



**Environmental
Planning
Commission**

**Agenda Number: 15
Project Number: 1003570
Case #s: 08EPC 40037/40036
June 19, 2008**

Supplemental Staff Report

Agent	Mark Goodwin & Associates
Applicant	The Haskell Company
Requests	Sector Development Plan Map Amendment Site Development Plan for Subdivision
Legal Description	Tract B-9-E-1 & Tract B-9-F, Seven Bar Ranch
Location	On Ellison Dr. NW (between West Cibola Loop & East Cibola Loop)
Size	Approximately 27 acres
Existing Zoning	SU-1 for R-2 uses
Proposed Zoning	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

That a recommendation of APPROVAL of 08EPC 40037, based on the Findings beginning on Page 15 and subject to the Conditions of Approval on Page 19, be forwarded to the City Council.

APPROVAL of 08EPC 40036, based on the Findings beginning on Page 19 and subject to the Conditions of Approval beginning on Page 22.

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 for an approx. 27 acre site located on Ellison Dr.

The applicant proposes to change the zoning from SU-1 for R-2 uses to "SU-1 for Senior Housing and Limited Medical Facilities" and "SU-1 for C-1 permissive uses including drive-up service window". Design standards are proposed.

Staff finds that the proposed zone change has been adequately justified for the most part, but recommends that a conditional approval be forwarded to the City Council. The proposed design standards have improved, but conditions are needed to strengthened them and provide clarity for future reviewers. Staff recommends approval subject to conditions.

A facilitated meeting was held. There are neighborhood concerns, mostly about building height and drive-thru uses.

This report should be read in conjunction with the original May 15, 2008 Staff report (see attachment).

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

Prior to the May 15, 2008 Environmental Planning Commission (EPC) hearing, the applicant 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. Note that this proposal is required to be forwarded to the City Council because it includes a request for a sector development plan map amendment, over ten acres, to the Seven Bar Ranch Sector Development Plan.

Staff met with the applicant on May 28, 2008 to discuss outstanding issues, particularly Staff's concerns that the proposed zone change was insufficiently justified and that the proposed design standards were mostly a re-iteration of Zoning Code requirements and did not provide sufficient guidance for future development. Since then, the applicant has provided a revised site development plan and supplemental information for the sector development plan map amendment (zone change).

REQUEST (repeated in brief)

This two-part proposal is for an amendment to the zone map of the Seven Bar Ranch Sector Development Plan (SBRSDP) and a site development plan for subdivision with design standards for an approximately 27 acre site located on the north side of Ellison Dr.

The applicant proposes to subdivide the subject site into three tracts and change its zoning from SU-1 for R-2 Uses to "SU-1 for Senior Housing and Limited Medical Facilities" (for the proposed Tract A) and SU-1 for C-1 permissive uses including drive-up service window (for the proposed Tract B). The applicant intends to develop a continuous care retirement center (CCRC) and commercial/retail uses, respectively. No zone change is requested for the proposed Tract C.

⇒ 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.

ZONING & SECTOR PLAN

⇒ Please refer to the original May 15, 2008 Staff report, beginning on p. 4, for an explanation (see attachment).

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. SECTOR DEVELOPMENT PLAN MAP AMENDMENT

Resolution 270-1980 (Policies for Zone Map Amendments)

Requirements

⇒ Please refer to p. 14 of the original May 15, 2008 Staff report (see attachment).

Request & Justification

The applicant is requesting “SU-1 for Senior Housing and Limited Medical Facilities” (for the proposed Tract A) and “SU-1 for C-1 permissive uses including drive-up service window” (for the proposed Tract B). The “including drive-up service window” would allow a drive-up service window as a right that goes with the requested zoning, which would supersede any limitation on drive-thrus contained in the associated design standards. No zone change is requested for the proposed Tract C. The requested zoning has not changed from the timeframe of the original report.

New Information

In a letter dated June 4, 2008, the applicant provided some additional justification in response to Staff’s concerns (see attachment). Here Staff revisits the zone change request in light of the new information, which consists of revised responses to Sections B, D, E, I and J of R270-1980. *[No new information]* is placed by the sections for which the response has not changed.

Staff Analysis Revisited

The following discussion of Sections A – J of R270-1980 incorporates supplemental information unless otherwise noted. For ease of reading, Staff has included the entirety of the discussion in this supplemental report. The applicant’s reasoning is in plain text. **Staff’s Analysis follows in bold text.**

- A. "A proposed zone change must be found to be consistent with the health, safety, morals and general welfare of the City."

[no additional information] The requests do not adversely affect health, safety, morals and general welfare of the residents of the City. The senior housing and neighborhood commercial will relieve pressure on Westside public schools and restore a better balance between jobs and housing.

Relieving pressure on the public schools and balancing the jobs/housing ratio are good reasons in support of the proposal. However, it is the applicant's task to explain how these reasons relate back to the City's health, safety, morals and general welfare, which is not made readily apparent. Another way to demonstrate consistency between health, safety, morals and general welfare is to show that the proposal furthers applicable Goals and policies. Though the applicant did not respond to Section A this way, Staff would have found it preferable.

- B. "Stability of land use and zoning is desirable; therefore the applicant must provide a sound justification for the change. The burden is on the applicant to show why the change should be made, not on the city to show why the change should not be made."

