



**Environmental
Planning
Commission**

**Agenda Number: 7
Project Number: 1004677
Case #s: 07EPC 40073/40074/40075
December 20, 2007**

Staff Report

Agent	Moule & Polyzoides Architects
Applicant	Jay Rembe
Requests	Sector Development Plan Map Amendment Site Development Plan for Subdivision Amendment Site Development Plan for Subdivision
Legal Description	all or a portion of Tracts 129A, 131, 133A1, 133A2, 133B, 134 and 135A, MRGCD Map 38; Tract B2A Lands of Albuquerque Little Theater; Tract A-1-A and Tract 129B1A Laguna Subdivision; and Tracts A & B, Lands of H.B. and Calvin Horn
Location	On Central Ave. SW, between Laguna Blvd. SW and San Pasquale Ave. SW
Size	Approximately 9 acres
Existing Zoning	SU-2/CLD and SU-2/SU-1 for Abq. Little Theater
Proposed Zoning	SU-2/SU-1 for a mixed use development

Staff Recommendation

DEFERRAL of 07EPC 40075, based on the findings on page 26, for 30 days.

DEFERRAL of 07EPC 40073, based on the findings on page 29, for 30 days.

DEFERRAL of 07EPC 40074, based on the findings on page 33, for 30 days.

Staff Planner

Catalina Lehner-AICP, Senior Planner

Summary of Analysis

This proposal is for a sector development plan map amendment, a site development plan for subdivision amendment and a site development plan for subdivision with design standards for approx. 9 acres on Central Ave. SW.

The applicant proposes to change the subject site's zoning to "SU-2/SU-1 for a mixed use development" to develop a mixed use commercial/residential project.

Staff finds that overall the proposal partially furthers most applicable Goals and policies. The zone change request has not been adequately justified; explanation is needed and required. The design standards are not strong enough to ensure the applicant's intent for a balanced, walkable neighborhood center. Staff recommends a 30 day deferral.

City Departments and other interested agencies reviewed this application from 11/05/'07 to 11/16/'07.
Agency comments used in the preparation of this report begin on Page 37.

AREA CHARACTERISTICS AND ZONING HISTORY

Surrounding zoning, plan designations, and land uses:

	<i>Zoning</i>	<i>Comprehensive Plan Area; Applicable Rank II & III Plans</i>	<i>Land Use</i>
<i>Site</i>	SU-2/CLD SU-2/SU-1 for Abq. Little Theater	Established Urban, Huning Castle & Raynolds Addition Sector Development Plan, Central Avenue Streetscape Master Plan	Commercial, parking, vacant, residential
<i>North</i>	SU-2/CC, SU-2/Office	Central Urban, Downtown Neighborhoods Sector Development Plan	Commercial, school
<i>South</i>	R-1	Established Urban, Huning Castle & Raynolds Addition Sector Development Plan	Single-family homes
<i>East</i>	SU-2/CC SU-2/CLD	Central Urban, Downtown Neighborhoods Sector Development Plan	Commercial, vacant
<i>West</i>	SU-2/SU-1 for Abq. Little Theater SU-2/CLD	Established Urban, Huning Castle & Raynolds Addition Sector Dev. Plan	Parking, multi-family residential

Proposal & Context

This three-part proposal is for a sector development plan map amendment, an amendment to a site development plan for subdivision and a site development plan for subdivision with design standards for the following, approximately 9 acre property: all or a portion of Tracts 129A, 131, 133A1, 133A2, 133B, 134 and 135A, MRGCD Map 38; Tract B2A Lands of Albuquerque Little Theater; Tract A-1-A and Tract 129B1A Laguna Subdivision; and Tracts A & B, Lands of H.B. and Calvin Horn (the “subject site”).

The applicant proposes to change the subject site’s zoning from SU-2/CLD (Commercial and/or Low-Density Apartments) and SU-2/SU-1 for Albuquerque Little Theater to “SU-2/SU-1 for a mixed use development” in order to develop a mixed-use commercial and residential project to consist of two restaurants with full-service liquor, four office/retail buildings, a larger office/retail building (possible grocery store/deli) and a complex of residential units (3 live/work, 44 apartments or condos). The proposed site development plan for subdivision amendment is to amend the previously approved site development plan for subdivision for Country Club Plaza I, an approx. 4.5 acre site (06EPC-00143). The only portion of Country Club Plaza I affected by the current request is the approx. 1.3 acre northwest portion of the subject site, for which commercial buildings are now proposed instead of townhomes.

Currently the subject site contains various small commercial uses, some residential uses, parking areas and vacant land. The existing restaurant and auto body shop that front Central Ave. are not a part of the subject site.

The subject site is located on the southern side of Central Ave. SW, between Laguna Blvd. SW and San Pasquale Ave. SW. To the north, across Central Ave., are various small commercial uses including a fast-food restaurant and a pharmacy. To the northeast, also across Central Ave., is a school. To the east are various small commercial uses. To the west lies a parking lot for the theater and a condominium development. Several single-family homes of the Huning Castle Addition lie along the subject site's southern boundary.

The subject site lies within the boundaries of the Established Urban Area of the Comprehensive Plan and within the Huning Castle & Reynolds Addition Sector Development Plan (HCRASDP), in the Huning Castle area. The subject site is not in a designated Activity Center. Rather, it is located between the Old Town Community Activity Center approx. 0.15 mile to the northwest and the Downtown Major Activity Center approx. 0.6 miles to the southeast. Central Ave., a designated Major Transit Corridor, bounds the subject site to the north.

History & Background

Overview: Much of the subject site's history corresponds to that of the Huning Castle Neighborhood area and is found in the Huning Castle & Reynolds Addition Sector Development Plan (HCRASDP) on p. 6. The subject site is located in the Huning Castle Area, which was platted as the Huning Castle Addition in March 1928. The Huning Castle Neighborhood grew around the Country Club, a two story Mediterranean style building that was built in 1928-1929, which was actually Albuquerque's second country club.

Though building slowed down during the Depression years, after World War II the remaining lots in the Huning Castle Addition were developed with large, architect-designed homes. This area contains many fine examples of Mediterranean, California Mission and Pueblo Revival architecture. Several homes from the 1920s and 1930s have been accepted on the National Register of Historic Places for their fine design.

The Reynolds Addition, which lies east of the Huning Castle Addition, was originally platted in 1912. Smaller single-family homes and apartment courts characterize the Reynolds Addition, which continues the style of the Huning Castle Addition but on a smaller scale.

Site Specifics: The subject site is occupied by some longstanding uses such as Kelly's Transmissions, a vehicle storage yard, a flower shop and Horn Oil Company and Lodge, though not all of these will be affected by the current proposal. The Sandia Theater (see attachments) is located on the subject site's northwestern corner. From what Staff can determine, the vacant parts of the subject site have been vacant for many years.

Only one case on file relates directly to the subject site. In March 2006, the EPC approved a site development plan for subdivision with design standards for an approx. 4.5 acre site (06EPC-00143) often referred to as the Country Club Plaza I project, part of which is included in the current proposal. The 2006 site development plan was for a redevelopment project consisting of residential uses (townhomes and

villas) and commercial uses. Due to numerous site development plan deficiencies, 48 conditions of approval were needed. The EPC's approval was appealed (AC-06-9) by the Downtown Neighborhood Association and was heard by City Council, which denied the appeal at its August 9, 2006 hearing.

The Country Club Plaza I project entered the Development Review Board (DRB) process and was indefinitely deferred at the applicant's request. The proposal was approved at the November 28, 2007 DRB hearing. Note that the approx. 1.1 northwestern corner of the subject site of 06EPC-00143 was not a part of the DRB proposal.

Nearby Sites: In July 2004, the EPC approved a proposal for a sector development plan map amendment, a site development plan for subdivision and a site development plan for building permit (Project #1003010) for an approx. 5 acre site adjacent to the west. This site, which belonged to the Albuquerque Little theater, now contains a condominium project.

In February 2003, the Zoning Hearing Examiner denied an application for a special exception for the small, narrow property included in the Country Club Plaza I project and intended to provide access from Laguna Ave. The request was for variance from the 26 ft. height requirement, so that the applicant could construct a residence in excess of 26 ft. Since a residence was not constructed on this parcel, it remained vacant and later became part of the Country Club Plaza I project.

Definitions (Zoning Code §14-16-1-5)

Apartment: Structures containing two or more dwelling units each, including dwelling units which do not have a separate entrance leading directly to the outdoors at ground level.

Setback: The shortest distance between a structure and a lot line or future street line.

Shopping Center Site: A premises containing five or more acres, zoned P, C-1, C-2, C-3, M-1, M-2 or a combination thereof; but excluding premises used and proposed to be used only for manufacturing, assembling, treating repairing, rebuilding, wholesaling and warehousing.

Site Development Plan for Subdivision: An accurate plan at a scale of at least 1 inch to 100 feet which covers at least one lot and specifies the site, proposed use, pedestrian and vehicular ingress and egress, any internal circulation requirements and, for each lot, maximum building height, minimum building setback, and maximum total dwelling units and/or nonresidential uses' maximum floor area ratio.

Townhouse or Town House: One of a group of two to eight attached dwelling units divided from each other by common walls, each having a separate entrance leading directly to the outdoors at ground level, and each having at least one-fourth of its heated and unheated floor area approximately at grade. A townhouse building is one type of apartment.

Variance: Variation from the strict, literal application of this article; however, the allowable use of premises may never be changed via a variance.”

Yard, Front: That part of a lot between the front lot line and the front façades of the principal building on the lot, and extended to both side lot lines.

Yard, Rear: That part of a lot between the rear lot line and the rear façades of the principal building on the lot, and extended to both side lot lines.

Yard, Side: That part of a lot not surrounded by buildings and not in the front or rear yard.

Long Range Roadway System

The Long Range Roadway System (LRRS) map, produced by the Mid-Region Council of Governments (MRCOG), identifies the functional classifications of roadways. Central Ave., one of the most important principal arterials in the City, has a 156 foot right-of-way and is listed as a high capacity transit corridor on the Long Range High Capacity Transit Map (Source: MRCOG). Lomas Blvd., also a principal arterial, has a 156 foot right-of-way. Laguna Blvd. and San Pasquale Ave. are local streets.

Public Facilities/Community Services

Transit: The Comprehensive Plan designates Central Ave. as a Major Transit Corridor (from Louisiana Blvd. to Atrisco Rd.). Lomas Blvd. is an Enhanced Transit Corridor from Rio Grande Blvd. to Wyoming Blvd..

The subject site is well-served by Transit. Two transit routes, Route #66 (a standard bus route and Route #766 (the Rapid Ride route Red line) run along Central Ave. Route #66 runs every 20 minutes, from early morning to night (about 9:45 pm). Route #766, the Rapid Ride Red Line, runs every 10 minutes and stops less frequently, and also has service from early morning to night (about 8 pm). A short walk from the subject site, Route #36-Twelfth St./Rio Grande, runs approx. hourly during the day along Lomas Blvd. Route #790, the Rapid Ride Blue Line that serves UNM-Coors Blvd., runs along Lomas Blvd. but has longer hours.

Police: The Gerald Kline Memorial Substation Valley Area Command, at 5408 2nd St. NW, provides police coverage.

