

#	P.	Section	Commenter	Current Zone	Acres	Comment	No Change	Change	Condition
PUBLIC COMMENTS									
1	85	Zoning, W66 C-2	Anagnostakos, S 6407 & 6411 Central Ave NW	C-2		I own property within the plan area set forth in the proposed West Route 66 Sector Development Plan. I oppose the adoption to the West Route 66 Sector Development Plan and want my zoning to stay the same as it is now.	Insufficient information for response		
2	106	Zoning, W66 SAC	Bandoni, Laurence A. - Angel Development Inc. (see K. Bandoni) 2415 & 2437 Central Ave NW	C-2	3.5	I own property within the plan area set forth in the proposed West Route 66 Sector Development Plan. I oppose the adoption to the West Route 66 Sector Development Plan and want my zoning to stay the same as it is now.	Insufficient information for response		
3	106	Zoning, W66 SAC	Bandoni, Keith - Angel Development Inc., 2415 & 2437 Central Ave NW	C-2	3.5	2415 Central NW is a mobile home park, with 31 mobile homes. When we start talking about conditional uses and the fact that we're a nonconforming use, I have to apply for a conditional use permit within six months. One of my concerns is if I have one mobile home move out, and I can't fill it for a year, does that particular area become such that I cannot put another mobile home in there? It's been vacant for one year; I have to conform to the new W66SAC zone. That would be a concern. I think a lot of people do not understand that if that use goes away and is not reused or grandfathered in, that use goes away.		Clarify that ZHE approval is not required for non-conforming uses to become conditional uses. Extend grace period to 2 years. Add a paragraph about pre-existing conditional uses. The conditional use status applies to the entire lot: vacancy of one mobile home would not trigger the new zoning status.	See Red-Line
4	106	Zoning, W66 SAC	Bandoni, Keith - Angel Development Inc., 2415 & 2437 Central Ave NW	C-2	3.5	3) It is undefined as to what "plan" would overrule the other plan. For instance, there are existing Corridor Plans, Sector Development Plans, Design Master Plans, and but not limited to "Other Plans" as mentioned on Page 14 of the rezoning plan. Adding an additional plan with the intent to control development creates unnecessary vagueness and confusion. Many of these existing plans already contradict one another. Add to this "buffer zones and boundary regulations" and it creates more confusion	The City application for the project includes amending the boundary of the West Old Town SDP to eliminate overlap between the two plans. No other plan applies to this property.		

#	P.	Section	Commenter	Current Zone	Acres	Comment	No Change	Change	Condition
5	106	Zoning, W66 SAC	Bandoni, Keith - Angel Development Inc., 2415 & 2437 Central Ave NW	C-2	3.5	5) Eliminating or limiting the Drive Up Windows whereby it is currently allowed with C-2 zoning is a taking of property rights. In addition, to limit them to 4/42 acres in the W66 SAC Zone means that Drive Up Windows could become a commodity among property. In other words, just like that of liquor licenses. If a current drive up window establishment closes, what prevents them from electing to sell their right to that drive up window? This W66SAC zone does not allow for auto-related businesses.		Change cap-and-replace by allowing drive-up uses subject to design standards.	See Red-Line
6	106	Zoning, W66 SAC	Bandoni, Keith - Angel Development Inc., 2415 & 2437 Central Ave NW	C-2	3.5	2) This Sector Development Plan is adopting a re-zoning plan known as Form Based Code. The City already tried to pass Form Based Code and it did not pass. This Plan is a method of forcing the Form Based Code upon property owners. The "intent" of SAC zoning as defined on page 77 is unrealistic. This is considered a down zoning for 2415 and 2437 Central and a taking of property rights.	The plan aims to further City goals and policies in higher-ranked plans that encourage pedestrian and transit-friendly development on designated transit corridors: this segment of Central is a Major Transit Corridor. It also is encouraging tourist-friendly development in this special activity center connecting Old Town with the BioPark and the Rio Grande. The plan seeks to do this using a hybridized zoning that retain appropriate uses while setting new design requirements.		
7	106	Zoning, W66 SAC	Bandoni, Keith - Angel Development Inc., 2415 & 2437 Central Ave NW	C-2	3.5	1) There are major differences between the east side of the Rio Grande River and the west side. It is unrealistic to adopt a plan that covers such an extended area of Route 66 from Rio Grande Blvd to 108th Street. The area is too diverse. There are various differences in demographics and trade areas.	The plan recognizes the character, needs and opportunities of different parts of the plan area by proposing several zones tailored to those differences.		

#	P.	Section	Commenter	Current Zone	Acres	Comment	No Change	Change	Condition
8	106	Zoning, W66 SAC	Bandoni, Keith - Angel Development Inc., 2415 & 2437 Central Ave NW	C-2	3.5	Throughout Albuquerque, there are development projects that have failed because parking has not been allowed between streets and building. These have failed due to being an inconvenience and a safety issue. Many businesses do not want their front doors being away from major arterials.	This area is already an area that draws pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit users as well as motorists. The W66 SAC zone includes requirements to locate any new buildings on Central close to the street, among other requirements, to make this stretch between Old Town and the Rio Grande that much more more convenient and attractive to access on foot or bike.		
9	106	Zoning, W66 SAC	Bandoni, Keith - Angel Development Inc., 2415 & 2437 Central Ave NW	C-2	3.5	Requiring a portion of private property to become public space in the W66SAC zone creates several problems. The space is to be public space yet retained by the property owner and such owner shall pay taxes on it and maintain it. This would eliminate property rights and will increase crime and development costs. Urban zone is being forced upon property owners, business owners and consumers. This is a problem unless this type of plan creates a redeveloped area at one time, it will turn out looking worse than the current situation. The demographics do not exist to support such undertaking. To think that this area can be redeveloped to create what the city planning department is envisioning is unrealistic and, quite honestly, counterproductive.		Clarify the usable open space and public space requirements of the Plan. The approach is actually more flexible than existing requirements in the Zoning Code for residential and non-residential uses.	See Red-Line
10	76	Zoning, R-2	Bishop, Ruby 225 40th St NW 87105	R-2	1	I own property within the plan area set forth in the proposed West Route 66 Sector Development Plan. I oppose the adoption to the West Route 66 Sector Development Plan and want my zoning to stay the same as it is now. My main concern is the possibility that part of my	Insufficient information for response		
11	94	Zoning, MAC	Brooks, George Trustee Dixon Family Trust 7110, 7226 & 7320 Central SW-	SU-1 PDA	13.5	I own property within the plan area set forth in the proposed West Route 66 Sector Development Plan. I oppose the adoption to the West Route 66 Sector Development Plan and want my zoning to stay the same as it is now.	Insufficient information for response		

#	P.	Section	Commenter	Current Zone	Acres	Comment	No Change	Change	Condition
12	86-89	Zoning, W66 CAC	Campbell and Wells, P.A., Lawrence M. Wells, representing Dr. Harold J. Ward and Mrs. Joyce A. Ward (incl. K-Mart) 4208 Central Ave SW (SWC Central/Atrisco)	C-2 (SC)		The bulk of the Ward Property has been used for many years as a K-Mart store, The K-Mart lease is in its last extension term and will soon expire. Our clients are actively working with a team of Albuquerque professionals on a comprehensive plan to redevelop the Ward Property within the next couple of years. with one or more new retail and/or restaurant uses on the site which would bring new shopping and dining alternatives to the Atrisco neighborhood. A number of the provisions of the Draft Plan which would apply to the proposed W66 Community Activity Center would materially interfere with our clients' efforts to successfully redevelop the Ward Property			
13	86-89	Zoning, W66 CAC	Campbell and Wells, P.A., Lawrence M. Wells, representing Dr. Harold J. Ward and Mrs. Joyce A. Ward. 4208 Central Ave SW (SWC Central/Atrisco)	C-2 (SC)		1. Drive-Up Service Windows: The limitation on drive-up service windows will reduce the number of operators who are interested in the site and reduce the variety and the quality of retail and restaurant offerings that would otherwise be available to the Atrisco neighborhood residents.		Change cap-and-replace approach to allow drive-up uses subject to design standards	See Red-Line
14	86-89	Zoning, W66 CAC	Campbell and Wells, P.A., Lawrence M. Wells, representing Dr. Harold J. Ward and Mrs. Joyce A. Ward. 4208 Central Ave SW (SWC Central/Atrisco)	C-2 (SC)		2. Alcohol sales. Alcohol sales for off premises consumption should be a permissive rather than conditional use in this long-established retail service area. My clients are concerned that making this a conditional use will discourage some retailers from choosing this site, thereby denying the Atrisco neighborhood the same level of services that other Albuquerque neighborhoods enjoy.	No change. Conditional status for this use is a standard City zoning category in commercial areas throughout the City and is scrutinized in Metropolitan Redevelopment and sector development areas.		
15	86-89	Zoning, W66 CAC	Campbell and Wells, P.A., Lawrence M. Wells, representing Dr. Harold J. Ward and Mrs. Joyce A. Ward. 4208 Central Ave SW (SWC Central/Atrisco)	C-2 (SC)		3. Mixed of Uses. Permitting mixed uses in the W66 Community Activity Center zone is a good idea. However, our clients feel strongly that mandating mixed uses on their site, or penalizing a lack of a mixed of uses on the site, will inhibit the redevelopment of the Ward Property, and will further limit the Atrisco neighborhood's access to the full breadth of retail and restaurant offerings that are available in other Albuquerque neighborhoods.	No change. The W66 CAC zoning does not mandate a mix of uses. Rather it allows one or a combination of wide-ranging uses.		

#	P.	Section	Commenter	Current Zone	Acres	Comment	No Change	Change	Condition
16	86-89	Zoning, W66 CAC	Campbell and Wells, P.A., Lawrence M. Wells, representing Dr. Harold J. Ward and Mrs. Joyce A. Ward. 4208 Central Ave SW (SWC Central/Atrisco)	C-2 (SC)		4. Dedicated Public Space: Open Space Requirement. Reasonable design guidelines that contribute to a favorable aesthetic in the neighborhood is a good idea, provided that the design guidelines do not create unreasonable burdens on new development through the required dedication of open or public space or excessive additional expense. My clients feel that the requirements in the Draft Plan will inhibit vibrant retail and restaurant development in the W66 Community Activity Center zone.		Language has been amended to clarify that requirements are not cumulative.	See Red-Line
17	86-89	Zoning, W66 CAC	Campbell and Wells, P.A., Lawrence M. Wells, representing Dr. Harold J. Ward and Mrs. Joyce A. Ward 4208 Central Ave SW (SWC Central/Atrisco)	C-2 (SC)		5. Permitted Building Types. The Wards should be entitled to redevelop the site by reusing the existing K-Mart building, whether for single user or as a demised space, and adding other buildings on the site without burdensome architectural requirements.	The plan does not affect demised space in commercial and office developments.		
18	86-89	Zoning, W66 CAC	Campbell and Wells, P.A., Lawrence M. Wells, representing Dr. Harold J. Ward and Mrs. Joyce A. Ward 4208 Central Ave SW (SWC Central/Atrisco)	C-2 (SC)		6. Off Street Parking Requirements. The Draft Plan creates an off-street parking maximum which appears to be well below the standard minimum on-site parking requirements of many national retailers. Imposing this standard as a mandate in the W66 Community Activity Center zone will likely severely limit the number of national retailers who are willing to come to the Atrisco neighborhood.		Retain lower minimum as an option but not a requirement.	See Red-Line
19	78	Zoning, Development Compliance	Campbell and Wells, P.A., Lawrence M. Wells, representing Dr. Harold J. Ward and Mrs. Joyce A. Ward 4208 Central Ave SW (SWC Central/Atrisco)	C-2 (SC)		7. CAC Development requirements. It is our clients' view that existing developed commercial sites such as the Ward Property should be exempted from new development standards when such a site is redeveloped.		The Plan grandfathers in existing development, honors current, approved site development plans and allows an increase of up to 25% in square footage before the new zoning is triggered. The new zoning allows a degree of flexibility. The section has been amended for clarity.	See Red-Line

#	P.	Section	Commenter	Current Zone	Acres	Comment	No Change	Change	Condition
20	76, 85	Zoning, SU-2/SU-1, C-2	Chronis, Anna SEC Coors/Central (6500 Central SW, 111 & 121 65th, 200-220 Bataan)	SU-1, C-2	5.6	I own property within the plan area set forth in the proposed West Route 66 Sector Development Plan. I oppose the adoption to the West Route 66 Sector Development Plan and want my zoning to stay the same as it is now.	Insufficient information for response		
21	106	Zoning, SAC	Coe, Steven - Real Estate Entertainment Central LLC 2306, 2310, 2312 & 2314 Central Ave SW-	C-2	0.45	I own property within the plan area set forth in the proposed West Route 66 Sector Development Plan. I oppose the adoption to the West Route 66 Sector Development Plan and want my zoning to stay the same as it is now.	Insufficient information for response		
22	106	Zoning, SAC	Coe, Steven - Real Estate Entertainment Central LLC 2306, 2310, 2312 & 2314 Central Ave SW-	C-2	0.45	The above-referenced property is improved with a retail building of approximately 13,745 square feet. I am apposed to the Plan's effect on the Property and hereby respectfully request that that property, as well as lots 1, 2, and 3 of Volcano Point Shopping Center (see Peterson - 98th/Central LLC), be removed from the boundary of the proposed Sector Plan.	No change. Removal would mean singling out a property for different treatment than other properties fronting Central in the plan area and would therefore be contrary to the fair & justified approach that the City must use in formulating sector development plans that include zoning.		

