

**City of Albuquerque**  
**Land Use Facilitation Program**  
**Project - Application Meeting Report**

**Project number:** PR-2019-002496  
**Property description:** Lots 1 through 4, Block 4, North Albuquerque Acres, Tract 3, Unit 3, located at the Southeast corner of Alameda Boulevard SE and Barstow Street NE, addressed as 8400, 8450, and 8474 Alameda Blvd NE.  
**Date submitted:** July 10, 2019  
**Submitted by:** Leslie R. Kryder  
**Meeting date and time:** July 8, 2019, 6:30 pm  
**Meeting location:** Room 5, North Domingo Baca Multigenerational Center, 7521 Carmel Ave NE  
**Facilitator:** Leslie R. Kryder  
**Co-facilitator:** Jessie Lawrence

**Parties:**

**Applicant:** Phil Lindborg, Bella Tesoro LLC  
**Agent:** Jim Strozier, Consensus Planning  
**Affected neighborhood associations (per CABQ notification requirements):**  
Vineyard Estates Neighborhood Association  
Nor Este Neighborhood Association  
District 4 Coalition of Neighborhood Associations

**Background/meeting summary:**

Applicant requests Development Review Board (DRB) approval of Subdivision and Land and Site plan for Lots 1 through 4, Block 4, North Albuquerque Acres Tract 3 Unit 3, located at the Southeast corner of Alameda Boulevard SE and Barstow Street NE and addressed as 8400, 8450, and 8474 Alameda Blvd NE. Applicant proposes to construct 93 1- and 2- bedroom apartment units with 150 parking spaces and amenities. There will be three three-story residential buildings and a community center, swimming pool, park area, and other amenities. The property is zoned MX-L. Proposed buildings will not exceed the 35 ft maximum height.

Meeting participants raised concerns about many topics, including parking, population density, traffic congestion and overflow, especially due to congestion already experienced by proximity to the school, design of the parking structures and the landscaped area between the parking structures and the south property boundary, dumpster placement and trash management, and aesthetics.

Neighbors are concerned that the number of units will result in unacceptable resident density in the context of the overall area. They wondered about the source of the market research

upon which this plan is based. They asked that the developer consider reducing the number of units, which could help address their density, parking and traffic concerns.

Neighbors are also concerned about impacts on the neighbors immediately to the south, including protection from the cars in the parking lot, security from trespassers, and impacts of the landscaping and trees. A summary of all concerns is included in the meeting specifics.

Agreement among all meeting participants was not reached on any concerns at the meeting. Agent stated that the project team would consider the concerns expressed as they continue to adjust the project plan.

**Follow-up items:**

1. Agent will distribute the market study showing the demographic this development is intended for.
2. Agent will research the demographics at the complex off Barstow & Holly and how that compares to this project, particularly regarding parking needs.
3. Architect will provide the percentage of compact parking spots allowed in the IDO and the percentage in this plan.
4. Agent will find out who is on the DRC and provide that information to attendees.
5. Agent will look for an elevation or detail of the parking structure. If one exists, Agent will distribute it.
6. Agent will create and distribute a color image similar to one mentioned by a meeting participant that shows the layout of the parking, barrier, landscaping, and boundary wall.
7. Agent will evaluate options to make the carport more attractive to nearby residents, either by lowering it where it shows above the boundary wall, or by installing a screen to hide the carport, or other alternatives.
8. Agent will review the plan and consider whether the retaining wall creates a security hazard on the boundary with properties to the south.
9. Agent will review the tree species to ensure species appropriate to the space are chosen, which will not shed leaves on the neighbors' property and will not damage the walls or parking lot.
10. Agent will consider whether the bright orange-red stucco can be substituted with a more muted color.
11. If individuals who did not receive the application wish to obtain a copy, they may contact the Facilitator by email, and she will send them the drawings via email.

**Outcomes:**

**Areas of agreement:**

1. None noted among all meeting participants. Project agent agreed to consider the comments from the meeting and how to address neighbors' concerns.