Fire: A fire station is located about 0.5 miles south of the subject site.

APS: Lew Wallace Elementary School, Washington Middle School, and Albuquerque High School serve the area.

Zoning

The applicant proposes to change the subject site's zoning from SU-2/CLD and SU-2/SU-1 for Albuquerque Little Theater to "SU-2/SU-1 for a mixed-use development" in order to develop a mixed-use commercial and residential project (see "Proposed Zoning" below).

Existing Zoning: The subject site is zoned SU-2/CLD and SU-2/SU-1 for Albuquerque Little Theater. The SU-2 zone (Zoning Code §14-16-2-23) "allows a mixture of uses controlled by a sector development

plan”, in this case the Huning Castle & Raynolds Addition Sector Development Plan (HCRASDP). The CLD (Commercial and/or Low-Density Apartment) zone “provides suitable sites for houses, townhouses, low density apartments and commercial uses.” (p. 17). CLD permissive uses are uses permissive in the R-2 zone and various commercial uses as elaborated in a lengthy list (see attachment). Some allowable commercial uses are, for example, bank, day care, grocery, jewelry store, restaurant (no drive-thru) and studio (various types).

Some of the CLD zone requirements are listed below (see attachment for the remainder). These are the four requirements that the applicant tends to vary from with the proposed SU-1 zoning.

Density- maximum residential density is .61 FAR.

Setbacks- Central Ave., not less than 5 ft.

Laguna/15th/San Pasquale- not less than 10 ft.

No pool/dumpster/building closer than 50 ft. from the R-1 zone or 15 ft. from any other lot line.

Height- 26 ft. no closer than 50 ft. from adjacent R-1 zone. If over 26 ft., must fall within a 25 degree angle plane. Otherwise, height as in the R-1 zone, but shall not exceed 46 ft.

Off-Street Parking- provided as in the Zoning Code.

Though it would be possible to request a variance for each through the Zoning Hearing Examiner’s office, at least four variances would be needed to accommodate the proposal under the current zoning. Also, the far southwestern lot, zoned SU-2/SU-1 for Albuquerque Little Theater, is particular to a theater use and not to the proposed commercial and residential uses. The applicant decided to propose a zone change for the entirety of the subject site.

The SU-1 zone (Zoning Code §14-16-2-22) provides suitable sites for uses that are special. The existing SU-2/SU-1 for Albuquerque Little Theater zoning is particular to the theater use, including the building and its parking lot.

Proposed Zoning: This has caused some confusion. The applicant is now, at Staff’s suggestion, requesting the following zoning: SU-2/SU-1 for a mixed use development. This zoning has been used recently on Harvard St. and in the Sawmill area. The SU-1 zone already exists in the HCRASDP (ex. SU-1 for Albuquerque Little Theater) and therefore can be used without consideration by the City Council. Note that, with the requested zoning, there would be departures from the sector plan requirements of the CLD zone.

Neither the originally requested zoning on the application, “SU-2/CLD with exceptions” nor the later requested “SU-2/SU-1 CLD as regulated by the SU-2/CLD zone except for density, setbacks, height and off-street parking” would have worked from a legal and enforcement standpoint for the following reasons: In the opinion of City Legal, the exceptions to the CLD zone would have turned the formerly proposed zoning into another category. Therefore, either of the formerly requested zones would have created a new zone in the HCRASDP. New zones require a text amendment to Plan and must be considered by City Council. If relief of a requirement in the CLD zone is desired, a variance is needed.

The intent of the SU-1 zone is to provide suitable sites for uses that are special, and for which the appropriateness of the use to a specific location depends upon the character of the site design. SU-1 zoning requires review by the Environmental Planning Commission (EPC). Additionally, “development within the SU-1 zone may only occur in conformance with an approved site development plan”. An application for a change to SU-1 zoning, at a minimum, must be accompanied by a site development plan for subdivision (Subsection 25b) as is the case here.

Sector Plan: The Huning Castle & Raynolds Addition Sector Development Plan (HCRASDP) applies and specifies zoning for the area. The zoning map (see p. 15) reflects zoning and developed areas as of approx. 1980. SU-2 zoning, available to sector plans, is used in the HCRASDP. Therefore, the request to change the subject site’s zoning is referred to specifically as a sector development plan map amendment instead of a zone map amendment, a term used when a sector plan is not involved.

⇒ Zoning Code §14-16-2-23, SU-2 zone, requires the Planning Commission to make a recommendation to City Council if a decision would impose or eliminate SU-2 zoning for an area over one block (approximately 10 acres). *Because the subject site is not greater than 10 acres, this request is not required to be forwarded to the City Council.*

Compliance: Zoning Code §14-16-3-11 (B) states “...Site Development Plans are expected to meet the requirements of adopted city policies and procedures.” This means that the proposed site development plan for building permit and site development plan for subdivision must meet the requirements found in applicable plans, meaning the Comprehensive Plan and the West Side Strategic Plan.

Design Standards

The purpose of design standards is to provide guidance for a development in order to ensure that the development will be a high quality that exceeds minimum Zoning Code requirements and furthers the intent of applicable City Plans, goals and policies. Design standards are included here with the proposed site development plan for subdivision.

I. ANALYSIS -CONFORMANCE TO ADOPTED PLANS AND POLICIES

A) Albuquerque/Bernalillo County Comprehensive Plan- Rank I

The subject site is located in an area that the Albuquerque/Bernalillo County Comprehensive Plan has designated Established Urban. The goal of the Established Urban Area is “to create a quality urban environment which perpetuates the tradition of identifiable, individual but integrated communities within the metropolitan area and which offers variety and maximum choice in housing, transportation, work areas and life styles, while creating a visually pleasing built environment.” Applicable policies include:

Land Use Policies-

Policy II.B.5a: The Developing Urban and Established Urban areas as shown by the Plan map shall allow a full range of urban land uses, resulting in an overall gross density up to 5 dwelling units per acre.

Policy II.B.5e: New growth shall be accommodated through development in areas where vacant land is contiguous to existing or programmed urban facilities and services and where the integrity of existing neighborhoods can be ensured.

Policy II.B.5d: The location, intensity and design of new development shall respect existing neighborhood values, natural environmental conditions and carrying capacities, scenic resources, and resources of other social, cultural, recreational concern.

Policy II.B.5h: Higher density housing is most appropriate in the following situations:

- In designated Activity Centers.
- In areas with excellent access to the major street network.
- In areas where a mixed density pattern is already established by zoning or use, where it is compatible with existing area land uses and where adequate infrastructure is or will be available.
- In areas now predominantly zoned single-family only where it comprises a complete block face and faces onto similar or higher density development; up to 10 dwelling units per net acre.
- In areas where a transition is needed between single-family homes and much more intensive development: densities will vary up to 30 dwelling units per net acre according to the intensity of development in adjacent areas.

Policy II.B.5i: Employment and service uses shall be located to complement residential areas and shall be sited to minimize adverse effects of noise, lighting, pollution, and traffic on residential environments.

Policy II.B.5j: Where new commercial development occurs, it should generally be located in existing commercially zoned areas as follows:

- In small neighborhood-oriented centers provided with pedestrian and bicycle access within reasonable distance of residential areas for walking or bicycling.
- In larger area-wide shopping centers located at intersections of arterial streets and provided with access via mass transit; more than one shopping center should be allowed at an intersection only when transportation problems do not result.
- In freestanding retailing and contiguous storefronts along streets in older neighborhoods.

Policy 5k: Land adjacent to arterial streets shall be planned to minimize harmful effects of traffic; livability and safety of established residential neighborhoods shall be protected in transportation planning and operations.

Policy II.B.5l: Quality and innovation in design shall be encouraged in all new development; design shall be encouraged which is appropriate to the plan area.

Policy II.B.5m: Urban and site design which maintains and enhances unique vistas and improves the quality of the visual environment shall be encouraged.

Policy II.B.5o: Redevelopment and rehabilitation of older neighborhoods in the Established Urban Area shall be continued and strengthened.

Community Identity and Urban Design Goal-

Goal: to preserve and enhance the natural and built characteristics, social, cultural and historical features that identify Albuquerque and Bernalillo County sub-areas as distinct communities and collections of neighborhoods.

Activity Centers-

Goal: The goal is to expand and strengthen concentrations of moderate and high-density mixed land use and social/economic activities which reduce urban sprawl, auto travel needs, and service costs, and which enhance the identity of Albuquerque and its communities.

Policy II.B.7.i: Multi-unit housing is an appropriate use in Neighborhood, Community and Major Activity Centers.

Transportation and Transit Policies-

Goal: To develop corridors, both streets and adjacent land uses, that provide a balanced circulation system through efficient placement of employment and services, and encouragement of bicycling, walking, and use of transit/paratransit as alternatives to automobile travel, while providing sufficient roadway capacity to meet mobility and access needs.

Policy II.D.4c: In order to add to transit ridership, and where it will not destabilize adjacent neighborhoods, additional dwelling units are encouraged close to Major Transit and Enhanced Transit streets.

Policy II.D.4g: Pedestrian opportunities shall be promoted and integrated into development to create safe and pleasant non-motorized travel conditions.

The proposed mixed-use development partially furthers Policy II.B.5a-full range of urban land uses because it would facilitate additional commercial, residential and possibly office uses in the area thus contributing to variety. However, a variety of land uses already exists in the area. The subject site is contiguous to existing urban facilities and services, though it is possible that the integrity of the existing neighborhood may be affected. Therefore, the proposal partially furthers Policy II.B.5e-programmed facilities /neighborhood integrity.

Policy II.B.5d states that the location, design and intensity of new development must respect neighborhood values, carrying capacities and resources of other social, cultural and recreational concern. Some neighbors generally support the proposal, but others have concerns such as traffic. The proposed intensity contrasts with the adjacent single-family homes, but there are other relatively intense projects in the area and the design is appropriate. The proposal partially furthers Policy II.B.5d.

Policy II.B.5l calls for new development to be of a quality design appropriate to the area. The proposed design standards contain great architectural detail that will ensure quality building design that is appropriate for the area, though some of the site standards need strengthening. The proposal

furthers Policy II.B.5l-design quality/innovation. Though the proposed development will generally improve the quality of the visual environment, the urban and site design may not maintain and enhance unique vistas for some. Therefore, the proposal partially furthers Policy II.B.5m-site design/visual environment.

The proposal furthers Policy II.B.5o-redevelopment and rehabilitation of older neighborhoods, because it would constitute a redevelopment effort in an older neighborhood in the Established Urban area. The proposal furthers Policy II.B.5h-higher density housing. Though not located in a designated Activity Center, a mixed density pattern is already established in the area and access to the major street network is excellent, though non-vehicle access and circulation would benefit from improvement. Also, the current zoning already allows higher density housing (R-2).

The proposal partially furthers the Activity Center Goal. The proposal would facilitate construction of a mixed-use, commercial/residential project that would contribute to creating high-density mixed land use in the area, which would generally reduce urban sprawl and auto travel needs. The subject site is located between two designated Activity Centers and not within one, but already has zoning for commercial and residential uses and would function as a de facto neighborhood activity center. The proposal does not further Policy II.B.7.i, which states that multi-unit housing is appropriate inside the designated activity centers.

