

CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD

M I N U T E S

December 18, 2019

Agenda Item 1
Project Number 2019-002184-Site Plan

MEMBERS:

Jolene Wolfley, Chair
Jeanne Wolfenbarger, Transportation
Kris Cadena, Water Authority
Shahab Biazar, City Engineer/Hydrology
Jacob Martinez, Code Enforcement
Christina Sandoval, Parks and Recreation

STAFF PRESENT:

Maggie Gould, Planning Manager
Jay Rodenbeck, Staff Planner
Nicole Sanchez, Attorney
Angela Gomez, Hearing Monitor

**DRB Minutes, Agenda Item 1
December 18, 2019**

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. All (inaudible) in favor of deferring Items 6 and 11 to January 8th, would you please raise your hand.

Okay. So we will not be hearing those items today.

I just want to give a little overview of the development review board for those who are -- could be here for the first time.

The development review board was created in 1982 to offer efficient considerations of technical standards, a one-stop shop for property owners and developers alike, which would have otherwise required an applicant to meet individually with the city staff experts from divisions and departments across the city.

The vision continues to be that the DRB streamlines the application process by bringing together any department staff responsible for the specialized review of projects in a form where staff and applicant meets to discuss projects, and the public can ask questions and share input for those decisions.

The DRB staff members apply the technical standards and requirements in the Integrated Development Ordinance and the Development Process Manual. As such, the DRB is not a policymaking board and functions very differently from the environmental planning commission.

I'd like to go ahead and have the board members introduce themselves today. So if we can start down there with Chris.

MR. CADENA: Hi. Kris Cadena of the water authority

MR. MARTINEZ: Jacobo Martinez, code enforcement.

MS. SANDOVAL: Christina Sandoval, parks and recreation.

MR. BIAZAR: Shahab Biazar, city engineer

MS. WOLFENBARGER: Jeanne Wolfenbarger, transportation department.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: And I am Jolene Wolfley, with planning, and I'm the DRB chair.

We have staff today. You may have met Angela Gomez. She's our hearing monitor. If anyone wants to speak on an item that is -- and you're not the applicant, please make sure you sign up over there with Angela.

And Nicole Sanchez here is -- if you'll just wave your hand -- is from your legal department, and she's counsel to the DRB.

Maggie Gould and Jay Rodenbeck, if you just wave your hands -- they're from our planning department, and they are staff and we'll swear them in.

(Witnesses sworn.)

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Thank you. If they speak with us, we'll have them sworn in. And on all our major cases, we will be swearing in both the applicant and then the speakers who may come before us.

Okay. With all of that, I think we're ready to proceed with Item Number 1, which is Project 2184. It's Site Plan 379 at 4909 Juan Tabo. And this is Guardian Storage.

**DRB Minutes, Agenda Item 1
December 18, 2019**

And if you want to go ahead and come forward, the applicant, and anyone you want with you.

MR. STROZIER: Good morning.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Good morning.

Okay. So if you each would state your name and your interest in the property, and then I'll swear you in.

MR. STROZIER: Jim Strozier, principal with Consensus Planning, and acting as the agent for the application.

MR. GRIER: Sheldon Grier, with RESPEC. I'm the engineer (inaudible) on the project, civil engineer.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay.

(Witnesses sworn.)

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Go ahead and present your applicant to the board.

MR. STROZIER: All right. Thank you, Madam Chair and Board Members. This is site plan DRB for a proposed indoor storage project located at the corner of Osuna Road and Juan Tabo.

It's -- the property is zoned MX-L, and as such, we are required to obtain a conditional use to allow the indoor storage use on this property, which we did. That use was appealed and upheld by the land use hearing officer and the city council.

So once that was completed, we put together the site plan, and this is our initial hearing to review staff comments on that, for that site plan.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Can you just go ahead, in your opening, explain the rezoning that occurred on the property.

MR. STROZIER: So this has been identified from the very initial PRP. The -- the AGIS map in is error. The -- and so the property to -- the western portion of this property has been shown R-1D. It is, in fact, MX-L. That was an error, I believe, in the conversion process.

The city is aware of that, and I am not sure why it's taking so long to get that updated in -- on AGIS. It's -- I think it's been verified at every step that it is, in fact, zoned MX-L.

The water authority property that the to the west is zoned R-1D, and so we do have that adjacency with the R-1 zoning, even though it's not developed as residential.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. I just kind of wanted to get the --

MR. STROZIER: Okay.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: -- get that.

MR. STROZIER: Thank you.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: All right. Anything else for now?

MR. STROZIER: I don't. I have some questions on the comments as we go through them.

**DRB Minutes, Agenda Item 1
December 18, 2019**

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay.

MR. STROZIER: Just a request for clarification on a few items, but --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: All right. And in our order of business, we're going to (inaudible) the public next --

MR. STROZIER: Okay.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: -- anyone who's signed up to speak. So if you want to take a chair back in the audience.

MR. STROZIER: We'll do that. Thank you very much.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. I have one person signed up to speak, Larry Pope. Okay.

Go ahead and come on forward, Mr. Pope. And if -- you might tell us your name and your interest in the -- the property. And then I'll swear you in.

MR. POPE: My name is Larry Pope. I'm the president of Albuquerque Estates East Neighborhood Association.

(Witness sworn.)