The existing zoning was the result of a sector plan amendment. The adoption of the WSSP showed the site as a Regional Employment Center, creating the potential for a zone change to a more intense employment center. This request would remove ambiguity and stabilize zoning so that people will know that C-1 and senior housing will be on the site, compared to the possibility of more intense C-2 and IP uses located elsewhere in the Seven Bar Regional Center.

Staff points out that any proposal will remove ambiguity, especially upon its final approval. The applicant's argument that more intense uses (such as C-2 and IP) could occur on the subject site is not completely thought out. Like the current proposal, these uses are not allowed under the current zoning of SU-1 for R-2 and would require a zone change. The same point can be made regarding any site in the Regional Center, so this argument is not unique to the subject site and not tied to the particular zoning requested.

- C. "A proposed change shall not be in significant conflict with adopted elements of the Comprehensive Plan or other city master plans and amendments there, to, including privately developed area plans which have been adopted by the City."

The request must be shown to not be in conflict with the policies of the Plan, as follows:

Comprehensive Plan Citations: programmed facilities/neighborhood integrity (Policy II.B.5e), location of higher density housing (Policy II.B.5h)*, location of employment and service uses (II.B.5i), location of new commercial development (Policy II.B.5j) and design quality/innovation (Policy II.B.5l)*. [*** indicates that new information has been provided for these items.**]

The applicant states that the development will occur on a site with exiting infrastructure and that the design standards will soften the impact to the adjacent neighborhood (Policy II.B.5e). The request fronts Ellison Dr. and around the site is a diverse pattern of mixed density. Densities greater than 30 DU/ac should generally be within the urban centers (Policy II.B.5h). There will be site plan review and residents will have input to address potentially adverse impacts (Policy II.B.5i). The proposed commercial uses are in a regional shopping center and are close to the neighborhoods, as well as being accessible to areas outside of the regional center which they will serve (II.B.5j). General design standards will be established and the design-build team is nationally recognized (Policy II.B.5l).

West Side Strategic Plan (WSSP) citations: community and neighborhood centers (Policy 1.1), development of employment centers (Policy 1.6), designation and development of neighborhood centers (Policy 1.9), location of neighborhood centers (Policy 1.16), school capacity (Policy 2.5), development in the Regional Center (Policy 3.1), uses in the Regional Center (Policy 3.2), Regional Center Development and connections (Policy 3.3), Seven Bar Ranch neighborhood centers (Policy 3.4).

The applicant states that the proposed development will occur in an activity center and that it's not strip commercial (Policies 1.9 and 3.2). It will be the right size for a neighborhood center (Policy 1.15) and appropriately located on an arterial street, and will provide bicycle and pedestrian connections (Policy 1.16).

Seven Bar Ranch Sector Development Plan (SBRSDP) citations: The applicant cites Goals 1, 2 and 3 regarding location of centers near a variety of housing types, buffers and creating a "streetscape" image and vehicular/non-vehicular circulation systems, respectively.

The applicant states that the proposal will lead to a more self-sufficient community and that the proposed design guidelines will create landscape buffers and the desired streetscape image. Roadway modification will ensure efficient handling of traffic loads, and a trail will be provided.

The applicant refers to several Goals and policies in applicable Plans including the Comprehensive Plan, the West Side Strategic Plan (WSSP) and the Seven Bar Ranch Sector Development Plan (SBRSDP).

Staff finds that the applicant's policy discussion is acceptable overall, but that it would benefit from strengthening in certain key areas. For example, the applicant should have addressed Activity Centers in the context of the Comprehensive Plan and not just the WSSP. Other Comprehensive Plan Goals and Policies, such as Housing and Transportation/Transit, were not included but should have been- especially given the subject site's location in a designated Activity Center. In other instances, the applicant did not finish the argument. For example, in the discussion of Policy II.B.5h-higher density housing, the applicant mentions driveways and a pattern of mixed density, but does not explain what this means and does not relate it back to the policy. Therefore, the discussion is somewhat disjointed and not as complete as it could be.

Regarding the applicant's discussion of the WSSP, several policies are cited but the response is not directly correlated to the policies. It is difficult to disentangle which ideas correspond to which policies. Staff finds that WSSP Policy 1.6, which refers to employment center development, does not apply. Though some jobs will be created, Staff does not consider the subject site to be an employment center in the same what that an office park and/or shopping center would be. Staff finds that the discussion of applicable Goals in the SBRSDP is satisfactory.

- D. "The applicant must demonstrate that the existing zoning is inappropriate because:
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 use category is more advantageous to the community, as articulated in the Comprehensive Plan or other city master plan, even though (D1) or (D2) above do not apply."

The applicant believes that changed community conditions have occurred (D2) and that the proposed zoning would be more advantageous to the community than the current zoning (D1).

The new police station contributes to this area as a node of community services. The housing/employment imbalance is a gradually changing condition, and the proposal will contribute to offsetting this imbalance by providing jobs. The proposed zoning would be more advantageous to the community because it would further several key elements and policies of the WSSP, such as siting higher density housing in the Regional Center (Policies 3.1 and 3.2) and attracting non-school age residents (Policy 2.5).

D 2: Staff finds that a logical nexus between the cited change and the proposal has not been adequately established. Adding the police substation is one change, though there are others such as additional commercial development in the vicinity in the Regional Center. However, Staff does not consider the jobs/housing imbalance to be a changed condition since it has existed for some time, which is all the more reason to work toward remedying the situation.

