



**Environmental  
Planning  
Commission**

**Agenda Number: 2  
Project Number: 1003570  
Case #: 08EPC 40037/40036  
July 17, 2008**

**Supplemental Staff Report**

<b>Agent</b>	Mark Goodwin & Associates
<b>Applicant</b>	The Haskell Company
<b>Requests</b>	<b>Site Development Plan for Subdivision</b>
<b>Legal Description</b>	Tract B-9-E-1 & Tract B-9-F, Seven Bar Ranch
<b>Location</b>	On Ellison Dr. NW (between West Cibola Loop & East Cibola Loop)
<b>Size</b>	Approximately 27 acres
<b>Existing Zoning</b>	SU-1 for R-2 uses
<b>Proposed Zoning</b>	SU-1 for Senior Housing and Limited Medical Facilities (Tract A, 11 acres)  SU-1 for C-1 permissive uses including drive-up service window (Tract B, 2.9 ac)  No change (Tract C, 12.4 acres)

**Staff Recommendation**

**APPROVAL of 08EPC 40036, based on the Findings beginning on Page 7 and subject to the Conditions of Approval beginning on Page 10.**

Note: the sector development plan map amendment (08EPC-40037) was considered at the June 17, 2008 EPC hearing.

**Staff Planner  
Catalina Lehner, AICP-Senior Planner**

**Summary of Analysis**

This proposal is for a sector development plan map amendment (zone change) and a site development plan for subdivision with design standards for an approx. 27 acre site on Ellison Dr. NW.

At its June 17, 2008 hearing, the EPC voted to recommend that an approval recommendation for the sector development plan map amendment be forwarded to the City Council. The EPC voted to continue the hearing regarding the site development plan for subdivision.

During the continuance period, the applicant has improved the design standards by incorporating the proposed conditions of approval from the June hearing, adding illustrations and refining key concepts. Overall, the proposed design standards are stronger and will provide sufficient clarity for future reviewers. Building height continues to be an outstanding issue. Neighbors expressed concern about this issue, and others, at the June hearing.

Staff recommends approval subject to conditions.

This report should be read in conjunction with the original May 15, 2008 Staff report and the first supplemental Staff report (see attachments).

City Departments and other interested agencies reviewed this application from 4/7/08 to 4/18/08. Agency comments used in the preparation of this report begin on Page 31 of the original Staff report.

## ***I. OVERVIEW***

Previously, the applicant had requested deferral of this proposal for 30 days to the June 19, 2008 EPC hearing in order to allow time to address outstanding issues raised by Staff and neighbors. Staff then met with the applicant to discuss outstanding issues, particularly insufficient justification for the zone change and the need for additional substance in the proposed design standards. The applicant provided additional information to address these concerns, and the proposal was considered at the June 19, 2008 Environmental Planning Commission (EPC) hearing.

At its June 17, 2008 hearing, the EPC heard this proposal and voted to: 1) recommend that an approval recommendation regarding the sector development plan map amendment (zone change, 08EPC-40037), with conditions, be forwarded to the City Council, and 2) voted that the hearing regarding the proposed site development plan for subdivision (08EPC-40036) be continued to the July 17, 2008 EPC hearing.

## ***PROCEDURE***

Unlike a deferral, a continuance means that the hearing will begin where it left off at the previous hearing. In this case, the previous hearing ended as a discussion was approaching regarding the proposed conditions of approval for the site development plan for subdivision. When a case is deferred, in contrast, the hearing would start at the beginning again.

## ***REQUEST (repeated in brief)***

As stated, this is a two-part proposal. The request for a sector development plan map amendment was heard at the June 19, 2008 EPC hearing and will not be heard again by the EPC. The second request, for a site development plan for subdivision with design standards, is up for consideration at the July 17, 2008 EPC hearing.

⇒ For more information, please refer to the original May 15, 2008 Staff report beginning on p. 2 (see attachment).

## ***HISTORY & BACKGROUND***

⇒ Please refer to p. 2 of the original May 15, 2008 Staff report (see attachment).

## ***RESTRICTIVE COVENANT (repeated in brief)***

⇒ Please refer to the original May 15, 2008 Staff report, beginning on p. 2, for a detailed explanation (see attachment).