**Principal unresolved issues and concerns:**

1. Neighbors stated that the higher density apartment complex is incompatible with the surrounding residential area. Neighbors would like to see less, and possibly larger, units.
2. Neighbors are unclear who is the target market for this project and whether the units are appropriate for the people who would want to live there.
3. Neighbors feel the planned parking will not be enough to meet demand and fear overflow parking into the surrounding neighborhood.
4. Additional traffic from the project would exacerbate existing traffic issues, especially with regard to nearby school pickup and drop-off.
5. Neighbors had a number of concerns about the design of the parking structures near the southern edge of the property, and the adjacent landscape and retaining wall.
6. Neighbors were concerned about color choices for the buildings and the appearance of the elevation along Barstow.

**Meeting summary:**

- 1) Overview of changes since the pre-application meeting (05-21-2019).
  - a) Development team present at the meeting:
    - i) Jim Strozier with Consensus Planning
    - ii) Michael Vos with Consensus Planning
    - iii) Omega Delgado with Consensus Planning
    - iv) Dave Hickman, architect
    - v) Phil Lindborg, developer with Bella Tesoro LLC
    - vi) Zack Snyder, developer with Bella Tesoro LLC
    - vii) Sandy Salata, property manager
  - b) After the pre-application meeting, the Agent sent out responses to a number of comments they heard, created a diagram with changes based on comments, and sent that to neighborhood association representatives.
    - i) Prior to this meeting, the agent sent out a full drawing set.
  - c) Summary of changes made since the previous meeting:
    - i) To address concerns about security, they added wrought iron security fencing around strategic parts of project, to limit access into buildings to residents and their guests.
    - ii) To address concerns about the location of dumpsters adjacent to the South edge of the property, they met with Solid Waste. The two dumpsters along the South edge of the property will now be recycling only.
      - (1) The larger dumpster complex at the East end of the parking area is where the regular trash will be, located a bit away from the South property line. Not quite as convenient for residents, but addresses some concerns previously expressed.
    - iii) They added special crosswalks and signage in several locations, noting that schoolkids may be crossing in those areas.
    - iv) To address concerns about lighting spilling over into adjacent properties, they restricted lighting to the front edge of the covered parking overhangs.
      - (1) In addition, the lights would be down-lighted shielded lighting.
      - (2) They also added additional evergreen trees along the South edge.
      - (3) They didn't replace existing trees, but did add additional trees.
    - v) At the last meeting there was a request that the Agent meet with the Pre-Application Review Team (PRT), which was done prior to submitting the application.
    - vi) The site plan drawings include the site plan, landscape, grading/drainage, utilities, elevations, and project site details. All of that was submitted to the Development Review Board (DRB).

**2) Questions and concerns.**

**a) Responses to agent's presentation.**

- i) Q: There is an error on the drawing. The setback to the house that is the second lot from West to East is 7 feet not 8 feet.
  - (1) The Agent will make that change.
- ii) Q: How many housing units are planned?
  - (1) Agent: 93 units, 150 parking spaces.

**b) Parking.**

**i) Target market.**

- (1) Q: The prices you want to charge are more than what it costs to rent a house in this area. I've talked to people working in technical businesses, who have jobs. They make \$40,000 to \$50,000. They don't want to stay up here.
  - (a) The property manager responded that people making \$40,000 to \$50,000 are not the ones expected to live at this location.
- (2) Q: We still haven't heard much about the source of the developers' data.
  - (a) The property manager promised to provide the market study to neighbors.
- (3) Q: Are you looking at other complexes in this school district as your comparisons?
  - (a) According to the property manager, typically, residents of 1-2 bedroom apartments have one car. For this demographic the resident(s) will use a second bedroom as a study or guestroom, not necessarily a roommate situation.
- (4) Q: At last meeting, when we asked who target market was, you said young professionals.
  - (a) The Agent explained that "young" doesn't necessarily mean college aged people. And, in fact, the property is expected to also appeal to empty nesters. It's not just one demographic being looked at here. This is an upscale project.
- (5) Q: I asked a bunch of young people if they would come up here and live. They don't want to live up here. They want to be downtown, in Uptown, and by UNM. Your demographic doesn't fit. The people you're missing are people who want to downsize, and they want a house. You'd be better served building with those people in mind.
  - (a) Property manager: When we said demographic, we didn't have a specific age in mind. We're not looking for UNM students.
- (6) Q: I talked to people at the apartments off Barstow & Holly, and I disagree because I talked to them. It's an apartment complex with a lot of kids and families who live there in order to be in school district.
  - (a) The Agent agreed to take a look at that project.