Regarding the Transportation and Transit Goal, the proposal partially furthers it. The proposed mixed-use project would place employment, services and housing in proximity to Central Ave., a corridor with a lot of roadway capacity. Alternatives to auto travel would be facilitated, though improvements to the site design are needed to encourage walking, bicycling and transit usage to take advantage of the location. Similarly, the proposal partially furthers Policy II.D.4g-pedestrian opportunities/safe and pleasant conditions. Some pedestrian opportunities would be provided, but more choices are needed and internal site circulation needs improvement especially since the subject site would function as a de facto neighborhood activity center. Policy II.D.4c-dwelling units/transit streets, is furthered. The additional dwelling units would be close to a Major Transit corridor and would likely add to transit ridership.

The proposal furthers the Community Identity and Urban Design Goal. The architectural detail in the proposed design standards would ensure that the buildings are compatible with the historical and social character of the existing built environment in the area.

B) Huning Castle & Raynolds Addition Sector Development Plan (HCRASDP) - Rank III

The Huning Castle and Raynolds Addition Sector Development Plan (HCRASDP) is a rank-three plan adopted by the City Council in January 1981 (see attachment). The Plan generally encompasses properties south of Central Avenue between 8th Street and the Rio Grande. The Rio Grande also serves as the southwestern boundary of the Plan area.

The Plan's overarching goal is to maintain the area's special qualities such as varied architectural styles, mature landscaping and neighborhood scale. The Plan contains a summary of Objectives and

Recommendations in the following categories: Land use and Zoning, Transportation, Social Services, Parks, Housing and Neighborhood Maintenance, Public Facilities, Economic Development and Historic Preservation. The following apply to this request:

Land Use & Zoning Objective 2: Evaluate development on Central Avenue to encourage mixed use, neighborhood oriented development.

The proposal partially furthers Land Use & Zoning Objective 2. The proposed development would contain a mixture of uses-commercial, residential and possibly office. The subject site would function as a de facto neighborhood center and would basically be of a neighborhood scale. However, the proposal needs to be better integrated with the surrounding area and have better non-auto circulation to fulfill the Plan's intent regarding neighborhood oriented development.

Land Use & Zoning Objective 3: Use zoning to stabilize the residential character of the Plan area and to enhance the positive aspects of the area, including its distinctive architecture, pleasant landscaping, and human scale.

The proposal partially furthers Land Use & Zoning Objective 3. Regarding properties on Central Ave., the Plan's intent was to establish zoning to allow low-density apartments and limited commercial development (p. 11). The proposed residential density is higher than what was envisioned, so the proposed zoning may not stabilize the area's residential character although the proposed site development plan was created with CLD zoning in mind. However, the proposed zoning (since it is SU-1) is linked to the proposed site development plan which would provides for distinctive architecture but is somewhat weaker with respect to landscaping and human scale elements.

Housing and Neighborhood Maintenance Objective 1: Improve the overall appearance of the area.

The proposal furthers Housing and Neighborhood Maintenance Objective 1 and would generally improve the overall appearance of the area. The proposed design standards would ensure architectural compatibility with the built environment, and the new buildings would generally constitute an improvement of the mostly vacant subject site.

Economic Development Objective 2: Encourage new neighborhood oriented commercial development.

The proposal partially furthers Economic Development Objective 2. The proposal would provide a variety of commercial uses that would be available to current and new residents in the area, as well as to people who do not live nearby. The term "neighborhood oriented" is not defined in the context of the HCRASDP. However, neighborhood oriented can be considered using the concepts of purpose, service area and scale in the Comprehensive Plan. Staff finds that the proposed development is not as connected to the neighborhood as it should be, especially since it would function as a de facto neighborhood activity center that is intended to be the least auto dependent, with active pedestrian and bicycle connections and walkable from one side to the other.

Historic Preservation Objective 1: Preserve structures of historic significance.

A structure of historical significance, the Horn Oil Company site, is included in the subject site because it was a part of the previously approved site development plan (06EPC-00143). However, the Horn Oil Company site is not affected by the current proposal. The approx. 4 acres, which are included with the proposed design standards, do not contain any structures of historic significance. The Sandia Theater Building has an architecturally interesting façade, but the building as a whole has been altered so much throughout the years that it cannot be considered of historical significance (see attachment). Therefore, Historic Preservation Objective 1 does not apply to the current proposal.

C) Central Avenue Streetscape Urban Design Master Plan

Adopted by City Council in April 2002 (Enactment 21-2002), the Central Avenue Streetscape Plan (CASP) is intended to serve as a blueprint to guide the redevelopment of properties along Central Avenue. The CASUDP is part of a revitalization strategy that encompasses the entire length of old Route 66 through the City, though the Plan itself covers Central Avenue from 8th St. to the top of Nine Mile Hill (the western City limits).

The Master Plan is organized into six chapters. Chapters 3, 4, 5 and 6, the Urban Design Master Plan, the Transportation Plan, the Economic Development Plan and the Implementation Plan, respectively, have been developed so they could function as stand-alone documents. The Master Plan provides an overview and addresses the aforementioned subjects for each of the following subareas: West Downtown/Park District, Old Town/Bosque District, Southwest Vista District and the Route 66 Mesa District. Topics addressed for each include urban design criteria, economic activity and transportation.

Urban Design Master Plan: The subject site is located at the western end of the West Downtown/Park District and is depicted in the 14th to Laguna section (p. 3-6). Improvements are shown nearby, but none specific to the subject site. The existing bus stop near Garcia's restaurant is depicted. A plant palette is provided (p. 3-42) by District to ensure a consistent theme.

Design objective: to create an attractive corridor that provides for multiple transportation modes (p. 1-1).

Transportation Plan: The proposed improvements in the West Downtown/Park District mostly consist of improving the pedestrian and bicyclist environment at varying levels along the corridor (p. 4-2). All new intersections are intended to have handicap access and new delineated crosswalks. A continuous parkway sidewalk of 13 ft. is envisioned.

Transportation objective: The new Central Avenue should facilitate use by pedestrians, bicyclists, cruisers, shoppers and commuters. Links...along the entire corridor must be developed to promote alternative transportation uses and a vibrant street life (p. 1-1).

Economic Development Plan: The economic analysis identifies commercial node shopping centers at Old Town and Down Town (p. 5-2), but not at the subject site. The Plan notes that “the less intense commercial character of the street along this section of the corridor matches the quiet character of the surrounding residential neighborhoods” (p. 5-4). However, the entirety of the subject site from approximately Laguna to San Pasquale is shown as redevelopable land on a map.

Economic objective: Mixed uses of housing, office and retail development will stimulate the public use of the street (p. 1-1).

Implementation Plan: This Plan shows phasing and City projects. No specific projects, as of the Plan’s writing, are shown for the West Downtown/Park district area in which the subject site is located (p. 6-1).

Staff finds that the proposal furthers the above-cited objectives of the Central Avenue Streetscape Plan (CASP) in a general sense, but that details are needed in the submittal to ensure that the development’s specifics make the CASP’s vision a reality. With regards to the Design objective, the proposal would contribute to an attractive corridor but non-vehicle opportunities need to be improved. The same can be said of the Transportation objective. The subject site needs to be more connected to Central Avenue and have better internal circulation. The Economic objective can also be furthered in a general sense, but the degree to which the development stimulates public use of the street depends upon the site design. In sum, the proposal partially furthers the objectives of the CASP.

ADDITIONAL ISSUES

Traffic

Traffic Impact Study (TIS): The Country Club Plaza TIS has been completed. The front-end TIS text is provided as an attachment. The TIS uses 2010 as build and no build analysis years. 6,923 vehicle trip ends per day are projected. The TIS concludes that there will be no significant impact provided that the mitigation recommendations are implemented. There are a few mitigation recommendations, which are to maintain adequate sight distances and to have access from three driveways (see attachment-p. 15 of TIS)

Air Quality

Background: The last violation of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for carbon monoxide (CO) in Albuquerque/Bernalillo County occurred in December 1991. Since then, monitored CO levels have steadily declined to their present levels, which are approximately 39% of the 8-hour standard (28% of the 1-hour standard). The federally-approved Limited Maintenance Plan for Carbon Monoxide (2006-2016), following guidance from the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), demonstrates that CO levels are well below the 85% EPA requires to qualify an area for a “limited” maintenance plan. Therefore, there are no emission budgets and no need for development projects to conform to air quality plans. Local CO control strategies, such as the oxygenated fuels program and the woodburning program, combined with national advances in vehicle technology and mobile source modeling, have succeeded in dramatically decreasing CO pollution.

Requirement: However, Zoning Code §14-16-3-14 remains on the books. An Air Quality Impact Analysis (AQIA), a study of CO levels at a given intersection, continues to be required even though it is

not possible that Albuquerque/Bernalillo County will approach CO levels that would cause an exceedance of the Federal standards (see above). The AQIA is required because the proposed uses generate 9,103 vehicle trip ends per day, which exceeds the threshold of 4,700. The AQIA has been completed. The Environmental Health Department's Air Quality Division has not reviewed it yet, though it is not likely to present any significant impacts for the reasons mentioned above.

II. SECTOR DEVELOPMENT PLAN MAP AMENDMENT

Resolution 270-1980 (Policies for Zone Map Amendments)

Requirements

Resolution 270-1980 outlines policies and requirements for deciding zone map change applications pursuant to the City Zoning Code. The applicant must provide sound justification for the proposed change and demonstrate that several tests have been met. *The burden is on the applicant to show why a change should be made*, not on the City to show why a change should not be made.

The applicant must demonstrate that the existing zoning is inappropriate because of at least one of three findings: 1) there was an error when the existing zone map pattern was created; or 2) changed neighborhood or community conditions justify the change; or 3) a different land use category is more advantageous to the community, as articulated in the Comprehensive Plan or other City master plan.

Request

This request to change the subject site's zoning is referred to specifically as a sector development plan map amendment, instead of a zone map amendment, because a sector development plan is involved. Changing the zoning would result in a change to the zoning map in the Huning Castle Reynolds Addition Sector Development Plan (HCRASDP).

The subject site currently has two zoning designations: SU-2/CLD for the majority of the approx. 4 acres that the zone change request consists of, and SU-2/SU-1 for Albuquerque Little Theater for the approx. 1.1 acre southwestern corner of the subject site. Rather than of pursue separate variance applications for density, setbacks, height and parking, the applicant's intention is to change the subject site's zoning designations to allow the proposed mixed-use development. This can be best achieved by requesting SU-1 zoning that is specifically tied to the proposed site development plan for subdivision for the proposed mixed use development.

Therefore, the applicant is requesting that the current zoning be changed to "SU-2/SU-1 for a Mixed-Use Development", which was found to be the most appropriate zoning through Staff research. Neither the originally requested zoning on the application, "SU-2/CLD with exceptions" nor the later requested "SU-2/SU-1 CLD as regulated by the SU-2/CLD zone except for density, setbacks, height and off-street parking" would have worked from a legal and enforcement standpoint (see attachment and Zoning section of this report, p. 5).

