



**Environmental
Planning
Commission**

**Agenda Number: 11
Project Number: 1007017
Case #'s: 08EPC 40005
March 20, 2008**

Supplementary Staff Report

Agent	NMHCR LLC
Applicant	Kassam Hospitality
Request	Master Development Plan
Legal Description	Lot 2-A, Block 2, Sunport Park
Location	Woodward Road between University Blvd and Transport Blvd.
Size	Approximately 4.5 acres
Existing Zoning	IP (Industrial Park)
Proposed Zoning	no change

Staff Recommendation

APPROVAL of 08EPC 40005, based on the findings on page 7 and subject to the conditions on page 9.

Staff Planner
Carol Toffaleti, Planner

Summary of Analysis

This is a request for a master development plan (MDP) for Lot 2-A, Block 2, Sunport Park, a site of approximately 4.45 acres located between Woodward Road and Flightway Ave SE, west of University Blvd., zoned IP. The applicant proposes to split the site into three parcels, Lot 2-A-1 with 0.59 acres, Lot 2-A-2 with 2.03 acres and Lot 2-A-3 with 1.82 acres, to be developed in three phases. The master development plan (MDP) includes design standards.

A site development plan for building permit for a hotel on Lot 2-A-3 was approved at the Feb. 21, 2008 EPC hearing subject to conditions, including approval of this MDP.

The site is in the Developing Urban area of the Comprehensive Plan and within the Sunport Blvd. Design Overlay Zone.

No neighborhood or other comments were received.

The MDP has been revised since the February hearing at the EPC's request. Staff recommends approval with conditions to further strengthen the design standards and correct remaining errors in the submittal.

This report should be read in conjunction with the staff report for the Feb. 21, 2008 EPC hearing (attached)

Location Map (3" x 3")

City Departments and other interested agencies reviewed this application from 01/07/2008 to 01/23/2008. Agency comments begin on page 22 of the Feb. 21, 2008 report.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

The applicant submitted revisions to the master development plan on March 10 and 11, 2008 consisting of a cover letter, a site development plan for subdivision and design standards. The format of the submittal meets the requirements of the IP zone 14-16-2-19 (H)(1) which refers to “master development plan” and “site development plan for subdivision”, as defined in 14-16-1-5. General building locations and parking locations for Lots 2-A-1 and 2-A-2 are not included, because the end uses are not known.

Sheet 1 – Master Development Plan

Site Plan Layout / Configuration

The applicant proposes to subdivide the subject site into three lots and to phase development: Lot 2-A-1 is 0.59 acres (Phase 3); Lot 2-A-2 is 2.03 acres (Phase 2); and Lot 2-A-3 is 1.82 acres (Phase 1).

The two larger lots are oblong in shape and face south onto Woodward Road. The third lot is triangular and faces north onto Flightway Ave..

A site development plan for building permit for a hotel on Lot 2-A-3 was approved by the EPC at the hearing on February 21, 2008 subject to conditions, including approval of this Master Development Plan (Att., Condition 26). The proposed hotel is oriented along a north-south axis, below the adjoining food processing and distribution facility and across from an existing hotel south of Woodward.

No specific uses are proposed for the other lots. The MDP refers to permissive uses in the IP zone and mentions that adult amusement establishment or store is not allowed due to proximity to a residential zone, which is north of the industrial park.

No building footprints are indicated on the lots other than the hotel. Given the oblong shape of Lot 2-A-2 it is likely that a future building on that lot will have the same orientation as the proposed hotel, unless it is developed with multiple buildings.

The proposed building heights, setbacks and development densities comply with regulations of the IP zone.

Vehicular Access, Circulation and Parking

Vehicular access for the larger lots is from Woodward and, for the smaller lot, from Flightway. Cross-access is indicated on the master development plan between Lots 2-A-2 and 2-A-3 only. No explanation has been provided for the absence of cross-access between these lots and Lot 2-A-1. It is a condition of approval of the hotel development (Att., Condition #4.g).