**ii) Occupancy restrictions.**

- (1) Q: Are there occupancy restrictions on these units? Limits on the number of people staying in a one-bedroom or two-bedroom?
  - (a) Property manager: The housing code limits residents based on 2 people per bedroom.

**iii) Number and composition of parking spaces.**

- (1) Q: Is it assigned parking or first come, first served? How many spaces are covered? How many are compact?
  - (a) The Agent stated that there are 93 covered spaces, and each unit would be assigned one of those. Fifty-seven additional spaces are not covered. 40% of those are for compact cars.

- (2) Q: Clarification on compact parking spots. What I see in the IDO is a maximum of 25% may be designed for compact.
  - (a) Architect: We'll clarify and respond to everyone on the percentage of compact parking spots.
- (3) Q: You indicated that there are a total of 150 spaces for residents. How many spaces are available for visitors, property managers, and handicapped?
  - (a) The Agent stated that the total number is 150, which includes residents, guests, and employees. That's all part of the parking requirement. There are 6 regular handicapped spaces and 4 van-accessible spaces.
  - (b) Q: Point of clarification. During the school year, teachers and parents will park along Barstow past Alameda up to the arroyo, sometimes on both sides. They put paving in there for them to park. When you build, you'll have to deal with that traffic issue.
    - (i) The Agent stated that they will be improving the frontage on Barstow as part of the project.

**iv) Overflow**

- (1) Q: Where will you put the overflow? If teenagers are living there, that means 3-4 cars per unit.
  - (a) The Agent explained that the City's required number of parking spaces is 139. The plan has 11 more than required. In the Agent's experience, this is sufficient based on similar apartment projects throughout the metro area.
- (2) Q: If your projections are in error, what possible solutions do you have for parking overflow?
  - (a) The Agent explained that the estimates are based both on their projections and the City development code.
  - (b) Q: If the City is wrong and you are wrong—if more parking is required--given the physical location of this property, what are the options?
    - (i) Agent: In that case, to change the market for parking, property management would charge for parking. We need to live within our boundaries when it comes to parking.
    - (ii) Q: For clarity, who is the "we"? Adjacent streets have no on-street parking allowed. What makes it no-parking?
    - (iii) Agent: The scale of the street. Neighborhoods are not allowed to have on-street parking on that level of street.
    - (iv) Q: And with your experience of dealing with City and parking, if neighbors went to the City and asked for no parking signs, would they do that?
      - 1. The Agent did not know how the City would respond to such a request, but has no objection to it.
  - (c) Q: The concern is really about people parking in the surrounding neighborhood.
- (3) Q: Have any of you been through that intersection at 7 AM on a school day? You need to be out there before you start really thinking about traffic flow.

(a) Q: They park all the way to Napa Valley on both sides. I don't like it. It's in the morning and evening. I've never seen anything like this traffic from the school.

(i) Agent: No, I haven't been there at 7 in the morning, but I have been there in the afternoon.

**c) Unit Density.**

**i) Number of units and maximum number of residents.**

ii) Q: Does the Applicant own all 4 pieces of property?

(1) The Applicant owns two, and two are under contract.

(2) Q: How does that affect your DRB application?

(a) The Applicant stated that it did not affect him at all.

(b) The Agent explained that many applications are a contract purchase situation, where property doesn't get purchased until property is approved.

iii) Q: Where are you getting market data from?

(1) Property manager: La Cueva district area. Markana and neighboring properties as well.

iv) Q: How many units are single, how many are double?

(1) Applicant: approximately 30 singles, 63 doubles.

ii) Q: How many levels?

(1) Architect: The furthest-East building has a section that is part one story, the rest is three stories.

iii) Q: So the total number of people living in this complex could vary from 90 to 300. How will you limit it? Is there a limit on the number of total people?

(1) The Agent stated that it's not allowed to limit the total number of people. It is not expected that the maximum number of people allowed by the code will actually live there; experience shows that rarely happens.

(2) Property manager: Typically, when qualifying applicants, each resident (adult) has to qualify individually. If there's a child living with them, that's an occupant, not a resident. Typically you will not have residents surpassing the average occupancy, because they have to qualify individually. A one-bedroom apartment can have up to two occupants.

iv) Q: If I'm correct, the IDO does not have any limits on density.