Justification

Applicant: The applicant believes that the existing zoning is inappropriate due to: 1) an error when the sector plan was created in 1981, 2) changed neighborhood conditions, and 3) a different zone category is

more advantageous to the community. The vacant and derelict subject site needs to be revitalized, as does this whole stretch of Central Ave. The principal reason for this zone change is to increase the flexibility of very minor and outdated requirements for setbacks, height, parking and density in order to facilitate development of an infill, mixed-use development project. No new uses or material changes to the site's current zoning are proposed. The request is thoroughly consistent with an overwhelming majority of goals set forth in the Comprehensive Plan, the Huning Castle-Raynolds Addition Sector Development Plan and the Central Avenue Streetscape Master Plan.

Comprehensive Plan Citations: The applicant cites the following policies: 1) the Developing and Established Urban Area Goal, 2) Developing and Established Urban Area land use policies: full range of urban land uses (Policy II.B.5a), new growth/infrastructure/neighborhood integrity (Policy III.B.5e), clustering of homes (Policy II.B.5f), topography/trail corridors (Policy II.B.5g), higher density housing location (Policy II.B.5h), employment/service use location (Policy II.B.5i), commercial development location (Policy II.B.5j), land adjacent to arterial streets (Policy II.B.5k), new development/design quality and innovation (Policy II.B.5l), site design/visual environment (Policy II.B.5m), areas prematurely subdivided (Policy II.B.5n), redevelopment of older neighborhoods (Policy II.B.5o) and cost-effective redevelopment techniques (Policy II.B.5p). 3) the Activity Centers Goal and Activity Center Policies A and B. 4) Central Urban Area Goal and Policies A and B.

Huning Castle-Raynolds Addition Sector Development Plan Citations: The applicant cites the Plan's six major topics: land use and zoning, transportation, social services, housing and neighborhood maintenance, public facilities and economic development and one or two policies within each of these.

Central Avenue Streetscape Master Plan: The applicant cites some text (no reference provided) and specific recommendations for an unspecified length of Central Avenue (no reference provided).

- The applicant believes that the proposed zone map amendment conforms to R270-1980 as follows:
- A. The proposal does not contemplate any new uses or material changes to the current zoning. A mixed use development is thoroughly consistent with an overwhelming majority of goals in applicable plans, and in no way would compromise the health, safety, morals and general welfare of the City.
 - B. The proposal maintains the site's stability because it does not contemplate any new uses or material changes to the current zoning. There are some minor discrepancies, but the SU-1 zone is the appropriate mechanism to ensure that any plan variances are not harmful to the community.
 - C. The proposed zone change is not in conflict in any way with adopted City Plans, but in fact is "the most effective means to effectively promote an overwhelming majority of the goals" set forth in applicable plans and would directly achieve the following goals [applicant lists goals and policies and provides a brief discussion regarding each].
 - D. The existing zoning is inappropriate due to changed conditions. Growth and market demand are always changed conditions. The approval of Country Club Plaza I made it recognized that this stretch of Central needs to be revitalized. Market conditions have changed in this area. Regarding a different

zoning category being more appropriate, the proposal does not contemplate any new uses or material changes to the current zoning. As for an error, an error “may not have been created back in 1981”, but very minor and subtle modifications should be considered.

- E. No new uses are proposed that are not allowed under the current SU-2/CLD zoning. Therefore, no use in this application would be harmful to the neighborhood or the community.
 - F. No City funds or capital outlay are required or anticipated for this development project.
 - G. The cost of land or other economic considerations are not presented here as a central justification for this zone change. The goal is to ensure the flexibility necessary to develop a pedestrian-friendly, neighborhood serving mixed-use development.
 - H. This application for a zone change does not rely upon its location on a major street for its justification. No new uses or material changes to the current zoning are proposed.
 - I. Not applicable, this is not a spot zone.
 - J. Not applicable, this is not a strip zone.
- The applicant believes that the following four reasons justify the proposed zone change:
1. The request is thoroughly consistent with an overwhelming majority of goals set forth in the Comprehensive Plan, the Huning Castle-Raynolds Addition Sector Development Plan and the Central Avenue Streetscape Master Plan.
 2. Changed community conditions, such as growth and market conditions in the area, help justify the project, especially the approval of Country Club Plaza I which made it known that this stretch of Central needs to be revitalized.
 3. The proposal does not contemplate any new uses or material changes to the current zoning, and does not propose any different use category for these lands.
 4. The zone change is needed to increase the flexibility of very minor and outdated requirements for setbacks, height, parking and density in order to build a mixed-use development.

Staff Analysis:

With respect to the applicant’s justification and R270-1980 (Sections A-J above), Staff finds the following:

- A. The applicant cited several Goals and policies and offered a brief explanation regarding the relationship of each to the proposal. Some of the explanations of how each relates to the proposal are acceptable, but many are not because they need to be more thoroughly**

elaborated upon and fail to provide a convincing demonstration that a Goal or policy is furthered. For instance, the explanations of Policy II.B.5h-higher density housing location, and Policy II.B.5j-commercial development location, do not explain HOW the proposal furthers the policies, just that it does. Health, safety, morals and general welfare are mentioned, but the insufficient policy analysis does not prove that the proposal is consistent with them.

- B. Stability of land use and zoning is insufficiently addressed. Staff understands that no new uses besides those already allowed in the SU-2/CLD zone are proposed, but has never heard the term “material changes” in reference to zoning. The task, however, is to explain HOW the proposal would contribute to stability of land use and zoning. The applicant states that the SU-1 zone is the appropriate mechanism to ensure that variances from plan requirements are not harmful to the community. Staff agrees that SU-1 zoning is appropriate, but finds that the applicant does not address how the proposed departures from setback, height, parking and density will (or will not) ensure stability of land use and zoning.**
- C. The applicant cited several Goals and policies and offered a brief explanation regarding the relationship of each to the proposal. Some cited Goals and policies, however, are not applicable. For example, the subject site is not located in the Central Urban area. Other significant Goals and policies, such as those dealing with housing and economic development, were not included. Some of the explanations of how each relates to the proposal are acceptable, but many are not because they need to be more thoroughly elaborated upon and fail to provide a convincing demonstration that a Goal or policy is furthered (see A above). The explanation for the Activity Center Goal is insufficient because it parrots back the language in the Goal without providing a HOW or WHY the proposal furthers (or does not further) the Goal.**
- D. The applicant mostly refers to changed community conditions, but also discusses more advantageous to the community and an error as reasons that justify the proposed zone change. The approval of the Country Club Plaza I project created a recent changed condition, but what is the logical nexus between this change and the proposal that makes the existing zoning inappropriate? Staff considers market demand to be an economic condition, and not the community condition referred to in R270-1980. No explanation of “more advantageous to the community” is provided. The verbiage reiterates that no different uses are being proposed, but WHY is the proposed zoning more advantageous (or not) to the community? The applicant mentions that an error “may have not been created” back in 1981, but proceeds to discuss it anyway which is not needed or beneficial. Staff’s understanding is that the error used as justification for a zone change request refers to a mistake made by Staff such as a type-O on a zoning map.**
- E. Staff understands that no uses are proposed other than those already allowed in the SU-2/CLD zone. Therefore, the applicant states, no use in this application would be harmful since the allowable uses have already been considered. While this may be the case, Section E**

requires a discussion of the permissive uses in the proposed zone. The applicant did not complete this task.

- F. Staff acknowledges the applicant’s statement that the no City funds or capital outlay are required or anticipated for this development project.**
- G. Staff acknowledges the applicant’s statement that economic considerations are not presented as a central justification for this zone change. However, the applicant should have openly stated that economic considerations are a significant factor in this request. With the subject site’s current CLD (commercial, low-density apartment) zoning, the applicant can pursue a mixed-use development, just not with the height, density setbacks and parking desired which make the project economically feasible in the applicant’s opinion.**
- H. Staff notes the applicant’s statement that this zone change does not rely upon its location on a major street for its justification. However, the subject site’s location on a Central Avenue is a major factor in this proposal and should be addressed. Staff still doesn’t understand what “material changes” to zoning means since an explanation is not provided.**
- I. The applicant states that Section I is not applicable. Staff does not agree. Section I, like the rest of R270-1980, must be addressed. The applicant is required to explain why or why not the zone change request would (or would not) result in a spot zone.**
- J. The applicant states that Section J is not applicable. Staff does not agree. Section J, like the rest of R270-1980, must be addressed. The applicant is required to explain why or why not the zone change request would (or would not) result in a strip zone.**

With R270-1980 in mind, and the applicant’s four reasons justifying the proposed zone change, Staff finds the following:

- 1. The applicant has begun to establish a policy-based justification, but many of the explanations need additional thought and strengthening because they do not provide a convincing demonstration that a Goal or policy is furthered. Some cited Goals and policies, however, are not applicable while others that should have been cited were not.**
- 2. Stability of land use and zoning is insufficiently addressed (Section B). The task is to explain HOW the proposal would contribute to stability of land use and zoning. The applicant does not address how the proposed departures from setback, height, parking and density will (or will not) ensure stability of land use and zoning.**
- 3. The applicant does not sufficiently elaborate a logical nexus between a recent change and how it affects the subject site, making the existing zoning inappropriate. No explanation of “more advantageous to the community” is provided.**

-
4. **Section E requires a discussion of the permissive uses in the proposed zone. Staff understands that no uses are proposed other than those already allowed in the SU-2/CLD zone, but the applicant did not specifically discuss uses as required. Also, what does this mean since the request is for “SU-1 for a mixed use development”?**
 5. **The applicant should have openly stated that economic considerations are a significant factor in this request (Section G), and are a primary reason for seeking deviation from the sector plan’s requirements with respect to setbacks, height, off-street parking and density.**
 6. **Staff finds it laudable that the proposal is for a mixed-use development, on a transit corridor, that would blend architecturally with the surrounding area. However, just because a project is mixed use does not, in itself, justify the proposed zone change especially when a mixed-use development could be pursued with the subject site’s current CLD zoning. The applicant has not adequately explained the effect of adding the SU-1 for Abq. Little Theater zoned parcel.**

Staff Conclusion:

Overall, Staff concludes that the zone change request has not been adequately justified. Though the applicant has begun to establish a policy-based justification, the explanation of how Goals and policies are furthered in most instances needs elaboration in order to demonstrate a connection between the Goals and policies and the proposal. Additional policies should be included and less applicable policies are not needed. Also, Staff finds that additional explanation is warranted to adequately address Sections B, E and G of R270-1980. Staff points out that, pursuant to Section B of R270-1980, “the burden is on the applicant to show why the change should be made.” It is incumbent upon the applicant to provide solid reasoning to justify the proposed zone change.

III. ANALYSIS- SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR SUBDIVISION

SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR SUBDIVISION-AMENDMENT (07EPC-40074)

The applicant proposes to amend the existing site development plan for subdivision for the Country Club Plaza I project, which the EPC approved in March 2006 (06EPC-00143). The subject site of the Country Club Plaza I project, approx. 4.5 acres, consists of two parcels and the following uses: 32 proposed townhomes on the northwestern corner (Parcel 1), 17 urban villas in back of the two Horn Oil Company buildings and new commercial building facing Central Ave., and new retail shops and residential studios on the eastern side of the subject site (Parcel 2).

