for minor and major modification. See Table 3.3.
6	Use quiet asphalt on Montano, Unser and Paseo to reduce the noise impacts from traffic.		1	Planning team will look into this possibility for Paseo & Unser. As Montano is not part of this planning area, this effort has no jurisdiction over that road.
7	The development community/ property owners don't understand the need for pedestrian-friendly neighborhood designs. The development community is used to building walled suburban style neighborhoods here on the West Side. They do not understand how bad the traffic congestion can be during rush hour and why neighborhood connection and access is so important. Improved neighborhood connection, pedestrian access and attractive streetscapes. NMDOT is focused on high-speed, limited access roads to move traffic, not getting pedestrians across Unser and Paseo safely. Unser and Paseo will be difficult for pedestrians to cross. We may need to lower the speed limit, and build a pedestrian underpass beneath Unser Blvd. Since Unser was already built approximately 15 ft. above natural grade, this may be one way to provide pedestrian access to the Town Center. The Town Center also needs to design attractive streets that will connect neighborhoods together in the Volcano Heights Plan area.		1	Councilor Benton's amendment's on street connectivity will be included in this Plan. Methods to alleviate congestion and increase pedestrian safety will be decided pending the outcome of the traffic study. The Planning team believes the best solution might be a safe at-grade crossing, as an underpass in this area would be prohibitively expensive, and overpasses tend not be used.
8	Slide 34 / 35 – Map of “A” and “B” locations?		1	Map pending.

Volcano Heights
Focus Group Comments

	R	S	T	U
1	Comment / Question / Request for Change	Change - NO	Change - YES	Explanation / Action
9	ROADS / ACCESS			
10	Show how individual lines fit on the LU area to show what will have to be assembled to create developable property. This will also show what access will be needed to get to the plan areas.		1	Graphic pending.
11	Look at land uses based on roadway networks vs. just bands. As we have mentioned several times, this plan is being driven by the location of the access points to Unser/Paseo. Those access points should establish the roadway hierarchy for the plan at those locations where they connect to the network.		1	A traffic study that meets the requirements for TCC access modification submittal pending. Access points will also be determined by the TCC's approval. Staff believes zoning tied to mandatory roads is the best option, considering that property lines meet Paseo & Unser at 45 degree angles, the large property sizes, and checkerboard ownership patterns.
12	Based upon the traffic flow the land use should follow logical access points. If you look at how areas will be accessible and then let the land use center around the access points, it will follow a more logical development pattern than the current land use is showing. If you have a major access point on Paseo, it may make more sense to place the RC in a quadrant than to create the same zoning on a property that does not have that access. The current layout has multiple zoning designations on individual properties. That will necessitate platting and separating out the zoning areas. Put purple on the entire blocks based on access.		1	RC is intended to be accessed via local roads, not Paseo or Unser. Planning team disagrees that multiple zoning designations will require platting. A careful arrangement of uses and building character will result in the fine-grained mixing of development that this Plan envisions. This plan can only request access points on a policy level and therefore cannot use those access points as the basis for zoning. Zoning must be based on what this Plan has the power to regulate, and therefore zones are based on mandatory roads, not on property lines that will most likely change over time.
13	While so much of what has been a truly committed planning effort based on "location, location, location," discussion of the connectivity of the VHS, as well as the other sectors of the Volcano Mesa, with the Northwest Mesa and the greater Albuquerque/Rio Rancho metropolitan area, has remained limited. The issue at the very heart of the matter boils down to the simple matter of "roads, roads, roads."		1	Agreed. Traffic study pending.

Volcano Heights
Focus Group Comments

	R	S	T	U
1	Comment / Question / Request for Change	Change - NO	Change - YES	Explanation / Action
14	I realize that the Planning Department does not carry the burden of road infrastructure, however. From the inception, the assumption upon which the proponents of Volcano Heights Town Center development have made their arguments, developed strategic policies, and given marching orders to the Planning Department, echoes the movie, Field of Dreams: "Build it and they will come." I do not see how the Volcano Mesa dream can possibly be realized if people cannot get there.		1	Agreed. Traffic study pending.
15	Everyone at the Stakeholder sessions has expressed concerns that the considerable good in the difficult and complicated work that Planning Department has done will come apart under the weight of an inadequate road network. Can 20,000 jobs and a perhaps 3 or 4 million square feet of office and retail space (levels roughly similar to the Uptown Major Activity Center) be successfully squeezed into 360 acres (in comparison, the Uptown Major Activity Center covers nearly 600 acres) depending almost exclusively on Paseo del Norte, Unser Blvd., and Paseo del Volcan for access?	1		Uptown might be a good model for how Volcano Heights develops in the 5-10 year timeframe, but the ultimate build-out for Heights will be much more urban. The mandatory street network is the minimal number of roads that can support development. Additional local streets are expected to help to distribute traffic locally to lessen the impact on regional roads.
16	Planners need sociologists and anthropologists who specialize the study in urban communities to contribute to the conversation about the likelihood of people embracing and participating in a Mass Transit System on a large scale when the rest of the metropolitan area remains designed for—and heavily committed—to "car culture." (One small part of town cannot make an economic, social, and political movement to transform a long-held and much beloved life style choice. All we have to do is look to Southern California today.)	1		Planning team agrees this is a challenge. The Plan includes transit as an additional transportation option, which will also serve and support an urban development pattern, but the Plan is not dependent on transit happening. The Plan is for a 20-year horizon, and transportation choices show a pattern of more people embracing transit over time. It is unlikely that gas prices and commuting needs will decline over time, so transit use is likely to continue to rise despite the dominance of "car culture."

Volcano Heights
Focus Group Comments

	R	S	T	U
1	Comment / Question / Request for Change	Change - NO	Change - YES	Explanation / Action
17	Last November, at an EPC hearing to consider the WSSP, I read the tea leaves and asked if the Volcano Mesa initiative will not ultimately be deserve to be renamed Cuello de Botella Mesa ("Bottleneck Mesa") based on the experience will most likely have trying to get to, from, and across this landscape. This question continues to be relevant. If we anticipate that Volcano Mesa has the greatest potential to become a huge, inconvenient traffic bottleneck, not only will people not want to come, they will not want to live there. Just as the Cottonwood Major Activity Center, will VHS development fall far short of the dream and stagnate?		1	Agreed. Traffic study pending.
18	I strongly encourage the Planning Department to engage MRCOG and NMDOT to share information with the public through the Planning Department's website and be participants in the proposed planning discussion. I will welcome having the lingering fears that so many of us have about "roads, roads, roads" can put to rest we can concentrate positively (as opposed to devilishly) on details, including neighborhood integration, quality of life amenities, and cultural resources, that will contribute to making the Volcano Mesa, and the greater Northwest Mesa, a place where people will want to work and live.		1	Agreed. MRCOG and DMD have been very involved in this planning effort. Both will be invited to the Development workshop. MRCOG is acting as our interface with NMDOT.
19	Provisions should be made for rock outcroppings that are located in the middle of a major planned intersection. There are 2 major outcroppings on the 5 acres west of the "Ruiz" property (now City land) that the current alignment of Unser traverses. Provisions should be identified in the sector plan for removal of those features.		1	Map of priority rock outcrops to be preserved pending. Not all rock outcroppings will be mapped and prioritized for preservation. The Plan's approach to preservation is based on incentives, not regulation. The Plan will not include regulations about how to remove rock outcroppings that are not preserved.
20	I only hope that non-discussed items like roads big enough to handle supply trucks, and adequate areas for waste deposal and trucks are workable. The non sexy practical aspects like these must be included and made flexible.		1	Agreed. Planning team relies on review by DMD and property owners to ensure that road regulations meet their intended purpose. Other City policies and manuals, such as the Development Process Manual, will guide appropriate development in conjunction with the Sector Plan.