Staff does not find that the City's imposition of a restrictive covenant on the subject site is a changed community condition. This is a change, but it is not the community condition that R270-1980 means to refer to. Additionally, Staff's understanding is that the covenant was in place in 2006 and that the current owner acquired the subject property in that time frame, and not last year. Therefore, the covenant is a condition that has not changed in the context of the current proposal.

D 1: Staff agrees that the proposed zoning for Tract A (SU-1 for Senior Housing and Limited Medical Facilities) would be more advantageous to the community than the current zoning, especially since the residential use will not attract school age children and further burden the public school system. The location of higher-density housing furthers a number of relevant Policies (see Section I of this report).

However, Staff does not fully agree that the proposed zoning for Tract B (SU-1 for C-1 Permissive Uses including Drive-up Service Window) would be more advantageous to the community. The applicant has not demonstrated that this zoning would specifically further policies and how it would do so. Rather, the applicant has included supplemental discussion regarding the WSSP intent for the Regional Center (WSSP text, p. 32). The applicant argues that the regional center, including the subject site, is intended to serve the entire West Side so drive-up service window uses are justified.

Staff believes that unlimited drive-up service windows (there could be as many as three on the 2.9 acre tract) would not be more advantageous to the community and would not further applicable Goals and policies, especially with respect to neighborhood activity centers. Also, unlimited drive-up service windows would not fulfill the intent of the restrictive covenant, which runs with the land, to “provide services to the residents of the community.” Rather, as the applicant has stated, the drive-up service uses would be a part of the Regional Center and would serve the entire West Side.

Furthermore, Staff points out that unlimited drive-thru uses would not be conducive to creating the pedestrian-oriented, neighborhood-serving uses that are desired by applicable Activity Centers Goals and policies. The subject site is a *de facto* neighborhood center, albeit within a larger context, and should function as such. The WSSP intends that neighborhood centers be less automobile oriented than the larger center types. Also, neighborhood centers shall have a built scale very accommodating to pedestrians and bicyclists, and are intended for neighborhood services such as childcare, dry cleaners, drug stores and small restaurants (Policy 1.15).

- E. “A change of zone shall not be approved where some of the permissive uses in the zone would be harmful to adjacent property, the neighborhood, or the community.”

The change from R-2 to zoning for senior housing would not be harmful to the community because the activities associated with this use are typically less intense than those associated with the existing apartment zoning. C-1 uses are adjacent to residential uses in the Regional Center and elsewhere. Any new C-1 use would be located at least 120 ft. away from the nearest residential use in the Tres Placitas subdivision.

Staff finds that the discussion of Section E has improved, but that it still does not discuss specific permissive uses in the C-1 zone, such as auto repair and uses/activities in a tent, which neighbors often find harmful. Also, the applicant avoided the fact that the request would make a C-1 conditional use (drive-up service window) into a permissive use. This means that drive-up service windows would no longer require a conditional use permit and would be allowed as a right with the zoning designation, which could result in unlimited drive-thru uses. A limitation in the proposed design standards would not take precedence over the zoning.

- F. A proposed zone change which, to be utilized through land development, requires major and unprogrammed capital expenditures by the city may be:
1. Denied due to lack of capital funds; or
 2. Granted with the implicit understanding that the city is not bound to provide the capital improvements on any special schedule.

[no additional information] Development of the property will not require unprogrammed capital expenditures by the City; nor will the development rely upon them.

Staff agrees that the proposal would not require any unprogrammed City expenditures.

- G. “The cost of land or other economic considerations pertaining to the applicant shall not be the determining factor for a change of zone.”

[no additional information] The cost of land or other economic considerations are not a determining factor in this request. Central is the desire to not impact the schools and implement a Town Center.

Staff notes that the applicant is not requesting consideration of economic factors.

- H. “Location on a collector or major street is not in itself sufficient justification for apartment, office, or commercial zoning.”

The proposed uses are located off the corner of Ellison Dr. and Cibola Loop, so they will resemble a clustering of non-residential uses.

The applicant is not using the subject site’s location on a collector or major street as a justification for the proposed zone change, and has now stated this rather than referring to clustering of non-residential uses.

- I. “A zone change request which would give a zone different from surrounding zoning to one small area, especially when only one premise is involved, is generally called a “spot zone.” Such a change of zone may be approved only when:
1. The change will clearly facilitate realization of the Comprehensive Plan and any applicable adopted sector development plan or area development plan; or
 2. The area of the proposed zone change is different from surrounding land because it could function as a transition between adjacent zones; because the site is not suitable for the uses allowed in any adjacent zone due to topography, traffic, or special adverse land uses nearby; or because the nature of structures already on the premises makes the site unsuitable for the uses allowed in any adjacent zone.”

This request should not be considered spot zoning because it complies with City plans and policies adopted subsequent to R270-1980 that encourage clusters of non-residential zoning. The existing residential zoning on the corner of West Cibola Loop and Ellison Dr. may be considered unsuitable due to excess traffic, noise and pollution at the intersection.

The applicant has now mentioned that SU-1 zoning is typically not considered a “spot zone”, but does not state why or mention that there is other SU-1 zoning in the area. Staff points out that all SU-1 zones are spot zones, but they are justified if it can be demonstrated that they further applicable, adopted policies.