#	P.	Section	Commenter	Current Zone	Acres	Comment	No Change	Change	Condition
23	106	Zoning, SAC	Coe, Steven - Real Estate Entertainment Central LLC 2306, 2310, 2312 & 2314 Central Ave SW-	C-2	0.45	Peterson respectfully demands that Councilors Isaac Benton and Ken Sanchez and any other Councilor that has engaged in ex-parte communication regarding the proposed Sector Plan be recused from any hearing of the Land Use Planning and Zoning Committee (LUPZ) or of the City Council that deals with the proposed enactment of the proposed Sector Plan. The proposed Plan would invoke a downzoning that requires quasi-judicial hearing procedure in order to uphold the due process rights of Peterson and other landowners within the area of the proposed Sector Plan. represent another instance of due process rights violations by the City of Albuquerque such as those determined to have occurred in the following New Mexico Supreme Court cases: Commons v. Albuquerque City Council from 2008 Miller v. City of Albuquerque from 1976 Davis v. City of Albuquerque from 1982 High Ridge Hinkle Joint Venture v. City of Albuquerque from 1994 Old Town Neighborhood Association v. City of Albuquerque from 1996	Outside the purview of the EPC		
24	85	Zoning, W66 C-2	Coe, Steven - Coe & Peterson LLC 10120 Central Ave SW - Lot 5 in Block 1, Lands of the Atrisco Grant	SU-2 PDA	4.9	Peterson respectfully demands that Councilors Isaac Benton and Ken Sanchez and any other Councilor that has engaged in ex-parte communication regarding the proposed Sector Plan be recused from any hearing of the Land Use Planning and Zoning Committee (LUPZ) or of the City Council that deals with the proposed enactment of the proposed Sector Plan. The proposed Plan would invoke a downzoning that requires quasi-judicial hearing procedure in order to uphold the due process rights of Peterson and other landowners within the area of the proposed Sector Plan. (cont'd with same text as above, see Coe, S, 2306 - 2014 Central SW)	Outside the purview of the EPC		

#	P.	Section	Commenter	Current Zone	Acres	Comment	No Change	Change	Condition
25		Zoning	Contreras, M., representing several owners: 7226 Central SW, 2801 Central, NEC Central/Unser, and between 98th and 86th St.			There are problems with the plan: Who pays for public spaces. Safety issues--retailers consider parking behind buildings old-style development and dangerous for their employees. Elimination of drive-thrus in C-2 zoning, which in my opinion is a taking. Form based zoning--putting so many layers on current zoning makes it very confusing. National retailers should be consulted about what they need and would like to see. What we want is to foster growth, not inhibit it.	No change on parking design for now. Staff has found no hard evidence to date that location of parking on its own has significant effect on the incidence of crime. Drive-thrus are not prohibited in the W66 C-2 zone.	Clarify open space requirement, which is actually similar to general regulations in Zoning Code. Zoning language is amended for clarity.	See Red-Likne
26	76	Zoning, SU-2/R-2	Dalton, Ernest 127 40th St NW (#201 in AGIS)	R-2		I own property within the plan area set forth in the proposed West Route 66 Sector Development Plan. I oppose the adoption to the West Route 66 Sector Development Plan and want my zoning to stay the same as it is now.	Insufficient information for response		
27	95	Zoning, W66 MAC	EPC			Add lot depth as a trigger for the limitation on residential uses within 200 ft of Central		Make change	p. 95, Limited Uses, 1. insert at end, "and lots less than 150 ft wide and 200 ft deep as measured from the Central ROW are exempt."
28	77	Zoning, W66 zones	EPC			Consider making the form based zoning optional in combination with incentives to make it attractive.	The proposed form based zoning strategy of the plan builds in incentives for compliance, i.e. streamlined review and approval process, and allows developers flexibility to apply for modifications to allowable uses and forms, with additional review. A wide range of uses is allowed in zones most in need of commercial development to serve West Side residents. The zoning regulations and design standards aim to provide more assurance that future developments will be accessible by all modes and create a more attractive commercial corridor.		
29	79	Zoning, non-conforming uses	EPC			Consider extending the 1-year "grace" period for conditional uses that have ceased.		Extend to 2 years, in part due to the slow economic recovery.	See Red-Line

#	P.	Section	Commenter	Current Zone	Acres	Comment	No Change	Change	Condition
30	79	Zoning, non-conforming uses	EPC			Concerned about losing the existing businesses. Need to dispell misinformation about what the plan is proposing.		Changes are recommended to improve clarity, including section on "grand-fathering" of existing development.	See Red-Line
31		Zoning	EPC			Provide more evidence-based analysis and justification for zoning proposals.	No change for now regarding this Plan. Consider as a general approach in the future for sector development plans.		
32		Zoning	EPC			The plan should strike a balance between protecting existing businesses and promoting future development that accommodates pedestrians and cars.			
33		Zoning	EPC			The Plan area is a unique, historic transportation corridor and warrants unique zoning. However the proposed zoning regulations should be simplified to encourage development to come in.		Some changes are proposed to make the regulations more user-friendly	See Red-Line
34		General	Gallegos, J., SWAN and West Central Community Development Group			There are some good quality ideas coming out of this plan. However, we'd like to see more emphasis placed on the West Side of the river, because we feel it's more of a needed area. Our groups are trying to promote retail, commercial business in our area. We don't want detriments to improvements in retail and business. Our input is that we'd like to see more jobs, more retail and be able to use our side of town as opposed to having to drive to the Northeast Heights.		Some changes are proposed to make the regulations more user-friendly and encourage development	See Red-Line
35	98	Zoning, W66 MX	Geller, Jeff 4517 Central Ave NW	C-2	0.72	I own property within the plan area set forth in the proposed West Route 66 Sector Development Plan. I oppose the adoption to the West Route 66 Sector Development Plan and want my zoning to stay the same as it is now.	Insufficient information for response		
36	85	Zoning, W66 C-2	Hanna, Richard Hanna Commercial, LLC 120 Coors NW	C-2	0.3	I own a vacant land tract at 120 Coors NW that is about 1/3 of an acre. I am opposed to the zoning changes because it will be a taking on my property. My lot is currently regular C-2 and is primarily designed for a drive through business. Eliminating that use takes away my highest and best use for the property.	The proposed zone allows drive-thru businesses (or drive-up services, as referred to in the Comprehensive Zoning Code).		

#	P.	Section	Commenter	Current Zone	Acres	Comment	No Change	Change	Condition
37	85	Zoning, W66 C-2	Hanna, Richard Hanna Commercial, LLC 120 Coors NW	C-2	0.3	Requiring part of my land as public space reduces what land I already have plus I lose control over who can be on my property. This is a bad idea due to loitering.	The proposed zone does not include any Public Space requirement for non-residential uses above and beyond existing requirements of the Zoning Code (§14-16-3-18 (C)(4)). This Public Space is intended to be used by customers, employees, suppliers etc related to the business/organization on the site. It remains under private control and loiterers can be removed. The Usable Open Space (UOS) requirement in the proposed zone applies to residential uses and is based on the R-2 zone in the Comprehensive Zoning Code rather than the C-2 zone, which refers to R-3. UOS is intended for use by residents, not the wider public. The plan therefore does require a larger amount of UOS than C-2: 400 - 600 sf/unit vs. 200 - 300 sf/unit, depending on the number of bedrooms. Note that all UOS does not have to be provided at ground level, i.e. it does not necessarily reduce developable area on a 1:1 ratio.	Open space requirements have been clarified.	See Red-Line
38	85	Zoning, W66 C-2	Hanna, Richard Hanna Commercial, LLC 120 Coors NW	C-2	0.3	Third, not allowing parking between streets and buildings is not a good land use generally but also a safety issue. Cars and people are safer in areas where they can be seen. Not in the back where they can't be seen Are you going on now have a police force that patrols the back of all buildings to make this ordinance work?	While parking between streets and buildings is prohibited on properties fronting Central Ave, this property is on Coors and is not affected by this regulation.		

#	P.	Section	Commenter	Current Zone	Acres	Comment	No Change	Change	Condition
39	General	Zoning, SU-2/W66 C-2	Hanna, Richard Hanna Commercial LLC 120 Coors NW	C-2	0.3	I have been an investor and broker for over 30 years so I do understand zoning and real estate development. I would suggest if your real goal is to encourage development and investment in the area , to make it simpler to invest not harder. The trap that the city is falling into is thinking each area of the city is unique. We have almost 48 different kinds of zoning in our codes, we should have something that fits for any given area without another sector development plan. Have straight zoning so everyone understands what the rules are, make them efficient and you will have the best land uses as result.		The W66 C-2 zone is a hybrid zone that includes FBZ for residential uses only. The intent of sector plan zoning is to tailor rules to promote desired development to fulfill community and City goals and policies for a specific area. The WR66SDP seeks to streamline the approval process for projects that meet its regulations. The rules in	See Red-Line
40	94	Zoning, SU-2/W66 MAC	Heeter, David and Deborah Mortley, Margie - AM Trailer Leasing Inc 8715 Volcano Rd NW	SU-2/IP	7 or 9?	The new zoning, MAC, does not allow for semi-trailers and/ or warehousing, which is the existing use of the property. We would to keep our SU-2 IP zoning. We think that the City of Albuquerque and property owners share the same goals, that is, to create successful, healthy and attractive developments to fill-in the voids of the west side. We think that the proper zoning of SU-2 IP is the answer to achieve desired developments. The majority of development on the west side, between I-40 and Central Ave., has been the result of the SU2- IP zoning. Examples: the Atrisco Business Park, many distribution warehouses, numerous trucking companies and many other businesses. It is our opinion that industrial park zoning has had a successful track record in the development on the west side, and to take away SU2- IP zoning would be a major set back for the City and property owners	No change. Including the property within the boundary of the proposed Major Activity Center and its associated zoning meets the relevant Comprehensive Plan Policy policy. The property abuts residential zones on two sides.		
41	106	Zoning, SU-2/W66 SAC	Kenner, Joseph - Ram Gas Station 2309 Central NW	C-2	0.7	I own property within the plan area set forth in the proposed West Route 66 Sector Development Plan. I oppose the adoption to the West Route 66 Sector Development Plan and want my zoning to stay the same as it is now.	Insufficient information for response		
42		Plan boundary	Kildew, Kim 9101 Volcano Rd NW			Why is the property to my immediate east (a mobile home park) not included in the re-zone?	It is actually a subdivision of single family manufactured homes on individual lots. The Plan excludes single family residential to the extent possible.		