Volcano Heights
Focus Group Comments

	R	S	T	U
1	Comment / Question / Request for Change	Change - NO	Change - YES	Explanation / Action
21	<p>The proposed placement of the right-of way for the Type 2 street in the north Neighborhood Transition Zone creates such shallow lots between the road and the north boundary of the VHS as to preclude the development of single family homes similar in scale and density to those on the Vittoria and Villa Chamisa neighborhoods on the opposite side sector line. Under the existing guidelines, one can envision the construction of adjoining buildings that effectively form segments of a wall along the north edge of the VHS that could be as much as 600 feet long without breaks (possibly other than off-street parking areas for residents and their visitors) and without rear setbacks. From the viewpoint of the residences in existing neighborhoods along the north side of this boundary, such an end product hardly represents a “neighborhood” transition; it would effectively be a “neighborhood” barrier. [continued below]</p>		1	<p>Planning team is contemplating a smaller cross section for roads in Neighborhood Transition. Block size in this zone will require pedestrian-scale development. Non-mandatory roads must be added in this location in order to create the required blocks. While the Plan will have policies to encourage connections to neighborhoods outside the Plan area, these cannot be required, as they necessarily must be coordinated with neighborhoods outside the Plan area and therefore outside the Plan's jurisdiction. Adding these connections would require either removing existing cul-de-sacs or providing pedestrian/bike easements where cul-de-sacs terminate, roads end, or properties abut the Heights boundary. Planning team will reconsider the 0 foot rear and side setbacks where properties abut existing single-family homes.</p>
22	<p>Transition zone guidelines need to ensure that the zone standards are compatible with a sincere and meaningful commitment to the need for community integration. Deeper lots that would allow the option of signal family home development, and clear and precise standards language that defines the length of allowable continuous construction along the northernmost tier of lots are first steps in addressing this issue. Focused discussion of off-street parking for residents (and their visitors) for townhome and second story apartment/loft residents is also needed given that the shallow lot depth and construction setback guidelines in combination appear to preclude the use of driveways.</p>			

Volcano Heights
Focus Group Comments

	R	S	T	U
1	Comment / Question / Request for Change	Change - NO	Change - YES	Explanation / Action
23	Pedestrian connectivity of existing neighborhoods on the north side of the VHS deserves consideration. Discussion of the feasibility and desirability of pedestrian entryways along the VHS's north boundary other than as part of the Unser Blvd. ROW has been absent up to this juncture. The continued failure to address this topic will guarantee the balkanization of the Northwest Mesa.	1	1	Planning efforts rely on the participation of impacted parties. Solutions will require buy-in from neighborhoods outside the Planning area. Planning team is considering alternative options for gathering input from these neighborhoods.
24	The VHSDP needs to give attention to the bigger issue of pedestrian connectivity throughout the VHS as a whole. The WSSP Amendment calls for a coherent trail system w/in Volcano Mesa, which, for example, would allow access between Piedras Marcadas Canyon and the North Geologic Window. The need for pedestrian connectivity actually is much bigger; it concerns fundamental matters of public safety. The need for pedestrian crosswalks across at or close to the point at which Unser Blvd. crosses the north boundary of the VHS in the area of the Sunset Elementary and Monroe Middle School Campuses is both obvious and compelling. Such a crossing not only is required to create a pedestrian-friendly environment that provides area residents who live within and next to the VHS access throughout the sector, it is an necessity for the safety of the school children who will live in the VHS east of Unser Blvd.		1	Councilor Benton's amendment's on street connectivity will be included in this Plan. Methods to alleviate congestion and increase pedestrian safety will be decided pending the outcome of the traffic study. The Planning team believes the best solution might be a safe at-grade crossing, as an underpass in this area would be prohibitively expensive, and overpasses tend not be used. Planning team will be coordinating with APS on access issues. Pending the results of the traffic study, pedestrian connections will be re-examined and roadways and policies adjusted as necessary. OS/Parks is also working on opportunities for off-street, multi-use trails in Volcano Heights.
25	Address circulation around area north of Plan boundary (school complex). Where will kids cross?		1	See previous response.
26	My primary access to Heights will need to be by car unless pedestrian access is addressed. Residents in the Vittoria, Villa Chamisa, Chamisa Heights, Paradise View, and Sundance subdivisions, as well as the neighborhoods on the north side of Paradise Blvd. who might work in the VHS, will have little practical and safe option other than to drive to their place of business. Please engage the property owners with holdings along the VHS' north boundary, the abutting neighborhoods, and APS to explore desirable remedies.		1	See previous response.

Volcano Heights
Focus Group Comments

	R	S	T	U
1	Comment / Question / Request for Change	Change - NO	Change - YES	Explanation / Action
27	APS would prefer full signalization, but a RI/RO would be okay.	1		Traffic study that meets the requirements for TCC access modification submittal pending. Access points will also be determined by the TCC's approval.
28	Look at signal spacing w/ COA/MRCOG input on the total number of signals on both streets and consider the short term and long-term spacing needs.		1	Agreed. Traffic study pending, and coordination ongoing with DMD and MRCOG.
29	Look at the intersection of Unser/PdN to consider as an Urban Interchange. There are several designs that will allow the commuter traffic to bypass the intersection and let the local traffic stay at the ground level for movement. This will allow the signal spacing to be placed at closer locations than what is the current allowable distances and make the overall LU more workable.	1		The possibility of a grade-separated interchange may be considered pending the results of the traffic study. Currently, DMDs plans show an at-grade crossing for Paseo and Unser. Interchanges tend to take significant land that could otherwise support development, and their cost, which would be borne by the property owner, makes them prohibitively expensive. Pedestrian access would not necessarily be improved.
30	We also believe that all proposed access points which should include RI/RO with left access points be shown in the plan. These facilities are major facilities, and showing the approximate locations will aid in the approval by MRCOG. We also believe any improvements should go ahead and design in double left-hand turn lanes.		1	Traffic study pending. Coordination with MRCOG ongoing.
31	How does Volcano Heights integrate with ABQ area (people on Paseo)? Cottonwood as anti-model. Avoid "Bottleneck Mesa"		1	Traffic study pending.
32	Traffic pattern needs to be amenable to proposed land use.		1	Agreed. Traffic study pending.
33	Integrate Plan with established and developed areas on north and south (and east/west). East-west pedestrian crossing on boundary (north and south)		1	Agreed. Traffic study pending.
34	Access points will drive the plan for land use		1	Traffic study that meets the requirements for TCC access modification submittal pending. Access points will also be determined by the TCC's approval.

Volcano Heights
Focus Group Comments

	R	S	T	U
1	Comment / Question / Request for Change	Change - NO	Change - YES	Explanation / Action
35	Have MRCOG at the public meeting to present the draft. Need to hear from MRCOG that this works and has support.		1	Agreed. MRCOG has been very involved in this planning effort and will be invited to the Development workshop. MRCOG is also performing other economic analysis of land use and transit proposals in this Plan. DMD also excited to have a destination connected to transit. DMD & MRCOG excited to be coordinating land use and transportation.
36	Regional traffic movement important		1	Agreed. Traffic study pending.
37	Traffic model needed with high numbers in order to do the planning effort right the first time.		1	Agreed. Traffic study pending.
38	Local consultants needed to provide local knowledge.		1	Staff will consider this comment when choosing consultants in the future.

Volcano Heights
Focus Group Comments

	R	S	T	U
1	Comment / Question / Request for Change	Change - NO	Change - YES	Explanation / Action
39	ROADS / CROSS SECTIONS			
40	What happened to the grand E/W Blvd that was to include central planting, wide streets, and walkways to preserve a view of the Sandias? See exhibit 7 in July 2010 plan.		1	Mandatory road has been extended eastward based on this request. Final cross section for this road still pending. What's currently proposed does not seem to contradict Exhibit 7 in the July 2010 plan.
41	Slide 24 – 25 – Connect bike lanes in both Escarpment cross sections? Should parking be located on the escarpment side of the road instead of the residential side? Would trees be encouraged to be planted near the escarpment edge as depicted on the 3A PE cross section?		1	Revisions to cross sections pending.
42	TC zones do not allow for additional left turn lanes, which would make the traffic flow better on these two lane streets. Nose in angle parking would accommodate more cars, but takes more than 9". There is no room for delivery trucks. Bicycle lanes behind parked cars and between 2 way traffic are dangerous. There are only 2 short B segments. What happens when they hit a no bike lane street? Do they ride on the narrow 10 ft. sidewalk? How to high school students or teachers living in the new areas ride to the High School? The bike lane concept needs re-working. A large central boulevard system would be a good answer.		1	Revisions to cross sections pending. Graphic illustrating typical intersection pending.
43	We also believe that as the property develops some consideration should be provided for the establishment of the "A" or "B" Streets. We believe while it makes sense for first in to set the locations, it needs to be tempered by the larger traffic network needed to service the entire area.		1	Details pending.