The subject site is governed by a restrictive covenant which specifies that the subject site shall be used pursuant to the Housing for Older Persons Act of 1995, which generally limits occupancy to persons 55 years of age or older. This restriction does not prevent a combination of single unit and multi-unit dwelling types. A recreational facility, common areas, independent living, assisted living, a nursing home and office or retail uses are allowed. The office or retail uses cannot exceed 14,000 square feet (sf), are to provide services for the residents.

***DEFINITIONS***

⇒ Please refer to p. 5 the original May 15, 2008 Staff report for definitions of Drive-up service window and Site development plan for subdivision (see attachment).

***TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDY (TIS)***

⇒ Please refer to p. 13 the original May 15, 2008 Staff report for a discussion of the TIS and the TIS update (see attachment).

***POLICY ANALYSIS***

⇒ Please refer to the original May 15, 2008 Staff report, beginning on p. 6, for an analysis of conformance to adopted Plans and policies (see attachment).

***II. SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR SUBDIVISION***

The purpose of the proposed site development plan for subdivision is to create Tract A (approx. 11 acres) for the retirement center, Tract B (approx. 2.9 acres) for the commercial uses and Tract C (approx. 12.4 acres) for possible future senior apartments.

The proposed site development plan for subdivision does not comply with the definition of a site development plan for subdivision found in Zoning Code §14-16-1-5. Setbacks, height and dwelling units need to be specified.

⇒ Please refer to p. 20 of the original May 15, 2008 report for additional information (see attachment).

***III. ANALYSIS- SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR SUBDIVISION, DESIGN STANDARDS***

***Purpose & Proposal (repeated in brief)***

The purpose of design standards is to provide guidance to ensure that a development will further applicable goals and policies, exceed minimal Zoning Code requirements and establish a framework for future site development plans for building permit.

The revised, proposed design standards (version 5) are discussed below in the order presented on the site development plan for subdivision. Any changes and/or additional information (from version 4 to version 5) are discussed under “Update” after each section below. The underlining and strikethroughs on the design standards mostly correspond to revisions, although Staff points out that the indication of new and existing language is inaccurate in places. A new, separate detail sheet is included.

***1. Site Objectives:***

The main site objectives are to create an active pedestrian environment and link the individual sites together. Direct pedestrian connections are desired and parking adjacent to streets shall be screened. Staff suggests that enhanced paving be defined as textured, colored concrete (or thermoplastic) and that parking areas can provide more than one pedestrian link to the sidewalk network.

---

***Update:*** *Enhanced paving is now specified as textured, colored concrete, thermoplastic or other comparable surface. The reference to enhanced paving needs to be removed. Pedestrian links are now referred to as pedestrian connections and screen walls are now allowed a maximum height of 2 ft. These revisions improve the proposed design standards.*

***Standards 1-F and 1-G have changed significantly. Non-restaurant uses on Tract B shall provide 100 sf of shaded seating area for each 1,500 sf of building area, which is in excess of minimal Zoning Code requirements. Restaurants over 2,000 sf shall provide a minimum of 500 sf of outdoor patio space. Staff suggests that this requirement for restaurants less than 2,000 sf be proportional like the non-restaurant requirement. 200 sf of shaded seating area per every 1,000 sf, for instance, would ensure that a 1,999 sf restaurant would provide at least the 200 sf minimum (rather than 0).***

2. *Setbacks:*

The minimum building setbacks are 0 ft. from Ellison Rd., 20 ft. from the Cibola Loop right-of-way line and 10 ft. from internal lot lines. The zero setback from Ellison Dr. will allow buildings to be located close to the street, which will help create a streetscape feeling.

***Update:*** *The setbacks information was moved to sheet 1, but still needs to be included in the design standards so the design standards can function as a stand-alone document. The setback listed in Section 2-Transit Feasibility and Access Plan, specifies that front entrances for buildings on Tract B shall not be further than 52 ft. from Ellison Dr. This is to accommodate the 20 ft. landscape buffer and a drive-thru lane. If there are any drive-thrus, Staff suggests orienting their main elevation, rather than their back elevation, to Ellison Dr.*

3. *Parking/Circulation:*

This section does not contain any overarching Goal or vision statements.