#	P.	Section	Commenter	Current Zone	Acres	Comment	No Change	Change	Condition
43	106	Zoning, W66 SAC	Lee, June 2318 Central SW	C-2		I own property within the plan area set forth in the proposed West Route 66 Sector Development Plan. I oppose the adoption to the West Route 66 Sector Development Plan and want my zoning to stay the same as it is now.	Insufficient information for response		
44	143	Transportation	Lewis, Mark - Pro's Ranch Markets 4101 & 4201 Central NW (2 lots)			Leave existing lanes on Central in the Atrisco Center area. Suggest adding buses and full pull-out bus stops to maintain the traffic flow.	City Transit no longer installs pull-outs because buses have difficulty merging back into traffic.		
45	86	Zoning, W66 CAC	Lewis, Mark - Pro's Ranch Markets 4101 & 4201 Central NW (2 lots)	C-2	14.5	Supports idea of adding multi-story residential townhomes to community center areas. We should be given the opportunity to move the new commercial buildings around to suit the internal pedestrian traffic patterns. The design concept (p. 86) should not be a hard and fast zoning code requirement.		Clarify conceptual nature of diagram	See Red-Line
46	87	Zoning, W66 CAC	Lewis, Mark - Pro's Ranch Markets 4101 & 4201 Central NW (2 lots)	C-2	14.5	The restriction on drive-thru pad buildings and outparcels seems limited and myopic. Consider allowing new drive thrus for other non-food retail and services (Starbucks, dry cleaners, day care). One concept is to design the drive-thru lanes internally in the building or away from the street.		Allow new drive-thrus subject to requirements that keep them away from the Central/Atrisco intersection and locate queuing lanes internal to sites. Note that Starbucks is considered food and drink retail per the Zoning Code.	See Red-Line
47	89, 129	Zoning, W66 CAC	Lewis, Mark - Pro's Ranch Markets 4101 & 4201 Central NW (2 lots)	C-2	14.5	Maintaining a commercial visibility window into the anchor tenant spaces is important to maintain customer attraction for retailers who do not face the Central Ave., including Pro's Ranch, Ross and other small and large retailers. The parking area at the street needs to be wider and more visible so that automobile drivers can determine where available parking is situated. Allowing a 70/30 ratio of viewshed to building next to the street would be very helpful.	The requirement aims to encourage future infill buildings and new development in the CAC to relate more closely with Central, Atrisco and eventually on-site streets in the activity center. The Atrisco Center currently consists of one larger and one small lot. Future infill development on the site could be sited and designed to ensure visibility of existing retail and additional activity.		

#	P.	Section	Commenter	Current Zone	Acres	Comment	No Change	Change	Condition
48	78, 79, 86	Zoning, W66 CAC	Lewis, Mark - Pro's Ranch Markets 4101 & 4201 Central NW (2 lots)	C-2	14.5	Changes in zoning for this area must acknowledge existing conditional use permits for alcohol sales and not make such existing uses non-conforming uses that would need re-authorization. These types of liquor licenses are extremely costly and scarce.		Clarify that pre-existing conditional uses are grandfathered in.	See Red-Line
49	86	Zoning, W66 CAC	Lewis, Mark - Pro's Ranch Markets 4101 & 4201 Central NW (2 lots)	C-2	14.5	The existing type and style of buildings at the site should be used as a permitted building type.		The existing buildings are grandfathered in. The plan's regulations, including building types, would be triggered by additions or new development of 25% or more in square footage. Clarify that in the case of an addition to a building, whose location is already fixed, compliance with siting requirements of the Plan is required to the extent possible.	Amend p. 78 ref Development Compliance per Red-Line

#	P.	Section	Commenter	Current Zone	Acres	Comment	No Change	Change	Condition
50	87	Zoning, W66 CAC	Lewis, Mark - Pro's Ranch Markets 4101 & 4201 Central NW (2 lots)	C-2	14.5	The section on public spaces must include the benefit of some "grandfathering" to existing building and related conditions. Under the definitions, Pro's Atrisco would be obligated to construct 4,400 sf of new public spaces in Atrisco Center. Moreover, pedestrian space should be defined to include existing landscaped and retention areas in the right-of-way and private property areas in aggregate.		The Plan honors zoning entitlements, of existing premises, including current, approved site development plans. The public space requirement would be triggered with an increase of 25% in square footage. In general, the Plan should clarify its intent in this situation, i.e. to what extent an entire site would be expected to comply. However, note that Pre-Application Review is required for sites of 1 acre or more in order to establish the appropriate compliance and process.	Amend p. 78 to clarify the Plan's intent in cases of building additions to existing development.
51	106	Zoning, W66 SAC	Macji Aglimo Investments Inc 2411 Central NW	C-2		I own property within the plan area set forth in the proposed West Route 66 Sector Development Plan. I oppose the adoption to the West Route 66 Sector Development Plan and want my zoning to stay the same as it is now.	Insufficient information for response		

#	P.	Section	Commenter	Current Zone	Acres	Comment	No Change	Change	Condition
52	98	Zoning, W66 MX	Marquez, Joe C. - Owner/Operator of Classic Self-Service Storage/Classic Self-Service Car Wash 4813 & 4821 Central NW (3 lots)	C-2		Opposes plan because it will "severely impede my ability to utilize my property as I am currently able to do and have for twenty plus years." The plan includes new zones that contain similar use designations to existing zones but do not permit the same uses. My property is now zoned C2 which allows for conditional uses including self-storage facility and self-service car wash. The new zone labeled SU-2/W66 MX disallows conditional uses and uses of this nature. That destroys my intent and efforts to expand my existing business interests. I have explored other uses for the property and have been advised by the development experts consulted that expansion of my existing business use is the best utilization available. The plan does not permit that. If my understanding is incorrect please provide me the appropriate information and assurances.	The plan supports existing businesses by retaining their existing conditional use status. However, it has a 10 to 20 year time horizon. The W66 MX zone aims to create a more pedestrian-oriented commercial area in this flat and established part of the corridor.		
53	94	Zoning, SU-2/W66 MAC	Meyer, Paul G., Trustee for The Meyer Living Trust 7600 Central Ave SW	C-2 (fronting Central), R-T (rear)		I own property within the plan area set forth in the proposed West Route 66 Sector Development Plan. I oppose the adoption to the West Route 66 Sector Development Plan and want my zoning to stay the same as it is now.	Insufficient information for response		
54	145	Recommendations, Projects	Padilla-Morgan, A, West Old Town NA			Like the idea of the plan, the development of Central and the concept of Route 66 and bringing that about. Mainly has concerns about traffic congestion in the wider area, and about traffic safety at Rio Grande Blvd/Central Ave. in particular.	Plan includes recommendation to improve Central/Rio Grande Blvd intersection.		
55	85	Zoning, W66 C-2	Moya, Dominica M. 9317 Central Ave NW 9205 Central Ave NW 9720 Central Ave SW	C-2		I own property within the plan area set forth in the proposed West Route 66 Sector Development Plan. I oppose the adoption to the West Route 66 Sector Development Plan and want my zoning to stay the same as it is now.	Insufficient information for response		
56	145	Zoning, W66 MAC	Moya, Dominica M. 7412 Central SW	C-2					
57	145	Zoning, W66 C-2	Moya, Leroy - Grandview Motel 9700 Central Ave SW 87121	C-2		I own property within the plan area set forth in the proposed West Route 66 Sector Development Plan. I oppose the adoption to the West Route 66 Sector Development Plan and want my zoning to stay the same as it is now.	Insufficient information for response		

#	P.	Section	Commenter	Current Zone	Acres	Comment	No Change	Change	Condition
58	145	Zoning, W66 MAC	Myers, John - on behalf of Armstrong Central Unser Blvd LLC	C-2 (SC)	50	The proposed zone is more restrictive than the existing zone. The proposed rezoning constitutes a down-zoning. The City cannot demonstrate per R-270-1980 that there is a public need to rezone the Property from C-2 to W66 MAC in light of the fact that just 3 1/2 years ago the City found that the current zoning of the property was consistent with applicable City plans, which have not changed during this time.		Clarify that the Plan honors current, approved site development plans.	See Red-Line
59	145	Zoning, W66 MAC	Myers, John - on behalf of Armstrong Central Unser Blvd LLC SWC of Central/Unser aka Unser Crossing	C-2 (SC)	50	Quasi-judicial - To be "fair overall" the City must offer enhanced procedural protections to Armstrong Central Unser Blvd LLC, where the property has only recently zoned and where the owner has made a substantial investment upon such rezoning.		Clarify entitlements.	See Red-Line
60	145	Zoning, W66 MAC	Myers, John - on behalf of Armstrong Central Unser Blvd LLC SWC of Central/Unser aka Unser Crossing	C-2 (SC)	50	Armstrong requests that the City recognize Armstrong's vested right in the 2008 rezoning and the approval of the site plans		Clarify entitlements.	See Red-Line
61	145	Zoning, W66 MAC	Myers, John - on behalf of Armstrong Central Unser Blvd LLC SWC of Central/Unser aka Unser Crossing	C-2 (SC)	50	Armstrong requests that the City retain the C-2 zoning of the property by revising the plan	No change.		
62	145	Zoning, W66 MAC	Myers, John - on behalf of Armstrong Central Unser Blvd LLC SWC of Central/Unser aka Unser Crossing	C-2 (SC)	50	Ch 3, 1.1 - add "In light of its recent zoning, the Unser Crossing property is currently appropriately zoned.	No change.		
63	145	Zoning, W66 MAC	Myers, John - on behalf of Armstrong Central Unser Blvd LLC SWC of Central/Unser aka Unser Crossing	C-2 (SC)	50	Ch. 4, 1.0 - add "Properties within the C-2 zone are subject to only the regulations of the C-2 zone and not the plan's General Development Standards." Ch 4, 7.0 - except properties zoned C-2 from the General Development Standards.	All properties in the Plan area are currently subject to General Development Standards and would continue to be under the proposed Plan. Exempting one property would not be a fair approach for the City to take.		

#	P.	Section	Commenter	Current Zone	Acres	Comment	No Change	Change	Condition
64		Zoning	NAIOP			NAIOP opposed the form based zones [adopted as part of the Zoning Code] and believes they should be optional. The market is in a transition from normal retail development or a normal layout, where you have the parking in front and the buildings set back. Our society is changing and how long that changes is anybody's guess until we get to smart growth and we can get some more retailers and more consumers really oriented towards that. So we're in a tough position right here right now to say how do we get from where we're at today to where whatever the future is. There are some good things in this plan. Of all the places in the city, this is one place that you can use this because of the mass transit that's on Central Avenue. It's literally the one place that you could probably make it work.	The Plan has a 10 to 20 year time horizon. It aims to facilitate change, by grandfathering in existing development, setting reasonable triggers for compliance, and requiring new development to be convenient and attractive for access by all travel modes.		
65	98	Zoning, W66 MX	Navarro, Roman, Owner of former Super 6 and Cibola Court 4814 Central Ave SW 4904 Central Ave SW	C-2		I own property within the plan area set forth in the proposed West Route 66 Sector Development Plan. I oppose the adoption to the West Route 66 Sector Development Plan and want my zoning to stay the same as it is now.	Insufficient information for response		
66	85	Zoning, SU-2/W66 C-2	Nelssen, Judith and Maniza, Shirk 5407 Central NW Church's Chicken	C-2		I own property within the plan area set forth in the proposed West Route 66 Sector Development Plan. I oppose the adoption to the West Route 66 Sector Development Plan and want my zoning to stay the same as it is now.	Insufficient information for response		
67	106	Zoning, SU-2/W66 SAC	Patel, Dhirajbhai L. El Don Motel 2222 Central Ave SW	C-2		Form letter from Peterson Properties. Opposes the adoption of the West Route 66 Sector Development Plan. Wishes zoning to remain the same as now.	Insufficient information for response		