An amendment to the existing site development plan for subdivision is needed because the applicant has secured adjacent properties and desires to correspondingly revise a portion of the formerly approved project. The 32 proposed townhomes depicted on the subject site’s northwestern corner (designated as Parcel 1, approx. 1.3 acres) are no longer being pursued. In their place, the applicant proposes a complex of 5 retail buildings (see attachment) with the currently requested site development plan for subdivision (see text below). Note that the approx. 1.3 acre parcel was not included in the Development Review Board’s (DRB) recent consideration of the Country Club Plaza I project (06EPC-00143).

SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR SUBDIVISION (07EPC-40073)

The proposed site development plan for subdivision has two objectives: creating new lot lines (discussed here) and establishing design standards (discussed later in this report). The proposed site development plan for subdivision is intended to supersede an approx. 1.3 acre portion (Parcel 1) of the March 2006 site development plan for subdivision. The new site development plan for subdivision proposes to subdivide Parcel 1 into four smaller lots: Lots 1, 2, 3 and 4. Each lot would contain a small commercial building and some parking.

Zoning Code §14-16-1-5, Definitions, specifies that a site plan for subdivision shall address the following: proposed use, pedestrian and vehicular ingress and egress, internal circulation, maximum building height, minimum building setback and maximum floor area ratio (FAR). The proposed site plan for subdivision does not comply with this definition because it does not address pedestrian and vehicular ingress and egress, internal circulation and minimum building setback. Staff recommends that these components be addressed on Sheet A-1 in order to comply with the definition.

IV. ANALYSIS- SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR SUBDIVISION, DESIGN STANDARDS

Note: This application can be a bit confusing since, for certain aspects such as parking and open space, it has the level of detail typically found in a site development plan for building permit. However, the defining characteristic of a site development plan for building permit, building elevations, is not included. Because there are no elevations, the application is termed a site development plan for subdivision (with design standards).

Purpose: The purpose of design standards is to provide guidance for a development in order to ensure that the development will further the intent of applicable City Plans, goals and policies. In addition, design standards establish a framework for a development that will guide submittals of future site development plans for building permit on a given site. The vision for a development is contained in the design standards; therefore, it is important to make sure that the vision is well articulated so that it can become reality in line with the expectations for that vision.

Proposal: Design standards commonly consist of several sections, after a discussion of the proposed development's overall theme and/or goal. These sections typically are the following, or a combination thereof: Site elements, Pedestrianism, Parking, Setbacks, Landscape, Lighting, Screening, Utilities, Signage, Building elements and Architecture. The proposed design standards are organized somewhat differently and provide a much greater level of architectural detail than the norm. They are discussed below in the order presented on the site development plan for subdivision, with Staff's section by section analysis following.

Introduction/Design Theme/Land Use Concept

The proposed mixed-use development envisions a walkable, neighborhood scale area. The design standards are intended to apply to the 3.86 acre current subject site. Delegation of approval authority to the Development Review Board (DRB) is requested. The overall design theme is a synthesis of urban patterns and architectural styles surrounding the subject site. A mix of styles is intended.

The vision is for a walkable, neighborhood scale development; it is of utmost importance to ensure that the design standards will make this vision a reality. The proposed design standards are intended to apply only to the current, approx. 4 acre subject site. The other 4.5 acre site (Country Club Plaza I) would be subject to the formerly approved design standards, except for the approx. 1.3 acre parcel on the northwestern corner which is now proposed for inclusion in Country Club Plaza II. It is possible that the projects could develop and be quite different from one another.

Staff is concerned that the land use concept and intentions regarding site layout are not elaborated upon. There is much discussion about the design theme, but the overarching intent to make this development walkable and neighborhood scale is not sufficiently considered or explained. Staff recommends that approval authority not be delegated to the DRB (which is a technical review board). Because the proposed design standards do not provide sufficient guidance to ensure the proposed vision, an in-depth, planning based review at the EPC level continues to be warranted.

A. Architectural Character & Styles

The allowed architectural styles include Moderne, Mediterranean Revival, Pueblo Revival and Territorial. Narrative about the style's origin and characteristics is included. Any of the styles may be found on any of the lots, in any combination except for Lots 1 and 2 which are required to be either Moderne or Territorial or a hybrid.

The development could wind up being just one style or a combination of all styles, which would blend with the surroundings in a broad sense though perhaps not with respect to details. "Sympathetic contemporary interpretations" of the architectural styles are allowed, but it is unclear what this means. Also, the applicant's letter specifies certain styles (or range thereof) for certain lots but this idea is not reflected in the design standards but should be. Franchise architecture, which would undermine the site's architectural cohesiveness, should be prohibited.

B. Incorporated Architectural Design Elements

The principal characteristics of the styles are discussed with respect to massing, roofs, windows & doors, shading & entries, building details and building materials & colors.

Staff finds that the level of architectural detail is sufficient to ensure that the architectural design elements are well-defined for each style. To ensure this happens, however, the word "shall" needs to be used consistently throughout.

C. Building Density & Height

For commercial uses, a Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 0.61 shall not be exceeded for each parcel. For residential uses, a proposed FAR of 0.83 is not to be exceeded. Building height of up to 46 ft. is proposed for all lots, with an exception of up to 50 ft. for the residential building on Lot 8.

Density and height are two areas that constitute a proposed deviation from the HCRASDP requirements. Staff would like to clarify what the HCRASDP states regarding density: "A FAR of .61 shall be the maximum permitted for residential development." The Plan does not mention FARs for commercial development. Regarding height, the Plan specifies an allowable height of 26 ft. at

any location no closer than 50 ft. from an R-1 zone. Up to 46 ft. is allowed if the structure falls within a 25 degree angle plane. No demonstration of the angle plane test has been provided. Rather, the applicant is requesting 46 ft. for all lots and 50 ft. for Lot 8.

D. Building Setbacks

Some building setbacks are specified. Internal setbacks, however, are not and are “to be controlled by the developer”.

Staff finds that the design standards are the appropriate area to establish minimum setback requirements. The lack of specificity will likely contribute to ambiguity later. Setbacks for Lots 2, 3, 4, 5 and 8 need to be specified in this section. The setbacks specified seem to comply with the HCRASDP. It is unclear what requirement the applicant is requesting variation from.

E. Parking

The parking strategy is based on a transit reduction and on shared parking, as well as the project’s mixed use nature. The proposed parking totals, by lot, are shown. A 25% reduction for transit proximity and mixed uses was taken. The applicant calculates that 243 spaces are required. 196 are proposed.

The math behind the parking calculations is not shown here or on the proposed site development plan for subdivision, so it is unclear how the totals were arrived at. Occupancy calculations for Lots 1 and 2 are needed and the reduction should be taken off the total, not before. Staff calculates a total of 281 spaces needed based on Zoning Code requirements and including a 25% reduction. The applicant calculates 243. Proposed parking spaces provided are 196, which includes 8 handicap spaces. Staff points out that, pursuant to Zoning Code §14-16-3-1 (E)(6)(a) and (b), the applicant is asking for a 10% reduction for proximity to a transit line and, since the maximum reduction for transit and mixed use is 25%, that leaves a 15% reduction based on mixed use. The calculations, however, should be slightly different because the applicant has not applied the 10% transit reduction to the residential uses. The mixed-use reduction, for non-residential uses only, is correctly applied.

In sum, the proposal is underparked. Justification has not been provided to demonstrate that the site could function with a 25% reduction in parking. Its mixed used nature is relied upon to justify providing less parking. While (hopefully) many people will use transit along Central Ave., the site plan does not indicate a transit shelter or show the existing bus stop. With two proposed restaurants and a possible grocery store, there is the possibility that traffic could spill over into the neighborhoods and park there. The applicant has verbally indicated that he is pursuing a shared parking agreement with the Little Theater, which would be helpful.

The proposed site plan for subdivision does not sufficiently address vehicular ingress, egress and circulation patterns, which relates to the subject site’s functioning as a cohesive shopping center. To comply with Zoning Code §14-16-1-5, Definitions, the design standards need to address how vehicles will enter, exit and circulate.

E. Mechanical Equipment & Utilities (should be F.)

This section provides for screening of roof-mounted and ground-mounted mechanical equipment with materials that are architecturally compatible with a given building.

Staff has no comment regarding this section.

F. Landscaping (should be G.)

More formal plantings are planned for Central Ave. and the internal streets, while informal plantings are planned for the southern landscape buffer. The landscape standards propose 75% coverage (actually less), and address minimum plant sizes, maintenance and installation timing.

Staff has several comments regarding this section. First, the landscape theme needs to be developed and explained. Second, design standards need to function as a stand alone document. Therefore, the plant palette referred to on Sheet L one needs to be included here and any inconsistencies between the design standards and Sheet L need to be reconciled. Note that the design standards propose less landscaping than the minimum Zoning Code requirement, since they propose to count tree canopies as part of the requirement for 75% coverage with living, vegetative material. Also, the design standards should comply with the City's pollen ordinance but do not.

G. Pedestrian Circulation (should be H.)

Pedestrian circulation is intended to be a fundamental design element. Consistent connection through the site is intended, and walkways will be enriched with shading and the use of textured paving. Pedestrian walkway widths are shown on the site plan.

The design standards need to be strengthened to achieve the intent that pedestrian circulation is a fundamental design element. A pedestrian plan needs to be included and aim to minimize pedestrian/vehicle conflict, especially since the subject site will function as a de facto neighborhood center. The graphic needs to show proposed path locations, and specify widths and materials. The proposed design standards do not address transit and bicycle access, either internally or from Central Ave. and the neighborhoods. Non-vehicle connections to the surrounding neighborhood and the adjacent Country Club Plaza I site are not depicted.

Staff recommends that functional pedestrian connections be provided throughout the site to create the pedestrian-friendly environment desired in Neighborhood Activity Centers and promoted as a key component of the proposed development. The pedestrian connections depicted on the proposed site development plan either connect from sidewalk to parking space or from sidewalk to landscape area. To be functional and guide pedestrians, pedestrian pathways need to be clearly delineated and connect sidewalks with sidewalks.

I. Walls & Fences

Perimeter walls shall be of CMU and stucco finished. Chain link and barbed wire are prohibited.

Additional information is needed. Staff recommends that all walls and fences be compatible with the nearby buildings and architectural themes in terms of color and style.

J. Lighting-Site

Site lighting will conform to City standards and will not be mounted at higher than 12 ft. Site lighting type shall complement the character of the project and enhance the pedestrian and auto portions of the site.

Site lighting needs to conform to Zoning Code standards and night sky standards. At least a couple of possible fixture designs should be included in the design standards and should be measured from top to grade, not to exceed 16 ft. in height, Staff suggests. Both parking lot lighting and building mounted lighting need to be clearly addressed. Staff also suggests that all light fixtures be fully shielded, and that high-pressure sodium lighting and uplighting be prohibited. Since pedestrian circulation is an important component of the proposed project, pedestrian scale (i.e-not higher than 2 ft.) lighting should be provided at key pedestrian pathways.

K. Signs & Signage

Entry signage will be consistent with the site's architectural character. Signage will comply with the C-1 zone. One free-standing sign is allowed for each street frontage. Signs are not to exceed 100 sf and 26 ft in height.