Additional detail is shown on Lot 2-A-3 that is being developed as a hotel. This lot would have two points of ingress and egress from Woodward, providing convenient two-way access to a drive at the main entrance of the hotel. The remaining internal drive is one way, in a counterclockwise direction. Cross-access with Lot 2-A-2 is indicated at the northwest corner of the lot.

Pedestrian and Bicycle Access and Circulation, Transit Access

The information on pedestrian access is incomplete: primary access to Lots 2-A-1 and 2-A-2 and cross-access between Lot 2-A-1 and Lot 2-A-2 are not indicated. (The pedestrian link from Lot 2-A-3 to the sidewalk on Flightway Ave. was deemed sufficient to also provide access to Lot 2-A-1, per the approved site development plan for building permit.)

The applicant proposes bicycle parking on the hotel site although none is required for this use by the Zoning Code (14-16-3-1 (B)(3)(a) Parking).

The MDP indicates the location and number of the nearest transit route.

Other information

The Internal circulation system also needs to comply with applicable regulations in the Zoning Code and DPM standards. The more restrictive standard governs.

Signage also needs to comply with General Sign Regulations in the Zoning Code. The more restrictive standard governs.

The landscape plans also need to comply with the Street Tree Ordinance.

Several typographical errors should be corrected.

Sheet 2 - Design Standards

[Note: the design standards are also attached in standard document format for easier reference]

The purpose of design standards is to provide guidance for a development in order to ensure that it will be of high quality, exceeding minimum Zoning Code requirements and furthering the intent of applicable City Plans, goals and policies. The proposed design standards are lengthy and redundant in some areas. They include more elements than are required in a Master Development Plan and Site Development Plan for Subdivision as defined in Section 14-16-1-5. In general, design standards do not need to re-state an applicable zoning regulation, but should highlight regulations that are particular to the site, e.g. in this case due to its location in the Developing Urban Area of the Comprehensive Plan and the Sunport Blvd. DOZ. The proposed design standards have been reviewed in that light.

1. Framework

This section describes the policy context of the site and the proposed platting action.

2. Proposed Uses

For clarity, (a) should also state that:

- Off-premise signs are prohibited on the site per the Sunport Blvd. Design Overlay Zone
- Wireless Telecommunication Facilities on the subject site shall comply with 14-16-3-17(A)(9) of Council Bill F/S(3) O-06-40 (1/16/08) (Att.).

A broader question is whether the MDP should set further limitations on the types of uses on Lots 2-A-1 and 2-A-2 to ensure that they are compatible with the pattern of hospitality uses that is now

established in the area between Sunport Blvd. and Woodward Rd., a land use pattern that will be reinforced and expanded by the proposed hotel on Lot 2-A-3.

3. Design Standards

b) ii) Land Use Concepts

Staff recommends deleting the phrase “, other than all development shall be beneficial...and the City of Albuquerque.” as it does not provide the intent or substance of a design standard.

c) Parking

Paragraphs i) and ii) are superfluous and should be deleted.

Paragraph iii) should only retain what is additional to the relevant zoning regulation, possibly the last two sentences about the distribution and location of disabled spaces. The last sentence needs rewording to make sense and should only be retained if it is more restrictive than zoning regulations.

Paragraph iv) contains some useful standards for pedestrian connections. However, the first sentence should state “raised *and/or* textured paving” [change in italics] and the last sentence should be strengthened by changing “or” to “and”.

Paragraph v) should also state that a minimum 11’ standard landscape buffer is required between parking areas and the adjacent public ROWs. This width is required due to the 4.4 acre area of the site per 14-16-3-10(E)(3)(a) Landscaping.

In Paragraph vi), the first and second sentences should be reworded for the sake of clarity to read “Parking within 30’ of a public ROW shall be located behind buildings or screened by any or a combination of earth berms,... and evergreen landscaping.” The last sentence of (1) should be deleted as the inclusion of 3 feet “above or” is less restrictive than the applicable zoning regulation (14-16-3-1(F)(4) Off-street parking).