***Update:*** *Minimum off-street parking for all Tracts is now proposed to be based on Zoning Code §14-16-3-1, the General Parking Regulations. Before, parking calculations were different by tract. For the limited medical units on Tract A, parking is proposed to be one space for every four residents which seems reasonable. Pedestrian connections over drive-aisles are now required to be 8 ft. wide, as opposed to 6 ft. wide. However, standard sidewalk width has decreased from 10 ft. to 8 ft. Therefore, the improvement cancels out. Four new parking standards have been added regarding setbacks, parking near Ellison, more than one pedestrian connection allowed and segmentation of parking areas.*

***The parking standards now specify minimum parking setbacks, which they did not do previously. This has created inconsistencies within the proposed design standards which will need to be remedied for the sake of future clarity. For instance, Staff finds that the 15 ft. minimum parking setback along Ellison conflicts with the 20 ft. landscaping buffer along Ellison. In addition, parking is prohibited between south facing façades and Ellison. These internal inconsistencies need to be remedied. All setbacks need to be discussed in the setbacks section, which was removed from the design standards.***

*4. Sidewalks/Bikeways:*

These standards aim to encourage and enhance pedestrian activity. Sidewalks must be at least 6 ft. wide and trails at least 10 ft. wide. Pedestrian connections are to be “convenient”, though convenient is not defined. Access to Transit stops and the relationship between pedestrian connections and transit should be mentioned here, and should mirror the site development plan for subdivision (Sheet 1). The Transit Access & Feasibility Plan will improve pedestrianism and access to transit, and help make this *de facto* neighborhood activity center function according to policy guidance for Activity Centers.

***Update: Pedestrian crossings of drive aisles are now required to be 8 ft. wide. The minimum 12 ft. wide sidewalk along the entrance side of office buildings has been lessened to 8 ft. wide. Staff suggests that the sidewalk width at least increase proportionately with building size, as required in Zoning Code §14-16-3-18(C)(1). Pedestrian connections are now required to be direct.***

***The only change to the Transit Access & Feasibility Plan is an increase in the distance of front entrances from Ellison Dr., which is now 52 ft. as opposed to 35 ft.***

*5. Landscape Standards:*

Now entitled Standards, the Landscape Standards establish a framework to unify the individual sites through a common landscape theme.

***Update: All landscape areas 36 square feet or greater shall be covered with live vegetative material over at least 80% of the required landscape area. Coverage was 75% previously. Goal 2 of the SBRSDP calls for a highly-landscaped streetscape, but the design standards do not explain how the proposed development will meet this goal.***

***The plant palette has been expanded to include a greater variety of trees, shrubs and flowers and is now easier to read. High water-use turf is now prohibited, but can be up to 15% of the turf blend. The language regarding prohibition of spray type sprinklers and compliance of the irrigation system with the Water Conservation Ordinance was removed. Raywood Ash and Chinese Pistache are proposed as street trees along Ellison Rd.***

*6. Architectural Standards:*

Now entitled Standards, the architectural standards are intended to create a visually integrated site.

***Update: Permitted architectural styles still include Pueblo, Territorial and New Mexico traditional, but the word “southwest” has been added to qualify “contemporary”. This will help to create a visually integrated site. Colors are now discussed and limited to earth tones, except for decorative elements. Three standards regarding equipment screening have been moved to the Utility Standards. These changes improve the proposed design standards.***

*7. Screening, Walls & Fencing Standards:*

The proposed design standards address screening of parking lots, loading areas, trash enclosures, storage areas and walls.

---

**Update:** *Screen walls are now required to not exceed 2 ft. high and now must have openings for pedestrians. All refuse enclosures will be gated and unfinished CMU block is now prohibited. A wall detail should be provided, though there is now a detail of security fencing. Staff is concerned that security fencing could be installed around the perimeter of Cibola Loop, which would create an exclusionary “gated compound” feeling that separates the current and future residents.*

8. *Lighting Standards:*

The lighting standards aim to enhance safety, security and aesthetics.

**Update:** *Light poles height is now measured from top to grade. A general lighting detail is provided on the detail sheet.*

9. *Signage Standards:*

The signage design standards regulate the size, location type and quality of signs in the proposed development. Signs are limited to wall signs and monument signs. Monument signs cannot exceed 6 ft. high or 32 sf sign face. One project entry sign, up to 12 ft. tall with 75 sf face area, is proposed.