Signage details are commonly provided in design standards and should be provided here. An entry sign is shown facing Central Ave., between buildings 1 and 2. It is unclear if this is a monument sign or a pole mounted sign. Staff believes that the allowed sign sizes are too large and will detract from the setting and overpower pedestrians. The pedestrian scale nature of the proposed development is a critical component of this Neighborhood Activity Center. Staff recommends that monument signs do not exceed 50 sf sign face and points out that the HCRASDP states that the C-1 requirements are a maximum. Staff also recommends that building mounted signage not face the adjacent R-1 lots and that it be limited to 9% (Harvard Mall has 9%). Staff suggests that pole-mounted signs and signs supported with wires be prohibited.

L. Solid Waste

Dumpster locations and enclosures are to conform to the City's solid waste standards and shall not encroach in the 50 ft. setback area adjacent to the R-1 homes.

Though often included under Walls/Screening, the proposed design standards have a separate section for Solid Waste. More information is needed, such as specifications that the enclosures will be gated and walls will be stucco-finished and compatible with the development.

Staff Conclusion: Staff finds that, overall, the design standards need strengthening if they are to fulfill the intent of applicable Plans, goals and policies, provide an adequate framework for future submittals and ensure that the applicant's vision for the project becomes reality. Overall, there is a disconnect between what the applicant is "selling" in terms of the project and what is found in the design standards, which currently would allow for departure from that vision, particularly with respect to pedestrian connectivity, pedestrian circulation and integration with the existing neighborhood which are all critical elements of a mixed-use project.

Grading & Drainage Plan

The subject site slopes downward from north to south. Elevations range from \approx 4,955 feet to \approx 4,950 feet, for a grade change of 5 feet. Water flows generally south, away from Central Ave., into a proposed 18 ft. deep retention pond along the subject site's southern boundary.

Utilities/Utility Plan

An existing utility easement and water and sanitary sewer easement runs west-east from San Pasquale to the subject site. A water line and a sanitary sewer line are proposed to connect from San Pasquale to the subject site's southwestern corner, proceeding toward the middle of the site. Two fire hydrants are proposed.

Open Space

The proposed design standards should include a section about open space/public outdoor space, but do not. Open space calculations provided for the residential building indicate that 18,800 sf of open space is provided based upon balconies and small yards.

Pursuant to Zoning Code §14-16-3-18 (B)(4), public outdoor space must be provided with buildings that are 60,000 square feet or greater. A collection of smaller buildings is considered one building. Staff notes that this mixed-use, high-end development does not comply with this section. No plaza area or outdoor gathering/employee area is provided, despite the proposal's intention to promote pedestrianism.

Concerns of Reviewing Agencies/Pre-Hearing Discussion

City departments and other interested agencies reviewed this application from 11/5/07 to 11/16/07. The applicant did not attend the pre-hearing discussion meeting on November 28, 2007.

Few agency comments were received. The Advance Planning Division considers pedestrian connections within the site to be weak and that improvements with respect to pedestrian circulation are needed. The Department of Municipal Development commented that a bicycle lane is needed along this stretch of Central Ave. Albuquerque Public Schools (APS) comments that the elementary school in the area is nearing capacity, but that there is excess capacity available in the middle and high schools.

Neighborhood Concerns

The neighborhood associations required to be notified are the Huning Castle Neighborhood Association (HCNA) and the Downtown Neighborhood Association (DNA). A pre-facilitated meeting was held on August 30, 2007 to introduce the proposed project. There was very general support.

A facilitated meeting was held on November 27, 2007 (see attachment). Members of both the HCNA and the DNA attended. Neighbors expressed general concern regarding variance from sector plan requirements and were worried about precedence. Neighbors posed a question about this at the meeting and requested that Staff answer; Staff did so in a two page essay in which the applicant's choice of zoning to request is explored (see attachment). Note that the formerly proposed zoning designation was discussed at the facilitated meeting. The applicant agreed to pay attention to environmentally sound building practices, though this intention is not reflected in the proposed site development plan. Overall, there is

general support for the proposal but some hesitation, mainly due to the proposal's complexity which renders it difficult for people to understand.

As of this writing, Staff has received only one written comment from a nearby resident (see attachment). The resident is concerned about parking for the subject site, and is worried about potential parking overflow into the neighborhoods. Neighborhood representatives have indicated in conversation that they are concerned about traffic, building height and zoning.

V. CONCLUSION

This three-part proposal is for a sector development plan map amendment, an amendment to a site development plan for subdivision and a site development plan for subdivision with design standards for an approx. 9 acre property located on Central Ave. SW, between Laguna and San Pasquale. The subject site lies within the boundaries of the Established Urban area and the Huning Castle-Raynolds Addition Sector Development Plan area, and is not located in a designated Activity Center but already has the zoning to allow the proposed commercial uses.

Overall, Staff finds that the proposal partially furthers applicable Goals and policies and concludes that the zone change request has not been adequately justified. In most instances, the explanation of HOW Goals and policies are furthered needs elaboration in order to demonstrate a connection between the Goals and policies and the proposal. Also, additional explanation is warranted to adequately address Sections B, E and G of R270-1980.

A facilitated meeting was held on November 27, 2007. There is general neighborhood support, but some concerns about traffic, height and zoning. Staff recommends deferral of the proposal to allow the applicant time to provide adequate justification pursuant to R270-1980 and strengthen the design standards so that they ensure the applicant's intent for a holistic, balanced neighborhood center. Delegation of approval authority to the DRB is not recommended. Since the proposed design standards do not provide sufficient guidance to ensure the proposed vision, in-depth review at the EPC level continues to be warranted.

FINDINGS -07EPC 40075, December 20, 2007- Sector Development Plan Map Amendment

1. This request is for a sector development plan map amendment for all or a portion of Tracts 131, 133A1, 133A2, 133B, 134 and 135A, MRGCD Map 38; Tract B2A Lands of Albuquerque Little Theater, an approximately 4 acre site located on Central Avenue SW, between Laguna Boulevard and San Pasquale Avenue.
2. A request for a site development plan for subdivision amendment (07EPC-40073) and a site development plan for subdivision (07EPC-40074) accompany this request.
3. The applicant proposes to change the subject site's zoning from SU-2/CLD (Commercial and/or Low-Density Apartments) and SU-2/SU-1 for Albuquerque Little Theater to "SU-2/SU-1 for a mixed use development" in order to develop a mixed-use commercial and residential project to consist of two restaurants with full-service liquor, four office/retail buildings, a larger office/retail building (possible grocery store/deli) and a complex of residential units (3 live/work, 44 apartments or condos).
4. The subject site is located within the boundaries of the Established Urban Area and the Huning Castle-Raynolds Addition Sector Development Plan, which uses SU-2 zoning to indicate sector plan control of sites within its boundaries. A change of zoning would affect the sector plan's zoning map. Therefore, this request is referred to as a sector development plan map amendment instead of a zone map amendment.
5. The proposal *partially furthers* the following relevant Comprehensive Plan policies:
 - A. Policy II.B.5a-full range of urban land uses. The proposal would facilitate additional commercial, residential and possibly office uses thus contributing to variety. However, a variety of land uses already exists in the area and is allowed under the current zoning.
 - B. Policy II.B.5e-programmed facilities/neighborhood integrity. The subject site is contiguous to existing urban services, though the integrity of the existing neighborhood could possibly be affected.
 - C. Policy II.B.5d-new development/neighborhood values, resources. Some neighbors generally support the proposal, but others have concerns. The intensity contrasts with the adjacent single-family homes, but there are other relatively intense projects in the area.
 - D. Policy II.B.5m-site design/visual environment. Though the proposed development will generally improve the quality of the visual environment, the urban and site design may not maintain and enhance unique vistas for some.

- E. Policy II.D.4g-pedestrian opportunities/safe and pleasant conditions. Some pedestrian opportunities would be provided, but improved internal circulation is needed since the subject site would function as a *de facto* neighborhood activity center.
6. The proposal generally *further*s the following relevant Comprehensive Plan Goal and policies:
- A. Community Identity and Urban Design Goal. The architectural detail in the proposed design standards would ensure that the buildings are compatible with the existing built environment in the area.
 - B. Policy II.B.5h-higher density housing. Though not in a designated Activity Center, a mixed density pattern is already established in the area and the current zoning allows higher density housing. Access to the major street network is excellent, though non-vehicle access and circulation would benefit from improvement.
 - C. Policy II.B.5l-design quality/innovation. The proposed design standards contain great architectural detail that will ensure quality building design that is appropriate for the area, though some of the site standards needs strengthening.
 - D. Policy II.D.4c-dwelling units/transit streets. The additional dwelling units would be close to a Major Transit corridor and are likely to add transit ridership.
 - E. Policy II.B.5o-redevelopment and rehabilitation of older neighborhoods. The proposal would be a redevelopment effort in an older neighborhood in the Established Urban area.
7. The proposal *partially further*s the Activity Center Goal. It would facilitate a mixed-use development that would create high-density mixed land use, which would generally reduce urban sprawl and auto travel needs. The subject site is located between two designated Activity Centers, but already has zoning for commercial and residential uses and would function as a *de facto* neighborhood activity center.
8. The Transportation and Transit Goal of the Comprehensive Plan is *partially furthered*. The proposed mixed-use development would place employment, services and housing in proximity to Central Avenue and facilitate alternatives to auto travel, though improved pedestrian connections are needed to encourage walking, bicycling and transit usage to take advantage of the location.
9. The proposal *partially further*s the following objectives of the Huning Castle-Raynolds Addition Sector Development Plan:

- A. Land Use & Zoning Objective 2: Mixed use development is encouraged on Central Avenue. However, better non-auto circulation is needed to fulfill the Plan's intent regarding neighborhood oriented development.
- B. Land Use & Zoning Objective 3: The proposed residential density is higher than what was envisioned. The proposed site development plan would provide for distinctive architecture but is somewhat weaker with respect to landscaping and human scale elements.
- C. Economic Development Objective 2: The proposal would provide a variety of commercial uses, but is not as pedestrian oriented and connected to the neighborhood as it should be.

10. Overall the proposal *generally furthers* the ideas of the Central Avenue Streetscape Plan (CASP) in an overarching sense, but non-vehicle opportunities, connectivity and internal circulation need to be improved so the development's specifics comport with the Plan's objectives and thereby make the Plan's vision a reality.

11. The applicant has not adequately justified the zone change request pursuant to Resolution 270-1980:
- A. Section A: The applicant cited several Goals and policies. Some of the explanations of how each relates to the proposal are acceptable, but many need to be more thoroughly elaborated. The insufficient policy analysis does not prove that the proposal is consistent with the City's Health, safety and general welfare.
 - B. Section B: Stability of land use and zoning is insufficiently addressed. Staff agrees that the SU-1 zone is the appropriate mechanism to ensure that variances from plan requirements are not harmful to the community, but finds that the applicant does not address how the proposed departures from setback, height, parking and density will (or will not) ensure stability of land use and zoning.
 - C. Section C: Some cited Goals and policies are not applicable and other significant Goals and policies were not included. Some of the explanations of how each relates to the proposal are acceptable, but many need to be more thoroughly elaborated upon.
 - D. Section D: The applicant does not develop a logical nexus between the recently approved Country Club Plaza I project and the proposal to demonstrate "changed neighborhood or community conditions." The brief explanation of "more advantageous to the community" is insufficient.
 - E. Section E: A discussion of the permissive uses in the proposed zone is required. The applicant did not complete this task.
 - F. Section F: The applicant states that the no City funds or capital outlay are required or anticipated for this development project.