(1) Agent: That's correct.

**ii) Request for less units, but larger.**

(1) Q: At the pre-application meeting, I heard a number of people saying it would be saner if you made slightly larger apartments and fewer of them to alleviate stress on all the systems. Was any serious consideration given to that request between the pre-application meeting and this meeting tonight?

(a) Agent: Yes. Immediately after that meeting we got on the phone. Mr. Lindborg met with the architect and went through the comments. We did our own notes with a list of items. We considered all of the things we heard. Some of them we were able to address, and some we weren't.

(2) Q: This is right next to one of the most popular schools in our City. I think the people who will want to live here are parents, so their kids can go to this school district. If that is true, I question why the apartments are so small and there are so many of them. If I had a child in high school, I would not rent a one or two-bedroom apartment. It just wouldn't work. In my mind, it would make more sense to have townhomes or apartment buildings with 3 bedrooms, but less of them. It think that would also solve a lot of the other issues that we're having with parking, traffic, and other things.

(a) The Agent stated that adding 3-bedroom units would cause the parking requirement for each unit to go up. Doing that might or might not alleviate parking issues; it might actually exacerbate them.

(3) Q: Maybe you want to reevaluate where you put the one-story building so you're not alienating the people that live behind you. This way you're not having people looking into their houses. I still say it should be a 55+ gated community for people with money.

(a) Architect: The buildings are sited on the very North side of the site. They've been pushed as far as they can be to the North to provide a visual buffer. A portion of the very furthest East building is only one story.

**d) Traffic.**

**i) Property egress and school traffic.**

(1) Q: When you come out of this parking lot onto Barstow, there's not much space until the stop sign. Could that exit be left turn only?

(a) [Another participant commented, you don't want to be crossing traffic.]

(b) Agent: We'll look at that, but it's a puzzle laying out a project like this. By locating the buildings as far North as possible, we are able to place the access as far South as possible, away from the intersection. There is the second access to the North onto Alameda, which is as far as possible to the East. We've separated those two access points as far apart as we can, and located them as far from the Alameda & Barstow intersection as possible.

(c) Applicant: Those accesses are very similar to developments at Alameda & Louisiana and Alameda & San Pedro. Those have the same distances to the intersection.

(i) Q: True, but there isn't a school near those other intersections.

(a) Q: There are times when school is out when we cannot turn either left or right onto Barstow between 2:00pm and 3:30pm.

(2) Q: You seem to have forgotten that there is another street, there's Alameda, this property, and the intersection at Signal & Barstow. It's already hard at times to get out at Signal & Barstow, and you didn't take that into consideration.

(a) Agent: We did consider that intersection. We're limited by the depth of our property.

**ii) Coordination with the City.**

(1) Q: The City may put a cut through Alameda opposite your North access. At what time will those changes start to come together?



- (a) Agent: Once we get through the DRB process, we'll start going through DRC (Design Review and Construction section) process, where they will review the separate road improvements. In addition, I think the City has been working on plans for Alameda; they put some of the implementation of those plans on hold pending this project. That's also a part of that project. As part of the DRB process there is an infrastructure list, which identifies all of the infrastructure items that need to be financially guaranteed by the developer prior to the City signing off on the site plan. Those processes happen simultaneously but go through different parts of City review.
- (2) Q: Is this a large enough scope that we should expect the City to host a public meeting on improvements?
  - (a) Agent: It's unlikely that the City would host a public open house meeting.
  - (b) Q: We will make a request.
- (3) Q: Who are you talking to through DRC and DRB?
  - (a) Agent: The DRB is made up of staff that represents various disciplines. Kym Dicome is the chair of the DRB. The DRB includes representatives from several departments: Traffic, Transportation, Hydrology, Codes Enforcement, and also the Water Authority (ABCWUA). I don't interact with the DRC, so I don't know who's on that body, but that's another group of civil engineers. We can find that out if people want to know that.
  - (b) Q: I think a traffic study would help alleviate a lot of the stress and tension.
    - (i) Agent: Due to its size, this project does not meet the threshold for a traffic study. Under the old rules, the threshold for a traffic study was 300 apartments. The new rules are based on peak hour traffic generation. At 93, we're less than the threshold. City does have a Neighborhood Traffic Management Program (NTMP), which is typically initiated with a request through the City council office or Tim Brown.
      - 1. Q2: The NTMP is not intended for major streets like Alameda and Barstow.