Volcano Heights
Focus Group Comments

	R	S	T	U
1	Comment / Question / Request for Change	Change - NO	Change - YES	Explanation / Action
44	<p>Streets: Pages 19-26.</p> <p>a. The streets are too narrow.</p> <p>i. Each mandatory road should have at the very least a 12ft-14ft center lane, to prevent grid lock (1) in the case of an accident (2) people wanting to turn left, (3) more parking for emergency personnel vehicles, and (4) to allow for mid-road on/off loading on the BRT route if needed.</p> <p>ii. The wider road will give a more open feel.</p> <p>iii. Allow for better ease of trucks.</p>	1		Revisions to cross sections pending. Graphic illustrating typical intersection pending.
45	<p>b. Consider angled parking at least on one side of the streets.</p> <p>c. Some streets, should have the option to have bike route on only one side.</p> <p>d. Some of the sidewalk requirements are too narrow, especially if there are to be trees on them.</p>	1		Revisions to cross sections pending. Early review by DMD and bike advocate group indicate that bike lanes on each side of the street are safer for cyclists than a bike lane on one side of the street. A separate, multi-use trail system is being considered for casual riders.
46	<p>Slide 26 – What is furn. Zone? Is 13' necessary for the sidewalk or would 10' suffice? Is the labeling of transit / shared lane correct or are the middle two lanes shared transit / auto lanes and the outer two lanes auto only? How are left turns accomplished for either ingress or egress to the transit center (location TBD) with only a 4' median?</p>	1		Furnishing Zone was removed from the latest cross sections. In general, it is the location for street trees, poles, bus seating, newspaper stands, bike racks, etc.
47	<p>Street cross sections page 26. Do we really want a row of trees between a busy road and a sidewalk in this commercial zone? Who will water and care for them?</p>	1		Trees act as a buffer between vehicles and pedestrians to improve pedestrian safety and increase the attractiveness of the street for pedestrians. Street trees within the Public ROW are maintained by the City.
48	<p>The turning radius and widths should consider the size and scope of the buses or BRT that may get used.</p>	1		Planning team is depending on Transit/MRCOG review to satisfy this consideration. This analysis is beyond the scope of this Plan.
49	<p>Street canyons with buildings pushed to streets? What would work for residential uses? Wider corridors? In exchange for height?</p>	1		Staff is considering a regulation that will require a setback for stories above four feet of 20 feet to avoid the canyon effect. Wider corridors tend to increase auto speeds, which reduces safety for bikes and pedestrians and undermines the pedestrian-friendly feel of the road.

Volcano Heights
Focus Group Comments

	R	S	T	U
1	Comment / Question / Request for Change	Change - NO	Change - YES	Explanation / Action
50	Mistake to allow first-in development to determine A or B Street. Plan should dictate (benefits whole area). Provides predictability. Criteria based on water, drainage, etc. (staff decides).	1		The Mandatory Streets establishes a pattern of A and B Streets. Mandatory Streets designated as either A or B will have regulations that maintain the predictability of the built environment over time.
51	Streets should be wider.		1	Cross section revisions pending. Remember that property owners will be required to dedicate ROW and construct roads.
52	BRT route – head-in parking?		1	Planning team will consider this suggestion as part of cross section revisions, but it should be noted that this would increase the total ROW. Wider cross sections require more dedication of ROW from abutting property owners as well as higher costs for developers constructing these roadways. Property owners will need to acknowledge and agree to these consequences.
53	Bike trails along South (teacher / student can walk to school)		1	Trail network details pending. Open Space/Parks looking at potential off-street trail corridors. Cross sections including bike lanes/trails still under revision.
54	Need clear responsibilities for maintaining landscaping & street trees		1	Plan will specify responsibilities.
55	Figure out left-hand turn lanes in Town Center		1	Details pending.
56	Need 3 turn lanes		1	Details pending.
57	Roads seem dominated by bikes – would prefer to see two driving lanes (at least a center turn lane)		1	Staff will consider this suggestion as cross sections are revised.
58	With exclusively single-lane roads, accidents will cause gridlock		1	Staff will consider this suggestion as cross sections are revised.

Volcano Heights
Focus Group Comments

	R	S	T	U
1	Comment / Question / Request for Change	Change - NO	Change - YES	Explanation / Action
59	TRAFFIC STUDY			
60	We believe that the City should undertake and compute Trip Generation numbers for the project when it is finally established. This will provide the local impact versus the regional impact for the network and specifically for those people who need to understand the overall amount of traffic being generated in the area versus just traveling through the plan area.		1	Traffic study pending.
61	We support a traffic study for the region. It needs to not only look at the traffic congestion on top of the west mesa, but also the traffic congestion that is currently taking place in Taylor Ranch, and the bridge crossings, during the morning and afternoon rush hours. Any increase in traffic coming from Rio Rancho or the mesa top development will certainly make this situation worse. So far, the traffic reports I have seen only focuses on the mesa top street design, which concludes that everything is fine. But it is not fine here in Taylor Ranch or the bridge crossings. We want the traffic study to specifically illustrate the current traffic congested areas, and what the traffic projections are for a full build out of the Volcano Mesa area and Rio Rancho on our current road capacity.		1	Traffic study pending. Boundaries will be as broad as this City contract can afford. MRCOG may be able to provide additional analysis at the regional scale requested here. This issue is broader in scope than this Sector Plan, so likely the full concerns expressed here cannot be addressed in this planning effort.

Volcano Heights
Focus Group Comments

	R	S	T	U
1	Comment / Question / Request for Change	Change - NO	Change - YES	Explanation / Action
62	CHARACTER ZONES			
63	Property just south of Unser Blvd ("B" street) is designated as VHRC. Transit Rd cross-section has a median that would appear to prohibit left turns for auto oriented access.	1		This is a typical section and does not cover where medians will need to be placed. Future engineering will determine these details. The intent is not to have an unbroken median along the whole corridor.
64	Slide 14 – Extend VHRC S of Unser Blvd from the SE corner of the Unser / Transit road to the blue Escarpment Transition zone. This location would be most favorable for auto-oriented use to meet the needs of evening commuters residing north of the plan area. Autos leaving the transit center would have 1) R-I access from the Transit Road and either 2a) RO to the Transit Road / RO to Unser northbound, or 2b) internal street connection to the Petroglyph Monument Parkway, which would have RO access Unser Blvd. northbound.	1	1	Staff will take another look at property lines and character zones in that area. Staff believes VHMx should serve as a transition zone between VHRC and VHET. VHMx still includes the ability to develop commercial and retail uses that seem desired.
65	Extend VHRC on SE corner of Unser Blvd / Transit Rd eastward to align with the eastern edge of the VHTC zone. This location provides convenient RI/RO auto-oriented access for the evening commuters from the transit center north to Rio Rancho.	1		See response above.
66	Slide 15: What are existing areas in Albuquerque (e.g. ABQ Uptown) that would meet the requirements of the VHRC character zone?		1	Examples pending
67	Slide 12: Area allotted to Neigh Centers is too small. They should be at least 10 acres.	1		NCs on the east and west have been increased significantly from the Aug. 14 proposal. A balance needs to be reached to have enough land to develop but not too much land that provides over-entitlement and undermines the "gravity" that these Centers are supposed to create for surrounding development. Each totals over 8 acres, which the planning team feels is sufficient. Property may need to be consolidated to develop to full potential. The Plan also includes the flexibility to move zone lines within minor and major thresholds. See Table 3.3.

Volcano Heights
Focus Group Comments

	R	S	T	U
1	Comment / Question / Request for Change	Change - NO	Change - YES	Explanation / Action
68	Slide 12: Escarpment Transition, for the land in the North-East of the rectangle on Unser to Paradise (See page 4 and 14) is incorrect. This area adjoins platted land to the north that has been excluded from the drawing. This land has already been zoned for big box development and other projects. There is no escarpment here! I want all maps to go north to Paradise and show the entitlements already granted.	1	1	The project abutting Volcano Heights boundary to the north is a single-family development. The "big box zoning" is farther north and east. Staff agrees most maps should show more context of surrounding development.
69	Slide 28 – Assuming the VHRC zone depth from Unser Blvd. is ~400', it will be impossible to achieve a minimum block face dimension of 300' for the VHTC zone on my property, especially after subtracting 36' for 50% of the ROW for the 1B□TC road. Depth of the VHRC zone away from Unser Blvd and Paseo del Norte appears to be ~400' or 60% of a typical 660' x 330' five acre parcel	1		Depth is 400 feet measured from the centerline of the street. Block face dimension will be measured from centerline of street to centerline of street, therefore achieving the required block face dimension.
70	Slide 27. What does "adjacent to single family home" mean for VHMx north of Paseo? Are you creating another transitional use area? I don't believe property on the north edge of Paseo is saleable as a 26 foot high structure.		1	The Plan doesn't anticipate that this condition would happen anywhere, but it is included as a failsafe in the case of an unforeseeable change, such as a vacation of the current alignment of Paseo del Norte, for example, in which case Town Center would be adjacent to Neighborhood Transition. Staff will consider a change.
71	9.3 Regional center: Does the grocery store with the front parking lot (such as Smith's) go here? Drive in's , Firestone tire centers, Drive up banks, etc. The style (or lack thereof) of these facilities bordering Unser and Paseo should be defined somewhere in this document. At least general comments about signage, minimum parking spaces vs. building square footage, and windows should be mentioned.	1		RC is intended for more auto-oriented uses but will require parking lots to be along B streets and building fronts on A streets, where available. Paseo and Unser are designated by the Plan as B streets, so adjacent developments must follow the regulations associated with B streets.