- J. “A zone change request, which would give a zone different from surrounding zoning to a strip of land along a street is generally called “strip zoning.” Strip commercial zoning will be approved only where:
1. The change will clearly facilitate realization of the Comprehensive Plan and any adopted sector development plan or area development plan; and
 2. The area of the proposed zone change is different from surrounding land because it could function as a transition between adjacent zones or because the site is not suitable for the uses allowed in any adjacent zone due to traffic or special adverse land uses nearby.”

The applicant refers to the definition of “strip commercial” in the WSSP, and points out that the proposed C-1 zoning would not allow a very long strip of buildings and that the associated design standards will ensure that the future commercial uses are connected to the adjacent land uses.

Staff finds that the applicant’s discussion of Section J has improved. Though the proposed zone change for Tract B (the commercial portion) would give different zoning to a strip of land along a street, the intent of the WSSP is to prevent long “strip mall” type of development. Therefore, the proposed zone change would be for a relatively small area. The associated design standards, and proposed conditions of approval, will ensure that the commercial uses are integrated with the other uses on the subject site and the neighborhood.

Staff Discussion and Conclusion:

Staff believes that, for purposes of clarity, it makes sense to conceptualize the proposed sector development plan map amendment (zone change) as two sub-parts: the proposed zone change for Tract A to SU-1 for Senior Housing with Limited Medical Facilities, and the proposed zone change for Tract B to SU-1 for C-1 Permissive Uses including Drive-up Service Window.

Staff finds that the applicant’s policy discussion is acceptable overall, but that it would have been stronger had it more thoroughly addressed Activity Centers, Housing and Transportation/ Transit policies in the Comprehensive Plan (Section C). In addition, the applicant should have established a more direct connection between the proposal and the uses in the immediate area to demonstrate stability of land use and zoning (Section B). The applicant did not address specific permissive uses in the requested commercial zoning, or explain the implications of making a conditional use into a permissive use (Section E).

In sum, Staff concludes that the proposed zoning for Tract A would be more advantageous to the community than the current zoning, but does not find that the proposed zoning for Tract B (the commercial portion) would be more advantageous to the community. The applicant's explanation of why it would be more beneficial to include drive-up service windows as part of the zoning designation for Tract B is neither policy-based nor convincing. Therefore, Staff suggests that a recommendation of approval for the zoning on Tract A, and a recommendation of conditional approval for the zoning on Tract B to limit drive-up service windows, be forwarded to the City Council for consideration.

III. 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 DUs/acre need to be specified.

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

IV. 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 proposed design standards are discussed below in the order presented on the site development plan for subdivision. Staff's analysis of the previous version of the design standards begins on p. 20 of the original May 15, 2008 Staff report. Any changes and/or additional information are discussed under "Update" after each section.

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. Requiring public space be provided according to the Zoning Code does not go far enough to create the "active pedestrian environment". Outdoor seating with shading needs to be provided to promote pedestrianism.

Update: A “Table of Headings” has been added just before the Site Objectives, as a table of contents. No changes have been made to the Site Objectives section.

2. Setbacks:

The minimum 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: No changes have been made to the Setbacks section.

3. Parking/Circulation:

Parking for the Tract A facility continues to be based on the Community Residential program requirements in Zoning Code §14-16-3-1, the General Parking Regulations. 390 units would need approx. 99 parking spaces [$1 + 390/4 = 98.5$] The additional 10% [approx. 9 spaces] would make the total maximum allowed parking 108 spaces.

Tree planters need to be a minimum of 36 sf, not 25 sf and truck parking should not be permitted on internal streets.

The applicant continues to request unlimited drive-thru uses on Tract C, which means that 3 fast-food restaurants uses could occur. As a compromise, Staff recommends that drive-up service windows be limited to two, one restaurant and one other. This limitation needs to be listed in the zoning descriptor as well (see Section II of this report).

Update: The maximum allowed parking has been changed to the required parking plus 10% (previously was 20%) and language has been revised to indicate that pedestrian crossings “shall” be clearly delineated. The tree planter language no longer stands alone but has been included in 3-G.

Staff recommends referencing the General Parking Regulations for the parking requirement on Tract B and Tract C, which is more direct than referencing R-2 and C-1.

4. Sidewalks/Bikeways:

These standards mostly reiterate existing requirements and do not go beyond them to create the pedestrian oriented development mentioned under Site Objectives. Sidewalks proposed 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 discussed here, and should mirror the site development plan for subdivision (Sheet 1).

Update: Two new statements have been added. One requires a sidewalk or trail along at least one side of a street or drive way, and the other states that pedestrian crossings of vehicular paths shall be designated with “thermoplastic markings”. Staff suggests that textured, colored concrete also be allowed for the pedestrian crossings.

Also, the Transit Access & Feasibility Plan required by WSSP Policy 1.2 for sites within the Regional Center, has been added to this section. Pedestrian access routes will be provided between each building and bus stops, and a pedestrian path will traverse the subject site, connecting future residents with the park and ride to the east.

Other than a couple of minor language changes to improve clarity, Staff finds that the Transit Access & Feasibility Plan will improve pedestrianism and access to transit and will help make this *de facto* neighborhood activity center function according to policy guidance for Activity Centers.