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Perfect. Okay. Go ahead.

MR. POPE: The board member who attends our correlation meetings could not be here today because of illness, so I'm here as a backup. So I haven't been a party to the coalition meetings of the neighborhood association.

But many, or most of them, are not in favor of this particular project. And we wanted to formally let you know that as a neighborhood association, we also are not in favor of this particular project.

We have some questions and we're not qualified to answer them, and that is, with whether the proposal is compliant with all federal, state, IDO, City of Albuquerque requirement for the -- for the construction of the building in a flood zone. It's a floodplain.

And I'm aware of that, because when I relocated back to Albuquerque 40-some years ago, I contemplated building a home above where that damn now is, and I was told I'd have to have flood insurance.

And so one of the questions we have is, does the city require them, should this be approved, for them to carry flood insurance to minimize the liability the city might incur by having a constructed facility in a floodplain?

We're also concerned as to whether or not there might have been an external assessment made to make certain that their foundations and their footings and such are adequate to survive a flood when such event might happen.

Our biggest concern has to do with the focus of this project. It's proposed as a storage facility, but if you look at their company online, they indicate that they're also involved with distribution center, hazard waste storage, perhaps a homeless shelter. And based on some prior experiences with the facility, when Walmart expanded on Wyoming and Academy, their proposed

**DRB Minutes, Agenda Item 1
December 18, 2019**

warehouse expansion was supposedly for safety and other things, when, in fact, it turned out it was to have space for the food they wanted to sell.

And so we're concerned about a potential migration of this project from storage to hazardous waste, for example. We don't believe that we want a hazardous waste facility in a floodplain. We don't believe we ought to have a homeless shelter in a floodplain with all of the liability that that might entail.

And so if this proposal is approved, we would hope that there would be strong words added that they cannot migrate to some other use other than storage without advanced debate, evaluation and consideration to make certain we're not migrating one proposal into some function different than that.

And that would basically be the position of our neighborhood association.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Excellent.

I think we've got a lot of experts here that will speak to that. But I think we'll also have the applicant go ahead and just respond to anything that you brought forward that they would like to respond to.

MR. POPE: Okay.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: All right. Thank you, Mr. Pope.

MR. POPE: Yes.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Thank you.

If you want to speak on this item, you need to go and sign in with the hearing monitor.

MR. FREEMAN: Where should I sign?

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Just right up there with Angela.

Is there anyone else wanting to speak on Item Number 1?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I will say that --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: We just can't speak from the audience. I'm sorry. If you want to speak --

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: That's all right.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: -- you need to go sign up.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: It's okay.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay.

MR. FREEMAN: Yes, I'd like to speak.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Mr. Steve Freeman.

MR. FREEMAN: Yes.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Go ahead and come up to the table.

MR. FREEMAN: Yes.

DRB Minutes, Agenda Item 1
December 18, 2019

CHAIR WOLFLEY: If you'll state your name and your interest in the property for the record. And then I'll swear you in.

MR. FREEMAN: Steve Freeman, personally.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Do you live near this --

MR. FREEMAN: I do, yes.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: -- property? Okay.

(Witness sworn.)

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Go ahead.

MR. FREEMAN: I've been living in that area for about 32 years when I moved there with the Air Force back in 1987. I've walked around that area almost every day for those 32 years. If you look at it, it's only a space of dirt and sagebrush, pretty much. I don't know how many of you have looked at it.

But within that property is lots of rabbits and squirrels and roadrunners, and yeah, coyotes, too. So my time there, my wife and I feed the rabbits and the squirrels, and some of them even have names.

So this project sort of hits me in a personal way. And admittedly, I'm here for selfish reasons. So obviously, I strongly oppose a project of this kind in that area. And I would like -- and I'm not familiar with whatever considerations you have for a project like this, but to consider the open space that isn't what -- for an area such as that, particularly associated with the park. So it's all -- to me, it's all one.

And the tenor of the storage facility there displacing all the -- all the wildlife that lives there, to me, is just totally unacceptable and destroys the nature of the -- and the tranquility of the area.

So I would ask the board to give that every consideration.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Freeman.

Mr. Strozier, do you have a response to the public testimony so far?

MR. STROZIER: Thank you. Madam Chair, so just quickly, and I think both AMAFCA and city hydrology's comments can probably speak to the -- the floodplain issue. It's not in -- it's not in a floodplain. But it is within the 500-year designation that FEMA has.

In terms of the comment about the review of the foundation and footings, my assumption is that that takes place as part of the building permit process and review as -- which would happen provided this site plan is approved.

The site plan does specifically state that the use proposed is self-storage. And as defined in the IDO, we actually reference the specific use standards associated with that, which, I understand, would eliminate the ability to store hazardous materials and use this building as a homeless shelter.

So I think that the site plan is clear with regard to that, what the intent is. If -- if this board has additional language that would clarify that, we'd certainly consider that.

**DRB Minutes, Agenda Item 1
December 18, 2019**

With regard to the second -- Mr. Raymond's [sic] comments, I understand that this has been vacant for a long time, and -- and *Kelli A.* probably considered to be what I would characterize as borrowed open space for that period of time. But it is private -- private property and it is zoned for commercial and mixed use -- mixed use, and the property owner would like to sell it and somebody would like to develop it. So I understand that point, but I would just reference the fact that this is private property and zoned for development.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Thank you. I just also wanted to mention that the project has already gone through the zoning hearing examiner to get a conditional use, so if you want to do an indoor storage in a location like this, you need to go through the zoning hearing examiner.