Volcano Heights
Focus Group Comments

	R	S	T	U
1	Comment / Question / Request for Change	Change - NO	Change - YES	Explanation / Action
72	9.4.2 Neighborhood center: (xi) If the residential building is setback less than 10' from the front property line, the grade of the slab or first floor elevation shall be elevated at least 18 inches above the grade of the sidewalk. If the residential structure is setback 10' or more from the property line and is not elevated above the grade of the sidewalk, a 3' high fence shall be provided at the front property line. What good is a 3' high fence? Any person or most dogs can get over it easily. Wind blown rubbish will collect at it. Transients will sit on it.	1		That is the standard height for a fence in the front yard, per City Zoning Code Section 14-16-2-15 a.12 (c)1. A wall would also be acceptable. The intent is to provide a sense of a street wall where the building is set back more than 10 feet. This protects the urban, pedestrian-friendly feel of the street corridor. Property maintenance is assumed to be responsibility of the property owner.
73	VHET poses a challenge. I recognize, understand, and accept the reality of private property rights, but the successful implementation of the transition concept between the Volcano Mesa and the VHSDP requires the creation of an Open Space buffer that extends west of the Petroglyph National Boundary to the curb of the proposed Type 3 street. The VHSDP should include clearly articulated goals and needs that identify the importance for the City to acquire the land parcels east of the Park Edge street to fulfill the vision of a reasonable and sustainable escarpment transition. The VHSDP can also provide policy, standards language, and outline incentives, which, in combination, explain how it is in the landowners' material interest to engage with the City to make the vision of escarpment transition a reality. Ultimately, other City authorities need to step forward and publicly commit to acquiring these few parcels for Open Space on behalf of the citizenry of Albuquerque as a priority.		1	Plan will include policies and goals about purchasing OS. Plan will also prioritize OS purchases. Creating a fully single-loaded street should be weighed against rock outcroppings and the playa area for limited OS funds.
74	There needs to be more intensity in the area along Paseo Del Norte east of the town center. There should be either Town Center or RC along this area. The development should match traffic intensity.	1		The Plan intends to match character zones across roadways to provide consistent character of development along corridors. In Volcano Cliffs across Paseo in this area, the zoning is MX and therefore Volcano Heights also proposes MX to match.

Volcano Heights
Focus Group Comments

	R	S	T	U
1	Comment / Question / Request for Change	Change - NO	Change - YES	Explanation / Action
75	The Escarpment Transition in the NE needs to be changed to Mixed Use, especially that of the land which is south and west of the escarpment road and near Unser.	1		Staff believes it is important to have a significant Transition between the Escarpment and the higher-intensity uses in Town Center and Regional Center. Staff is also trying to respect property lines whenever possible.
76	Transition land bordering APS on the north needs to be either more flexible or changed to Mixed Use.	1		Neighborhood Transition is a mixed-use zone. The form of the development must match the single-family character of surrounding uses. APS is not subject to City design regulations; therefore, it cannot be used as a comparative gauge for adjacent development.
77	The eastern Neighborhood center should be larger.	1		Neighborhood Centers were increased in size. The intention is to drive the intensity of the development to create gravity at planned intersections, with the highest intensity at the plan center. Increasing the size of this zone further might dilute development potential at the corners.
78	Show map of proposed zones and property lines		1	Pending.
79	Address conflicting property lines & zone lines		1	Graphic pending. Plan gives flexibility to move zone lines within minor and major thresholds. See Table 3.3.
80	What is allowed within the setback? No parking = a 'taking'?			When the setback is along a B street and greater than 60 feet, parking is allowed. Parking would be allowed between Paseo/Unser and a development, for example. Landscaping or open space can be in the setback and can also count toward frontage requirement.
81	Design charrette would be helpful to test regulations		1	Charrette planned for coming months.
82	Too many designers involved already; just ask "doers"	1		"Doers" will be invited to stay for the charrette after the panel discussion.
83	Development meeting a good idea		1	Development meeting planned in conjunction with charrette to test regulations in the coming months.
84	Invite national developers (e.g. Forest-Covington). Opportunity to start selling ideas to the market	1		The City will be inviting representatives from NAIOP and other local development experts. It is the responsibility of property owners to market their land.

Volcano Heights
Focus Group Comments

	R	S	T	U
1	Comment / Question / Request for Change	Change - NO	Change - YES	Explanation / Action
85	Add an active citizen on Panel Discussion in November	1		The panel is intended to provide information about the development process. The City has therefore invited development professionals. We welcome active citizen input as part of the panel discussion or at any time during this planning process.
86	How can the Plan protect property owners with Town Center zoning if market bleeds out to RC, MX, etc.? (Phasing)	1		The Plan does not intend to regulate phasing. The Plan tries to incentivize development with entitlements that match market desires and provide a streamlined development process that can act quickly to meet market needs; however, the Plan can't affect basic market conditions.
87	Is the commercial market open too wide in the MX zone?	1		The use table intends to strike a balance of desired uses in Town Center versus Mixed Use. The Plan intends to provide flexibility to property owners to be able to develop their land. The Plan is not intended to interfere with market conditions.
88	How do businesses in Town Center survive next to Regional Center, larger-scale businesses?	1		Town Center will offer uses not allowed in Regional Center, and vice versa in order to encourage different niches for the market. The Plan cannot change market conditions or prohibit one property from developing before another. In Albuquerque, we have examples of big box uses in higher-density, pedestrian area, such as Staples in Nob Hill and a small, local business owner in a more suburban, auto-oriented area, such as Bookworks in a strip mall. The Plan provides a range of flexible uses and zones in order to meet different needs/clients, etc., but property owners will have the flexibility to meet market demands.
89	Phasing development will be important	1		Other than some high-level discussion of infrastructure phasing, the Plan does not intend to regulate phasing of development due to checkerboard ownership.

Volcano Heights
Focus Group Comments

	R	S	T	U
1	Comment / Question / Request for Change	Change - NO	Change - YES	Explanation / Action
90	TC/RC/NC – lower buildings and lesser density for a while	1		See response above. In addition, staff does not foresee the market driving redevelopment on existing development sites for the foreseeable future. The site development standards are designed so that sites can intensify over time but still develop in the short-term.
91	Ground floor finish level requirement difficult with rock & topographic changes	1		Topography and geologic conditions must be addressed through architectural design and engineering. Where issues arise, they will be addressed on a case by case basis.
92	Blasting of subsequent development will crack buildings	1		The planning team anticipates that most property owners will import fill rather than choose to blast. In any case, the topographic and geologic conditions in Volcano Heights will require broad coordination among property owners as development occurs over time. Developers in a nearby area have built successfully and more cost effectively with trenchers to break rock versus blasting. Trenching does not typically affect surrounding properties. It will be the responsibility of developers who choose to blast to mitigate the effects of blasting and coordinate with surrounding existing development.
93	Hard to coordinate with adjacent developments if go with ADA compliance only	1		This is a design and construction issue and would be addressed on a case by case basis where the need arises.