5. Landscape Plan:

The list of plant varieties allows any plant in the City's xeriscape book. However, some plants in the xeriscape book are inappropriate because they are high water users intended for limited residential usage (i.e.-the "oasis" zone of someone's house). Staff finds that the plant palette contains few varieties and would benefit from expansion, especially given the size of the subject site. Shade trees need to be canopy forming and deciduous, especially since they will be used in the parking lot and along the streets.

Landscape shall be provided pursuant to Zoning Code §14-16-3-10. Section 5-G states that all landscape areas 36 square feet or greater shall be covered with live vegetative material over at least 75% of the required landscape area. This is a minimum; Staff suggests 80% coverage. Street trees along Ellison Rd. need to be mentioned in the narrative-what type, planting distance and planter size. 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.

Update: Some changes have been made to the Landscape standards. Short trees (not greater than 20 ft. tall) would be allowed in easements. The plant palette has been expanded to include a greater variety of trees and shrubs.

High water-use turf was prohibited, but is now proposed to be allowed up to 20% of the landscaping area and be 20% of the turf blend. Typically, in design standards, the turf blend is specified to contain no more than 15% high-water use turf. Reveille bluegrass, a new hybrid turf grass that is heat tolerant and uses less water than Kentucky bluegrass, used to be specified but no longer is. Also, spray sprinklers used to be prohibited but are now included.

Staff believes that small turf areas would be a nice amenity for Tract A, but that the areas should be limited in the interest of water conservation. Artificial turf, however, should not be similarly limited.

6. Architectural Objectives:

The architectural objective is to create a visually integrated site. Permitted architectural styles include Pueblo, Territorial, New Mexico traditional or contemporary, which means virtually anything. This will not create a visually integrated site. Staff suggests eliminating "contemporary" or adding "southwest" to contemporary, especially since contemporary can be interpreted as franchise architecture. Colors need to be discussed and be compatible with nearby buildings.

Update: The word "shall" has been added in all but one location where the word "should" used to be.

7. Screening, Walls & Fences:

The proposed design standards address screening of parking lots, loading areas, trash enclosures, storage areas and walls. Staff recommends that all refuse enclosures have gates, that unfinished CMU block be prohibited and that walls be compatible with building architecture in terms of color, style and finish. A wall detail should be provided.

Update: The word “shall” has been added where the word “should” used to be.

8. Lighting Standards:

The lighting standards aim to enhance safety, security and aesthetics. Light pole height is limited to 16 ft. for walkways and plazas and within 150 ft. of residential uses. Otherwise, light poles will be 20 ft. high. Uplighting is not permitted. A lighting detail should be provided.

Update: No changes have been made to the Lighting standards.

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. The project entry signs can be up to 12 ft. tall with 75 sf face area.

Update: A couple of significant changes have been made to the Signage standards. One project entry sign is now proposed, instead of two. Staff finds this logical since there is only one main entrance to the development, and each business will have its own monument sign. Previously, illuminated signage was not allowed to face a residential area. This language has been removed.

10. Utilities:

These standards state that the negative visual image shall be mitigated. Staff suggests deletion of the phrase “when viewed from the public right-of-way”, since utilities need to be screened from residents’ views.

Update: A couple of changes have been made to the Utilities standards. The word “shall” has been added to 10-B. Language has been added to indicate that utilities will be screened from internal drives, driveways and parking areas. Staff suggests, instead qualifying from where the view would be, to simply remove the language as suggested above.

11. Open Space (new section):

This new 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).

More information needs to be provided regarding provision of open space for Tract B, which will contain commercial uses. Staff suggests that each use have a shaded, outdoor seating area for customers and employees.

12. Proposed Approvals Process (new section):

This new 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.

Conclusion: Staff acknowledges that some major and some relatively minor revisions have been made to the proposed design standards, which have improved overall. However, most language remains the same as in the previous version and therefore would still need to be strengthened to meet certain Zoning Code requirements as well as further the intent of Goals and policies in applicable Plans. Staff has crafted the proposed conditions of approval to achieve these objectives, and also to provide additional clarity for reviewers of future site development plans.

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, 2008 Staff report (see attachment).

During the deferral period, Staff has received a letter from the Cottonwood Heights NA and letters from individuals (see attachments).

V. CONCLUSION

This two-part proposal is for an amendment to the zone map of the Seven Bar Ranch Sector Development Plan (SBRSDP) and a site development plan for subdivision for an approximately 27 acre site located on Ellison Dr. The applicant proposes to change the subject site’s zoning from SU-1 for R-2 Uses to “SU-1 for Senior Housing with Limited Medical Facilities” (Tract A) and “SU-1 for C-1 Permissive Uses including Drive-up Service Window” (Tract B). The proposed site development plan for subdivision would subdivide the subject site into Tract A, Tract B and Tract C. Staff concludes that the proposal generally furthers the intent of relevant Goals and policies in the Comprehensive Plan, the West Side Strategic Plan and the SBRSDP.

Staff conceptualizes the proposed sector development plan map amendment (zone change) as having two parts: the proposed zoning for Tract A and the proposed zoning for Tract B. Staff concludes that the applicant has adequately justified the zone change for Tract A, but not completely for Tract B, based on the proposed uses being more advantageous to the community. The applicant’s explanation of why it would be more beneficial to include drive-up service windows as part of the zoning designation for Tract

B is neither policy-based nor convincing. Therefore, Staff suggests that a recommendation of approval for the zoning on Tract A, and a recommendation of conditional approval for the zoning on Tract B, be forwarded to the City Council for consideration.