That case was appealed. The land use hearing officer opinion was that the zoning hearing officer's approval of the indoor storage was correct.

Then it goes to the city council, and the city council determined that they would accept the recommendation of the land-use hearing officer.

So the parameter of the site being developed for indoor storage is sort of a settled matter with the city council. And the job of the DRB is to look at the site design and the engineering particulars. And we're going to go through those various portions of the site review that's within our purview. And once again, that's the Integrated Development Ordinance and the Development Process Manual, our guidelines. And we work within those guidelines.

Okay. So we're going to start now, and this will be a little bit of an interaction between the applicant and the board members to discuss those various site design parameters. So we'll start with water authority.

MR. CADENA: Good morning. You have (inaudible) landscape on this site, correct? Landscaping?

MR. STROZIER: Yes.

MR. CADENA: And that's (inaudible) one water meter that's to be used to (inaudible) irrigation?

CHAIR WOLFLEY: If anyone can't hear, would you please raise your hand at any moment you can't hear and we'll try to get the mics to the person speaking.

MR. STROZIER: I don't know the answer to that, but we can -- we can certainly check that. I assume it would need a --

MR. CADENA: Yeah.

MR. STROZIER: -- (inaudible).

MR. CADENA: The -- well, the reason is, there's not a potable line in the Juan Tabo to the east for district fire's connection to what is potable line, not potable or (inaudible) within 200 feet of the property. So that would be the requirement to connect for that irrigation, that there's a nonpotable line directly leading to the property.

MR. STROZIER: Okay.

**DRB Minutes, Agenda Item 1
December 18, 2019**

MR. CADENA: (Inaudible) pressure (inaudible) for irrigation, but more a talking point that we talk about --

MR. STROZIER: Okay.

MR. CADENA: -- (inaudible) this meeting.

MR. STROZIER: Okay.

MR. CADENA: On-site waterline and fire hydrant shall be labeled "Private" on (inaudible). And (inaudible) correspondence with respect -- there was previous discussion about (inaudible) west (inaudible) grading and drainage plan. The existing flow, I think, was like four and a half cfs, and now going to the south drainage channel. And where, like, half the cfs is going up to the water property.

I noticed that there were steep slopes. I just wanted to see what your thoughts were for mitigating any possible erosion or high velocity (inaudible) very small, but (inaudible) engineer.

MR. STROZIER: So that's a -- there's a little thin strip, you're -- you're correct. And -- and so one of the -- one of the comments from code enforcement was that because the water authority property is zoned 1, we need to have a solid wall on -- on that property line.

And so we would like to coordinate, and there may be some slight modifications to what's happening along that edge in order to accommodate the solid wall on that boundary. And then, there's a trail that comes across the water authority's property just immediately adjacent to this property.

So we want to make sure we coordinate with -- with drainage on the construction of that wall in order to make that area work.

MR. CADENA: That (inaudible) would be reflected in the site plan, correct?

MR. STROZIER: Correct.

MR. CADENA: Okay. So we have a (inaudible).

MR. STROZIER: Okay.

MR. CADENA: But I do understand that historical flows (inaudible) what's going to be on the site, right?

MR. GRIER: Yeah, we're greatly reducing the historic flow. There is -- there is some steep slopes there, and we're proposing a gravel surfacing on those slopes, together with the landscaping.

MR. CADENA: So private property --

MR. GRIER: Should take care of that.

MR. CADENA: -- (inaudible) property? Okay.

MR. GRIER: Yes, sir.

MR. CADENA: And for information, we have availability (inaudible) condition for service. Thank you.

MR. STROZIER: Thank you.

DRB Minutes, Agenda Item 1
December 18, 2019

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Before we go on, I just wanted to mention that for this case, there are some comments on the back table, if someone from the public would like those.

And then, Maggie, would you put those -- those are parks department comments on all the cases that --

MS. GOULD: Let me hand one over to the applicant, because we got these late last night, and I don't think the applicant (inaudible).

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay.

MR. STROZIER: No, we did not.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: And those are just available for anyone who would kind of like to have some of what we're talking about in their hands.

Okay. Code enforcement.

MR. MARTINEZ: Thank you.

As you had mentioned, (inaudible) for self-storage for the use specific standards requires that no big wall or fence at least 6 feet or no more than 5, or (inaudible) buffer (inaudible), no wall (inaudible) shall be provided along the lot line that abuts residential zones. That is an R-1 zone, so you're going to have to put that opaque wall.

MR. STROZIER: Correct.

MR. MARTINEZ: So I wasn't sure from the (inaudible) description if that was an opaque wall.

MR. STROZIER: It was not. That was an oversight on our part. We -- we didn't -- you know, it's -- it's -- it's not -- it's zoned residential, but it's the water authority's (inaudible) and -- and (inaudible) improvement. So -- but we -- we will make that modification.

And -- and then the one question we -- we had on that, does that need to actually be on the property line, or can it be inset? And this is just based on kind of this conversation about how that edge is being treated and the adjacent trail and wanting to potentially have -- if the -- if the wall was -- was built in from the property line, it would create less of a tunnel along that -- the trail is kind of right along that edge of the property, and so that's -- that was just a question that we had when looking at -- at the implementation of the requirement.