**iii) Cut-thru traffic.**

- (1) Q: Do you have any management plan for drivers who cut through the apartment complex? Could there be a gate?
  - (a) Agent: We did look at that as an option and decided not to do that at this point. If cut through traffic becomes an issue, we will look at ways to address that. Gates are not our preference, but we could do that. There could also be other traffic management through the site.

**e) Light and noise overflow.**

- i) The Agent stated that all outdoor lighting will be night sky compliant, down lighting, shielded so light doesn't spill out. The City has specific requirements related to night sky provisions and light spillage. On the South side, lighting will be under the cover on the North side of the canopies and directed downward.
- ii) Q: How many lumens per fixture?
  - (1) Agent: That's not how we do the analysis, so we don't have that information right now.

**iii) Parking structures.**

- (1) Agent: One of the questions that we got in advance was related to grading. The landscape strip will maintain the elevation at the base of the wall. The parking and drive aisle is 1-2 feet lower than that. There will be a bit of retainage along that edge. That will make the wall seem 1-2 feet higher than what it actually is. We're not planning to do anything to alter the wall or compromise the wall. The grade is staying where it is. We'll add landscaping and making parking slightly lower.
- (2) Architect: That is included in the grading and drainage plan, but it is technical.
- (3) Q: In the application package, there is no drawing of carports or the parking along the South wall. Are there drawings of the parking structure?
  - (a) Architect: They are noted on the site plan. I'd have to look back at the elevations to see if they are included.
  - (b) Agent: If we do have a detail, we can send that out.

**iv) Compact parking spaces.**

- (1) Q: Where I work, compact parking spaces, they are 7.5 feet wide as opposed to 8.5 feet, and you cannot put two standard vehicles in compact spaces. I don't understand how you can get so many compact spaces.
  - (a) Applicant: Not all of them are narrow. "Compact" also includes spaces compromised by the landscaping, i.e. the diamond cutouts where the trees are planted.
  - (b) Agent: There's a combination of both regular compact and landscape.

**v) Request for access to the plans and drawings.**

- (1) Q: Is there someplace that we have access to review the plans? Because you said you didn't bring all of the plans.
  - (a) The Agent sent them electronically to the association representatives.
  - (b) The original drawings that went out with the notice of application were posted on NorEste.org , the Vineyard Estates website, and NextDoor.
  - (c) The Facilitator stated that if individuals contact her by email, she will send them the drawings.
- (2) Q: At the last meeting it was unclear about the landscaping and wall. The Applicant had a color image that clarified a lot for me. If you could send that out, it would help. It makes it clear that there would be a barrier. I was concerned about headlights going into houses. Six feet of landscape, wall, and parking curb, it's all much farther away than I anticipated.
  - (a) The Agent promised to distribute a color image similar to one the Applicant provided at the pre-application meeting showing the parking, barrier, landscaping, and boundary wall.

**vi) Lighting.**

- (1) Q: With respect to lighting, what is adequate lighting around the property to make sure there aren't dark spots for crime?
  - (a) Applicant: Typically we try to have 3.5 foot-candles for parking lot areas. In some areas, pedestrian areas and entrances, there will be higher light levels,

maybe 7 foot-candles. In addition to using cutoff fixtures, there will be LED lights which are more directional, to focus light on public areas.

**vii) Noise.**

(1) Q: How will you enforce noise levels? Quiet hours? Security?

(a) Property manager: Typically it's part of the lease addendum. Quiet hours are typically after 10 PM. There will be a courtesy patrol (we don't call it security) that will patrol the area, and we have someone on call after hours for noise complaints or residents can call courtesy patrol directly.

(2) Q: Putting air conditioner packs on the roof. Make a note to put them as far to the center as possible for sight line issues. They make a lot of noise, please consider that and use screening.

(a) The Architect stated that the systems in the design are quiet compared to commercial air conditioning. The units will be placed 130 feet from neighbors and 33 feet up in the air and there should be no noise at ground level.

(b) Q: How many units will there be?

(i) Architect: 1 condenser unit per unit. They are very quiet.