**Update:** *One building-mounted signs is allowed per façade, but not facing a residential area. The project entry sign is proposed to be located at the centralized driveway on Ellison Rd.*

*One free-standing business monument sign is allowed per premises which has at least 150 ft. of street frontage. Each of the subdivided tracts (most likely there will be 3) of Tract B will be allowed 2 monument signs-one facing Ellison and the other facing the internal circulation street. Staff suggests that one monument sign be allowed per premises.*

10. *Utility Standards:*

Now called standards, these standards state that the negative visual image shall be mitigated.

**Update:** Language is missing from standard 10-B. The three utility related standards that were formerly in the architecture section have been relocated with the rest of the utility standards.

11. *Open Space:*

This section establishes open space requirements for residential uses based on the type of facility and number of bedrooms. 300 sf of open space per bed would be provided for the nursing facility, 400 sf for efficiencies, 500 sf for two bedrooms and 600 sf for three or more bedrooms. This amount of open space exceeds the requirement in the SU-1 zone, which applies to Developing Urban areas (the subject site is in an Established Urban area).

**Update:** *No changes have been made to this section. Information regarding provision of open space for Tract B has been included under Section 1- Site Objectives.*

12. *Proposed Approvals Process:*

This section states that future site development plans for building permit will return to the EPC for review. The word “proposed” should be removed since, at this stage, the whole document is proposed.

---

**Update: No changes have been made to this section.**

*Conclusion:* Staff finds that the proposed design standards (v.5) have improved since the previous version (v.4) and generally will provide a workable framework for reviewers of subsequent site development plans for building permit. Improvements have been made to the sections regarding Site Objectives and Landscaping, though the sections regarding Parking/Circulation, Sidewalks/Bikeways and Screening, Walls & Fencing have both improved and worsened. Also, there are some internal inconsistencies that need to be reconciled (ex. setbacks) and some errors in need of correction. In light of the revisions, Staff has crafted the revised proposed conditions of approval to remedy any remaining deficiencies and provide additional clarity where needed.

**CONCERNS OF REVIEWING AGENCIES/PRE-HEARING DISCUSSION**

⇒ For a discussion of reviewing agencies' concerns, please refer p. 22-23 of the original May 15, 2008 Staff report (see attachment).

**NEIGHBORHOOD CONCERNS**

⇒ For a discussion of neighborhood concerns, please refer to p. 23 of the original May 15 Staff report and the June 19, 2008 supplemental Staff reports (see attachments).

**V. CONCLUSION**

This proposal is for an approximately 27 acre site located on Ellison Dr. NW. The second part of this proposal, a request for a site development plan for subdivision with design standards, is the subject of the July 17, 2008 hearing which the EPC voted to continue from the June 19, 2008 hearing. The sector development plan map amendment (zone change, 08EPC-40037), was considered at the June 19, 2008 EPC hearing. The EPC recommended that an approval recommendation, with conditions, be forwarded to the City Council.

The proposed site development plan for subdivision would subdivide the subject site into Tract A (approx. 11 ac), Tract B (approx. 2.9 ac) and Tract C (approx. 12.4 ac). Staff has concluded that the proposal generally furthers the intent of relevant Goals and policies in the Comprehensive Plan, the West Side Strategic Plan and the Seven Bar Ranch Sector Development Plan (SBRSDP).

Also proposed are design standards to guide future development. Delegation of the EPC's review authority to the DRB is not requested nor recommended. Staff finds that the revised proposed design standards are an improvement over the previous version, and will provide sufficient clarity for reviewers of future site development plans. Staff recommends approval subject to conditions.

***FINDINGS -08EPC 40036, July 17, 2008-Site Development Plan for Subdivision***

1. This is a request for a site development plan for subdivision for Tract B-9-E-1 & Tract B-9-F of Seven Bar Ranch, an approximately 27 acre site located on Ellison Drive, zoned SU-1 for R-2 Uses.
  
2. This request accompanies a sector development plan map amendment request (08EPC-40037), which the EPC considered at its June 19, 2008 hearing. The EPC recommended that an approval recommendation for the sector development plan map amendment, with conditions, be forwarded to the City Council.
  
3. The applicant proposes to eliminate the lot line between Tract B-9-E-1 & Tract B-9-F and create three tracts in order to develop a continuous care retirement center (housing for older persons) on Tract A and small commercial uses on Tract B. Design standards are proposed. Delegation of approval authority to the Development Review Board (DRB) is not requested nor recommended.
  