Paragraph vii) should be deleted as it is less clear than the relevant zoning regulation (14-16-3-1(C)(2) Off-street parking).

d) Street Design

Paragraph ii) should be deleted because site and internal drives are subject to the City Engineer’s approval.

Paragraph iii) should be deleted because it is less restrictive than Condition #4.g. of approval of the site development plan for building permit for the hotel on Lot 2-A-3.

Paragraph iv) should be deleted as this aspect of development is already covered by i).

Paragraph v) – Staff recommends that the minimum width of the landscape buffer be increased to 11’ for consistency with parking lot landscaping. The reference to sidewalks should be reworded for the sake of clarity, e.g. “public sidewalks” may suffice.

e) Pedestrian Amenities and Connections

The title should refer to private and public amenities generally, not just “pedestrian” amenities.

In the first paragraph, the reference to pedestrian connections should be consistent with ***c) Parking iv)***, as amended (see above).

In Paragraph i) “asphalt” should be deleted, as this material would not distinguish pedestrian connections from parking areas.

Paragraph ii) refers to connections within each site. Staff does not support the use of (organic) mulch for secondary pedestrian paths as it is potentially unstable.

In Paragraph iii), the criterion for a 150’ common boundary between lots means that a connection is not required between Lot 2-A-1 (the north lot) and Lot 2-A-3 (the hotel). This is acceptable as the hotel development was approved with a link to the sidewalk on Flightway, which provides convenient access to the north lot. The restrictions on cross-access between other lots is apparently to ensure that the land uses are compatible. Staff considers the proposed exclusions too restrictive. For example, staff sees no reason why offices, park-and-ride facilities and parking lots are excluded.

Paragraphs iv) and v) should describe the seating, shading and any other facilities to be provided for the public, guests/customers and employees on the lots. These must be coordinated with amenities provided in the approved hotel development for the sake of consistency. In v), staff recommends adding “and DPM standards”, for completeness and clarity.

f) Bicycle Facilities

This paragraph should be deleted, as it does not add anything to the applicable zoning regulation.

g) Engineering

The standard should use the exact wording supplied by the City Environmental Health Department in relation to development in landfill buffer zones.

h) Landscaping

The first paragraph should state that a minimum of 15% “of each lot area minus the building footprint(s)” shall be landscaped.

In paragraph i), staff recommends that a minimum of one quarter of the plantings shall be evergreen as a way of achieving the intended year round color and interest. Staff considers it more efficient to allow acceptable substitutions at the time future site development plans are reviewed by the City.

Low water use plants are encouraged in each category, yet the example palettes still include a majority of medium water use species. The palettes should be adjusted to reflect the intent for xeric landscaping, while allowing several species of shade trees, which are typically medium water use.

i) Site Planning

This section should be limited to Walls and Fences, by re-titling it and deleting paragraphs ii) and iii) which duplicate other standards (see *c)Parking* and *e)Pedestrian amenities and connections* above).

Staff recommends that chain link fencing be prohibited, in addition to the materials already specified, to support the higher quality of development desired in an industrial park, particularly in the Sunport Blvd. view corridor. Also, the design of walls and fences should be compatible with the architectural style of the building(s) on the lot.

j) Setbacks

These are acceptable.

k) Architecture

Staff recommends that generic franchise architecture be prohibited on the site to uphold the visual quality desired in the Sunport Blvd. view corridor.

Paragraph iii) does not mention the major public entry for buildings on Lot 2-A-2.

Paragraph iv) is confusing because it combines service entrances and loading areas but tries to apply different standards to them.

Paragraph v) should be deleted as it is vague and contains no implementable standard.

l) Lighting

Staff recommends that the same style of lightpoles and fixtures be installed across the subdivision to create a cohesive effect.