-
- G. Section G: The applicant states that economic considerations are not a central justification for this zone change. However, they are a significant factor. With the current CLD, the applicant can pursue a mixed-use development, just not with the height, density, setbacks and parking desired which make the project economically feasible in the applicant's opinion.
- H. Section H: The applicant states that this zone change does not rely upon its location on a major street for its justification. However, the subject site's location on a Central Avenue is a major factor in this proposal and should be addressed.
- I. Section I: The applicant is required to explain why or why not the zone change request would (or would not) result in a spot zone. This task was not completed.
- J. Section J: The applicant is required to explain why or why not the zone change request would (or would not) result in a strip zone. This task was not completed.

12. A deferral is warranted because the zone change request has not been adequately justified. Pursuant to Section B of R270-1980, it is incumbent upon the applicant to provide solid reasoning to justify the proposed zone change. In most instances, the explanation of how Goals and policies are furthered needs elaboration to demonstrate a connection between applicable Goals and policies and the proposal. Additional explanation is needed to adequately address Sections B, E and G of R270-1980.

13. A facilitated meeting was held on November 27, 2007. The affected neighborhoods are the Huning Castle Neighborhood Association (NA) and the Downtown NA. The neighborhoods generally support the idea of a mixed use development, but have concerns about traffic, building height and zoning.

RECOMMENDATION - 07EPC 40075, December 20, 2007

DEFERRAL of 07EPC 40075, a request for a sector development plan map amendment from SU-2/CLD (Commercial and/or Low-Density Apartments) and SU-2/SU-1 for Albuquerque Little Theater to SU-2/SU-1 for a mixed use development for all or a portion of Tracts 131, 133A1, 133A2, 133B, 134 and 135A, MRGCD Map 38; Tract B2A Lands of Albuquerque Little Theater, located on Central Avenue SW, based on the preceding findings, for 30 days.

FINDINGS -07EPC 40074, December 20, 2007-Site Development Plan for Subdivision Amendment

1. This is a request for an amendment to an existing site development plan for subdivision known as Country Club Plaza I, an approximately 4.5 acre site located on Central Avenue SW, between Laguna Boulevard and San Pasquale Avenue. The EPC approved the Country Club Plaza I site development plan for subdivision in March 2006 (06EPC-00143).

2. This request is accompanied by a request for a sector development plan map amendment (07EPC-40075) and a request for a site development plan for subdivision (07EPC-40074).

3. The applicant proposes to amend the approximately 1.3 acre northwestern corner of the Country Club Plaza I site development plan for subdivision, which shows 37 loft residences at this location. The amendment consists of changing a residential use to commercial uses. The applicant now proposes, in lieu of the residences, two commercial buildings that are intended for restaurant uses.

4. Except for the change in use (see 3 above), the existing the Country Club Plaza I site development plan for subdivision will continue to apply to the remainder of the Country Club Plaza I site. The 1.3 acre northwestern corner is the only portion of the Country Club Plaza I site that overlaps with the proposed site development plan for subdivision for Country Club Plaza II (07EPC-40074).

5. The subject site lies within the boundaries of the Established Urban Area of the Comprehensive Plan and the Huning Castle-Raynolds Addition Sector Development Plan.

6. The proposal *partially furthers* the following relevant Comprehensive Plan policies:
 - A. Policy II.B.5a-full range of urban land uses. The proposal would facilitate additional commercial, residential and possibly office uses thus contributing to variety. However, a variety of land uses already exists in the area and is allowed under the current zoning.

 - B. Policy II.B.5e-programmed facilities/neighborhood integrity. The subject site is contiguous to existing urban services, though the integrity of the existing neighborhood could possibly be affected.

 - C. Policy II.B.5d-new development/neighborhood values, resources. Some neighbors generally support the proposal, but others have concerns . The intensity contrasts with the adjacent single-family homes, but there are other relatively intense projects in the area.

 - D. Policy II.B.5m-site design/visual environment. Though the proposed development will generally improve the quality of the visual environment, the urban and site design may not maintain and enhance unique vistas for some.

 - E. Policy II.D.4g-pedestrian opportunities/safe and pleasant conditions. Some pedestrian opportunities would be provided, but improved internal circulation is needed since the subject site would function as a de facto neighborhood activity center.

7. The proposal generally *further*s the following relevant Comprehensive Plan Goal and policies:
- A. Community Identity and Urban Design Goal. The architectural detail in the proposed design standards would ensure that the buildings are compatible with the existing built environment in the area.
 - B. Policy II.B.5h-higher density housing. Though not in a designated Activity Center, a mixed density pattern is already established in the area and the current zoning allows higher density housing. Access to the major street network is excellent, though non-vehicle access and circulation would benefit from improvement.
 - C. Policy II.B.5l-design quality/innovation. The proposed design standards contain great architectural detail that will ensure quality building design that is appropriate for the area, though some of the site standards needs strengthening.
 - D. Policy II.D.4c-dwelling units/transit streets. The additional dwelling units would be close to a Major Transit corridor and are likely to add transit ridership.
 - E. Policy II.B.5o-redevelopment and rehabilitation of older neighborhoods. The proposal would be a redevelopment effort in an older neighborhood in the Established Urban area.
8. The proposal *partially further*s the Activity Center Goal. It would facilitate a mixed-use development that would create high-density mixed land use, which would generally reduce urban sprawl and auto travel needs. The subject site is located between two designated Activity Centers, but already has zoning for commercial and residential uses and would function as a *de facto* neighborhood activity center.
9. The Transportation and Transit Goal of the Comprehensive Plan is *partially further*ed. The proposed mixed-use development would place employment, services and housing in proximity to Central Avenue and facilitate alternatives to auto travel, though improved pedestrian connections are needed to encourage walking, bicycling and transit usage to take advantage of the location.
10. The proposal *partially further*s the following objectives of the Huning Castle-Raynolds Addition Sector Development Plan:
- A. Land Use & Zoning Objective 2: Mixed use development is encouraged on Central Avenue. However, better non-auto circulation is needed to fulfill the Plan's intent regarding neighborhood oriented development.
 - B. Land Use & Zoning Objective 3: The proposed residential density is higher than what was envisioned. The proposed site development plan would provide for distinctive architecture but is somewhat weaker with respect to landscaping and human scale elements.

C. Economic Development Objective 2: The proposal would provide a variety of commercial uses, but is not as pedestrian oriented and connected to the neighborhood as it should be.

11. Overall the proposal *generally furthers* the ideas of the Central Avenue Streetscape Plan (CASP) in an overarching sense, but non-vehicle opportunities, connectivity and internal circulation need to be improved so the development's specifics comport with the Plan's objectives and thereby make the Plan's vision a reality.

12. The required Traffic Impact Study (TIS) has been completed. The proposal is expected to generate approximately 6,923 vehicle trip ends per day. The TIS concludes that there will be no significant impact provided that the mitigation recommendations are implemented.

13. The required Air Quality Impact Analysis (AQIA), a study of CO levels at a given intersection, has been completed. Zoning Code §14-16-3-14 remains in place despite Federal approval of the Limited Maintenance Plan for Carbon Monoxide (2006-2016), which contains no local CO emission budgets to which transportation projects must conform.

14. The proposed amendment to the existing site development plan for subdivision for Country Club Plaza I (06EPC-00143) is closely associated with the proposed site development plan for subdivision for Country Club Plaza II, which is currently under consideration (07EPC-40074). The latter contains design standards which need to be strengthened in order to ensure that the applicant's vision for a balanced and walkable neighborhood center becomes reality.

15. A facilitated meeting was held on November 27, 2007. The affected neighborhoods are the Huning Castle Neighborhood Association (NA) and the Downtown NA. The neighborhoods generally support the idea of a mixed use development, but have concerns about traffic, building height and zoning.

RECOMMENDATION - 07EPC 00439, December 20, 2007

DEFERRAL of 07EPC 00439, a Site Development Plan for Subdivision Amendment for all or a portion of Tracts 129A, 131, 133A1, 133A2, 133B, 134 and 135A, MRGCD Map 38; Tract B2A Lands of Albuquerque Little Theater; Tract A-1-A and Tract 129B1A Laguna Subdivision; and Tracts A & B, Lands of H.B. and Calvin Horn, zoned SU-2/CLD (Commercial and/or Low-Density Apartments), based on the preceding Findings, for 30 days.

FINDINGS -07EPC 40073, December 20, 2007-Site Development Plan for Subdivision

1. This is a request for a site development plan for subdivision for all or a portion of Tracts 131, 133A1, 133A2, 133B, 134 and 135A, MRGCD Map 38; Tract B2A Lands of Albuquerque Little Theater, an approximately 4 acre site located on Central Avenue SW, between Laguna Boulevard and San Pasquale Avenue (the "subject site").
2. The applicant proposes to construct twelve townhomes (three clusters of four units) on individual lots. The site development plan for subdivision will to eliminate the lot line between Tracts A-2-C and A-2-D, shift the eastern portion of the northern property line southward to align with the proposed private street, and create twelve individual lots.
3. A request for a sector development plan map amendment (07EPC 40075) and an amendment to an existing site development plan for subdivision (07EPC 40073) are associated with this request.
4. The subject site lies within the boundaries of the Established Urban Area of the Comprehensive Plan and the Huning Castle-Raynolds Addition Sector Development Plan.
5. The proposal *partially furthers* the following relevant Comprehensive Plan policies:
 - A. Policy II.B.5a-full range of urban land uses. The proposal would facilitate additional commercial, residential and possibly office uses thus contributing to variety. However, a variety of land uses already exists in the area and is allowed under the current zoning.
 - B. Policy II.B.5e-programmed facilities/neighborhood integrity. The subject site is contiguous to existing urban services, though the integrity of the existing neighborhood could possibly be affected.
 - C. Policy II.B.5d-new development/neighborhood values, resources. Some neighbors generally support the proposal, but others have concerns. The intensity contrasts with the adjacent single-family homes, but there are other relatively intense projects in the area.
 - D. Policy II.B.5m-site design/visual environment. Though the proposed development will generally improve the quality of the visual environment, the urban and site design may not maintain and enhance unique vistas for some.
 - E. Policy II.D.4g-pedestrian opportunities/safe and pleasant conditions. Some pedestrian opportunities would be provided, but improved internal circulation is needed since the subject site would function as a de facto neighborhood activity center.

6. The proposal generally *further*s the following relevant Comprehensive Plan Goal and policies:
- A. Community Identity and Urban Design Goal. The architectural detail in the proposed design standards would ensure that the buildings are compatible with the existing built environment in the area.
 - B. Policy II.B.5h-higher density housing. Though not in a designated Activity Center, a mixed density pattern is already established in the area and the current zoning allows higher density housing. Access to the major street network is excellent, though non-vehicle access and circulation would benefit from improvement.
 - C. Policy II.B.5l-design quality/innovation. The proposed design standards contain great architectural detail that will ensure quality building design that is appropriate for the area, though some of the site standards needs strengthening.
 - D. Policy II.D.4c-dwelling units/transit streets. The additional dwelling units would be close to a Major Transit corridor and are likely to add transit ridership.
 - E. Policy II.B.5o-redevelopment and rehabilitation of older neighborhoods. The proposal would be a redevelopment effort in an older neighborhood in the Established Urban area.
7. The proposal *partially further*s the Activity Center Goal. It would facilitate a mixed-use development that would create high-density mixed land use, which would generally reduce urban sprawl and auto travel needs. The subject site is located between two designated Activity Centers, but already has zoning for commercial and residential uses and would function as a *de facto* neighborhood activity center.
8. The Transportation and Transit Goal of the Comprehensive Plan is *partially furthered*. The proposed mixed-use development would place employment, services and housing in proximity to Central Avenue and facilitate alternatives to auto travel, though improved pedestrian connections are needed to encourage walking, bicycling and transit usage to take advantage of the location.
9. The proposal *partially further*s the following objectives of the Huning Castle-Raynolds Addition Sector Development Plan:
- A. Land Use & Zoning Objective 2: Mixed use development is encouraged on Central Avenue. However, better non-auto circulation is needed to fulfill the Plan's intent regarding neighborhood oriented development.