And -- and if it was located along the -- basically the back of the parking, along that, it would provide screening of that -- of that parking area, as well as allow that -- that buffer to the trail.

So I don't know if that's an option. That was one of the questions that we had about that comment.

MR. MARTINEZ: Thank you. That's something that we can help kind of clarify as we discuss this.

Now, the language itself says an opaque wall or fence, (inaudible) to be high, shall be provided along any lot line that abuts any residential zone district, but we'll discuss --

DRB Minutes, Agenda Item 1
December 18, 2019

MR. STROZIER: Okay.

MR. GRIER: Thank you for the clarification.

MR. STROZIER: All right. Thank you.

MR. MARTINEZ: Also, we have 452 --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: And --

MR. MARTINEZ: Oh, I'm sorry.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Can I just clarify for my purposes? So you're talking about your southern property.

MR. MARTINEZ: They're talking about the lot line to the west.

MR. STROZIER: The western property line.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Oh, the western property line. Okay. So I guess it abuts a residential zone, but not a residential use.

MR. MARTINEZ: Correct.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Correct. Okay.

MR. MARTINEZ: 4-3(D)(28)(d) also notes the public access to any storage unit within 100 feet of any residential zone district.

You said any mixed-use zone district does not allow between 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. I guess we'd like to see that note made on the -- on the site plan.

MR. STROZIER: We'll -- we'll add that note.

MR. MARTINEZ: Okay.

MR. POPE: And would you repeat that?

MR. MARTINEZ: Sure. Under the IDO, 4-3(D)(28)(d), it reads: Public access to any storage unit within 100 feet of any residential zone district or lot containing a residential use in any mixed-use zone district is not allowed between 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m.

MR. POPE: Are those times (inaudible) or --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Excuse me, sir. We're not allowed to have you speak from the -- from the audience.

MR. POPE: Okay.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay?

MR. POPE: Should I come up front, or...

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Let me see where we're at. You kind of had your opportunity to speak, but let me see if we can --

MR. POPE: But this is new information.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Right. Yeah, let's -- let's see if we can address that.

Let me ask one question. This might help. In your conditional

**DRB Minutes, Agenda Item 1
December 18, 2019**

use application, you said your hours would be 9:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. Is that -- excuse me?

MR. STROZIER: That -- yes. Well, that's when the office -- that's the office hours. And we can clarify that. We're okay with --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Yeah, it says hours of operation, 9:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. This is just your application. Customers will have gate access until 7:00 p.m.

MR. STROZIER: Correct.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. So my question is, are you able to follow those time periods?

MR. STROZIER: Yes.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Yes?

MR. STROZIER: Yes.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. That might help a little bit.

MR. POPE: (Inaudible).

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Mr. Strozier just stated that they could follow the operational hours of 9:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. It's 9:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. for their hours of operation, where their office would be open, and then customers would have gate access until 7:00 p.m. Okay? And that's a little more restrictive than what the IDO --

MR. POPE: I would like to say something else.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. We can -- I'll try to circle back to you --

MR. POPE: Thank you.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: -- later on. Okay.

MR. POPE: How much later?

CHAIR WOLFLEY: When we are done with the DRB comments. Okay? We're going to be going through each member of the DRB, and they're going to be giving comments, and there will be some interaction, and then I'll -- I'll try to give you a short, short time to speak, which is not our normal process, but --

MR. STROZIER: We will --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Yeah, but we can let you ask questions at the end, so...

MR. STROZIER: And we can add a note to the site plan that specifies those -- those hours more specifically.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay.

MR. STROZIER: Consistent with the application.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: And while we're -- we're on that subject, this might be a little out further, I'll come back to Mr. Jacobo, you also showed an internal -- internal loading and storage bay, quite a larger -- could you describe that? Is that still your

**DRB Minutes, Agenda Item 1
December 18, 2019**

intention?

MR. STROZIER: That is not. So that was -- that was the -- that was one of the -- that was part of the plan when we went through the conditional use. We actually heard concerns about that exit of that internal loading area going out to the north. So we've actually modified the plans.

And the site plan before you shows inset loading areas that are on the -- on the west edge of the property and the southern edge of the building -- I mean, the building. The west side of the building and the south side of the building that doesn't face the residential neighbors. And those -- so it's not a drive-through --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Right.

MR. STROZIER: -- per the original concept. It's just inset -- an inset loading areas on both of those sides. And we did that in response to concerns --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Outdoor insets.

MR. STROZIER: -- that were expressed. They're outdoor --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Outdoor.

MR. STROZIER: -- but their covered.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: But they're covered.

MR. STROZIER: The second and third floor are above those areas.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay.

MR. STROZIER: Thank you for that clarification.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Let's go back to Mr. Martinez.

MR. MARTINEZ: The last comment I have is, this property is at least -- at the very least, within 330 feet of a major public open space, with a major open space edging to the back.

MR. STROZIER: Yes. And we -- so we did address that in our -- in our letter. And -- and you had the comment regarding -- is that 5-2(H)?

MR. MARTINEZ: 5-2(H).

MR. STROZIER: Is that the reference? Yes. Okay. So I guess my -- our question was just, we did address that and were there any concerns with how we addressed it?