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 design standards have improved. However, certain aspects still need to be strengthened to fulfill the intent of applicable Goals and policies and provide clarity for reviewers of future site development plans. Staff recommends approval of the site development plan for subdivision subject to conditions.

FINDINGS -08EPC 40037, June 19, 2008-Sector Development Plan Map Amendment (Zone Change)

1. This request is for an amendment to the zone map in the Seven Bar Ranch Sector Development Plan (SBRSDP) for an approximately 27 acre site located on Ellison Drive. Upon its adoption in 1985, the SBRSDP established zoning for the area. Because the subject site is greater than one City block in size, approval of the sector development plan map amendment requires approval by the City Council pursuant to Zoning Code §14-16-2-23.

2. The zone map amendment, which consists of two parts, proposes a change from SU-1 for R-2 Uses to the following: “SU-1 for Senior Housing and Limited Medical Facilities” for the proposed Tract A and “SU-1 for C-1 Permissive Uses Including Drive-up Service Window” for the proposed Tract B. No zone change is requested for the proposed Tract C. This request is accompanied by a site development plan for subdivision (08EPC-40036) that proposes the creation of Tracts A, B and C.

3. 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.

4. 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.

5. The Activity Center Goal of the Comprehensive Plan is *partially furthered*. The subject site is located in a designated Major Activity Center. 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 all drive-thru uses. Though the proposed uses are desired, Activity Centers are intended to be accessible by all modes of travel, not just vehicles.

6. 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 service uses.

7. The proposal generally *further*s the following West Side Strategic Plan (WSSP) policies:

- A. Policy 1.1: The proposed zone change would allow multi-family residential and commercial development, as desired, within the boundaries of the Regional Activity Center.
- B. Policy 1.2: Due to its location in the Regional Center, a transit feasibility and access plan is required and has been included.
- C. Policy 2.5: The proposed 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.
- D. Policy 3.2. It is appropriate to locate multi-family housing and commercial services in the Regional Center.
- E. 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.
- F. Policy 3.4. Though not a designated Neighborhood Activity Center, the commercial uses may function as a de facto neighborhood center within the Regional Center.

8. With incorporation of a related condition to limit drive-up service windows, the proposed zoning will *further* the following West Side Strategic Plan (WSSP) policies:

- A. Policy 1.15: Limiting drive-up service windows will help ensure that this de facto neighborhood center is very accommodating to pedestrians and bicyclists and provides small-scale services geared to the neighborhood as intended.

- B. Policy 4.10: Limiting drive-up service windows will help ensure that the land use pattern created will promote alternatives to vehicle use and not adversely affect bicycle and pedestrian circulation on and around the subject site.
9. With respect to the Seven Bar Ranch Sector Development Plan (SBRSDP), the proposal *partially furthers* the following Goals and policy.
- A. Goal 1: The proposed commercial uses will be located close to the existing residences and the new retirement center. Some vehicle trips may be minimized, though drive-thru uses by nature foster more vehicle trips and would not help create a “self-sufficient community.”
- B. Goal 2: The proposed design standards provide for a “streetscape image” and discuss open space, but do not address creation of a unified visual image or ensure that the streetscape will be “highly landscaped”.
- C. 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 unlimited drive-thru uses on Tract B.
10. The applicant has adequately justified the zone change request pursuant to Resolution 270-1980:
- A. Section A: Relieving pressure on the public schools and balancing the jobs/housing ratio are good reasons in support of the proposal that relate to the City’s health, safety, morals and general welfare.
- B. Section B: The applicant’s statement that the request will remove ambiguity is true of any development proposal. While correct that more intense uses (such as C-2 and IP) could occur on the subject site, these uses would also require a zone change. Though the discussion of Section B is not strong, in totality the applicant has provided adequate justification for the proposed zone change.
- C. Section C: The applicant refers to several Goals and policies in the Comprehensive Plan, the West Side Strategic Plan (WSSP) and the Seven Bar Ranch Sector Development Plan (SBRSDP). The applicant’s policy discussion is acceptable overall, though it would benefit from additional discussion in certain areas such as Activity Centers, Housing and Transportation/Transit Goals and policies.
- D. Section D: The proposed zoning for Tract A would be more advantageous to the community than the current zoning, though the proposed zoning for Tract B (the commercial portion) would not necessarily be more advantageous to the community than the current zoning. The applicant has not

provided a policy-based explanation regarding why it would be beneficial to include unlimited drive-up service windows as part of the zoning designation for Tract B.

- E. Section E: The applicant explained why the proposed uses would not be harmful to the adjacent property or neighborhood, but did not discuss other, specific permissive uses in the C-1 zone
- F. Section F: The proposal would not require any unprogrammed City expenditures.
- G. Section G: The applicant is not requesting consideration of economic factors.
- H. Section H: Location on a collector street is not being used as a justification for the zone change.
- I. Section I: SU-1 zoning creates a justified “spot zone” as long as it can be demonstrated that the change will facilitate realization of applicable Goals and policies.
- J. Section J: The proposed zone change for Tract B would give different zoning to a strip of land along a street for a small area, which does not conflict with the WSSP intent to discourage long commercial strip development along roadways.