#	P.	Section	Commenter	Current Zone	Acres	Comment	No Change	Change	Condition
68		General	Pena, Klarissa, President, Southwest Alliance of Neighborhoods			The Southwest Alliance of Neighborhoods (SWAN) respectfully requests that the CABQ Environmental Planning Commission defer the hearing of the West Route 66 Sector Development Plan. As you may know SWAN represents 18 different neighborhoods associations on the Southwest Mesa and we are still receiving comments on the plan from our members. In recent years, SWAN has worked closely with the City of Albuquerque to develop the West Central Metropolitan Redevelopment Plan through vigorous community involvement and engagement of residents. We feel that without allowing those most affected an opportunity to analyze and respond to the plan, we would be negligent in our mission to represent our neighborhoods.	No change requested.		
69	80	Zone map	Peterson, Doug - for 98th/Central, LLC and Diamond Shamrock, AutoZone, T McCollum NWC Central & 98th	SU-2/PCA		Is opposed to the Plan's effect on the Property and requests that that property, as well as lots 1, 2, and 3 of Volcano Point Shopping Center be removed from the boundary of the proposed Sector Plan. Although Peterson, does not own lots 1 through 3 of Volcano Point Shopping Center, Lot 4 and such lots are subject to the same architectural standards as set forth in a Site Development Plan for Subdivision and additionally, lots 1 through 4 are subject to that certain Declaration of Covenants, Conditions, Restrictions, and Cross-Easements dated March 20, 2007, as recorded as document 2007051660 in the Real Property Records of Bernalillo County and, thereby, Peterson has a substantial interest in lots 1 through 3 also. Plan would result in down-zoning. Requests recusal of City Councilors who have allegedly engaged in ex-parte communication regarding the Plan.	Removal from Plan: Would single out a property for different treatment and create a significant gap by removing one of four corners of the key intersection of Central/98th in the plan area . Downzoning: The proposed W66 C-2 zoning allows a wider range of uses and streamlines the approval process as compared to the existing SU-2 PCA, which does not allow residential or any conditional C-2 uses and requires EPC approval. Recusal: outside EPC's purview.		
70	80	Zone map	Peterson, Doug - for Old Town Shopping Center LLC & Old Town Shopping Center Partners, Ltd NWC Central/Rio Grande Blvd	C-2		Remove Tracts A-1 and A-2 from plan boundary. The property is already subject to the Old Town SDP, RGB Corridor Plan, and H-1 Historic Old Town Buffer Regs.	The application for this plan includes an amendment to the Old Town SDP, to eliminate the overlap (Case 12EPC-40010).	The draft WR66SDP is amended to specify that where the WR66SDP conflicts with the H-1 zone and other Rank III plans, the more restrictive regulation prevails.	See Red-Line

#	P.	Section	Commenter	Current Zone	Acres	Comment	No Change	Change	Condition
71	107	Zoning, W66 SAC	Peterson, Doug - for Old Town Shopping Center LLC & Old Town Shopping Center Partners, Ltd NWC Central/Rio Grande Blvd	C-2		"Permitted Uses" - clarify "Uses not limited to 30 du/acre; density is controlled by building and site envelope". Does that mean any uses in the Zoning Code that are not specifically restricted by the language of their zone from existing at the rate of 30 du/acre or not specifically required to exist in a greater density than 30 du/acre?		Clarify the permissive uses allowed in the zone	See Red-Line
72	79, 111	Zoning	Peterson, Doug - for Old Town Shopping Center LLC & Old Town Shopping Center Partners, Ltd	C-2		Relationship with other City Codes - What happens if there is a conflict (not a silence) in the Plan versus what exists in either the Rio Grande Boulevard Corridor Plan or the Old Town Sector Development Plan or the H-1 Buffer Zone Boundary regulations? Then, on p. 111 under "General Development Standards for All Zones", the last sentence states "Where a conflict exists between the Plan and other applicable Rank III plans and Design Overlay Zones, such as the H-1 Historic Old Town zone, the stricter regulation will prevail." Is this sentence intended to apply to conflicts arising from the Plan in general or just from Section 7.0 of the Plan? It is difficult to determine which standard is stricter with qualitative standards. Ensure consistency between 3.3 p. 79 and 7.0 p. 111.		Ensure language on p. 79 and 111 is consistent.	See Red-Line
73	78	Zoning, Development Compliance	Peterson, Doug - for Old Town Shopping Center LLC & Old Town Shopping Center Partners, Ltd NWC Central/Rio Grande Blvd	C-2		2.B Clarify calculation of 25% increase in square footage: "[f]or sites with existing structures: when there is an increase of 25% or more of a building's existing square footage." Does this mean "net" square feet and, if so, how is that calculated? Does it apply to each building on a "site" individually or are all buildings on the "site" considered together for determining the percentage increase?		Reword for clarity	See Red-Line
74	78	Zoning, Development Compliance	Peterson, Doug - for Old Town Shopping Center LLC & Old Town Shopping Center Partners, Ltd NWC Central/Rio Grande Blvd	C-2		2.C.3 Clarify exemption for change in ownership: Do the zoning regulations encompass not only the regulations of the property's particular zone but also the "Development Standards" that are mandatory pursuant to, and start on, page 111?		Ref 2.C, clarify that it includes zone-specific and general regulations. Ref 2.C.3, clarify that exemption is limited to a change in ownership that does not involve new development or building additions.	See Red-Line

#	P.	Section	Commenter	Current Zone	Acres	Comment	No Change	Change	Condition
75	78	Zoning, Development Compliance	Peterson, Doug - for Old Town Shopping Center LLC & Old Town Shopping Center Partners, Ltd NWC Central/Rio Grande Blvd	C-2		Ref. Notes - Clarify "Conventional zones"		Reword and re-arrange to improve clarity	See Red-Line
76	78	Zoning, Development Compliance	Peterson, Doug - for Old Town Shopping Center LLC & Old Town Shopping Center Partners, Ltd NWC Central/Rio Grande Blvd	C-2		Pre-Application Review - clarify site size criteria for exemption		Reword for clarity	See Red-Line
77	79	Zoning, Development Compliance	Peterson, Doug - for Old Town Shopping Center LLC & Old Town Shopping Center Partners, Ltd NWC Central/Rio Grande Blvd	C-2		3.2 Clarify approach to non-conforming uses: Because Old Town's buildings would not be able to be built in their present configuration under the Plan and the proposed zoning under the plan is Form Based, does that mean that all buildings and other parts of Old Town's Property that are not in compliance with the new Plan are non-conforming uses upon the adoption of the Plan? If so, does this paragraph mean that a property owner has to have its non-conforming buildings and uses approved as a conditional use in order to keep them? If that is the case, then, with regard to the second sentence, is it the responsibility of the property owner to apply to the Planning Department for conditional use approval within 6 months after the adoption of the plan? Clarify process, approval authority, compliance, compensation, remedy/appeal.		Also consider further changes to those in Red-Line in consultation with Code Enforcement and in light of text amendment currently under review.	See Red-Line
78	77, 124	Zoning, Gen Dev't Standards	Peterson, Doug - for Old Town Shopping Center LLC & Old Town Shopping Center Partners, Ltd NWC Central/Rio Grande Blvd	C-2		7.J. 1st paragraph - Clarify relationship of signage regulations under overlapping plans.		Language added for clarity	See Red-Line
79	115	Zoning, Gen Dev't Standards	Peterson, Doug - for Old Town Shopping Center LLC & Old Town Shopping Center Partners, Ltd NWC Central/Rio Grande Blvd	C-2		D.6.d - Clarify private owner's rights and responsibilities over public art piece.		Add a definition of public art to address comment	See Red-Line

#	P.	Section	Commenter	Current Zone	Acres	Comment	No Change	Change	Condition
80	118	Zoning, Gen Dev't Standards	Peterson, Doug - for Old Town Shopping Center LLC & Old Town Shopping Center Partners, Ltd NWC Central/Rio Grande Blvd	C-2		E.4.c - Clarify meaning of public space in the context of an ATM machine. Is it subject to 15% landscaping under 7.M.1.c Landscape Standards on p. 127?		Change language for clarity	See Red-Line
81	107	Zoning, W66 SAC	Peterson, Doug - for Old Town Shopping Center LLC & Old Town Shopping Center Partners, Ltd NWC Central/Rio Grande Blvd	C-2		Limited Uses - Check the number of existing drive-ups (5 not 4). Clarify cap & replace system.		Change cap-and-replace to allow drive-ups subject to design standards	See Red-Line
82	107	Zoning, W66 SAC	Peterson, Doug - for Old Town Shopping Center LLC & Old Town Shopping Center Partners, Ltd NWC Central/Rio Grande Blvd	C-2		"Permitted" uses is not clear.		Insert "Residential" to clarify.	See Red-Line
83	107	Zoning, W66 SAC	Peterson, Doug - for Old Town Shopping Center LLC & Old Town Shopping Center Partners, Ltd NWC Central/Rio Grande Blvd	C-2		Public space - Clarify private owner's rights and responsibilities in relation to the public space required by the plan.		Reword section for clarity. Note that public space is already required by the Zoning Code in non-residential development under General Building & Site Design regs in the Zoning Code (14-16-3-18)	See Red-Line
84	84, 107	Zoning, W66 SAC	Peterson, Doug - for Old Town Shopping Center LLC & Old Town Shopping Center Partners, Ltd NWC Central/Rio Grande Blvd	C-2		Landscape Standards 2. - Define "site wall". Requiring adobe conflicts with General Devt Reg C.1 on p. 114. Define "adobe" (true adobe or adobe-like?).		Pending: definition of "site wall".	See Red-Line
85	84	Definitions	Peterson, Doug - for Old Town Shopping Center LLC & Old Town Shopping Center Partners, Ltd NWC Central/Rio Grande Blvd	C-2		Include definition of "Building Amenity Zone" in Definitions section of Chapter 4 and/or of Appendix		Consolidate definitions used in Zoning chapter in one location. Pending: move definition of Building Amenity Zone to Zoning Definitions section.	

#	P.	Section	Commenter	Current Zone	Acres	Comment	No Change	Change	Condition
86	84	Definitions	Peterson, Doug - for Old Town Shopping Center LLC & Old Town Shopping Center Partners, Ltd NWC Central/Rio Grande Blvd	C-2		Clarify "lot", "site", "development", "properties", "premise", "project", "single project". Is "Development" = an area built to one shell construction permit? Is the same as a "lot" under the zoning code? Assuming a "single land use", would an applicant that owned two adjacent lots of 0.9 acres each and wishing to get approval of either a site Development Plan for Subdivision or a Site Development for Building Permit need to have a Pre-Application Review? Similarly, to the use of "site" and "development" throughout the plan, the term "project" is used on page 17 in the introductory paragraph of E. General Site Standards and again "single projects"; what is a "single project" and how does it differ from a project? Similarly, are "properties" as referenced on p. 125 the same as "lots"? Is the term "premise" that is used on page 125 the same as "lot"?		Add terms to definitions. Lot, premises are defined in Zoning Code. Pending: development; project.	See Red-Line
87	84	Definitions	Peterson, Doug - for Old Town Shopping Center LLC & Old Town Shopping Center Partners, Ltd NWC Central/Rio Grande Blvd	C-2		Clarify/define "internal side setback".		Add to definitions.	p. 84, add "Internal side setback. Side setback between lots within a specified zone, i.e. does not apply to side setback of a lot adjoining a different zone."

#	P.	Section	Commenter	Current Zone	Acres	Comment	No Change	Change	Condition
88		Zoning	Peterson, Doug - Old Town Shopping Center Partners and Old Town Shopping Center, LLC, Peterson-98th/Central, LLC	C-2		There are three major detriments to the proposed rezoning: 1) it eliminates drive-up windows or imposes regulations that make them so impractical they are effectively prohibited; (cont. below)		Amend to allow all drive-up uses in W66 CAC and W66 SAC. However, general development regulations are expanded to ensure their layout minimizes visual impact on street scene and pedestrian-oriented and residential areas. Plan aims for a balanced approach that furthers the City's adopted goal and policies to promote convenient access and attractive environment for all modes on Central, a designated transit corridor	See Red-Line
89		Zoning	Peterson, Doug - Old Town Shopping Center Partners and Old Town Shopping Center, LLC, Peterson-98th/Central, LLC	C-2		2) requires part of private property to be public space, which eliminates many private property rights; (cont. below)		Clarify public space regulations, which are based on Zoning Code.	See Red-Line
90		Zoning	Peterson, Doug - Old Town Shopping Center Partners and Old Town Shopping Center, LLC, Peterson-98th/Central, LLC	C-2		3) disallows or severely limits parking between streets and buildings, which causes inconvenience and raises public safety concerns.	Plan limits front parking in new development within form based zones, but no in W66 C-2 zone, to achieve a change in development pattern over time that strengthens the identity of West Central Ave/, improves multi-modal access along this designated Transit Corridor and encourages compact clusters of uses in Activity Centers. No clear evidence has been found to date regarding reduced safety of rear and side parking.		