4. The proposal *further*s the following Comprehensive Plan policies:
  - A. Policy II.B.5a: Adding an age-restricted residential use and neighborhood commercial uses will increase land use variety in the area.
  
  - B. Policy II.B.5e: The subject site is contiguous to existing urban facilities and services, the use of which is unlikely to disrupt neighborhood integrity.
  
  - C. Policy II.B.5h: In this area, a mixed density pattern is already established. A multi-family development up to 30 DU/acre would be compatible with existing land uses, infrastructure is available and the subject site is located in a designated Activity Center.
  
5. The proposal *partially further*s the following Comprehensive Plan policies:
  - A. Policy II.B.5d: There are no details at this stage regarding site layout of the future uses. However, neighbors are generally concerned about building height, the uses' intensity and scenic resources.
  
  - B. Policy II.B.5k: Cibola Loop Rd. would be widened to accommodate additional traffic. However, increased traffic could affect the livability and safety of the established residential neighborhoods.
  
  - C. Policy II.B.5j: The proposed commercial development would be located in the boundaries of the Regional Activity Center, a larger area-wide shopping center, though the existing zoning is not commercial.



- 
6. The Activity Center Goal of the Comprehensive Plan is *partially furthered*. The subject site is located in the designated Regional Activity Center for the Westside. The proposed uses would be generally compatible with the area's land use pattern. However, the commercial uses would not necessarily reduce auto travel needs, especially if they are mostly drive-thru uses. Activity Centers are intended to be accessible by all modes of travel, not just vehicles.
7. The Transportation and Transit Goal and Policy II.D.4g of the Comprehensive Plan are *partially furthered*. The proposal would place multi-unit housing and commercial uses in a Transit Corridor, but the circulation may not be balanced and efficient (Goal). The proposed design standards have integrated pedestrian opportunities, but pedestrian-friendliness would be adversely impacted without a limitation on drive-thru uses.
8. The proposal generally *further*s the following West Side Strategic Plan (WSSP) policies:
- A. Policy 1.1: The accompanying sector development plan map amendment (zone change) would allow multi-family residential and commercial development within the boundaries of the Regional Activity Center.
  - B. Policy 2.5: The zone change and site development plan, for an age-restricted residential development and some commercial uses, would not contribute to additional school overcrowding on the Westside. As required, the Planning Department has considered school capacity in its evaluation of this proposal.
  - C. Policy 3.2. It is generally appropriate to locate multi-family housing and commercial services in the Regional Center.
  - D. Policy 3.3. A bicycle trail, sidewalks and connections to the transit system are included, and information on connectivity is provided in the design standards.
  - E. Policy 3.4. Though not a designated Neighborhood Activity Center, the commercial uses may function as a smaller, de facto neighborhood center within the Regional Center.
9. With respect to the Seven Bar Ranch Sector Development Plan (SBRSDP), the proposal *further*s Goal 2. The proposed design standards provide for creation of a "streetscape image" that will be landscaped based on a plant palette that will create a unified visual image.
10. With respect to the SBRSDP, the proposal *partially further*s the following Goal and policy.
- A. Goal 1: The proposed commercial uses would be located close to the existing residences and the new retirement center. Some vehicle trips may be minimized, though some uses may foster more vehicle trips and would not help create a "self-sufficient community."

- B. Policy 4g: Though pedestrian and bicycle paths have been integrated into the development, non-motorized travel conditions may not be “safe and pleasant” given the proposed road widening and concentration of commercial uses on the corner of west Cibola Loop.

11. The subject site will function as a de facto neighborhood activity center within the context of the much larger Regional Center. Pedestrian connectivity and circulation are particularly important in neighborhood activity centers. The proposed design standards will generally provide for alternatives to vehicle travel, though connectivity between the various residential and commercial uses will be demonstrated at the site development plan for building permit level.

12. The proposed design standards have improved since the previous version and generally will provide a workable framework for reviewers of subsequent site development plans for building permit. Improvements have been made to the sections regarding Site Objectives and Landscaping, though the sections regarding Parking/Circulation, Sidewalks/Bikeways and Screening, Walls & Fencing have both improved and worsened. The revised proposed conditions of approval are intended to remedy any remaining deficiencies and provide additional clarity where needed.