11. The applicant’s explanation of why it would be more beneficial to include drive-up service windows as part of the zoning designation for Tract B is neither policy-based nor convincing. Therefore, Staff suggests that a recommendation of approval of the zoning “SU-1 for Senior Housing and Limited Medical Facilities” on Tract A is warranted, and a recommendation of conditional approval for the zoning on Tract B to limit drive-up service windows is appropriate.

12. 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 40037, June 19, 2008

APPROVAL of 08EPC 40037, a request for a sector development plan map amendment from SU-1 for R-2 Uses to the following zoning: “SU-1 for Senior Housing and Limited Medical Facilities” (Tract A) and “SU-1 for C-1 Permissive Uses with One Drive-up Service Window” (Tract B), for Tract B-9-E-1 & Tract B-9-F of Seven Bar Ranch, 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 40037, June 19, 2008-Sector Development Plan Map Amendment (Zone Change)

1. The zoning for Tract B shall be: "SU-1 for C-1 Permissive Uses with One Drive-up Service Window".
 2. The associated site development plan for subdivision (08EPC-40036) shall indicate, on the site plan and in the design standards, that one drive-up service window is allowed on Tract B.
-

FINDINGS -08EPC 40036, June 19, 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. This request accompanies a sector development plan map amendment request (08EPC-40037).
2. 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 (senior housing) 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.
3. 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.
4. 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.

5. The Activity Center Goal of the Comprehensive Plan is *partially furthered*. The subject site is located in a designated Major Activity Center. 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 all drive-thru uses. Though the proposed uses are desired, Activity Centers are intended to be accessible by all modes of travel, not just vehicles.

6. 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 service uses.

7. The proposal generally *further*s the following West Side Strategic Plan (WSSP) policies:

- A. Policy 1.1: The proposed zone change would allow multi-family residential and commercial development, as desired, within the boundaries of the Regional Activity Center.
- B. Policy 1.2: Due to its location in the Regional Center, a transit feasibility and access plan is required and has been included.
- C. Policy 2.5: The proposed 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.
- D. Policy 3.2. It is appropriate to locate multi-family housing and commercial services in the Regional Center.
- E. 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.
- F. Policy 3.4. Though not a designated Neighborhood Activity Center, the commercial uses may function as a de facto neighborhood center within the Regional Center.

8. With incorporation of a related condition to limit drive-up service windows, the proposed zoning will *further* the following West Side Strategic Plan (WSSP) policies:

- A. Policy 1.15: Limiting drive-up service windows will help ensure that this de facto neighborhood center is very accommodating to pedestrians and bicyclists and provides small-scale services geared to the neighborhood as intended.
- B. Policy 4.10: Limiting drive-up service windows will help ensure that the land use pattern created will promote alternatives to vehicle use and not adversely affect bicycle and pedestrian circulation on and around the subject site.

9. With respect to the Seven Bar Ranch Sector Development Plan (SBRSDP), the proposal *partially furthers* the following Goals and policy.

- A. Goal 1: The proposed commercial uses will be located close to the existing residences and the new retirement center. Some vehicle trips may be minimized, though drive-thru uses by nature foster more vehicle trips and would not help create a “self-sufficient community.”
- B. Goal 2: The proposed design standards provide for a “streetscape image” and discuss open space, but do not address creation of a unified visual image or ensure that the streetscape will be “highly landscaped”.
- C. 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 unlimited drive-thru uses on Tract B.

10. 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 need to be strengthened to promote alternatives to vehicle travel and ensure connectivity between the residential and commercial uses.

11. The proposed landscape standards do not provide for creation of the “highly landscaped streetscape image” mentioned in the Seven Bar Ranch Sector Development Plan (SBRSDP) and do not meet certain Zoning Code requirements.

12. 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.

13. 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, June 19, 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, June 19, 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 zone map amendment (08EPC-40037) 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. 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.

6. Setbacks & Density:

- A. Building setbacks and building height shall be specified on the site development plan for subdivision (Sheet 1) to comply with the Zoning Code definition of a site development plan for subdivision.
- B. Dwelling units per acre (DU/ac) and floor area ratio (FAR) shall be addressed in the design standards and shall match the DU/ac and FAR on Sheet 1.

7. 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).

8. Drive-up Service Window for a Bank:

- A. Drive-thru use for a bank shall be limited to one, consistent with zoning for C-1 permissive uses.
- B. The drive-up service window shall be oriented away from residentially zoned areas.

9. Parking:

- A. Parking shall not exceed the required parking plus 10%.
- B. Parking areas shall be visually and functionally segmented into smaller subareas by landscaping and/or pedestrian connections. No single subarea shall exceed 100 parking spaces.
- C. Parking areas shall be permitted to have more than one pedestrian connection to the street sidewalk network.
- D. Except for deliveries, parking of commercial trucks shall not be allowed.
- E. As indicated in the project letter, parking shall not be allowed between the commercial uses and Ellison Drive.
- F. Areas for the storage of high profile delivery/transport vehicles shall be prohibited (7-B).

10. Parking Lot Screening:

- A. Screening of parking facilities adjacent to the streets, required pursuant to Zoning Code §14-16-3-1, shall be a maximum height of 2 ft. tall.
- B. Screen walls for parking facilities shall include wall openings to facilitate pedestrian circulation.