Volcano Heights
Focus Group Comments

	R	S	T	U
1	Comment / Question / Request for Change	Change - NO	Change - YES	Explanation / Action
94	BUILDING DESIGN			
95	Building Design 8.1.8 page 35. (Windows required) Neighborhood centers may have a pharmacy, and most new pharmacies today have very few windows because of security.	1		Staff believes this issue can be addressed through building design, for example putting the pharmacy in the back where windows are not required on the façade, for example. Where needed, developments can also use high-security windows.
96	<i>Building Design XV. p38 Generally, buildings shall be located and designed to provide visual interest and create enjoyable, human-scaled spaces. Perhaps this applies to multifamily residences. It certainly would not apply to well-designed modern buildings of which we have many examples in downtown and along the Jefferson corridor. The lofty ceilings in Dekker et al leed-certified building are not human-scaled! How does “enjoyable” fit with an insurance office, or the pit of a newspaper publishing office?</i>	1		Building Design standards apply for exterior facades only, not interior spaces. The Plan allows mixed-use zoning in exchange for design regulations that provide predictability along pedestrian-friendly corridors. The Plan includes the option to take projects that do not meet these standards through the EPC approval process.
97	<i>9.1.3 Building Massing and Scale: (i) Commercial and Mixed-Use buildings shall be simple, rectilinear forms with flat or low pitched roofs with parapets. 9.2.2 Massing and Façade Composition (i) Buildings generally have a rectangular layout scheme with single or multiple components with mostly flat front and square, round, or octagonal corner towers. (ii) The Base façade shall maintain a prevalent rhythm of 20’ to 30’ or multiples thereof along all Town Center Streets, the BRT corridor, and any non-mandatory ‘A Streets.’ Way too unimaginative!! Boring!! What about a half circle front with a circular drive and fountain? Must churches be boxes?</i>		1	Staff has added a provision for EPC approval of projects that meet the intent but not the standards of the Plan.

Volcano Heights
Focus Group Comments

	R	S	T	U
1	Comment / Question / Request for Change	Change - NO	Change - YES	Explanation / Action
98	Buildings for large enterprises such as banks, insurance firms, and corporate offices will be wider than 20-30 feet. These 'regulations' should be deleted as they discourage such endeavors. These are just the type of enterprises that the city needs as workplaces. Even city structures such as branch libraries, and senior centers might extend more than 20-30 feet.	1		The regulation is about the articulation of the façade, not the width of the building. The intent is to limit the expanse of blank, boring walls.
99	Page 42 illustration shows a 3 storied building, at least part commercial which has an attractive gabled roof. A solar array mounted flat on a south facing roof pitched to a optimal angle for year round collection would be much less obtrusive than an array of panels each mounted at the same angles on a flat or low pitched roof.	1		The Plan does not intend to regulate solar panel angles or placement.
100	9.1.3. This entire section is not a good thing. Too simple, too boring. (1). "Commercial buildings to be simple rectangular buildings", I could not disagree more. Let the dreamers dream. (2). Boring.	1		The intent of the Plan is to provide predictability of development and forms. The Plan has added a provision for projects that meet the intent of density and employment but do not meet the standards. Such projects may be approved via the EPC process. Innovative projects benefit from having a fabric to break out of. Design regulations are the trade-off for an expedited approval process later.
101	Can't all be boxes. Circular façade should be okay	1		See response above.
102	9.2.1. (3). A 5 yr guarantee is not going to happen, is the city building the building...because why would the employer sign a development agreement with an employer. This also gets in the way of speculative capital which by building the building it attracts employers with the 250 or more jobs in either 50 employee increments or in one fell swoop.	1		Bonus criteria under revision. The City regularly signs development agreements with employers, such as Industrial Revenue Bonds. Staff does not believe that speculative building will happen at this scale for the foreseeable future.
103	9.2.3. Whoever wrote this do they own shares in a masonry or brick company? Materials you are requiring manufacturers' warranties of 50 years? Is this possible...will this change...will this keep buildings from being built? Will money get spent on this and then the builder is cheap elsewhere? Materials should be suggested and in smaller percentages.	1	1	Draft has been updated to include stucco using a 3-step process as the first in this list of high-quality materials. The Plan's intent is to provide the predictability of high-quality development for properties across property lines, along corridors, and over time.

Volcano Heights
Focus Group Comments

	R	S	T	U
1	Comment / Question / Request for Change	Change - NO	Change - YES	Explanation / Action
104	The window design is very limiting. The glazing appears it will be very limiting too, such that the concepts of views will be meaningless. What about solar gain from southern exposures?		1	The Plan does not intend to regulation the organization or arrangement of windows. The designer has the freedom to place windows to achieve the best views. Staff will review this requirement.
105	How will Unser and Paseo del Norte look along the roadway? I was told that that the plan is to make Paseo del Norte look similar to how it appears in the NE side of town. Unfortunately on the NE side of town, there are big commercial buildings built adjacent to Paseo del Norte exposing the back of their buildings to motorists. The idea behind this was to hide the parking lots. It would be more attractive to see the front of the buildings set back from the roadway, with nice architecture facing the roadway and hide the parking lots with a natural berm. Note: Unser Blvd. is a 4 lane parkway with design standards, which includes a berm adjacent to the roadway with natural vegetation. We should design Paseo del Norte the same way. This will also provide more room for a wider view corridor along both roadways to maintain the views of the mountains, etc.		1	Due to the challenging nature of the limited-access, regional roads the Regional Center zone is designed to be more auto-oriented and accessed by automobile. Locating parking and orienting the building will always cause trade-offs, and in this case, because of access limitations for both pedestrians and automobiles, staff believes it is the most beneficial to orient buildings toward local streets that will serve those developments.
106	Good architecture is sparse on the Westside. We have seen too much construction of new buildings with very bland architecture. I'm glad the Planning Team is trying to do something about it. I would like to see more attractive architecture on the sides of buildings that face streets or public areas.		1	The Plan includes design regulations and frontage requirements for "A" and "B" Streets.
107	Anything bright on the mesa top will be a beacon for the whole city to see. We need to minimize unnecessary lights and not allow LED signs.		1	All new lighting must meet the New Mexico Night Sky Ordinance. The area will also have to comply with the Electronic Sign Ordinance, which prohibits LED signs along Unser Boulevard and sets other regulations about on-site and off-site electronic signs throughout the City. Staff intends to prohibit LED signs in Transition Zones.

Volcano Heights
Focus Group Comments

	R	S	T	U
1	Comment / Question / Request for Change	Change - NO	Change - YES	Explanation / Action
108	Solar panels – meet optimum solar angle	1		The Plan does not intend to regulate solar panel angles. Solar panels do not count toward height limits for structures.
109	Cesar Pelli building needs to be allowable		1	An additional option has been added for development that meets the intent of the Plan but not its standards. A Cesar Pelli building could be approved through the EPC process.
110	Architectural innovation allowable pending Review Team approval	1		The Review Team can approve minor modifications. DRB can approve major modifications. Non-compliant development proposals that meet the Plan's intent but not its standards can be approved through the EPC process.
111	30-foot façade articulation requirement boring	1		This requirement is intended as a minimum requirement, not an absolute. The intent is to disallow long stretches of blank walls, not limit innovation or interesting architecture. This requirement can be met with windows, colonnades, arches, recessed or protruding wall planes, material changes, etc.
112	Architectural style should be required to be consistent on adjacent projects	1		This Plan is not intended to regulate architectural style. The Building Design Standards intend to require high-quality materials, while Site Development Standards intend to regulate development patterns. Together, staff believes these provide the predictability of high-quality development with similar character along corridors, while still providing flexibility of style and innovation within individual developments.

Volcano Heights
Focus Group Comments

	R	S	T	U
1	Comment / Question / Request for Change	Change - NO	Change - YES	Explanation / Action
113	SITE DEVEL / BLOCK SIZE			
114	Standards need more flexibility	1		Please recommend new thresholds based on Table 3.2 and 3.3.
115	Need more slack	1		Please see approval processes proposed in Section 3.2 based on how closely development proposes to follow standards. Projects that meet the intent but not the standards of this Plan may be approved by the EPC.
116	Standards seem too cookie cutter	1		Site Development Standards intend to regulate development patterns along corridors and within zones. Together with Building Design Standards, these regulations intend to provide the predictability of high-quality development with similar character along corridors, while still providing flexibility of style and innovation within individual developments. If there are particular standards that need to change, staff will consider additional comments.
117	What happens if you can't comply with the minimum block face dimensions?	1		Plan includes flexibility to change zoning lines within minor and major thresholds. Owners could join abutting lots. 1 block is allowed to have multiple zoning (i.e. a local road is not required to split the zones). Blocks need not be rectangles. Planning team willing to consider changing block size requirements based on the outcome of the charrette to test regulations.
118	Is the Build-to-Zone measured from setback or property line?	1		The property line.
119	a. Build to zone and Set Backs need better clarification about how they relate to one another for all zones (i.e. are they additive or are they within each other?).		1	They are within each other. Plan will add clarification.