Paragraph iv) should be deleted as it essentially duplicates ii).

n) Signage

General Sign Regulations should be added to the list of applicable regulations, as well as the phrase "whichever is more restrictive". One permanent identification sign is also allowed on each lot with a maximum sign face area of 20 sf, as per the approved site development plan for the hotel.

Paragraph i) should be deleted as illumination is covered in the General Sign Regulations.

The following should be added to paragraph iii) concerning prohibited signs:

- Free-standing and projecting signs per 14-16-2-19(A)(25)(b)2
- Re. Off-premise signs, replace "referring to ...displayed" with "per the Sunport Blvd. DOZ".

o) Wireless Telecommunications Facilities

The correct reference is stated above under 2. Proposed Uses. Essentially, any WTFs should be architecturally integrated as the southern part of the site is within 1/8 mile (or 660') of Sunport Blvd., as measured by staff on the City's AGIS system.

No grading and drainage plan or utility plan is provided, which is acceptable per IP zoning.

In their original letter, the applicant requested that the EPC delegate approval authority for Phases II and III to building permit plan check. The request is not reflected on the master development plan or in the design standards. Staff does not recommend this delegation. A TIS will be required when the next application for development on the site is submitted, which will cover all uses on the site. In addition, parking arrangements for the hotel development on Lot 2-A-3 have not been finalized. Addressing these issues would benefit from a coordinated review by the EPC or DRB.

CONCLUSIONS

Staff considers that the revised master development plan (Sheet 1) is generally acceptable. The design standards (Sheet 2) show some improvement, but still require major “pruning” and changes to create a clear and practical framework for the design and review of future developments, and to ensure compliance with applicable policies and regulations. Staff recommends approval with conditions.

FINDINGS – 08EPC 40005, March 20, 2008, Master Development Plan

1. A master development plan (MDP) is proposed for Lot 2-A, Block 2, Sunport Park, a vacant site of approximately 4.45 acres located between Woodward Road and Flightway Avenue west of University Blvd., zoned IP (Industrial Park). The applicant proposes to split the subject site into three parcels, to be developed in three phases: Lot 2-A-1 of 0.59 acres, Lot 2-A-2 of 2.03 acres and Lot 2-A-3 of 1.82 acres. The MDP includes design standards.
2. A site development plan for building permit for a hotel on proposed Lot 2-A-3 (Phase I) was approved by the EPC at the hearing on February 21, 2008 subject to conditions, including approval of this Master Development Plan (ref. Condition 26).
3. The applicant requests that the EPC delegate approval authority for Phases II and III to building permit plan check.
4. The subject site is in the Developing Urban area of the Comprehensive Plan and within the Sunport Blvd. Design Overlay Zone, which regulates signage.
5. There is a previously approved master development plan for Sunport Park, an area of 125 acres, signed off at DRB in 1986 and amended in 1999 (Z-85-98-1, 4/1/1985, amended DRB-97-257, 7/8/1999). The proposed MDP would supplant the previously approved MDP relative to the subject site only.
6. A Traffic Impact Study was not included with this request or with the site development plan for building permit for proposed Lot 2-A-3, but will be required when a development application for Lots 2-A-1 and/or 2-A-2 is submitted.
7. The following uses are not allowed on the site:
 - a. Off-premise signs, per the Sunport Blvd. Design Overlay Zone.
 - b. Free-standing and projecting signs, per the IP zoning, because the subject site is in the Developing Urban Area of the Comprehensive Plan and is less than 5 acres (14-16-2-19(A)(25) (b)2)).