11. Pedestrian and Bicycle Connections:

- A. "Special surfacing" and enhanced paving shall be defined as textured, colored concrete and/or thermoplastic, or other comparable surface.
- B. Pedestrian sidewalks, no less than 8 ft. in width, shall be provided adjacent to and along the full length of the building. A minimum width of 6 ft. shall remain clear and unobstructed at all times for pedestrian use.
- C. Pedestrian connections from parking areas to the street sidewalk network shall be short and direct, not circuitous.
- D. Pedestrian and bicycle crossings of vehicular paths shall be designated by thermoplastic or textured, colored concrete. 4-B

12. Pedestrian and Bicycle Trail:

- A. The existing 10 ft. paved trail along Ellison Dr. shall be connected, with textured concrete or thermoplastic, across west Cibola Loop Rd. and east Cibola Loop Rd. in the site development plan for subdivision (sheet 1) and shall be discussed in the associated design standards.
- B. 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.

13. Pedestrian and Bicycle Access- Sheet 1:

A pedestrian connection, of textured, colored concrete or thermoplastic, shall be provided across Cibola Loop Rd. near Cuba Rd. NW.

14. Public Space:

- A. The design standards shall discuss provision of outdoor space for the commercial uses.

B. Restaurants shall provide a shaded, outdoor seating area.

15. Landscape Standards:

- A. Landscaping coverage with living, vegetative materials shall be 80% for areas over 36 sf. in size.
- B. Xeriscape and native plant material shall be required.
- C. The landscape strip along Ellison Dr. shall be at least 20 ft. wide.
- D. The detention pond area shall have a landscape buffer at least 10 ft. wide on its western, northern and eastern sides.
- E. This section shall be referred to as "Landscape Standards" rather than landscape plan.

16. Landscape Palette:

- A. The landscape palette shall list water usage, allergenic potential and the Latin name for all plant material.
- B. High water use turf shall be prohibited, except as part of a turf blend mix which does not contain more than 15% high water use turf.
- C. Artificial turf shall be allowed.

17. Landscape- Trees:

- A. Trees shall be capable of reaching a mature height of at least 25 ft., unless they are located below power lines.
- B. Parking lot area trees shall be deciduous and canopy forming.
- C. In areas around the residential structure, trees shall be provided at not less than the rate of one tree per ground floor dwelling unit and one tree per two second-story dwelling unit.
- D. Tree planters shall have a minimum surface area of 36 square feet.
- E. Street trees shall be provided along Ellison Dr. and shall be discussed in the design standards.
- F. Pursuant to §6-6-2-1, the Street Tree Ordinance, street trees shall be placed between the curb and the public sidewalk, unless traffic safety requires different locations as specified therein.

18. Architectural Standards:

- A. The “contemporary” building style shall be “southwest contemporary” to be compatible with the architectural styles (Pueblo, Territorial and New Mexico Traditional) listed in the design standards.
- B. “Sensitive alteration of colors” shall mean alteration that does not produce very light or very dark colors that are outside of the middle range of reflectance.
- C. Treatment of vertical building planes with regard to color, material architectural details and trim materials shall be consistent (SBRSDP, Appendix 6).
- D. Major architectural elements such as roof-line, articulation of building fenestration and articulation of massing shall be consistent (SBRSDP, Appendix 6).
- E. The primary building mass shall be of an earth-tone color regardless of materials. Colors other than earth tone palette shall be used only for decorative elements (SBRSDP, Appendix 6).
- F. Materials shall generally be non-reflective, cementitious in visual quality, and no more than three materials shall be combined in a given building elevation (SBRSDP, Appendix 6).

19. Screening, Walls & Fences:

- A. Service functions shall be oriented away from any street, pedestrian area and/or residential area.
- B. Loading docks shall not be visible from residential areas.
- C. Unfinished CMU block shall be prohibited.
- D. Chain link fencing or any kind of real wood fencing is not permitted in the development.
- E. A wall detail shall be provided.

20. Refuse Enclosure/Dumpster:

- A. All refuse enclosures shall be gated.
- B. Refuse collection areas shall not be allowed between the street and the building front.

21. Lighting Standards:

- A. High pressure sodium lighting shall be prohibited.
- B. Light pole height shall be measured from top to grade.
- C. A light pole detail shall be provided.
- D. The lighting design objective (8-H) shall be included in the narrative regarding the Lighting Standards.

22. Signage Standards:

- A. The development shall be allowed one project entry sign at the principal access point at Cibolita Dr./Ellison Dr.
- B. A sign detail of the project entry sign and the monument sign shall be provided.
- C. Building-mounted signs shall not face residential areas.

23. Utility Standards:

- A. Transformers, utility pads and telephone boxes shall be screened with walls and vegetation.
- B. Design standards 6-K, 6-L and 6-M, which have to do with equipment, shall be moved to the Utilities section.

24. General:

- A. Design guidelines shall be referred to as Design Standards.
- B. The word “should” shall be replaced with “shall”.

25. Minor “Clean-up”:

- A. Pedestrian linkages (and links) and pedestrian paths shall be referred to as “pedestrian connections.”
- B. “General guidelines” shall be referred to as Standards.

- C. The reference to the Neighborhood Commercial zone in 9-E shall be corrected.
- D. The General Parking Regulations, Zoning Code §14-16-3-1, shall be referenced in design standard 3-A instead of referencing the C-1 zone and the R-2 zone, which refer to the General Parking Regulations.
- E. The word “on” shall be changed “one” in design standard 4-B.
- F. The word “style” shall be added to finish the sentence in design standard 6-Q.

26. 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.

27. 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., 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