Volcano Heights
Focus Group Comments

	R	S	T	U
1	Comment / Question / Request for Change	Change - NO	Change - YES	Explanation / Action
120	a. Build to zone and Set Backs need a wider range of min and maxes.	1		Planning team will consider changes based on the outcome of the mini-charrette to test regulations. Specific recommendations about revised minimums and maximums are welcomed.
121	Question. How does a mid block building get its frontage on an A street and a B street? The minimums make this impossible.		1	A mid-block building will only front one street, so it must meet the frontage requirements for that street, whether A or B.
122	Block size definition needs to be articulated in the plan. There is still a disconnect between public ROW or streets or areas that break up the development and allow the movement of pedestrians, vehicles, and other means of travel and separation. It should also include in the definition that it does not necessarily need to be at a property line.		1	Block size is a measurement from centerline of public right-of-way to public right-of way. Pedestrian pass throughs and alleys that cross a development do not create separate blocks. Block divisions are not required at property lines.
123	Block Standards: i. The min needs to be smaller and the max needs to be larger, at least to be the guidelines as the mandatory streets have created. ii. The block perimeter needs to be the same as the mandatory street blocks created by the map. The developer can make smaller at their choice.		1	Block sizes are intended to create an attractive, walkable urban area. The "blocks" created by the mandatory streets as currently proposed are far too big to meet this intent. Non-mandatory roads serving local developments will create the smaller block sizes. Currently, they are not drawn in as mandatory roads in order to provide the flexibility to developers to configure their projects to best match their needs. The Plan could add mandatory roads to match the block sizes, but then it would be more of a master plan level effort, which does not have the input from all property owners and seems unlikely to move forward expeditiously.
124	Get rid of block sizes – mandatory road network is already small enough	1		Mandatory roads would create block sizes of 1,000 feet long in some cases. Staff believes smaller block sizes are key to the creation of a walkable, urban environment as envisioned by this Plan. The larger block sizes allowed by the Plan are intended to provide the flexibility for a range of development types and uses where appropriate.

Volcano Heights
Focus Group Comments

	R	S	T	U
1	Comment / Question / Request for Change	Change - NO	Change - YES	Explanation / Action
125	Block sizes don't seem to allow for imaginative layouts – like center courtyard in the middle of the block	1		Block sizes have no relation to site planning in terms of civic and open spaces. A mid-block courtyard would be considered civic or open space, which would count toward frontage requirements, if on an A street. The regulation does not preclude a plazas or courtyards or other public amenities along pedestrian corridors.
126	Frontage and block size seem incompatible	1		Staff needs more details in order to respond.
127	Performing arts center, etc. will be too big for these blocks	1		An average block downtown is ~ 350 x 350. VHTC allows 300 x 500 blocks. It would seem a performance center could fit on a block that's bigger than a city block, and if not, a larger site could be proposed and approved through the EPC process. Staff is unsure whether a project with such a footprint would be appropriate in a pedestrian context or more appropriate in VHRC or VHMx, which both allow for block sizes of 300 x 1000 or 300 x 1200 feet, respectively.
128	Block size one of most important regulations for pedestrian friendliness. Block size criteria a key part of Town Center. No pedestrian feel with long blocks.	1		Agreed.
129	Sketch out blocks – see if math works with requirements		1	The City will include a mini-charrette to test regulations as part of the workshop with the development panel.
130	Is it realistic to recreate “live, work, shop” in one block?	1		The mixed-use allowed by these zones includes the flexibility but not the requirement to mix uses. The property owners have the freedom to meet market demands. Whether live, work, shop is viable to the market now, it certainly can't occur unless allowed by mixed-use zoning. Regardless of the use, the form of the blocks and the building design is intended to create an attractive, high-quality, pedestrian-friendly built environment.

Volcano Heights
Focus Group Comments

	R	S	T	U
1	Comment / Question / Request for Change	Change - NO	Change - YES	Explanation / Action
131	iii. Floor heights, should be allowed to be within a tolerance of the 15 and 10 ft listed.		1	All standards in the Plan are subject to minor modification as laid out in Table 3.2. Staff will consider adding floor heights to the table.
132	v. At grade parking, should always be a percentage along A and B streets, to avoid cookie cutter effects...give designers room to play with ideas. vi. Off Street Parking. This number should be a dual phased number if the parking area allows public parking or leverages space in other facility. vii. Drive way widths should be distances within the guidelines needed to accommodate suppliers and customers of a district.			The intent of the regulation is to preserve A streets as pedestrian-friendly, retail-supportive environments; therefore, auto access and parking areas should be along B streets. B street frontage is only required for 30% in Town Center, for example, so designers could play with where parking should be located on the other 70%.
133	Building Frontage Required i. For A and B streets lower minimums for both.		1	Staff will consider specific requests.
134	I think that these documents are very finite and in some cases for good cause, but most it goes too far in that major essential elements like a large park and its placement will do more for the area are completely ignored by the city vs. that of 1st floor's on buildings being masonry.		1	The City has purchased thousands of acres of Open Space surrounding Volcano Heights. The Plan cannot rezone property to become a park. Should property owners decide to dedicate a large park, the City will incorporate such a benefit into the Plan. The Plan will encourage the creation of trails, which can also be a shared amenity and quality of life enhancement. The Plan's design regulations are intended to drive the creation of an attractive, walkable urban space, and ground floor regulations are integral to the success of placemaking.

Volcano Heights
Focus Group Comments

	R	S	T	U
1	Comment / Question / Request for Change	Change - NO	Change - YES	Explanation / Action
135	USE TABLE			
136	Commercial. Most commonly the best office use in a neighborhood is an insurance or real estate office. Change to C.		1	Staff will change the Use Table.
137	Educational, Public Admin, healthcare or other institutional. i. Public Admin uses: This should be broken down and some made P for neighborhood transitional.	1		Non-residential uses in the Neighborhood Transition need to be Conditional so that conditions can be applied to ensure their compatibility with single-family residential uses adjacent.
138	Residential Uses i. Multifamily should be allowed in all zones as P. Unless the Conditions are not spelled out.	1		See response above. Conditions will be spelled out in Table 4.2.
139	Other uses: i. Motels? No motel listed. ii. Parking Surface. All zones should be C....as this allows for transition of development for the area....some areas may be temp parking for 2-5 years before entering a ground breaking.		1	Staff will add Motels to the Use Table. A definition for a commercial surface parking lot (for fee) will be added to the Definitions section. Staff does not believe that such a use is appropriate for Transition zones, which are designed to be primarily single-family uses. Paid parking lots often are incompatible with residential areas.

Volcano Heights
Focus Group Comments

	R	S	T	U
1	Comment / Question / Request for Change	Change - NO	Change - YES	Explanation / Action
140	HEIGHTS/BONUS TABLE			
141	Slide 29 – Heights should be 40 feet allowable with additional bonus criteria up to 65 feet in center zones. Bonus criteria should include employment criteria in all nontransition zones, not just in the Town Center.	1		Heights are under review. Bonus criteria are under review.
142	Slides 14 – 17, Heights – It does not make sense that the VHMx, VHNC, VHRC, and VHTC zones in the VHSDP have more restrictive height limits without concessions for height bonuses than similar VHVC, VHMx, and VHUR zones which allow 35' heights and were recently approved in the Volcano Cliffs and Volcano Trails sector plans. The base height without bonus criteria should be increased to 40' which is the current limit prescribed in the NWMEP.	1		See response above.
143	We believe that the 35 feet should be preserved from the West Side as the legal height for commercial, industrial, and office buildings.	1		See response above.
144	Building heights shall be measured from the higher of either i. the improved pad site or ii. highest natural point on the site or iii. the grade of the bordering A street or Unser or Paseo del Norte.	1		Building heights are proposed to be measured from approved grade, which would be post-fill.
145	Where Unser and Paseo have been elevated by fill, cannot the adjacent lots be elevated toward road level? Should not building heights be measured from the filled level? Nobody wants to be in the gully next to a road.	1		See response above. The Plan does not preclude properties adjacent to the roadway from adding fill to the road level, although the policies trying to limit fill may recommend other solutions. The Plan includes a provision allowing any property next to Paseo or Unser to pull back from those roads as much as 75 feet in order to not have to be "in the gully next to the road."
146	Transition zones should have height restriction no less than the structures for which the transition is designed.	1		Other than the APS schools, which are exempt from City height limits, abutting properties north of Volcano Heights are limited to 26 feet.