#	P.	Section	Commenter	Current Zone	Acres	Comment	No Change	Change	Condition
91		Zoning	Rainhart, George on behalf of Peterson Properties			FBZ and Main Street/Architecture Forward building form problematic for retail development in linear and shallow plan area. The form requires 5 conditions--high ped traffic, a few anchor retailers, adequate parking, concentrated population within walking distance, shorter segments--which W66 "retail" areas do not have. Eliminate minimum setback requirement: it would discourage redevelopment and development; have negative impact on property values because it prohibits the most likely uses; the many existing properties that are setback create gaps that prevent pedestrian connectivity critical for success of urban retail form. Main Street / Architectural Forward Building Form is difficult to achieve without existing high pedestrian traffic volumes, high draw anchor retailers and adequate adjacent parking	This plan seeks to begin a shift toward this type of development and provides for the inclusion of adequate parking and pedestrian-oriented amenities in new development that will draw business investment. Not all development in the plan area is intended to develop as Main Street, but all development is intended to be attractive and convenient for pedestrians.		
92		Zoning	Rainhart, George on behalf of Peterson Properties			Successful Main Streets are rarely longer than a few blocks.	The plan is not proposing 5 miles of "Main Street". Instead it is trying to create several "park once and walk" areas along the corridor connected by attractive multi-modal routes.		
93	32	Existing Conditions	Rainhart, George on behalf of Peterson Properties			The Retail Market Study states there is a market for 161, 700 sf of new retail, which would be absorbed by a small amount of the available land in the plan area.	The market study addressed existing conditions to determine the potential demand for new retail, but also identifies that the forecast increase in residents will justify new retail demand in the future.		
94	85	Zoning, W66 C-2	Rainhart, George on behalf of Peterson Properties			The W66 C2 would eliminate the most likely uses including drive-ups.	The W66 C-2 zone allows drive-up uses.		
95	86	Zoning, W66 CAC	Rainhart, George on behalf of Peterson Properties			In the W66 CAC, retailers' concern for visibility will prevent infill and additional density	This view may not be general, e.g. it is not shared in its entirety by owner of Atrisco Center (see Lewis, M. above).		
96	87	Zoning, W66 CAC	Rainhart, George on behalf of Peterson Properties			Allowing a lower minimum parking requirement in W66 CAC will not create more density.	The W66 CAC is intended to be a transit-oriented zone, that capitalizes on the frequency of the existing transit service.		

#	P.	Section	Commenter	Current Zone	Acres	Comment	No Change	Change	Condition
97	86, 106	Zoning, W66 CAC, W66 SAC	Rainhart, George on behalf of Peterson Properties			The W66 CAC and SAC scenario diagrams are completely impractical.	The scenario diagrams are conceptual and show what is allowed at full build-out, within the 10 to 20 year time horizon of the Plan.		
98	95	Zoning, W66 MAC	Rainhart, George on behalf of Peterson Properties			Due to the large quantity of existing retail land at the major intersections, it seems impractical to restrict residential uses on the ground floor within 200 ft of Central for development of street-fronting retail.		Partially addressed	See Red-:Line
99	98	Zoning, W66 MX	Rainhart, George on behalf of Peterson Properties			The existing development pattern in this zone and the lack of potential for future density in the nearby W66 CAC make main street retail development impossible.	The plan has a 10 to 20 year horizon. It has identified this flat stretch of Central, adjoining residential areas, as having the potential for pedestrian-friendly development.		
100		Zoning	Sallee, B. on behalf of Peterson Properties LLC			From safety standpoint, it is better to have the parking up front. Visibility is key for safety, for customers to see their entire pathway, for employees to see potential problems in their parking lot. Visibility from traffic driving by means more witnesses and ease for patrol officers to check on businesses. If lighting goes out in the back it's more of a problem than in the front, where there are streetlights. Parking in the back and on the side of a business will encourage criminal activity, such as auto burglaries, robbery and other violent crimes, drug dealing, loitering. It's important for our businesses to have the safest design layout, and that means parking in the front not to the side or back.	No change for now. Public safety related to location of parking lots is under investigation in conjunction with APD.		
101	85	Zoning, W66 C-2	Samon's Tiger Stores Inc 5306 Central SW 5314 Central SW	C-2		Form letter from Peterson Properties. Opposes the adoption of the West Route 66 Sector Development Plan. Wishes zoning to remain the same as now.	Insufficient information for response		

#	P.	Section	Commenter	Current Zone	Acres	Comment	No Change	Change	Condition
102	94	Zoning, W66 MAC	Stewart, Michael J. Mike's Car Wash 8101 Central NW 87121	SU-2/IP		I received a letter recently from Peterson Properties, which brought to my attention problems with the Sector Plan. I would not want to diminish property value or potential business growth and opportunities. After reviewing the study provided by Mr. George Rainhart, Architect AIA, I am concerned that the Plan's setback requirements and other issues could be problematic for business development. Without some changes, I would rather my zoning stay the same as it is now.	The W66 MAC zoning allows a significantly wider range of uses than the existing IP zoning, including retail and multi-family residential. The regulations in the zone and general development standards aim to promote accessible and attractive development to serve the Southwest Mesa and create a regional destination on West Route 66.		
103	6, 160	Plan area, Projects	Tafoya, Louis			Opposes extension of plan boundary east of the river. The Plan appears to promote projects east of the Rio Grande, and based on past history, implementation of the Plan's projects will start east and not come to fruition on the West Side.		Projects are recommended that would improve every part of the plan area, as well as the West Central corridor as a whole. Information will be added to the projects table and it can be expanded to include priority level and/or timeframe for implementation. Actual implementation is outside the immediate scope of a sector development plan.	p. 32, add language from addendum to retail market study that discusses potential impacts of "east extension". P. 160, add priority level/timeframe in consultation with community and departments & agencies.
104	99	Zoning, W66 MX	Tafoya, Louis			Opposes MX zoning. It is the mirror image of mixed use zoning that was rejected by the community west of the Rio Grande years ago.	The existing C-2 zoning qualifies as a "mixed use" zone because it allows R-3 residential uses. The proposed W66 MX zone covers the relatively small area between Arenal Canal and the Atrisco Center. It is more restrictive with regard to auto-dependent uses in order to support a more pedestrian-friendly environment for surrounding residents. Existing uses are grandfathered in to allow a gradual transition over time.		

#	P.	Section	Commenter	Current Zone	Acres	Comment	No Change	Change	Condition
105	90	Zoning, W66 EPR	Tierra West, LLC on behalf of Fred Seeley and West Ridge Mobile Home Park Segment, 9301 Volcano Rd NW	SU-1/MH 7.5 dus/acre		Requests addition of warehouse use in zone to allow for household self-storage on site of existing mobile home park. Also anticipates that a modification to the approved Site Development Plan would have to be processed, which would detail the manner in which the warehouse component would work within the park and provide the necessary background and for approval.	No change to W66 EPR for now.		
106	81	Zoning,	Tierra West, LLC on behalf of Trevor Hatchel and Mike Schiffer NWC of Churchill and Batan South Portion of Tract 63 Town of Atrisco Grant Unit 6		1.38 +/- acre	Requests rezoning of block bounded by Coors Blvd, Bataan and Churchill from SU-2/O-1 to SU2/W66 C-2, which includes client's property and other lots.		Change expands development potential while respecting adjacent zoning (R-2, SU-1 for retail/office). City owns middle lots and owner of westernmost lot is in agreement (see att. to staff report from Mr. Brad Allen).	See Red-Line
107	80	Zoning, SU-2/IP	Tierra West, LLC on behalf of Old Dominion Trucking Facility, 10210-10300 Central SW	SU-2/M-1		Opposes proposed zoning. Owner purchased the property in 2008 based on the current zoning to develop a new trucking facility, which is a permissive use. The use would be conditional under the proposed zoning. Conditional uses are not guaranteed and limit the ability to expand the use in the future should the new zoning be imposed.	The property and adjacent lot are the only existing SU-2/M-1 zones in the proposed plan area, and are adjacent to existing less intensive SU-2/IP, SU-2/PDA and residential zones. SU-2/IP is a better fit for the area and supports the Plan's long-term goals for , based on City policy and community input. It still maintains many of the uses allowed in M-1 as permissive or conditional..		
108	102	Zoning, W66 RA	Villalobos, Maria 123 40th St NW	R-2		I own the property within the plan area set forth in the proposed West Route 66 Sector Development Plan. I oppose the adoption of the West Route 66 Sector Development Plan and want my zoning to the stay the same as it is now.	Insufficient information for response		
109	102	Zoning, W66 RA	Wendell, Ruth Wendell LLC 4011 Central NW	C-2		I own the property within the plan area set forth in the proposed West Route 66 Sector Development Plan. I oppose the adoption of the West Route 66 Sector Development Plan and want my zoning to the stay the same as it is now.	Insufficient information for response		

#	P.	Section	Commenter	Current Zone	Acres	Comment	No Change	Change	Condition
110		Zoning, W66 C-2	Yanes, Lonnie S. 6220 Central SW 6314 Central SW 5922 Central SW			I own the property within the plan area set forth in the proposed West Route 66 Sector Development Plan. I oppose the adoption of the West Route 66 Sector Development Plan and want my zoning to stay the same as it is now.	Insufficient information for response		
111	AGENCY COMMENTS								
112	64	Existing Conditions, 9.0.	AMAFCA			AMAFCA would like to note that the Amole-Hubbell Drainage Management Plan (1999), mentioned in Section 9.0, is currently being updated to reassess AMAFCA's facilities further downstream. There are no anticipated changes in the SDP area.		Add information	P. 63, 9, insert after Amole Watershed Drainage Master Plan "is being updated as of 2012"
113	132	Transportation, Bicycle	Buntz, Jennifer - GABAC/Duke City Wheelmen Foundation			1) Strongly agree that the definition of multi-use path (MUP) be used and understood correctly...It would be better to treat bicycle-specific paths and concerns distinctly from pedestrian paths and concerns if the city wants to develop use of bicycles as a viable commuter/transportation option.		Will review in plan and tighten language if/where necessary.	
114	34	Transportation, Bicycle	Buntz, Jennifer - GABAC/Duke City Wheelmen Foundation			2) I think including population projection information in the West Central/Route 66 plan is critical due to population growth on the West Side and most residents working on the east side of the Rio Grande. It makes addressing bicycle transportation issues even more important.		Demographics section based on 2010 Census data is being finalized.	p. 34, insert Demographics section.
115	132	Transportation, Bicycle	Buntz, Jennifer - GABAC/Duke City Wheelmen Foundation			3) Full bike lanes of the recommended width and configuration are needed on both sides of Central Ave/Route 66 throughout the area covered by this sector plan.	Covered in Ch 5 beginning p. 133 & Ch 6 beginning p. 160.		
116	132	Transportation, Bicycle	Buntz, Jennifer - GABAC/Duke City Wheelmen Foundation			4) Issues like speed limits and educational/informative signage are also important. There will never be enough bike paths or lanes to take cyclists everywhere they want or need to go. Supporting full integration of bicycles as vehicles on the road (the legal definition of a bicycle) is important in a long range plan.		Will review in plan and change or add language if/where necessary.	
117	132	Transportation, Bicycle	Buntz, Jennifer - GABAC/Duke City Wheelmen Foundation			5) Consistency in the implementation of transportation enhancements is extremely important. Compliance with AASHTO or city DMD guidelines would be of great benefit to the look, feel, safety and functionality of cycling infrastructure in this sector plan.	Noted, no change.		