- c. Adult amusement establishment or adult store, per the IP zoning, because the site is within 500' of the residential zone to the north (14-16-2-19 (A)(1)(b)).
8. Any Wireless Telecommunications Facilities on the site would need to comply with 14-16-3-17(A)(9) of Council Bill F/S(3) O-06-40 (1/16/08).
9. The subject site is within two landfill buffer zones (Schwartzman and Yale).
10. The proposed master development plan with design standards furthers the following applicable goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan:
 - a. Policies II.B.5.e and II.B.5.i, because the proposed subdivision involves a vacant site contiguous to existing infrastructure that is sufficiently distant from the residences to the north to minimize adverse impacts.
 - b. The Activity Center Goal and Policy II.B.7.a, because the subject site is in the vicinity of the Sunport Special Activity Center and the proposed subdivision increases the concentration of economic activities compatible with the airport.
 - c. The Economic Development Goal and Policies II.D.6.a and II.D.6.d, because the proposed subdivision increases the potential for diversified uses on the site, including a hotel, that will create new employment opportunities and promote tourism.
11. Property-owners within 100' were notified of the proposal. No recognized neighborhood association is affected by the request. No comments were received.

RECOMMENDATION - 08EPC 40005, March 20, 2008

APPROVAL of 08EPC 40005, a Master Development Plat, for Lot 2-A, Block 2, Sunport Park, Zoned IP, based on the preceding Findings and subject to the following Conditions of Approval.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL - 08EPC 40005, March 20,, 2008, Master Development Plan

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. Prior to application submittal to the DRB, the applicant shall meet with the staff planner to ensure that all conditions of approval are met.
3. Future site development plans for building permit for Lots 2-A-1 and 2-A-2 shall return to the EPC for approval.
4. There is the potential for this project to be impacted by the presence of landfill gas generated by two former landfills (Schwartzman and Yale Landfills). The developers of this site are required to follow the most current version of the *City of Albuquerque Interim Guidelines for Development within City Designated Landfill Buffer Zones*. A review and approval of the Site Plan(s), the proposed construction, design drawings, and a certification of construction will be required by the Environmental Health Department (EHD), Environmental Services Division.
5. RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS FROM CITY ENGINEER, MUNICIPAL DEVELOPMENT, WATER AUTHORITY and NMDOT:
Conditions of approval for the proposed Master Development Plan and Site Development Plan for Building Permit shall include:
 - a. All the requirements of previous actions taken by the EPC and/or the DRB must be completed and /or provided for.
 - b. 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).
 - c. When future development occurs on either proposed Lot 2-A-1 or Lot 2-A-2 a Traffic Impact Study (TIS) will be required.
 - d. Site drives to be located and designed per DPM.
 - e. Provide cross access agreements.
 - f. Site plan shall comply and be designed per DPM Standards.
 - g. Platting to be a concurrent DRB action.

6. The following changes shall be made to Sheet 1 (the Master Development Plan):
- a. On plan – Show and label primary pedestrian access for Lots 2-A-1 and 2-A-2 and pedestrian cross-access between Lot 2-A-1 and Lot 2-A-2.
 - b. Under Internal Circulation,
 - i. Insert “and comply with applicable regulations in the Zoning Code and DPM standards. The more restrictive regulation or standard shall govern.”
 - ii. Refer to any restrictions on inter-lot pedestrian access in Design Standards (3) e) iii)).
 - c. Under Signage, insert “and General Sign Regulations, whichever is more restrictive.”
 - d. Under Landscape Plan, insert “, Street Tree”.
 - e. Typographical errors shall be corrected.
7. The following changes shall be made to Sheet 2 (Design Standards):
- a. Proposed Uses –
 - i. Add that off-premise signs are prohibited per the Sunport Blvd. Design Overlay Zone.
 - ii. Add that Wireless Telecommunication Facilities on the subject site shall comply with 14-16-3-17(A)(9) of Council Bill F/S(3) O-06-40 (1/16/08)
 - b. Under b) ii) Land Use Concept, delete phrase “, other than all development shall be beneficial....and the City of Albuquerque.”
 - c. Under c) Parking –