Volcano Heights
Focus Group Comments

	R	S	T	U
1	Comment / Question / Request for Change	Change - NO	Change - YES	Explanation / Action
147	Slide 18 – What is the rationale for different point values for height bonus in the different zones. 100 points in VHRC for 65 foot height bonus is excessive ... there are only 145 total natural environment points, so if a landowner does not have a rock outcropping (25 points) then there most likely could not be a trail connecting rock outcroppings (25 points) which would make 100 points unachievable. I would like to see an example for how a smaller landowner (e.g. 5 acres) could realistically achieve the 65 foot criteria. There should be some employment allowance in all areas since the plan allows mixed use everywhere. What is LEED certification?		1	Bonus criteria under review. Mini-charrette is intended to test the feasibility and implementability of the regulations and the bonus criteria system. LEED certification is a nationally recognized industry standard for sustainable building practice.
148	9.1 ii and iii Bonus system. If so much space is to be devoted to bonuses, there might not be enough left for a viable building, particularly in the small Neighborhood Centers. Perhaps better planning for neighborhood centers would happen if they were placed entirely in one property owner's domain, or if the city bought out the remnants of the lesser owners by giving them bonuses for property elsewhere. Bonuses should be granted to a property owner as lifetime vouchers which can be applied to the owner's properties or sold to another owner. They should be applicable in any zone where increased height is allowed.		1	Heights are under review. Bonus criteria are under review. Mini-charrette is intended to test the feasibility and implementability of the regulations and the bonus criteria system.

Volcano Heights
Focus Group Comments

	R	S	T	U
1	Comment / Question / Request for Change	Change - NO	Change - YES	Explanation / Action
149	The height limitation table creates the most difficult element of the plan. As we mentioned, we feel that a 2-story office building or a single-story flex building should be the standard and then transition from that point. Our argument on both uses and the height would be for ample room to get floor to floor height plus parapet height for a 2-story office building. The flex space needs internal clear heights of 30 feet, plus the roof deck and fixtures. As also mentioned, we feel that it will be very difficult for the community to go through the process and get the points system up for many various reasons. As few is that green roofs add to the structural costs and increases heights in some cases. What happens if you don't have any rock features or your property is predominantly rock outcroppings, how big are the patio areas, etc. I think this area would benefit greatly from the design charrette.	1		See response above.
150	Pages 15, 16, 17. a. Building heights in the Town Center and Village Center and Mix Use are too low starting at 26ft. This should be increased to 36 ft. or higher (48 ft) as there are properties in Volcano Area plan which start at 36 ft and there is an APS site which is at 45 ft and there is land to the north which allows for 36 ft. Most importantly the land is burdened with rock and crazy road design of Unser and Paseo Del Norte which will make development more expensive this increases the need for the 36 ft min with the various bonuses noted.	1		See response above.
151	Pages 15, 16, 17 b. Please clearly state that there are no building height limits in the TC as stated in the meeting if the property is a building to meet employment needs and goals for the ABQ MSA area.	1		There are no building height limits in TC if an employer with over 250 jobs signs a development agreement with the City. A speculative building sized for 250 employees does not meet this criteria.

Volcano Heights
Focus Group Comments

	R	S	T	U
1	Comment / Question / Request for Change	Change - NO	Change - YES	Explanation / Action
152	Pages 15, 16, 17. The notion that an employer will come to employ 250 people and get a bonus from that with a claw back is not realistic...many employers come to existing office space already built. The time to wait by employer is rare. The form of the building itself will indicate the number of people that will work there by the square footage, and floor plates. While your idea seems good on the surface it will not get any traction. Allow buildings that will and can house more than 250 people will get bonuses for heights.	1		Staff has seen speculative building market collapse and does not expect it to return for the foreseeable future. Staff does not want to encourage large, empty buildings to be built on spec that could sit empty for long periods of time. The streamlined development process and clear design regulations are intended to provide predictability for the market and ability to quickly meet market conditions.
153	Optional Bonus Table: a. Please provide a 5 acre and a 15 acre site or a block as established by mandatory roads, a mock up of the site using bonus criteria to build to higher heights.		1	City intends to hold a mini-charrette to test regulations and bonus height criteria.
154	Do bonuses align with what is most important,....water conservation vs. open space?	1		Bonus points have been assigned to match the values staff has heard expressed by participants and stakeholders. If they need to be adjusted, please be specific and let us know.
155	Each bonus item should allow a range of points per topic as the scale of what is done per the item, may be worth more than all the other items added together. Example....large park area vs. a token park area. Well appointed plaza and nice fountain vs. a token one. Bonuses should taken to account quality and quantity, if you want some grandness in the area.		1	Bonus height system is under review. Staff likes this suggestion.
156	Bonus criteria – good idea, but need to test		1	Staff intends to hold a mini-charrette to test bonus height system.
157	Height limit/bonus system a problem		1	Bonus height system is under review. See response above.
158	Users from out of state will walk away (too complicated, too unpredictable)		1	See response above.

Volcano Heights
Focus Group Comments

	R	S	T	U
1	Comment / Question / Request for Change	Change - NO	Change - YES	Explanation / Action
159	The bonus incentives should be used for open space, rock outcrops, park land, trails, and view preservation, rather than bus transit shelters etc. Also realize that there is concern about the height of the buildings being too tall and out of character for the area.	1		As currently developed, the bonus height system requires two tiers of criteria in order to benefit the natural environment while creating incentives for high-quality built environment. Staff believes both are important and should be balanced. It is difficult if not impossible to get density without height. The bonus height system attempts to provide tradeoffs that benefit the entire area in order to designate additional heights in the most appropriate areas and where additional height will have the least impact on existing residential areas.
160	Some rock outcroppings can be preserved, but others can't based on engineering, etc.		1	OS Division is working on a map of significant rock outcroppings, which will serve to prioritize rock outcroppings that are important for preservation.
161	I think we are missing the point about allowing high density. One of the reasons to allow higher density in certain areas is to preserve Open Space in other areas on the mesa. So far, the City has made cuts to the impact fee program. This fee program helped to fund parks, trails and open space. In addition, only \$700,000 was dedicated to the open space land acquisition program for this upcoming bond election. This is not enough. This is down from the \$3 million bond money which was approved in 2009 and \$5 million in 2007, for open space land acquisition. I feel we are being prohibited from preserving the most unique features in Albuquerque. Future generations will wish we had done so. In order to have quality density the development community needs to dedicate land for common areas, parks and open space, or the City will have to raise the money through City bonds, impact fees, or ¼ cent sales tax, or do all of the above.		1	See response above. The Plan cannot zone land as Open Space. Staff is working with OS Division to prioritize land for purchase and preservation. The Plan also intends to provide optional incentives for voluntary preservation of rock outcroppings, open space, and trails, etc. Open space funding and purchase are outside the purview of this sector planning process.

Volcano Heights
Focus Group Comments

	R	S	T	U
1	Comment / Question / Request for Change	Change - NO	Change - YES	Explanation / Action
162	We cannot ignore protecting the views. This is what residents value on the westside of town and one of the reasons we love living here. We have the best views in town. The West Side Strategic Plan states the importance of the views and the need to protect them.	1	1	Regulations cannot preserve views from private property. View preservation must happen from the Public Right-of-Way or public property. Staff has extended one of the east-west mandatory roads to help preserve views. Standards for non-mandatory streets will require local roads to develop in an east-west orientation, which will provide and preserve views toward the Sandia Mountains. Views toward the volcanos will be wiped out by any development over three feet, as they are below the Plan area and not tall enough to be seen above a single-story building. The Park Edge Street is intended to preserve views on the Plan's eastern edge.
163	Protecting views, providing parks, trails, attractive architecture, preserving the rock outcrops, easy access for pedestrians, attractive streetscapes and roadways, convenience to shopping and services are the things that will make this area a success and improve the quality of our lives. There needs to be a balance between development impacts associated with high density, traffic congestion and noise, and providing the amenities within the Town Center. Otherwise it's not worth living here.	1	1	Staff agrees. The Plan intends to balance these quality of life amenities with property rights and incentives for a high-quality, attractive, successful, vibrant, dense, pedestrian-friendly, urban environment.