MR. MARTINEZ: Right now, I didn't have a concern on how you addressed this. I just want to make sure that --

MR. STROZIER: Okay.

MR. MARTINEZ: -- it is addressed.

MR. STROZIER: Right.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: And I think we'll talk about that a little bit --

MR. STROZIER: All right.

DRB Minutes, Agenda Item 1
December 18, 2019

CHAIR WOLFLEY: -- in planning comments.

Okay. Let's hear from parks.

MS. SANDOVAL: Good morning.

MR. STROZIER: Good morning.

MS. SANDOVAL: This development is on Juan Tabo, which street trees are required on that classification of street. Any disturbance to the multi-use trail all need to be mitigated by the developer and repaired as part of the construction.

Regarding the comment that was made earlier on the property being part of the park or, you know -- and those types of recreational uses, as is stated by the applicant, the property is privately owned. The park is buffered by a property owned by the water utility authority, so actually, this property is not contiguous or adjacent to park property.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Please refrain from speaking from the audience, but we will give you a chance to talk later.

MS. SANDOVAL: We -- we have a (inaudible) request from the public, the neighbors, about purchasing that property. And at this time, parks does not feel that that is feasible for various reasons. One being that based on our service levels, the current neighborhood is already served by parkland, and so additional parkland is not needed, where there are other parts of the city that do not have park and recreation opportunities, so we'd rather focus our resources there.

In addition to that, placing the park on a street with such high traffic is not ideal. We don't want kids running into the street, things like that. And then, based on the zoning the cost of the property would be very high. Typically, when we're acquiring property, we look for something zoned residential that is more affordable.

Regarding open space comments and the buffer, we do also want to note that you are within the sensitive lands buffer zone, and so that those requirements need to be adhered to. Based on initial assessment, open space does not feel that this will impact their program through traffic noise or site issues, so they have no objection as well.

MR. STROZIER: Okay. Thank you.

Madam Chair, I would just point out that we've provided, as part of the landscape plans, street trees along Juan Tabo and along Osuna, as well.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. We're next going to hear from hydrology. And I'm going to ask -- ask for kind of a deep -- you can use this one or whatever you want.

I'm going to ask you to be detailed about the floodplain and issues of grading, drainage, all that sort of thing, so that the public is really clear on --

MR. BIAZAR: Sure.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: -- what will happen here.

MR. BIAZAR: Maybe I'll go through my comments --

DRB Minutes, Agenda Item 1
December 18, 2019

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay.

MR. BIAZAR: -- and I'll go back and circle around and talk about the floodplain.

We -- we did receive a conceptual grading and drainage plan, and we did provide the applicant, you guys, the comments

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Microphone closer, please.

MR. BIAZAR: I'm sorry. Can you hear me?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I think it's off.

MR. BIAZAR: Oh, it got turned off. Sorry. Sorry about that.

All right. So we did receive a conceptual grading and drainage plan, and we did provide comments to the applicants. And as far as the pipe penetration into the channel, that needs to be a (inaudible).

And as far as floodplain, the site, itself, does not fall within a floodplain. It is next to a floodplain. And they are draining into that channel, so, you know, we have looked at it. We did have some concern about the -- the slopes, and the applicant is aware of that.

They are designing the site in such a way that it will drain into the channel. It will not be impacted by the floodplain themselves, nor there will be impacting anybody else. And, you know, the -- the engineer of record, they've done a lot of work within the city and they are pretty experienced with the floodplain. And our staff is fairly, you know, experienced with the floodplain. I have over 25 years experience doing a lot of design work in the city and in the floodplain area, so I also overlook our engineer's work and make sure that, you know, we don't miss anything as far as design goes.

I guess there was also a concern about -- excuse me -- foundation and -- so typically, the sites -- I mean, they -- it's -- the applicant's responsible to really how they prepare their own site and how well they grade it and they compact it. But typically, all the plans go through city building permit process for foundation design, and there's a structural engineer involved with all the foundation design, and they typically -- I mean, I'm assuming on this site they probably over-excavate the site and they compact it well enough that it won't be any issues with settling and any of that stuff.

Like I said, you know, we had some concerns about the slopes, and the applicant is going to look at that. And, you know, especially being closed to a right-of-way, we like to see three-to-one slopes. I mean, it's close to a right-of-way, and we have brought that to the applicant's attention.

There was a concern, Kris, that you had about the slopes to the west. We typically -- if it's anything steeper than three to one, we require the applicant to provide slope treatment so that -- I believe that would be addressed as far as that is concerned.

And regarding the wall, so if you guys are thinking about moving the wall to the back of the curb, how would be able to maintain the landscaping? So that's an issue, and...

MR. STROZIER: Right. Yeah, and I think -- we just wanted to,

**DRB Minutes, Agenda Item 1
December 18, 2019**

and as we move forward with the design of that edge, make sure that we understood what the -- what the parameters were to design. It could be that that wall, rather than being right at the back of the curb, is somewhere within that upper area, and -- and we're able to maintain the landscaping on the inside, but also not create that tunnel effect next to the --

MR. BIAZAR: No, I agree.