**f) Dumpsters.**

i) Agent: After meeting last time, we met with Solid Waste about options relative to the locations of dumpsters. What we came up with was that two dumpsters along the South side of the property will be recycling only. The larger unit at the East end of the parking area will be a double set of dumpsters for trash.

**ii) Placement.**

(1) Q: I'd also make sure trash is away from people. You'll get wildlife visiting, such as coyotes and foxes. And you want to keep smells away from neighbors.

**iii) Capacity.**

(1) Q: How do you calculate capacity of dumpsters for residents?

(a) Architect: That is determined by City Solid Waste department. They said for 93 apartments, they would expect 4 dumpster locations. I couldn't tell you how they set that, but they set that.

(2) Q: There's only one dumpster on East side?

(a) Agent: It's a double dumpster.

(3) Q1: You probably will need two dumpsters. There could be overflow, dumping around. There will also need to be education about proper recycling practices.

(a) Agent: That's a great comment, and we want to make sure we have education built in. There are several ways to do that. I take the point on managing the dumpsters in terms of number of pickups, making sure we don't have issues with people not physically being able to get their garbage to where the dumpsters are, and making sure the dumpsters are picked up on a regular schedule.

(b) Property manager: There will be a valet service, once or twice a week, picking up trash. So if residents are elderly or can't make it out, someone will be by there to pick it up. There will be overflow every once in a while; sometimes people throw things out when they move. We work with the City on large item trash pickup, and the valet service also deals with large item trash.

**iv) Enforceability and covenants.**

- (1) Q: How can we make sure this is enforceable? This is not a City code. If things do not work out right, the neighbors have no recourse, unless you'd be willing to look at some covenants that would bind any future owner.
- (a) The Agent stated that those concerns can be addressed in the lease agreements and in rules that the tenants have to follow, including penalties for non-compliance.
- (b) Q: But that doesn't protect us from management decisions.
- (c) Agent: When it is identified on the site plan, in effect it becomes part of the zoning, and is enforceable by the City. It can't be changed except through a formal process. The City could come out and enforce that because it's on the site plan.
- (i) The Architect concurred. It becomes a zoning enforcement issue.
- (2) Q: Is there anything else that covenants might help with? I want others to think about that as well. Covenants are hard to enforce, but they are a legal contract.
- (3) Q2: At the pre-application meeting, the Agent said that changes of less than 10% can be made administratively. Wouldn't covenants protect against that?
- (a) Agent: If it's a standard on the site plan, that's in effect a restriction, which couldn't be changed by an administrative amendment. One couldn't just make changes without going back through the process. I don't think the dumpster placement would fall into that category.
- (b) Property manager: My experience with other properties is that to make any type of change, there's an approval process that must be followed. Even changing the size of the bin requires approval from the City.
- (4) Q1: The elevator shaft exceeds standards for MX-L. Is there anything else in the plan that exceeds a standard?
- (a) Architect: This is the only thing.
- (b) Agent: The IDO does have a table of allowed exceptions to maximum height. The plan shows it going higher, but the IDO allows that height in the "maximums" section of the development standards.

**g) Retaining wall.**

**i) Carport.**

- (1) Q: Not sure what the carport height is. What and where will the existing wall be in comparison to the height of the carport?
- (a) Applicant: The intent is for the far South end of the carport to line up with 1-2 foot retaining wall, so drainage will go into landscaping. Carports typically will be 8.5-9 feet high.
- (b) Q: So the carport won't be higher than residents' wall?
- (i) Applicant: It will be in some places. As the parking lot steps down, the carport will be slightly higher than wall. We also have the landscape barrier.
- (c) Q: That infuriates me. My home value just went down as a result of the carport.
- (i) Applicant: We can look at that.

- (2) Q: I think bumpers are required to be 2 feet from the landscaping. Is that sufficient to keep people from backing in and damaging the landscaping?
- (i) Architect: There will be a wall, or curb, 1-2 feet in elevation that changes along the edge of the parking. It will be a retaining wall. Those drawings will be completed in the request for building permit.
  - (b) Q2: Will there also be a parking stopper?
    - (i) Architect: The City standard for an 18-foot parking space is a 2-foot overhang. The curb will stop parking.
  - (c) Applicant: Where appropriate, we'll put parking bumpers in.
- (3) Q: When my kids are playing in the backyard and a truck comes through, what will stop it?
- (a) Architect: The 1-2 foot curb and 6 feet of landscaping.
- (4) Q: The parking structure is just a roof? Why couldn't you put something at the end to line up with the retaining wall, a screen or something?
- (a) Agent: We're trying to design it so our structure is lower, so you don't see it from your backyard.
  - (b) Q: But you said that isn't going to be uniform. So why not put something really pretty in there?
    - (i) Agent: That's a good idea, and we're open to those suggestions. We'll take a look at that.