13. The subject site is currently zoned SU-1 for R-2 Uses. The proposed zoning would also be SU-1. With respect to building height, Zoning Code §14-16-2-22, Special Use Zone, states that “the same regulations apply as in the R-2 zone unless modified by the Planning Commission.” Therefore, the EPC will decide the appropriate heights for the future buildings.

14. A facilitated meeting between the applicant and the neighborhoods was held. The main issues discussed were building height, views, siting of the senior housing, traffic, fast-food restaurants, liquor sales, and the process. Staff received comments, which reflected these concerns, from the Cibola Loop NA, the Cottonwood Heights NA and individuals. The Cibola Loop NA is opposed to drive-up service windows.

***RECOMMENDATION - 08EPC 40036, July 17, 2008***

**APPROVAL of 08EPC 40036, a Site Development Plan for Subdivision for Tract B-9-E-1 & Tract B-9-F of Seven Bar Ranch, zoned SU-1 for R-2 uses, located on Ellison Dr. NW, between West Cibola Loop and East Cibola Loop, based on the preceding Findings and subject to the following Conditions of Approval.**

---

---

***CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL -08EPC 40036, July 17, 2008- Site Development Plan for Subdivision***

1. The EPC delegates final sign-off authority of this site development plan to the Development Review Board (DRB). The DRB is responsible for ensuring that all EPC Conditions have been satisfied and that other applicable City requirements have been met. A letter shall accompany the submittal, specifying all modifications that have been made to the site plan since the EPC hearing, including how the site plan has been modified to meet each of the EPC conditions. Unauthorized changes to this site plan, including before or after DRB final sign-off, may result in forfeiture of approvals.
2. Final approval by the City Council for the related sector development plan map amendment (08EPC-40037) as recommended by the EPC (SU-1 for C-1 Permissive Uses with No Drive-up Service Windows and SU-1 for Housing for Older Persons and Limited Medical Facilities) is required before final DRB sign-off of this site development plan for subdivision.
3. Prior to final DRB sign off, the applicant shall meet with the Development Review Staff planner to ensure that conditions of approval are met. Evidence of this meeting shall be provided to the DRB at the time of application.
4. The applicant shall obtain a Certificate of No Effect or a Certificate of Approval pursuant to F/S O-07-72, the Albuquerque Archaeological Ordinance, prior to approval of a preliminary plat, site development plan or master development plan.
5. Once approved by the City Council or other final approval body, the zoning resulting from the associated sector development plan map amendment (08EPC-40037) shall be indicated on the site development plan for subdivision (Sheet 1).
6. Process:

The "Process" section shall explain that the approval process for any tracts resulting from a subsequent subdivision of Tract A, Tract B and Tract C shall return to the EPC.
7. Setbacks & Density:
  - A. Building setbacks and building height shall be discussed in the design standards as well as on the site development plan for subdivision (Sheet 1).
  - B. The parking area minimum setback from Ellison Rd. shall be 20 ft., as to not conflict with the 20 ft. landscaping buffer along Ellison.

C. The Setbacks section of the design standards shall be re-instated.

8. Height:

- A. Building height shall not exceed 36 ft. for the residential uses and 26 ft. for the commercial uses.
- B. Building height shall be specified on the site development plan for subdivision (sheet 1).
- C. The building height diagram (Sheet 6) shall specify zones using height, not stories.

9. Public Space:

- A. Design standard 1-F shall state that all non-residential sites (not all sites) shall provide public space in accordance with Zoning Code §14-16-3-18.
- B. Restaurants less than 2,000 square feet shall provide a minimum of 200 square feet of shaded seating area.
- C. Design standard 1-G shall refer to restaurants equal or greater than 2,000 square feet.
- D. Adequate shading shall be defined as shade covering at least 50% of the area.

10. Transit Feasibility & Access Plan:

The language stating “a minimum [of the residential units] will be occupied by household heads of 55 years and older” shall be deleted.

11. Vehicular Access & Parking:

- A. The vehicular access points identified in the site development plan for subdivision shall not be relocated at the site development plan for building permit stage.
- B. Parking shall not exceed the required parking plus 10% for the non-residential uses.
- C. Areas for the storage of high profile delivery/transport vehicles shall be prohibited (ref: former Standard 7-B).