-
- B. Land Use & Zoning Objective 3: The proposed residential density is higher than what was envisioned. The proposed site development plan would provide for distinctive architecture but is somewhat weaker with respect to landscaping and human scale elements.
- C. Economic Development Objective 2: The proposal would provide a variety of commercial uses, but is not as pedestrian oriented and connected to the neighborhood as it should be.

10. Overall the proposal *generally furthers* the ideas of the Central Avenue Streetscape Plan (CASP) in an overarching sense, but non-vehicle opportunities, connectivity and internal circulation need to be improved so the development's specifics comport with the Plan's objectives and thereby make the Plan's vision a reality.

11. The required Traffic Impact Study (TIS) has been completed. The proposal is expected to generate approximately 6,923 vehicle trip ends per day. The TIS concludes that there will be no significant impact provided that the mitigation recommendations are implemented.

12. The required Air Quality Impact Analysis (AQIA), a study of CO levels at a given intersection, has been completed. Zoning Code §14-16-3-14 remains in place despite Federal approval of the Limited Maintenance Plan for Carbon Monoxide (2006-2016), which contains no local CO emission budgets to which transportation projects must conform.

13. The design standards in the proposed site development plan for subdivision need to be strengthened in order to ensure that the applicant's vision for a balanced and walkable neighborhood center becomes reality. A deferral will allow the applicant time to provide additional information.

14. Pursuant to Zoning Code §14-16-3-1(D)(6)(b)(2), shared parking calculations must clearly demonstrate the feasibility of shared parking. Also, the parking calculations need to reflect that the reduction for Transit proximity (10%) is taken from residential and non-residential uses and the mixed-use reduction (15% in this case) is taken for non-residential uses.

15. A facilitated meeting was held on November 27, 2007. The affected neighborhoods are the Huning Castle Neighborhood Association (NA) and the Downtown NA. The neighborhoods generally support the idea of a mixed use development, but have concerns about traffic, building height and zoning.

RECOMMENDATION - 07EPC 40073, December 20, 2007

DEFERRAL of 07EPC 40073, a Site Development Plan for Subdivision for all or a portion of Tracts 131, 133A1, 133A2, 133B, 134 and 135A, MRGCD Map 38; Tract B2A Lands of Albuquerque Little Theater, zoned SU-2/CLD (Commercial and/or Low-Density Apartments) and SU-2/SU-1 for Albuquerque Little Theater, based on the preceding Findings, for 30 days.

***Catalina Lehner, AICP
Senior Planner***

cc: Jay Rembe, 723 Silver Ave. B, Albuquerque, NM 87102
C. David Day, 1913 Gabaldon Ct./ NW, Albuquerque, NM 87104
Terry Brunner, Downtown NA, 601 Luna NW, Albuquerque, NM 87102
Steve Morrow, Downtown NA, 405 Luna Blvd. NW, Albuquerque, NM 87102
Ab Potter, Huning Castle NA, 1705 Chacoma SW, Albuquerque, NM 87104
Diane Souder, Huning Castle NA, 1709 Kit Carson SW, Albuquerque, NM 87104

AGENCY COMMENTS

- The following agencies did not review or comment on Project #1004677:

City of Albuquerque

Environmental Health, Air Quality Division
Environmental Health, Env. Services Division
Environmental Health, City Forrester
Fire Department, Planning
Parks & Recreation, Planning and Design
Transit Department

Other

Bernalillo County
Middle Rio Grande Conservancy Dist (MRGCD)
Mid-Region Council of Governments (MRCOG)

- The following City of Albuquerque Departments reviewed and commented on Project #1004677:

Planning, Zoning Code Services

Reviewed, no comments.

Planning, Office of Neighborhood Coordination

Downtown NA (R)

Huning Castle NA (R)

11/5/07 – Recommended for facilitation – siw

Diane Grover has been assigned and to be held on Tuesday, November 27, 2007 @ 7 p.m. at the Old Town Community Substation, 2060 Central Ave. SW - siw

Planning, Advance and Urban Design

1. Central Avenue is a Major Transit Corridor, but besides that it is an Arterial Street and as such is required in the DPM to have a six foot wide sidewalk with a six foot wide planter/utility strip instead of the 4 feet indicated on the site plan. I am attaching a hard copy of the DPM section to the site plan. The citation is Table 23.2.1A.

2. Pedestrian Connections.... The connections between segments of the development look weak or absent. Pedestrian crossings over the parking area from the east and west facing building rows to the north facing section at the southern end of the site should be clearly marked and run directly from one walkway to another.

The sidewalks do seem marked well from Central Avenue into the site.

Sidewalks should be included on the easterly easement access road as well as the main entrance. No entrance should be car only. Pedestrians actually need more choices than cars.

3. Mixed Use... It looks like a good mixture of uses. I think they just need to clearly mark how a person on foot accesses every part of it.

Parks & Recreation, Open Space Division

Open Space has no adverse comments.

Police Department/Planning

Gerald Cline Memorial Substation.

No crime prevention on CPTED comments concerning the proposed site development plan for subdivision. Amended site development plan for subdivision and/or the amendment to zone map due to incomplete information about property use. Comments could be provided once use has been determined.

Solid Waste Management Dept., Refuse Division

Approved on condition, will comply with all SWMD ordinances and requirements, and have required recycle areas for enclosures.

City of Albuquerque Public Works Department

Transportation Development (City Engineer/Planning Department):

- The Developer is responsible for permanent improvements to the transportation facilities adjacent to the proposed site development plan. Those improvements will include any additional right-of-way requirements, paving, curb and gutter, sidewalk and ADA accessible ramps that have not already been provided for. All public infrastructure constructed within public right-of-way or public easements shall be to City Standards. Those Standards will include but are not limited to sidewalks (std. dwg. 2430), driveways (std. dwg. 2425), private entrances (std. dwg. 2426) and wheel chair ramps (std. dwg. 2441).
- A Traffic Impact Study (TIS) has been submitted and reviewed by Transportation Staff.
- Per Transportation Development Staff, completion of the required system improvements that are attributable to the development, as identified in the TIS, is required.
- The Traffic Impact Study is available for review by any interested party, in the office of the Traffic Engineer.
- Platting to be a concurrent DRB action.
- Site plan shall comply and be designed per DPM Standards.

Hydrology Development (City Engineer/Planning Department):

- No comments received.

Transportation Planning (Department of Municipal Development):

Findings

- Central Avenue adjacent the subject development is designated a bikeway corridor on the Long Range Bikeway System map.
- Because of numerous right-of-way and development constraints along Central Avenue, either on-street bicycle lanes or a shared 14 foot wide bicycle route/driving lane is considered the most practical bikeway improvements for this corridor.

Conditions

-
- Construction of either on-street bicycle lanes or a shared 14 foot wide bicycle route/driving lane along Central Avenue adjacent to the subject property as designated on Long Range Bikeways System map.

Traffic Engineering Operations (Department of Municipal Development):

- No comments received.

Street Maintenance (Department of Municipal Development):

- No comments received.

Utility Development (Water Authority):

- No comments received.

Water Resources, Water Utilities and Wastewater Utilities (Water Authority):

- No comments received.

New Mexico Department of Transportation (NMDOT):

- No comments received.

RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS FROM CITY ENGINEER, MUNICIPAL DEVELOPMENT, WATER AUTHORITY and NMDOT:

Conditions of approval for the proposed Amendment to the Sector Development Plan, Amendment to Site Development Plan for Subdivision and Site Development Plan for Subdivision shall include:

- a. The Developer is responsible for permanent improvements to the transportation facilities adjacent to the proposed site development plan. Those improvements will include any additional right-of-way requirements, paving, curb and gutter, sidewalk and ADA accessible ramps that have not already been provided for. All public infrastructure constructed within public right-of-way or public easements shall be to City Standards. Those Standards will include but are not limited to sidewalks (std. dwg. 2430), driveways (std. dwg. 2425), private entrances (std. dwg. 2426) and wheel chair ramps (std. dwg. 2441).
- b. Per Transportation Development Staff, completion of the required system improvements that are attributable to the development, as identified in the TIS, is required.
- c. Platting to be a concurrent DRB action.
- d. Site plan shall comply and be designed per DPM Standards.
- e. Construction of either on-street bicycle lanes or a shared 14 foot wide bicycle route/driving lane along Central Avenue adjacent to the subject property as designated on Long Range Bikeways System map.

➤ The following agencies reviewed and commented on Project #1004677:

Abq. Metropolitan Arroyo Flood Control Authority (AMAFCA)

Reviewed, no comment.

Albuquerque Public Schools (APS)

Central Ave Properties Abq, Tracts 129-B-1-A, 131, 133-A-1, 133-A-2, 133-B, 134 and 135-A, Lands of Albuquerque Little Theatre is located on Central Ave SW between Laguna Blvd SW and San Pasquale SW. The owner of the above property plans to redevelop the current property uses into a mixed use development. This will include office/retail facilities and residential uses. The development will consist of a combination of 44 single family and multi family residences. This will impact Lew Wallace Elementary School, Washington Middle School, and Albuquerque High School. Lew Wallace Elementary School will be nearing capacity; Washington Middle School and Albuquerque High School both have excess capacity to absorb student growth.

Loc No	School	2007-08 Projections	2006-07 Capacity	Space Available
373	Lew Wallace	277	285	8
465	Washington	571	763	192
590	Albuquerque	1,888	2,100	212

To address overcrowding at schools, APS will explore various alternatives. A combination or all of the following options may be utilized to relieve overcrowded schools.

- Provide new capacity (long term solution)
 - Construct new schools or additions
 - Add portables
 - Use of non-classroom spaces for temporary classrooms
 - Lease facilities
 - Use other public facilities
- Improve facility efficiency (short term solution)
 - Schedule Changes
 - Double sessions
 - Multi-track year-round
 - Other
 - Float teachers (flex schedule)
- Shift students to Schools with Capacity (short term solution)
 - Boundary Adjustments / Busing
 - Grade reconfiguration
- Combination of above strategies

All planned additions to existing educational facilities are contingent upon taxpayer approval.

Public Service Company of New Mexico (PNM)

There is an overhead distribution line on the north side of the property (Central Ave SW). However, PNM does have plans to reconductor the overhead line along San Pasquale Ave SW. The proposed property use will be served from the overhead line along the north side of the property (Central Ave SW). Developer needs to meet with PNM.