**ii) Security.**

- (1) Q: I don't know if you have new ways to build retaining walls that will inhibit someone from hopping over. Where I live, retaining walls create an opportunity for people to hop over fences and break into houses. I think height will be a key component, and also, are you looking at the ability to jump over?
- (a) Agent: In this case, along that edge, the high curb/low retaining wall is 6.5 feet to the rear yard walls. The goal is not to impact the existing wall at all. I don't think we've created that situation, but we'll look at that.
  - (b) Q: I think that area is where you need good lighting.
  - (c) Agent: The idea is that there will be lights under the North edge of the canopy. We're also trying to be mindful that we're not adding light into backyards. We're trying to make sure what we're doing provides adequate security.

**iii) Landscaping.**

- (1) Q: Do the homeowners want those trees? Do they want that buffer?
- (a) Architect: The trees are in the City ordinance. They will be there. We have provided trees in addition to what the ordinance requires. All landscaping will be maintained with the project.
  - (b) Applicant: We've intentionally selected an evergreen species that doesn't shed as the additional tree.
- (2) Q: We have a buffer of 6.5 feet. That's where you'll plant these trees.
- (a) Agent: We'll plant in the landscape diamonds to push them further into the project.
  - (b) Applicant: All of these trees are designed to not go into neighbors' property.

- (c) Q: [Looking at landscape plan with listing of tree species and sizes.] Even if the trees are planted at 6 feet away from the wall, and it will probably be closer than that, tree #1 is an Austrian pine, they can grow 50-60 feet diameter. Then we have honey locust, 30-40 feet diameter. That tree will go over my wall by 17 feet. It will also affect property value when I sell my house. Then a 20 foot diameter species—that's 7 feet over my wall. Then a 40 foot diameter species, another 17 feet over my wall. Then olive, 15 feet in diameter, another 5 feet over my wall. Then the myrtle, another 5 feet over.
- (i) Agent: We can look at the tree selection along the South edge. Those numbers that you've said are the maximum size, I don't think we typically get trees to that size in New Mexico.
- (ii) Q: I see those trees, and they do get that big.
- (iii) Applicant: They will be pruned on a regular basis. We can look at getting some smaller tree species; we can talk to the landscape architect about that. It's our intent to manage the property properly and have a positive impact. If there is an issue with trees coming onto your property, I'm sure that's something property management will address.
- (iv) Q: My concern is that shade trees will overlap onto my wall and I will have to pick up the leaves.
- (v) Property manager: If we need to trim trees because they are affecting your property, we will do that.
- (d) Q: There will be some folks with properties on that property line who will love trees for screening from the apartments. If it were me, I'd want a tree. However, you're not going to get much water to the feeder roots on the trees. The honey locust, you might want your arborist to take a look at that because its roots run along the surface, and it could affect the wall and parking area.
- (3) Q: Earlier you mentioned drainage. As far as landscaping is concerned, the water will drain to the South side of the property?
- (a) Applicant: There will be some drainage off canopies that will drop into the landscape buffer.
- (b) Architect: I have a correction to that. The site is designed to drain into middle. Water will fall into the landscape area when it rains, but all water is being directed into the middle and then to the West.

**h) Other topics.**

**ii) Pets.**

- a) Q: I don't know if you're allowing pets, but adequate pet stations are important. Have you planned for this?
- i) Agent: Dogs will be allowed on the property. There will be a dog run and dog facilities on site, including an inside dog wash station. The intent is to be pet friendly and have residents responsibly take care of pets.
- b) Q2: Is there a size limit?
- i) Property manager: There would be breed restrictions. All pets will have DNA tests on file. In the event that people don't pick up after their dogs, that

information can be in residents' files. There will be a substantial pet rent as well.