MR. STROZIER: But there -- it's not the multi-use trail that's on that west edge, but it is a -- sort of a neighborhood trail that connects to the multi-use trail that comes across there. And we just want to make sure we're doing the best job we can along that -- along that boundary, and what our --

MR. BIAZAR: Sure.

MR. STROZIER: -- what our -- what flexibilities we have and what we don't in doing the design.

MR. BIAZAR: That would be definitely nice to have the landscaping along the trail.

MR. STROZIER: Right.

MR. BIAZAR: Yeah, if you put the wall right up there, I mean, it's -- yeah, it doesn't really -- it will defy purpose of the landscaping.

MR. STROZIER: Correct.

MR. BIAZAR: And now, let me see. I think -- and that's all I had.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Transportation.

MS. WOLFENBARGER: Yes. Have you received my comments?

MR. STROZIER: We have.

MS. WOLFENBARGER: From yesterday?

MR. STROZIER: Yes.

MS. WOLFENBARGER: So I had a lot of minor comments, provide curb, curb ramp and sidewalk, detailed, dimensioned parking, eye lines, provide (inaudible) details for the handicap sign and motorcycle sign. Provide a cross section for the new sidewalk that you're proposing along Osuna, and fire marshal approval. All of my basic standard comments.

And the bigger one is on Juan Tabo. It's requested a change, the 10-foot sidewalk easement to 10-foot dedicated right-of-way. That was -- that was brought up to me, actually, by DMD.

MR. STROZIER: Okay. Yeah.

MS. WOLFENBARGER: And I have a copy of the plat, if you'd like to see it.

MR. STROZIER: Yes. And I think we've shown that easement on there. I'm -- it's -- I guess it -- there might be some clarification on the purpose, so -- so there's a sidewalk built along -- within the right-of-way along Juan Tabo, and there's -- then there's a 10-foot sidewalk easement adjacent to that that isn't needed for the sidewalk, because the sidewalk's already

**DRB Minutes, Agenda Item 1
December 18, 2019**

built within the right-of-way.

Is it just that it needs to be additional right-of-way?

MS. WOLFENBARGER: DMD is requesting additional right-of-way on Juan Tabo. They didn't state exactly --

MR. STROZIER: And that's part of the slope?

MS. WOLFENBARGER: Yes.

MR. STROZIER: Okay.

MS. WOLFENBARGER: So we -- we can probably meet with them for further clarification --

MR. STROZIER: Okay.

MS. WOLFENBARGER: -- if you wish afterward. That's probably --

MR. STROZIER: I just wasn't sure what --

MS. WOLFENBARGER: That's probably best. It was something they requested, so...

MR. STROZIER: Okay. All right. And that's kind of --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Part of the slope, which you have in your landscaping, plan, right?

MR. STROZIER: So -- yeah. So we --

MS. WOLFENBARGER: So if there's a conflict, it sounds like we need to work it out on-site.

MR. BIAZAR: I would definitely like to know what the purpose of that would be, because, you know, it is a steep slope, three to one. So if they're thinking about expanding the road in the future or something --

MS. WOLFENBARGER: I believe we are.

MR. BIAZAR: -- (inaudible) purposes.

MS. WOLFENBARGER: Yeah.

MR. BIAZAR: That would be good to know ahead of time. Okay.

MR. STROZIER: So, yeah, we just -- understanding the purpose of that and the intent would be good and how that -- how that could potentially impact -- you know, we paid special attention to that slope area because of the sensitive lands requirements and looking at how we're revegetating that and adding trees along that slope to help stabilize it. So that would -- we'll follow up with you and get clarification on that.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Did we get through your list? Okay.

And I'm going to work -- okay. And I'm going to work on the planning list with some help from Ms. Gould.

MR. STROZIER: Okay.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: So confirming the number of parking spaces meets the code, and that their three loading spaces are provided.

**DRB Minutes, Agenda Item 1
December 18, 2019**

MR. STROZIER: So we had a question on that. When we looked at the -- let me make sure I have my notes. So in the off-street loading space requirements, the table has nonresidential zone districts identified and then all other zone districts. And so this is a mixed -- MX zone. So it would be our understanding that the second part of the table, under all other zone districts applies, and that requires one space that is 9-foot by 25 feet, which we would modify the site to accommodate.

MS. GOULD: Tell me -- tell me the page.

MR. STROZIER: So Table 5-5-7. I don't know what page it's on. So it does -- and the table differentiates between nonresidential zone districts and then all other zone districts.

And our understanding is the MX zones are -- would fall into the all other.

MS. GOULD: Let me --

MR. STROZIER: Check.

MS. GOULD: -- confirm with code enforcement --

MR. STROZIER: Okay.

MS. GOULD: -- but...

MR. STROZIER: And then our read of the code is that that loading space does not count as a parking space, so we would need to modify the site plan to replace that space, basically.

MS. GOULD: Yeah.

MR. STROZIER: And I -- and I don't know if there's -- so for this particular use, is there an ability to waive that? We have way more parking than we -- than we need for this particular use on-site. And, of course, that loading space for this use would be used by a customer. I think it does make sense to have that larger space available. But to have to then provide another parking space in addition to that space seems counterproductive, but we would -- would sort of --

MS. GOULD: Okay.

MR. STROZIER: -- like clarification on that, if it's possible to ask that we modify the plan to put that space -- replace that space, but not have to provide an additional parking space above and beyond that. And I don't know if there's a process to ask that.