#	P.	Section	Commenter	Current Zone	Acres	Comment	No Change	Change	Condition
118	64	Existing Conditions: Drainage	City Engineer/Hydrology Department			In Paragraph 9.1.d please amend [second] sentence to "...but also to insufficient storm drain capacity and electricity supply..."		Change to reflect suggested edit.	Amend the second sentence of paragraph 9.1.d to read "...but also to insufficient storm drain capacity and electricity supply in the area."
119	64	Existing Conditions: Drainage	City Engineer/Hydrology Department			Near the end of paragraph 9.0 change "...velocity of stormwater." to "flow of stormwater."		Change to reflect suggested edit.	Amend the second to last sentence in paragraph 9.0 on page 64 to read "...volume and flow of stormwater."
120	64	Existing Conditions: Drainage	City Engineer/Hydrology Department			Change the beginning of paragraph 9.0 to "The City of Albuquerque has received its EPA MS4 Permit for stormwater quality with an effective date of March 1, 2012."		Change to reflect suggested edit.	Amend the first sentence of paragraph 9.0 to read: "The City of Albuquerque has received its EPA MS4 Permit for stormwater quality with an effective date of March 1, 2012."
121	135; 143; 145; 147; 160; 161; 165	Transportation Recommendations, Projects	City Engineer/Transportation Development			Median (landscaping and proposed structure): landscaping height needs to be minimized at all intersections and entrances to avoid sight distance obstruction; structures located within median will need to be evaluated with roadside safety features as prescribed by the Roadside Design Guide, AASHTO, latest update.		Add references to DPM, etc. as necessary	Draft condition
122	124	General Development Standards, J	City Engineer/Transportation Development			As a precaution neon signs should not overshadow signal lights, therefore neon signs should be located away from the vicinity of the signal intersections. All proposed commercial and residential sign locations confined to private property (includes air space) or a revocable permit could be issued for two types of signs that can be located within the Right-of-Way, Temporary Directional/Identification Signage for New Subdivisions and Portable signs as identified in the Zoning Code under General Sign Regulations.		Revise/add sign language as necessary.	Draft condition

#	P.	Section	Commenter	Current Zone	Acres	Comment	No Change	Change	Condition
123	142; 143; 146; 155; 160; 161	Recommendations, Projects	City Engineer/Transportation Development			Pedestrian and striped crossings should be confined to signalized intersection on major roadways.	HAWK signal language should remain for now pending further discussion, Council consideration, etc.		
124	117	General Development Standards	City Engineer/Transportation Development			A blanket parking and cross access easements requirements should be incorporated into Site Development Plan for pad site.		Revise or add language on Site Development Plan requirements as necessary	see Red-Line
125	85, 89, 93, 97, 109; 143, 145	Zoning, Transportation Recommendations	City Engineer/Transportation Development			Curb cuts need to be limited and compliant with DPM's criteria on spacing and frequency.		Revise language to include DPM curb cut criteria where necessary	
126	144	Transportation Recommendations	City Engineer/Transportation Development			Central Avenue on-street parking and lane reduction is discouraged due to the amount of traffic circulating through this major roadway.	No change for now -- this is a recommendation for future discussion as needs change along the corridor. Traffic patterns could change with BRT, etc.		
127	89, 97	Zoning, W66 CAC, W66 MAC	City Engineer/Transportation Development			Ref. Properties of 4+ acres: A 24 ft minimum drive aisle (two 12 ft lanes) should be defined in plan as well as service aisles of 30 ft in width (two 15 ft lanes) at rear of commercial buildings for private access aisles.			see Red-Line
128	137	Transportation Recommendations	City Engineer/Transportation Development			2. viii Fig. 47: Multi-use trails location - modify pedestrian crossing location to side street approaches instead of crossing frontage islands parallel to Central's traffic.	Keep for now, need to discuss.		
129	133	Transportation Recommendations	Transportation Planning/Department of Municipal Development			6. The Plan does not utilize the 2035 traffic volume projections (it is discussed in the transit section only). This is a federal-aid eligible facility. If any federal funding will be requested, it must comply with this planning horizon for consideration		Add references to 2035 MTP volume projections to Recommendations section	Add condition

#	P.	Section	Commenter	Current Zone	Acres	Comment	No Change	Change	Condition
130	44, 133	Transportation Conditions and Recommendations	Transportation Planning/Department of Municipal Development			7. The Plan presents numerous policy and strategic issues that appear to be in conflict	None for now		
131	133	Transportation Recommendations	Transportation Planning/Department of Municipal Development			8. The Plan has created a difficult situation by defining such a long corridor, that it has to be broken into segments. We recognize this was probably established by others, but this is a single corridor and trying to treat it as a local street or a major commercial street or functionality in between will make it difficult to plan, fund and construct improvements.	None for now		
132	144	Transportation Recommendations	Transportation Planning/Department of Municipal Development			9 & 10. When changes decrease roadway capacity, they move that surplus capacity to other streets in the immediate area. Therefore, when capacity is modified, the effects extend beyond the immediate street and that impact should be addressed. 10. Any recommendations to reduce capacity should be documented with appropriate engineering analysis to determine potential effects. Engineering analysis should accompany the recommendations.		Add language to reflect additional criteria/requirements for capacity reduction.	Add condition
133	57	Transportation Conditions. Bikeways and Multi-Use Trails, 6.4.1.	Transportation Planning/Department of Municipal Development			11. No bike lanes exist on Central between Atrisco and Rio Grande bridge. Also, the description of which multi-use trails intersect the Plan area is confusing: east side (not north side) of Coors; east side (not Southside) of Unser; and eastside (not Southside) of 98th Street.		revise text as noted to reflect lack of bike lanes, trail locations	Amend Section 6.4.1 , including Segment 2 discussion in part a, to reflect lack of bike lanes between Atrisco and and the Rio Grande Bridge. Revise trail descriptions to correct locations.
134	138	Transportation Recommendation,	Transportation Planning/Department of Municipal Development			15. There is a need for a continuous bike lane on west bound Central in Figure 48. The trail shown is not an appropriate substitute for a bicycle facility.		Change diagram to show westbound bike lanes, which exist at site currently.	Amend Figure 48 to show continuous westbound bike lane on Central at 98th
135	137	Transportation Recommendations	Transportation Planning/Department of Municipal Development			13. Typical Sections: The width of the trail shown in the typical section is not defined to show bike lanes, and doesn't appear to be consistent with Figure 49.	none for now		
136	137	Transportation Recommendations	Transportation Planning/Department of Municipal Development			14. Median trail crossings create a dangerous situation. Median trails and driveways are conflict points and are not supported by DMD Engineering Division.	none for now		

#	P.	Section	Commenter	Current Zone	Acres	Comment	No Change	Change	Condition
137	137	Transportation Recommendations	Transportation Planning/Department of Municipal Development			2.viii Multi-use trails location (page 137, figure 47): Modify pedestrian crossing location to side street approaches instead of crossing frontage islands parallel to Central's traffic.	none for now		
138	146	Transportation Recommendations	Transportation Planning/Department of Municipal Development			18. Recommendation of a full intersection at Clayton should be made after a complete engineering analysis, otherwise this is not supported by DMD Engineering.		Add engineering analysis language per suggestion.	Amend Section 1.2.1 .m to note need for engineering study of signalization at Clayton
139	143 a, 150 d. & e.	Transportation Recommendations	Transportation Planning/Department of Municipal Development			18. There are references to open or flush mount curbs. Curb specifications for arterial roads are designed to contain runoff. Any changes to the approved roadway specifications will require engineering, hydrology analysis, and street maintenance approvals.	none for now		
140	140, 141	Transportation Recommendation, Fig. 53	Transportation Planning/Department of Municipal Development			17. Signal intersections must be approved and supported by engineering analysis. The recommendation for through street connections should be supported and documents by engineering analysis to determine impacts and operations.			p. 140, Amend to note need for further evaluation in conjunction with DMD and MRCOG.
141	136	Transportation Recommendations, Frontage Road	Transportation Planning/Department of Municipal Development			12. Frontage Road improvements: Item number 1 does not designate a space for bike lanes that are referenced in Item 6.	No change -- Bike lanes referenced are on Central Ave., not in the frontage road improvements area.		
142	139	Transportation Recommendation, Fig. 50	Transportation Planning/Department of Municipal Development			16. The Plan should acknowledge future bike lanes on Coors through the intersection.		revise graphic as suggested	Amend Figure 50 to show bike lanes on Coors Blvd.
143	142, 143.e, 146	Transportation Recommendations, Projects	Transportation Planning/Department of Municipal Development			22. Related to additional crosswalks. DMD Traffic supports only marked crosswalks at <u>controlled</u> intersections. There are numerous publications that detail the research and impact of having marked crossings at uncontrolled intersections. In summary, they say that a marked crosswalk is less safe than an unmarked crosswalk at uncontrolled or mid-block crossings. The marked crosswalk does <u>not</u> change driver behavior and it provides a false sense of security for pedestrians. Controlled intersections, for the sake of this discussion, are those with a traffic signal or the legs of an intersection with stop signs.	No change for now -- these are references to HAWK signals, not unsignalized ped crossings. May need to consider conventional signal, needs further discussion, possibly at Council.		

#	P.	Section	Commenter	Current Zone	Acres	Comment	No Change	Change	Condition
144	117	General Development Standards, intersection diagram	Transportation Planning/Department of Municipal Development			20. There are references and typical drawings of landscaping or art in a 150' radius at the corners. Our concerns is that we <u>must</u> maintain a line of sight triangle for vehicles approaching an intersection to be able to see oncoming traffic.		Revise diagram to acknowledge sight triangle	Revise General Site Standards diagrams to acknowledge sight triangle preservation.
145	135	Transportation Recommendations, Projects	Transportation Planning/Department of Municipal Development			21. Signal timing has been synchronized on this corridor. There can be a number of reasons that it is not apparent at times. They include: malfunctioning equipment, unforeseen changes in traffic volumes or congestion periods, accidents, stalls or discharging passengers during the rush period, emergency vehicles or transit buses passing through the intersection with pre-emption equipment during the rush period, pedestrian and bicyclists pressing pedestrian buttons during the rush period which extends their green time. While we agree that pedestrian enhancements contribute to increased quality of life issues, congestion negatively impacts air quality, noise, road rage, accidents and drives off commercial and retail business customers.		Revise text to reflect that signals are synchronized	Amend 1.1.1c to reflect that signals are currently synchronized.
146	142, 143 e., 146, 155 7.1.a	Transportation Recommendations, Projects	Transportation Planning/Department of Municipal Development			23. In studies such as this there is usually a reference to HAWK lights or RRFB lights as an alternative way to have "control" for a crosswalk. Studies indicate that from the positive side there is an increased yielding to pedestrian traffic. In those same studies, it shows that because of those drivers that do not yield the pedestrian or bicyclists are in greater danger. Similar to the remarks above in 6, the City of Albuquerque does not support HAWK light or RRFB light installations as a substitute for the required control. These also preclude the ability to synchronize signals in a corridor and are not recommended for installation on an arterial.	none for now		

#	P.	Section	Commenter	Current Zone	Acres	Comment	No Change	Change	Condition
147	143 c.5, 123 I.2.a	Transportation Recommendations, Projects	Transportation Planning/Department of Municipal Development			25. The current street light policy is for vehicle navigation and has PNM street lights at intersections and 500' intervals. Security, pedestrian, and decorative street lighting is currently the responsibility of the adjacent property owner. Should additional lighting be installed in the right of way, it becomes an unfunded mandate and the operation and maintenance falls on the Traffic Engineering Division. PNM operates and maintains conforming lighting only. We currently have no budget, staff, equipment or parts to maintain non-PNM supported lighting.		Recommendations (Pending): Add explanation for custom lighting. Gen. Dev't Standard: Clarify that the regulation applies to site lighting not street-lightinig in the public ROW.	See Red-Line
148	8	Community Goals and Objectives	Long Range Planning			Are the goals and objectives meant to be used for internal review of projects and policies, such as by City divisions, of projects in the public right-of-way and other City projects, or are they supposed to be applied to development projects such as things that are reviewed by the DRB and EPC?		Clarify that the community goals and objectives also serve as policies that should be used by reviewing bodies and decision-makers, and can assist enforcement staff to interpret the intent of the plan's regulations.	p. 8, after 1st sentence, insert: "The community goals and objectives also serve as the policies that should be used by reviewing bodies and decision-makers in matters relating to land use and development in the West Route 66 plan area, and can assist enforcement staff to interpret the intent of the Plan's regulations."
149	116	General Development Standards, D-13	Long Range Planning			Sliding windows are not defined, please clarify the window type and the intent of the regulation.		The standard is not necessary, as the window design it refers to is of a different era.	p. 116, delete 13. and renumber the following standards. Include in Red-Line
150	115	General Development Standards, D-17	Long Range Planning			Gated Communities, this term is not defined. Would an apartment complex be able to have front and rear gates?		Define term. Clarify where gating is acceptable, e.g. in terms of the site's location relative to Central Ave., for parts of the development such as parking.	p. 84, add definition "A residential area where accessibility is controlled by means of a gate, guard, or barrier, which restricts access to normally public spaces such as streets and pedestrian/bike paths. Gated access to interior courtyards and residents only parking is allowed."