**i) Aesthetics.**

- (1) Q: You've done a pretty good job of meeting requirements for the façade on Alameda. But I find the elevation along Barstow appalling. It needs something architecturally interesting. It's hard to interpret to see if you have met requirements, but even if you have, please look at that.
- (2) Q: On one building, orange-red stucco is indicated for the West side, and that seems really out of character with neighborhood. Could that be tan? That will be such a large wall to be a bright orange-red.
  - (a) Agent: We'll look at that.
- (3) Q: Are there trees along Barstow? Are you considering visibility?
  - (a) Agent: We have to make sure any trees comply with City regulations on a clear sight triangle. Typically branches must be at least 8 feet high and no bushes higher than 3 feet high.

**ii) Other comments.**

- (1) Q: Here as a member of the Zoning and Development Committee of the District 4 Coalition. Summing up for me, I think the pushback you've gotten on this from the very start is because the plan is buying in to the notion of American capitalism as practiced since the 1970s. You've crammed as much as possible into smallest space possible contrary to wishes of surrounding neighborhoods. Folks most impacted were denied neighborhood edge. I think there is karma connected to what's happening. I wish the project well, but think profit eats at the soul of the community. I ask you to take that into account. Aesthetics are very personal. When I heard this would be called the Monet, I pulled up Monet's most famous paintings. I think you've got an Andy Warhol knockoff of a barracks. I think this is the most in the smallest amount of space and that's not going to help the community.

Application Hearing Details

1) Development Review Board Hearing Details:

- a. The Development Review Board (DRB) was established in March 1982, by Administrative Instruction 8-2. The Development Review Board reviews development proposals to ensure technical standards pertaining to land use, zoning, infrastructure, and transportation have been met. The DRB conducts public meetings on the types of applications shown as DRB responsibilities in Table 6-1-1 (major subdivision actions where no re-zoning or annexation is required, proposed major and minor subdivision actions, vacations of public rights of way or public and private easements and waiver-DRB).
- b. The members of the DRB are City staff representing the Planning Department, Parks and Recreation Department, City Engineer, Traffic Engineer, Code Enforcement, and Water/Sewer Utilities Engineer.

2) Hearing Process:

- a. Comments from facilitated meetings will go into a report which goes to the DRB.
- b. DRB meetings, a portion of which are public hearings, are held each Wednesday beginning at 9 a.m. in the Plaza del Sol Hearing Room at 600 2nd St NW. The public hearing portion of each week’s agenda is announced in the Albuquerque Journal.
- c. This application is scheduled for hearing on July 17, 2019, at 9 a.m. at the location listed above.

Any further questions or comments can be referred to:

Maggie Gould

[mgould@cabq.gov](mailto:mgould@cabq.gov)

Names and Affiliations of All Attendees:

Michael Odell	Neighbor
Karen Buehr	Neighbor
Philip Le	Neighbor
Dave Zarecki	VENA
James Griffie	NENA
Mildred Griffie	NENA
Brook Bassan	NENA
Zack Snyder	Money Apartments
Walt Gutierrez	Neighbor
Jim Strozier	Consensus Planning
Michael Vos	Consensus Planning
Omega Delgado	Consensus Planning
Richard Pfeiffer	visitor
Mark Hammond	Napa Valley



Vera Redige	V I
Diane Boomershine	Vineyard I
Ryan Stevens	N
Tim Krier	Nor Este NA
Beth Gnerich	Carrington
Anne Downing	Neighbor
David Downing	Neighbor
Kathleen Butler	Neighbor
Anita Roark-Mayer	Neighbor
Carla Irwin	Vineyard III
Phil Lindborg	Developer
Trista Mosman	Neighbor
Jeff Bland	Neighbor
M Carta	Neighbor
Nancy Jones	Neighbor
Paul Scarpa	Neighbor
Mary Villanueva	Neighbor
Eric Griego	Neighbor
Keith and Ginny Coulton	8500 Vina del Sol
Mark Motsko	NENA
Dan Regan	Dist 4 Coalition
Jo Sanchez	Neighbor
Meifen Zhao	Carrington
Elizabeth Meek	Vineyard Estates NA
Lucy Baca	Vineyard Estates NA
Adrian Segura	
Sandra Salata	Property manager
Ane Romero	in area