- i. Delete paragraphs i), ii) and vii).
 - ii. Under iii): delete the first sentence; reword the last sentence and retain if it is more restrictive than zoning regulations.
 - iii. Under iv), amend the first sentence to read “raised *and/or* textured paving” [change in italics] and, in the last sentence, change “or” to “and”.
 - iv. Under Paragraph v) , state that a minimum 11’ standard landscape buffer shall be required between parking areas and the adjacent public ROWs per 14-16-3-10(E)(3)(a).
 - v. Under Paragraph vi), reword the first and second sentences to read “Parking within 30’ of a public ROW shall be located behind buildings or screened by any or a combination of earth berms,... and evergreen landscaping.” The last sentence of (1) shall be deleted.
- d. Street Design –
- i. Delete paragraphs ii), iii), iv).
 - ii. In Paragraph v), replace with “The minimum width of landscape buffers between the Premises and public sidewalks shall be 11’.”
- e. Pedestrian Amenities and Connections
- i. Re-title this section “Amenities and pedestrian connections”; make the reference to pedestrian connections consistent with *c) Parking iv*), as amended
 - ii. In Paragraph i), delete “asphalt”.
 - iii. In Paragraph ii), delete “mulch”.

- iv. In Paragraph iii), add Office, Temporary park-and-ride and Parking lots to the list of uses on both lots, with any appropriate zoning code references.
- v. Paragraphs iv) and v) shall describe the seating, shading and any specific outdoor facilities provided to the public, guests/customers and employees. The description shall be consistent with amenities provided in the approved hotel development on Lot 2-A-3.
- vi. In paragraph v) add “and DPM standards”.
- f. Delete paragraph f) Bicycle Facilities.
- g. Engineering: the sentence beginning “Appropriate engineering measures..” shall be replaced with the exact language supplied by the City Environmental Health Department.
- h. Landscaping –
 - i. The first paragraph should state that a minimum of 15% “of each lot area minus the building footprint(s)” shall be landscaped.
 - ii. In paragraph i): Add: “A minimum of one quarter of the plantings shall be evergreen”. Reword the last sentence to allow acceptable substitutions at the time future site development plans are reviewed by the City.
 - iii. The plant palette for shrubs and grasses shall be amended to include a majority of low water use species.
- i. Site Planning –
 - i. Re-title this section “Walls and Fences” and delete paragraphs ii) and iii).
 - ii. Chain link fencing shall also be prohibited.

- iii. Add that the design of walls and fences shall be compatible with the architectural style of the building(s) on the lot.

j. Architecture –

- i. Add that generic franchise architecture shall be prohibited
- ii. Paragraph iii) shall address the location of the major public entry for buildings on Lot 2-A-2.
- iii. Reword paragraph iv) to clarify which standards apply to service entrances and which standards apply to loading areas without weakening them.
- iv. Delete Paragraph v).

k. Lighting–

- i. Add that the design of lightpoles and fixtures shall be consistent throughout the site.
- ii. Delete Paragraph iv).

l. Signage

- i. Add: “General Sign Regulations” to the list of applicable regulations, as well as the phrase "whichever is more restrictive"; “One permanent identification sign is allowed on each lot with a maximum sign face area of 20 sf.”
- ii. Delete Paragraph i).
- iii. Under paragraph iii), add: “Free-standing and projecting signs per 14-16-2-19(A)(25)(b)2”; under Off-premise signs replace "referring to ...displayed" with "per the Sunport Blvd. DOZ".

m. Wireless Telecommunications Facilities: replace text after “shall be”, with “architecturally integrated per 14-16-3-17(A)(9) of Council Bill F/S(3) O-06-40 (1/16/08)”.

8. Typographical errors in the design standards shall be corrected

*Carol Toffaleti
Planner*

cc: Kassam Hospitality, 200 Trimble Blvd., NE, Albuquerque, NM 87123
NMHCR LLC, 322 Wellesley SE, Albuquerque, NM 87106

Attachments

Notice of Decision for #1007017, 08EPC-40006, dated 2/22/08

14-16-3-17(A)(9) of Council Bill F/S(3) O-06-40 (1/16/08) [Note: update from previous staff report]

Sunport Blvd. Design Overlay Zone map

IP zoning regulations