MS. GOULD: Let me -- let me confirm with code enforcement outside --

MR. STROZIER: Okay.

MS. GOULD: -- of this meeting, and we'll -- because you -- what you've laid out is logical. And I want to make sure that we're -- we're looking at all the (inaudible) of the code, and I want to make sure that also transportation would be -- would be happy with that.

MR. STROZIER: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Then on your walkways, they appear to be too narrow.

**DRB Minutes, Agenda Item 1
December 18, 2019**

MR. STROZIER: Correct. We will -- we will make that -- we will modify the site plan.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay.

MR. STROZIER: That was an oversight on our part.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. And now we're going to move into an area a lot about sort of building design and several of the comments here about what the building will look like.

So in general, we just want you to go through 5-11, on facade design, and outline how all of those requirements are being met.

MR. STROZIER: We will provide a detailed response to each of those --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay.

MR. STROZIER: -- elements.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: So, for example, the -- is the CMU block going to be split face?

MR. STROZIER: Yes. And we will -- we will clarify that on the elevation. We -- we will add to -- we've -- we've already been in contact with the architect, and they're going to add a more detailed color, material and reflectivity --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay.

MR. STROZIER: -- table to the building elevations that provide answers to those questions, along with those calculations that -- to ensure that we're -- I think there are several of those lists where we get to pick -- you have to pick at least two of this list and another one out of this list. And we actually, I think, comply with more than that. But we'll -- we can provide that -- a detail that goes through those as part of the -- and add that to the elevation.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Yeah. And just for the benefit of the audience, as well, I just wanted to detail that 5-2(H)(1)(a) regulates reflectivity of the exterior surfaces, and 5-2(H)(1)(b) requires that the colors blend into the surrounding environment, using yellow ochres, browns, dull reds and grey greens.

Can you confirm that you're using grey green?

MR. STROZIER: So with -- so the green that's -- that's identified on the elevations is identified to fall within the -- I believe that's 5-2(H)(1)(b)1, which allows trim materials, constituting less than 20 percent of the facade may be any color in the design.

And so we have gone through and done an analysis of each of the facades, and it's -- it ranges from a low of 5 percent of the facade to a high of 12 percent of the individual facades, for an average of 7.5. So we're significantly less than the allowed 20 percent in that -- in that section. And so that would be our response, is that that is probably technically not a grey green. But that it would be utilized as our trim color.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. So we'll -- we'll look at those --

MR. STROZIER: And we'll provide those --

DRB Minutes, Agenda Item 1
December 18, 2019

CHAIR WOLFLEY: -- calculations in the next round.

MR. STROZIER: -- calculations on the --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay.

MR. STROZIER: -- on the elevation sheet, as well.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Yeah. I mean, just look at the (inaudible) grey green.

Okay. We wanted to talk a little bit about windows and lighting. Do you have spandrel windows, that are opaque and not see-through?

MR. STROZIER: So the -- on the elevations, and we will clarify --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: So we're talking about the windows that are the -- in the kind of three columns in the center of the building --

MR. STROZIER: That's correct.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: -- on those elevations? Okay.

MR. STROZIER: And those -- those are opaque.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Will these windows have lighting?

MR. STROZIER: So those windows will --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: I guess they'll transmit a little bit of light?

MR. STROZIER: I don't know that they're -- we can check -- we can check that.

And we were -- we were unclear with regard to the interior lighting. The reference in the IDO is -- is -- speaks to exterior lighting. And so I'm -- we would like some clarification as to what -- what regulation we're responding to --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Sure, sure.

MR. STROZIER: -- related to the interior --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. So --

MR. STROZIER: -- interior lighting.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: -- at the -- in that top elevation, which one is that? Your -- which elevation is that? The --

MR. STROZIER: That's Osuna.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. So that's your north elevation?

MR. STROZIER: Correct.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Correct? Facing the neighborhood?

MR. STROZIER: Yes.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. So the -- on the far left edge, there are

DRB Minutes, Agenda Item 1
December 18, 2019

windows that are transparent, correct?

MR. STROZIER: Correct.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: And so the visual quality at night would be what?

MR. STROZIER: So --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: What would --

MR. STROZIER: -- there would be lighting --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: -- the neighborhood see at night?

MR. STROZIER: -- in that where -- and -- and once again, we're trying to figure out what -- what the parameters, what the regulatory...

CHAIR WOLFLEY: The regulatory aspect is no adverse impact on the surrounding properties.

MR. STROZIER: Okay. So in terms of --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: That's one of the site plan review criteria.

MR. STROZIER: Okay. So we -- we have -- we have started discussing that, and that's part of what I wanted to get some clarification on --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay.

MR. STROZIER: -- is exactly what the standard we're trying to achieve.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Right.

MR. STROZIER: Yes, so...

CHAIR WOLFLEY: That's the standard.

MR. STROZIER: Okay.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: And -- and I think in general, what we're seeing with indoor storage, with this -- these windows and everything, by day, it has a -- kind of a positive effect, and by night, there are complaints about it.

MR. STROZIER: Right.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: And it's being --

MR. STROZIER: I'm familiar --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: -- considered in the IDO annual cycle as well because of concerns from residents and other property owners in areas where these are lit at night.