#	P.	Section	Commenter	Current Zone	Acres	Comment	No Change	Change	Condition
151	78	Development Compliance	Long Range Planning			Based on recent conversations about the implementation of Sector Development Plans it would be appropriate to clarify the following: 2.0 B Does this apply to both buildings and structures? The plan should define building because it is not defined in the Zone Code. 2.0 C 1. What is included in this category? 2. Does this apply to structures also? Notes: Could this section be re-formatted so that it is easier to read? At minimum, bold "Notes." Also please clarify the process for conventional zoning, right now it reads as though a building permit is to be obtained from DRB.		Add a definition of building. Rearrange Notes. Claify approval process for conventional zones.	p. 78, new 2.2, "EPC approval of site development plan for SU-2/SU-1 zones (14-16-2-22) and shopping center sites (14-16-3-2). DRB approval of site development plan for SU-2/IP, or for any development that includes phasing, platting or requires infrastructure. Direct to Building Permit for SU-2/R-2 and SU-2/O-1."
152	114	General Development Standards, Building Standards	Long Range Planning			8. Balconies and Portals, from where is the 8 foot vertical clearance measured? 10. Reflective glass--can some standards of measuring glare and heat be provided or language that clarifies how to process on this issue?		Pending: Clarify C.8.; add a measurable standard or C.10. It is important in the high desert to minimize glare.	Add condition
153	143 h., 148 e., 155 6.1.c, 161	Transportation, Open Space & Trails Recommendations and Projects	Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District (MRGCD)			1. If a pedestrian bridge is needed to safely accommodate increased pedestrian traffic across the river, connections from the bridge to the existing accessible bosque trails on the west side should be considered and evaluated.		Ensure that design of a bridge considers connection to accessible bosque trail on the west side of the river.	p. 143 h. After "vehicular bridge", insert "that connects to north-south trails along the river.", p. 148 e. At end of paragraph, insert "Connections to existing trails along both sides of the river should be incorporated in its design", p. 155 6.1.c At end of paragraph, insert "Ensure that connections to existing north-south bosque trails, including the accessible trails on the west side of the river, are considered and evaluated in its design." 7.1.c, p. 161, Explanation, insert after MR site: "and bosque trails"

#	P.	Section	Commenter	Current Zone	Acres	Comment	No Change	Change	Condition
154	155 7.1.d, 166	Open Space & Trails Recommendations and Projects	Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District (MRGCD)			2. The fencing around the Alameda Drain was installed by the City after a drowning death. The need for and pros and cons of the fencing along the drain could be revisited but this and the proposed connection to the Atrisco Acequia from Central need to be assessed for potential neighborhood and business impacts and support. If a new fence is installed along the drain, the MRGCD would have to approve it to make sure the drain could continue to be maintained with equipment.	No change is needed in the Projects section as MRGCD is listed as the lead agency.	Refer to the public consultation and assessment by MRGCD in the Recommendations section.	p. 155, 7.1.d, reword as follows: "Consider removing the existing chain-link fence along the Alameda Drain in the block north of Central Ave. or replacing it with a more attractive design."
155	155 7.1.b	Trails Recommendations	Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District (MRGCD)			3. Insufficient details are provided about the proposed "enhancement and extension" of a trail along the Atrisco Acequia, a ditch actively maintained for irrigation purposes, for the MRGCD to support it conceptually.		Reword recommendation to address MRGCD reservations.	p. 155, 7.1.b, Reword the 1st sentence: "Investigate with MRGCD the potential for enhancing and extending the informal trail along the Atrisco Ditch north and south of Central Ave."
156	155 7.0	Open Space & Trails Recommendations	Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District (MRGCD)			4. Any proposed improvements need to be reviewed by the MRGCD in the concept stage to evaluate impacts to, and ensure that projects maintain or enhance necessary access to facilities from roads.		Mention the need for review and evaluation by MRGCD.	p. 155, 7.0, At end of paragraph, insert: "Any proposed improvements need to be reviewed by the MRGCD in the concept stage to evaluate impacts to, and ensure that projects maintain or enhance necessary access to facilities from roads."
157	11	Community Goals and Objectives	Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District (MRGCD)			page 11, change Goal 1.5.3 to read "Ensure that the Bosque, drains, ditches and canals are being utilized in ways that may benefit the community, while maintaining and operating them for their designed purposes." 1.5.3.e change to read "Investigate the feasibility of creating or improving pedestrian and bike trails along canals and ditches."	No change to goal, which is meant to be fairly general.	Reword objective.	p. 11, 1.5.3.e, change to read "Investigate the feasibility of creating or improving pedestrian and bike trails along canals and ditches."

#	P.	Section	Commenter	Current Zone	Acres	Comment	No Change	Change	Condition
158	72	Existing Conditions: Trails	Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District (MRGCD)			3rd para. add a statement "Some facilities, or portions of facilities, may not be suitable for trail development due to right-of-way, landownership or other constraints." Last sentence, change to read "assume liability and responsibility for maintaining them."		Add information.	p. 72, 3rd para., add "Some facilities, or portions of facilities, may not be suitable for trail development due to right-of-way, landownership or other constraints." Last sentence, change to read "assume liability and responsibility for maintaining them."
159	72 d.	Existing Conditions: Trails	Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District (MRGCD)			5. The "MRGCD trails" referenced on page 72, item D, were constructed by the Army Corps of Engineers and are currently maintained by the Open Space Division.		Correct text.	p. 72, d., delete "MRGCD". At the end of the paragraph, add: "The trails were constructed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and are maintained by City Parks and Recreation Department/Open Space Division."
160		Zoning	Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District (MRGCD)			General comments on proposed zoning designations: 1. For the protection and comfort of adjacent landowners, MRGCD, irrigators and recreational users, the development setbacks for all zoning designations affecting properties adjacent to MRGCD lands and facilities should be written as follows: "Setback of 15 feet from MRGCD property boundaries or easements." This would prevent development of structures within 15 feet of rights-of-way or easements, including prescriptive easements the MRGCD holds on community ditches. We feel strongly that development allowed within 5 feet of an MRGCD facility could subject the landowner unnecessarily to equipment use and possible damage, noise, herbicide use and recreational uses. Residents or businesses with primary structures so close to a facility are less likely to support routine maintenance or changes in recreation use or developments with perceptions of adverse effects.		While a setback may be desirable, the requested 15 ft seems excessive as a blanket setback, without regard to the size and type of the facility or its legal status.	In zones that include MRGCD facilities, add a setback of 5 ft from MRGCD property or easement.

#	P.	Section	Commenter	Current Zone	Acres	Comment	No Change	Change	Condition
161		General	Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District (MRGCD)			Is the MRGCD included in a definition of "public rights-of-way" or "public realm?"	It is not included in the definition proposed in the Red-Line of the Zoning Chapter.		
162	103	Zoning	Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District (MRGCD)			Where applicable, landowners could be encouraged to locate required open space adjacent to the bosque and MRGCD facilities. Native plant landscaping requirements in the RA zone could also be used for other properties and zoning designations affecting MRGCD lands and facilities, excluding agricultural uses.			p.103, add "Required open space is encouraged adjacent to the bosque and MRGCD facilities."
163	148	Transportation Recommendations, 1.4	Parks and Recreation			Second sentence needs the word "to" struck. This second sentence is also fragmented and should be rewritten. First sentence of second paragraph insinuates that Parks and Rec maintain bike lanes (please reword). Third paragraph should read "a multi-modal corridor that is safe for bicyclists and pedestrians , and to ensure...). Under letter d. -- pedestrian bridge -- May want to mention this could be part of the Mayor's "The Plan" for funding and implementing the bridge. The Parks and Recreation Department should be contacted for appropriate placement, maintenance, and design.	The Mayor's Plan is not at a sufficiently advanced stage to mention in reference to funding and implementation.	Correct grammar and facts in 1st paragraph. Mention coordination with Parks & Recreation Department on design of pedestrian/bike/equestrian bridge.	p. 148, 2nd sentence 1st para.: "In order to encourage more trips by bicycle in the Plan area, it is necessary to ensure good bike connectivity between Central and the intersecting north/south streets, as well as good access to, and within, activity centers and to popular destinations along the corridor."
164			Parks (cont.)						2nd para., delete "maintained by the Parks Department". 3rd para., after bicyclists, insert "and pedestrians". At end of e, add "The Parks Department should be contacted for appropriate placement, maintenance, and design."
165	11	Community Goals & Objectives, 1.5.3 e.	Parks and Recreation			Change wording from "Create and improve pedestrian and bike trails along canals and ditches" to "Create and improve Multi-Use Trails along canals and ditches." Remove any references to "bike trails" as there are no trails that are specific to bicycles only.		Amend with a common rather than a technical term to convey the desired meaning of this community objective.	p. 11, 1.5.3.3, replace "pedestrian and bike trails" with "pedestrian/bike trails"

#	P.	Section	Commenter	Current Zone	Acres	Comment	No Change	Change	Condition
166	71, 154	Existing Conditions 11.1.1 a., Recommendations 5.1.b	Parks and Recreation			The 2.2 acre City owned vacant lot at 90th and Volcano Road would not be adequate in size to provide a park and facility for Family and Community Services. The standard for an active recreational use park such this proposed would be a minimum of 2.0 acres for the park use. The property would best be served as either a park of a Family and Community Services facility.		Make change.	p. 71, 11.1.1.a reword last sentence: "This is a potential site for Parks or Family and Community Services." p. 154, 5.1.b, reword beginning of sentence: "Consider a Parks or Family & Community Services facility..."
167	71	Existing Conditions 11.1.1 c.	Parks and Recreation			Please change this to read "Trail corridor" rather than "linear park."			p. 71, 11.1.1.c, replace "linear park" with "trail corridor".
168	154,	Parks Recommendations 5.1 c., Projects	Parks and Recreation			The proposed park would best be owned and maintained by the adjacent BioPark rather than Parks and Recreation as it would serve as an entry/gateway to the BioPark.	No change at this time. Further assessment of this project is needed to determine appropriate departments for involvement, in addition to MRGCD.		
169	154	Parks Recommendations 5.1 d.	Parks and Recreation			The minimum acreage for parks is to maximize active recreational use more than to provide parking although parking needs to be provided to minimize burden on adjacent neighborhood, residential or commercial. Goal 1.5.2 is to "Create more opportunities for active recreation."		Recommendation apparently would not achieve the goal of making smaller City parks viable under current Parks policy.	p. 154, delete d.
170	154	Parks Recommendations 5.1 e.	Parks and Recreation			Parks and Recreation does not presently have an "urban park model" or standards for small "pocket parks."			p. 154, c. add quotes i.e. "pocket park"; begin e.: "Consider developing an urban park model..." and insert ", which" after "active uses".
171	121, 127, 134, 143 c., 144 j.	General Development Standards, Transportation Recommendations	Parks and Recreation			Throughout document, street trees, streetscapes and associated landscaping are to be provided. Although these improvements may be built by the developer, it should be noted that the responsibility for maintaining the required improvements in the "streetscape" area (within the right-of-way) lies with the adjacent property owner just as with sidewalks		Address issue in General Development Standards F.3 Pedestrian Realm, which covers both sidewalks and street trees.	p. 121, 3.b.ii. and 3.c.i, add "Per City policy, maintenance is the property-owner's responsibility."