Volcano Heights
Focus Group Comments

	R	S	T	U
1	Comment / Question / Request for Change	Change - NO	Change - YES	Explanation / Action
164	Too much 26 feet. With 26 feet everywhere, will we get same roofline throughout?	1		The intent is not to have 26 feet everywhere but rather to provide incentive for bonuses that provide a mechanism to encourage OS dedication, parks, trails and built environment amenities. The concept seeks to use heights as the trade for benefits to the natural and built environment. Lower density, lower buildings could go forward, and higher density, higher buildings would trade off more amenities for additional heights. That said, staff is considering revisions to heights that would change the maximum heights to provide a hierarchy and variety of rooflines.
165	Users want "flex areas" with clear height of 28-30 feet (total height around 40 feet). Big boxes typically 32 feet, including Engineering/design users. New uses require around 38 feet		1	See response above.
166	Town Center height should match what can accommodate users (market reality). Town Center structure height should be at least 36'		1	See response above.
167	Couldn't build the live/work units like downtown without height bonuses		1	See response above.
168	Height should be "height of structure"		1	Draft makes this change.
169	Want to see bonus height transfer across properties, saleable, and lifetime		1	This is what the Plan intends. Finding a legal mechanism to ensure this presents a challenge. Staff is currently considering incorporating Transfer of Development Rights.
170	Buffer zones are enough to protect this special area.	1		The bonus height system is a voluntary, incentive-based attempt to replace the off-site open space requirement of the existing R-D zoning to enable more public open space/parks in Volcano Heights. Staff is considering a required off-site OS dedication and/or on-site OS that could be pooled and/or transferred across properties. These requirements would be coupled with a prioritized list of capital projects, which could include parks, trails, etc. as well as a priority list for OS purchases.

Volcano Heights
Focus Group Comments

	R	S	T	U
1	Comment / Question / Request for Change	Change - NO	Change - YES	Explanation / Action
171	Work with topography. TC is in a lower area, so higher heights may be okay	1	1	Staff plans to work with the 3-D model to "test" heights. It is important to remember that development will likely have to choose between blasting through rock or bringing in fill in order to sink building footings. Imported fill will change the topography to some extent.
172	Model the heights/topography and show pictures of possible development heights		1	Agreed. These efforts are anticipated in coming months.
173	Would rather see development on topography vs. cutting into hills to build	1		The Plan will include the same grading language as the other Volcano plans. The amount of fill should be minimized, but property owners are allowed to bring in fill to match the level of roads or to make the property developable. While the Plan can include a regulation to limit fill, it cannot prohibit fill.
174	Jobs/salaries need to be high enough to support housing costs	1		This falls outside the purview of this Plan. The Plan cannot control the market. Individuals choose to live and work as benefits their own situations.

Volcano Heights
Focus Group Comments

	R	S	T	U
1	Comment / Question / Request for Change	Change - NO	Change - YES	Explanation / Action
175	OPEN SPACE / PARKS / TRAILS / CULTURAL RESOURCES			
176	Of all the visions outlined in the Westside Strategic Plan Amendment (WSSPA), the numbers of projected jobs and zoning for dense and tall development have received nearly all the focus of concerted discussion and action. Treatments of quality of life and cultural resources issues still await. Meanwhile, "roads, roads, roads" remain in a separate, untouchable domain altogether.	1		The bonus height system is intended to build in incentives to protect quality of life and cultural resources, but the main focus will remain on meeting the goal of employment and commercial center. An open space/parks/trails planning session is expected in the coming months. Planning effort will include a detailed traffic study as part of the next step.
177	The Ransoms have visited with OS and suggest mapping the important features or establishing a hierarchy of protection so that it is clear how to preserve those features that are important to tie the entire area together by preserving the natural feel and history of the area. This will be the most difficult part of the plan in working with proposed urban density and preserving features that may not fit. Clear policy should be provided that takes precedent in the planning process: preserving rock or establishing urban density.	1		Map of priority rock outcrops to be preserved pending. Not all rock outcroppings will be mapped and prioritized for preservation. The Plan's approach to preservation is based on incentives, not regulation. The Plan will include clear policies about preservation and establishing urban density, but the Plan cannot regulate which takes precedence because it depends on the context of the site, the outcrop, and the development proposed.
178	Will open space features be identified, prioritized?		1	See response above.
179	Major park(s) are not included in the Plan because open space / parks are not interested in another park.	1		The City's Impact Fee Ordinance performs a calculation of how fees for parks/open space will be used in particular service areas of the City. This service area has its quota of parks/open space; therefore, fees collected for new development will go toward park/OS maintenance in this service area. The City is currently in the process revising the Ordinance, so this may change in coming months. In the meantime, this Plan will need to rely on private parks and open space, whether required or incentivized.
180	Open Space Impact Fee better than Bonus Point System (known dollar value vs. uncertain outcome & cost)		1	Planning team is considering requirements for open space, trails, etc.
181	Single loaded streets are needed along the Piedras Marcadas portion of the Monument. Land needs to be acquired to do so.	1	1	The Plan can prioritize these areas for OS purchase, but it cannot require it.

Volcano Heights
Focus Group Comments

	R	S	T	U
1	Comment / Question / Request for Change	Change - NO	Change - YES	Explanation / Action
182	OS should purchase playa area	1	1	See response above.
183	Pay attention to Piedras Marcadas		1	Planning team is depending on OS division and stakeholder involvement to ensure that this special area is treated appropriately.
184	Would like to see commitment from National Park Service to link Piedras Marcadas with their trail system & Jill Matricia parking area	1		The Plan can encourage this, and the planning effort can include working with NPS. The plan cannot require this, although the plan will include a preferred trail corridor system, which could show such links.
185	Consider inventory of cultural resources in Town Center zone.	1		This planning process does not currently include an effort at the scale that this comment implies. The Plan will rely on the City's Archaeological Ordinance 14-16-3-20 to protect such resources on sites greater than 5 acres. The planning team is working with OS Division to map significant features across the Plan area to prioritize for preservation.
186	Agricultural field features to be preserved as part of the bonus system		1	Planning team will consider this request. We would need assistance defining criteria that would be appropriate.
187	Integrate Plan with cultural landscape, perhaps with an overlay. Provide direction to landowners – priorities and choices. Plaza proposal as model.	1	1	This planning process does not currently include such an effort. If stakeholders and/or the OS Division were willing to draft such a section, the planning team would consider including it in the Plan.
188	Show Open Space map, Monument planned trails, and preferred trail corridors within Heights. Angled toward southwest to tie to other corridors. Allows property owners to consider how to integrate with Monument trails, access, and parking.		1	These efforts are anticipated in coming months.
189	Do meeting focused on OS/Parks. Look at cultural history, topography.		1	Agreed. Planning team welcomes help with cultural history.
190	Entitlements are a big gift from the City to property owners. In return, there should be a cost or impact fee. City should also benefit on behalf of the community.		1	Plan is trying to balance these costs and benefits. Regulations and Bonus Height System under review.

Volcano Heights
Focus Group Comments

	R	S	T	U
1	Comment / Question / Request for Change	Change - NO	Change - YES	Explanation / Action
191	INFRASTRUCTURE			
192	Slide 49 – The City should lead some effort for infrastructure planning / phasing for the area as this will require coordination with other agencies. Possible synergies with State or Federal transportation infrastructure assistance should be sponsored by the City. A coordinated infrastructure plan for mandatory roads, water, sanitary sewer, storm drains, etc. will be necessary for landowners to be able to implement in an efficient manner.		1	See response above.
193	Figure out the public infrastructure such as water, sewer, and storm drainage so that it can match the proposed planning areas. Also, due to the regional nature of the Major Activity Center, encourage the City, State, and even Federal support/sponsorship for available funding mechanisms such as SADs, PIDs, TIFs, and RIEs.		1	These planning efforts expected in the coming months. Significant efforts are needed from property owners to drive implementation planning.

Volcano Heights
Focus Group Comments

	R	S	T	U
1	Comment / Question / Request for Change	Change - NO	Change - YES	Explanation / Action
194	REVIEW PROCESS			
195	We support the streamline development process similar to Uptown Design Review Team process and hearings at DRB. We feel that if you work out the details at this time with the design charrettes, this is very feasible and will promote development.	1		Mini-charrette planned in conjunction with development panel.
196	EXISTING SURROUNDING LAND USE			
197	Create a larger map that shows the surrounding land uses not only immediately adjacent to the site but in the surrounding area to show how this will truly be an activity center. I would suggest showing from Paradise on the north to the escarpment edge on the south, then from Universe on the West to Golf Course Road on the east.		1	Graphic pending.
198	Page 14. Map is on many pages. Land use is mislabeled. Townhouse to the north should be single family and the Single family should be townhouse.		1	Graphics under revision.