12. Parking Lot Circulation & Screening:

- A. For all non-residential buildings, a standard sidewalk that is a minimum of 10 ft. shall be provided along the main entrance side of a building (3-E).
- B. The following language regarding shading (from the former Standard 3-G) shall be re-instated: Shade trees shall be provided at intervals of at least 30 ft. on center.
- C. In Standard 7-B, “parking facilities” shall be changed to “parking areas.”

13. Pedestrian and Bicycle Connections:

- A. The pedestrian sidewalks, no less than 8 ft. in width and along the full length of the building, shall increase in width pursuant to Zoning Code §14-16-3-18(C)(1).
- B. A pedestrian connection, of textured, colored concrete or thermoplastic, shall be provided across Cibola Loop Rd. near Cuba Rd. NW (Sheet 1).
- C. The material for the “new paved trail” shall be specified as textured concrete or thermoplastic in the site development plan for subdivision (sheet 1) and in the associated design standards.

14. Landscape Standards:

- A. The detention pond area shall have a landscape buffer at least 10 ft. wide on its western, northern and eastern sides.
- B. Agastache and Scotch Broom shall be listed separately on the plant palette.
- C. Parking lot area trees and street trees shall be deciduous and canopy forming.

15. Screening, Walls & Fences:

- A. A detail of the screen wall shall be provided.
- B. Fencing around a portion of, or the entirety of, the perimeter of Cibola Loop is prohibited.
- C. Security fencing shall not be required (7-F).
- D. Loading docks shall be screened by walls which match building architecture, materials and color.

16. Signage Standards:

- A. One free-standing business monument sign shall be permitted for each tract.
- B. A sign detail of the project entry sign and the monument sign shall be provided.

17. Lighting Standards:

A light detail shall be provided.

18. Utility Standards:

The following language shall be re-instated (10-B): “If pre-fabricated fiberglass enclosures are used, they shall be appropriately screened from view by walls and/or landscaping.”

19. Drive-up service windows are not allowed.

If drive-up service windows become an allowed use in the Cibola Loop Subdivision, the following design standards shall apply:

- A. The drive-up service window shall be oriented away from residentially zoned areas.
- B. Pedestrian crossings, of textured, colored concrete or thermoplastic markings shall be provided across all drive-thru service lanes.
- C. Separate vehicular and pedestrian access shall be provided.
- D. Each drive-thru use must have at least one functional entrance facing Ellison Dr.

20. General & Minor “Clean-up”:

- A. On the site development plan for subdivision and in the design standards, the term “senior housing” shall be changed to “housing for older persons.”
- B. The details on Sheet 4 shall be integrated into the design standards and placed near the relevant sections.
- C. The word “should” shall be replaced with “shall”.
- D. The sentence in Standard 7-F shall be completed.
- E. The word “proposed” shall be removed from Section 12-Approval Process.

21. RECOMMENDED CONDITION FROM THE TRANSIT DEPARTMENT:

The design standards shall include language incorporating Comprehensive Plan policies for buildings adjacent to Enhanced Transit Corridors, including siting buildings close to the street with parking to the side or rear and providing entrances facing the street.

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

Conditions of approval for the proposed Sector Development Plan Map Amendment, Zone Map Amendment 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. A Traffic Impact Study (TIS) has been submitted and reviewed by Transportation Staff. However, a revised TIS will be required based on the change in land use.
  - C. Per Transportation Development Staff, completion of the required system improvements that are attributable to the development, as identified in the TIS, is required.
  - D. Provide applicable cross access agreements.
  - E. A concurrent platting action will be required at DRB.
  - F. Site plan shall comply and be designed per DPM Standards.
  - G. The multi-use trail refuge area within the triangular island at the new right-in, right-out driveway on Ellison Drive should be a *minimum* of six feet in length at the point where the trail crosses the refuge. We ask that the applicant coordinate with the Department of Municipal Development, Transportation Section in the preparation of the final design plans.
- 

**Catalina Lehner, AICP  
Senior Planner**

cc: Mark Goodwin & Assoc., Attn: John MacKenzie, P.O. Box 90606, Albuquerque, NM 87199  
The Haskell Company, P.O. Box 44100, Jacksonville, FL 32231  
Scott and Beth Salvas, Cibola Loop NA, 10756 Galaxia Park Dr. NW, Albuquerque, NM 87114  
Jacque Abeyta, Cibola Loop NA, 10519 Blanco Dr. NW, Albuquerque, NM 87114