#	P.	Section	Commenter	Current Zone	Acres	Comment	No Change	Change	Condition
172	160	Projects	Parks and Recreation			The table seems incomplete as many of the Lead Agency and Funding boxes are not filled in with respective information. Funding opportunities are critical to the implementation of the recommendations. Many of the projects would be built by private developers as part of a development project, others would be built by the City as funding was available.		The table will be completed in consultation with departments and agencies.	p. 160, complete Project Table in consultation with departments and agencies.
173	57	Existing Conditions 6.4.1	Parks and Recreation			Second paragraph is confusing as both Coors and Unser run primarily north-south. Confused about north "side" of Coors and south "side" of Unser as these do not exist. Please clarify and/or reword. Same paragraph. The Paseo del Bosque Trail within the Plain area is not maintained by Open Space but rather by the Park Management (Campbell road south to Bridge blvd.).		Make corrections.	p. 57, 6.4.1, reword 2nd para.: "...: the Paseo del Bosque, the trail on Coors Blvd. north of Central, the trail on Unser Blvd. south of Central, and the trail on 98th St. south of Central."
174	136 d.2, 163	Transportation Recommendations, Projects	Parks and Recreation			The draft Plan proposes the Multi-Use Trail at 10 feet wide. This is Parks and Recreation's minimum standard for a multi-use trail. If a higher pedestrian use is expected, the trail should be wider; especially in the area of "the frontage road." If the multi-use trails are to be maintained by the City Parks and Recreation Departments, the trails and striping should be constructed to City standards or equivalent to the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) recommendations/standards. Signage should be confirmed and recommended by the City Parks and Recreation Department for multi-use trails (using the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices-MUTCD).		Make changes.	p. 136 d.1, insert "minimum" before 10; d.6, at end add "Trail and signage would conform with City standards in consultation with the Parks and Recreation Department."
175		Plan	Parks and Recreation			Throughout document, the word Bosque is grammatically wrong. The word Bosque throughout the entirety of the Plan should be a small letter "b" and the whole word in italics. For example, " <i>bosque</i> ". Exceptions include capitalizing the "B" when using it as a name of something; for example, Paseo del <i>Bosque</i> Trail.		Make corrections.	Throughout Plan, replace "Bosque" with "bosque" unless used as a proper name.

#	P.	Section	Commenter	Current Zone	Acres	Comment	No Change	Change	Condition
176	155	Trails Recommendations, Projects	Parks and Recreation			Arenal Irrigation Ditch Canal is identified as a "Proposed Secondary Trail" in the adopted Trails and Bikeways Facility Plan. It has been found that this particular ditch is a major pedestrian thoroughfare for residents and should be added as a future Multi-Use Primary Trail for the City of Albuquerque to build and obtain the needed licensing from MRGCD. The trail should follow the Arenal Irrigation Canal from the Rio Grande <i>Bosque</i> to Bridge Blvd.	No change for now.		
177	154, 155, 160	Parks and Trails Recommendations, Projects	Parks and Recreation			Maintenance, implementation, and funding should be clarified for all trail and park related proposed infrastructure. Some sort of language should be included in the Plan about how and where resources will come from and be obtained for trail and park maintenance and possibly how much more personnel would be needed at full build out of these systems within the Plan area.		Consider adding general language on p. 154. Potential funding would be added to Projects table on p. 160.	
178	117	Definitions	Parks and Recreation			Please add Multi-Use Trail definition to the Plan, as determined by the City Of Albuquerque's Parks and Recreation Department: "A multi-use trail is a path physically separated from motorized vehicle traffic by an open space or barrier, and constructed within the street right-of-way or within an independent right-of-way including shared-use rights-of-way or utility or drainage easements that permits more than one type of non-motorized use".			p. 171, add "Multi-use trail. A path physically separated from motorized vehicle traffic by an open space or barrier, and constructed within the street right-of-way or within an independent right-of-way including shared-use rights-of-way or utility or drainage easements that permits more than one type of non-motorized use".
179	171	Definitions	Parks and Recreation			Indicate the definition of "HAWK" in the definitions section.			p., 171, add definition of HAWK.
180	171	Definitions	Parks and Recreation			DRB is the Development Review Board. DRC is Design Review Committee.			p. 171, correct DRB definition.
181	57	Issues and Opportunities Inventory 6.4.1	Parks and Recreation			Second paragraph is confusing as both Coors and Unser run primarily north-south. Confused about north "side" of Coors and south "side" of Unser as these do not exist. Please clarify and/or reword. Same paragraph. The Paseo del Bosque Trail within the Plan area is not maintained by Open Space but rather by the Park Management (Campbell road south to Bridge blvd.).		Make corrections.	p. 57, 6.4.1, reword 2nd para.: "...: the Paseo del Bosque, the trail on Coors Blvd. north of Central, the trail on Unser Blvd. south of Central, and the trail on 98th St. south of Central."

#	P.	Section	Commenter	Current Zone	Acres	Comment	No Change	Change	Condition
182	136	General for City maintained multi-use trails	Parks and Recreation			The draft Plan proposes the Multi-Use Trail at 10 feet wide. This is Parks and Recreation's minimum standard for a multi-use trail. If a higher pedestrian use is expected, the trail should be wider; especially in the area of the "frontage road". If the multi-use trails are to be maintained by the City Parks and Recreation Department, the trails and striping should be constructed to City standards or equivalent to the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) recommendations/standards. Signage should be confirmed and recommended by the City Parks and Recreation Department for multi-use trails (using the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices- MUTCD).		Make changes.	p. 136 d.1, insert "minimum" before 10; d.6, at end add "Trail and signage would conform with City standards in consultation with the Parks and Recreation Department."
183	148	Bikeways and multi-use trails 1.4	Parks and Recreation			second sentence needs the word "to" struck. This second sentence is also fragmented and should be rewritten. First sentence of second paragraph insinuates that Parks and Rec maintain bike lanes (please reword). Third paragraph should read "a multi-modal corridor that is safe for bicyclists and pedestrians , and to ensure...). Under letter d. – Pedestrian Bridge – May want to mention this could be part of the Mayor's "The Plan" for funding and implementing the bridge. The Parks and Recreation Department should be contacted for appropriate placement, maintenance, and design.			
184	148, 161	Multi-Use Trail Recommendations & Projects	Open Space			The planning and design of a pedestrian bridge will need to be done in close collaboration with City Open Space Division Staff, in keeping with natural character of the Bosque and in compliance with the 1993 <i>Bosque Action Plan</i> .		Add to change proposed in response to MRGCD comment	p. 148, e., insert "and in keeping with the natural character of the bosque". p. 161, include consultation with Open Space
185	105	Zoning, W66 R	Open Space			Please emphasize that any development of the River Activity Zones should involve City Open Space Division Staff. With reference to the City-owned MRA-controlled tract on the northwest side of the Central bridge crossing, perhaps there could be some mention of the previous design by Consensus Planning and how it will tie in with the Mayor's new River Crossings Plan.			See Red-Line

#	P.	Section	Commenter	Current Zone	Acres	Comment	No Change	Change	Condition
186	155	Open Space Recommendations	Open Space			For all recommended improvements in and around the Bosque, especially the new parking area and ADA access and trail, please include implementation funding suggestions, time-lines that assume full funding, and identification of responsible agencies and their roles.		Projects table will be completed with this information in consultation with relevant departments and agencies.	
187	72	Trails Overview 11.d.	Open Space			The "MRGCD trails" referred to on page 72, item D, were constructed by the Army Corps of Engineers and are currently managed by Open Space Division.		Addressed under MRGCD comment	
188		Plan maps	Open Space			The maps are quite small and might hard for some to read. Would it be possible to enlarge them to 11x17 fold-outs?	No change for now, but consider larger format for a limited number of maps.		
189		Plan graphics	Open Space			Because this Plan will eventually be reproduced in black and white, it would probably be helpful for the graphics (primarily the maps) to not rely on color to distinguish areas. Perhaps the graphic designer could come up with a pattern-palette that would show up well in B&W	No change. Plan will be available on-line or as color hard copy.		
190		Plan boundary	Planning			3 lots, w/ same ownership and existing use & zoning as the lot fronting Central, were inadvertently excluded from plan area		Amend all maps in Plan accordingly.	
191	82	Zoning map	Planning			Zone W66 C-2 for consistency w/ ownership and existing use & zoning			See Red-Line
192	96, 97	Zoning, W66 MAC	Transit			The idea of creating "private drives" and "roadways" internal to sites (see particularly #3 in the second column on page 97) seems to pervade the document, as does the idea that a 36 foot height limit with stepback is desirable. As written, however, the stepback would apply only to Central. Firstly with R-O-W's that vary from 80 to 200 feet, we question why it is necessary to have such a severe stepback. But also: We submit that, if the purpose is to avoid a "concrete canyon" effect, the high limitation be extended to include internal drives and roadways, which are likely to be considerably narrower and thus even more susceptible to being visually cramped.		Make change to avoid "canyon effect" on-site.	p. 96, Building Height 4. insert after "public ROW", "or the edge of a primary drive off Central"
193	138	Transportation Recommendations, Figure 49	Transit			The diagram seems to show a transit vehicle, running bi-directionally in the outside west-bound lane. This, too, does not support future BRT on Central Avenue.	No change for now. Revised diagram may be available from DMD project consultant.		

#	P.	Section	Commenter	Current Zone	Acres	Comment	No Change	Change	Condition
194	116	General Development Standards, Multi-Family 10	Transit			Item 10, first column of page 116, would limit garages from the facing public ROW. Would this same stricture apply to "private drives" and "roadways" required to be created internal to sites?		Make change to reduce negative impact of garages on streets within developments.	p. 116. 10, replace "public ROW" with "street".
195	24. 60	Existing Conditions	Transit			At the bottom of 24/left column and on pp. 60 in 7.2: We want to make it clear that the property upon which the library is to be built actually belongs to ABQ Ride, and it is unclear what requirements the rest of the site is supposed to meet.		Make corrections	p. 24, bottom left, delete "that meets the requirements". p. 60, delete "Metropolitan Redevelopment"
196	95	Zoning, W66 MAC	Transit			"Limited Uses 1" states that <i>"Within 200 feet of the Central ROW, residential uses shall be prohibited in first floor buildings..."</i> We find this approach, if strictly interpreted, contrary in part to the goals of the Plan -- to activate the street, to create a strong pedestrian aspect, and to strengthen accessibility to transit. By hiding residential a minimum of 200 feet from Central and creating long walking paths to Central <i>through opr past parking lots</i> , the critical nexus between residential uses, pedestrian connectivity, and transit ridership will be broken. While we understand there may be some concerns about noise, lights, etc., we do not understand why any but the sleeping function of a residence needs to be protected. The Plan should at least allow for penetration of the Central street wall to access residential areas, if only with courtyard or lobbies.		See proposed change in response to EPC comment above.	
197	143; 160	Projects List; 1.3.1 c.	Transit			As you know, the Department is about to begin an "Alternative Analysis" for implementing Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) on Central Avenue. One of, if not <i>the</i> key characteristics of BRT is that it runs in dedicated lanes, often in the median if sufficient right-of-way is available. In various places in the latter part of the document, notably page 143 in the closing "Projects" list, many of the existing medians are called out to be landscaped. We wish it to be clear that this goal, and the goal of implementing BRT, may be at odds with each other. In this regard, paragraph "c" under 1.3.1 on page 147 may be sufficient.		Clarify that in the longer term, median projects may be affected by a BRT.	p. 143 1.2.1.a and p. 160 Projects table, add reference to potential BRT