Have you made a consideration to have those be motion activated lights, so only if someone is walking down the corridor, the lights would come on?

MR. STROZIER: So those areas are not actually -- they're -- they're display.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay.

**DRB Minutes, Agenda Item 1
December 18, 2019**

MR. STROZIER: You aren't really seeing into the interior of the building in those locations. Those are faux.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: I'm -- I'm talking about the -- the far left --

MR. STROZIER: The ones at the --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: -- edge.

MR. STROZIER: -- far left? Yes?

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Yeah.

MR. STROZIER: Correct. So the -- so the inside -- interior of the building, they will be -- if -- at night, they will be motion activated for the interior. But that's not what you're seeing there, just to be clear. And so what we're looking at is options in terms of the lighting design to minimize the impact of those -- that lit area at night. And so we're -- we'll come back with some --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay.

MR. STROZIER: -- suggestion as to how we would address that. I understand the concern better now.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. So right, and that could be -- I'm -- just give me one second.

Okay. So when we continue with this at another meeting, we'll get some more answers on that. Because I think that is important for not having a negative impact on surrounding properties, which it would include the open space as well, so...

MR. STROZIER: Correct. Okay.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay.

MR. STROZIER: We will -- we will come back with a -- a proposal --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: All right.

MR. STROZIER: -- for that.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Let me go through my list here.

All right. Could we talk about your -- your signage? We didn't have dimensions on the building-mounted signage.

MR. STROZIER: We'll --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: You'll provide that?

MR. STROZIER: We'll address that, as well.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. And your monument sign is on Juan Tabo; is that correct?

MR. STROZIER: Yes.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Would you give any consideration to just having the letters be lit and not the entire oval?

MR. STROZIER: We'll consider -- we will --

DRB Minutes, Agenda Item 1
December 18, 2019

CHAIR WOLFLEY: You'll consider it?

MR. STROZIER: We can definitely consider that, yes.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Thank you.

MR. STROZIER: And I would note that right now, there are two off-premise signs on this property that will be being removed as part of that.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Oh, thank you for bringing that up. Because I did go visit this property this weekend; I wanted to see what everything looked like. And that was one of my questions. There was a small, mini billboard; there are two of them.

MR. STROZIER: There's two of them.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. And those will be removed. Thank you for reminding me of my question. Thank you.

Okay. Did I miss anything, Ms. Gould?

MS. GOULD: I -- I do not believe so.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. We'll go ahead and -- Mr. Freeman or Mr. Pope, if you have any questions that you would like to ask the applicant or the board members, if you'll just focus your comments. And go ahead and come right up here, where we can get you in the recording.

MR. FREEMAN: Thank you for that opportunity. I'm just a member of John Q. Public, and I feel like a fool, because I'm here on this --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Do you mind speaking into the microphone?

MS. GOMEZ: (Inaudible) on the mic, or if you want to hold the mic.

MR. FREEMAN: They can hear me. They can hear me just fine, ma'am.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Well, it's our recording device that we have to -- you can pull it out of the stand and hold it, standing if you'd like.

MR. FREEMAN: Because I was under the mistaken impression, due to your signage on the property, that this was sort of an approval hearing for the project. Obviously, that's not the case. So --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Is that your question?

MR. FREEMAN: No. So I feel like a fool being here for that purpose.

So from a personal basis, obviously, as I've said, I totally oppose this project. But that doesn't sound like the purpose of our being here today.

So my first comment is, maybe I misread your signage on the property. Or maybe the signage doesn't indicate what the actual purpose of this hearing is, so I'll go back and look at it again.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Yeah, I --

MR. FREEMAN: But --

DRB Minutes, Agenda Item 1
December 18, 2019

CHAIR WOLFLEY: If I -- Mr. Freeman, so I tried to say at the beginning, as we started our discussion, that there had already been action to --

MR. FREEMAN: I heard you say that.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: -- approve the conditional use.

MR. FREEMAN: Yes. But that wasn't apparent on your signage on the property --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay.

MR. FREEMAN: -- as to what the purpose of this meeting is.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Yeah.

MR. FREEMAN: Okay? So --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: And --

MR. FREEMAN: -- maybe I misread the sign.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Right.

MR. FREEMAN: I'm not sure.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: And please note, just for the future, there's always a phone number on there, I think a couple phone numbers, where you can call and get more information.

MR. FREEMAN: Right.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: But right now, the purpose of you being back up here is to ask any questions that you might have.

MR. FREEMAN: Well, I'm not here to ask a question.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay.

MR. FREEMAN: I'm just here to make comments.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: The -- I'll give you one more minute. The comment portion was sort of over. But we are allowing you to ask questions of the --

MR. FREEMAN: I'll address my friend, who -- with the homeowners association, is to say that if you guys oppose this project, then I -- you need to motivate your members to -- to get out in the public.

So -- and from a personal perspective, that project is totally unwelcomed in my neighborhood, and I -- that's what I want to say.

I know you guys (inaudible).

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Yeah, it's -- it's the ownership of the property and --

MR. FREEMAN: If I lived right there, I would -- I would just be appalled, you know, but...

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Freeman. And yes, what's -- what's governing what happens on this site is the

DRB Minutes, Agenda Item 1
December 18, 2019

ownership of the property, the --

MR. FREEMAN: Okay. I think your signage could do a better job.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: -- the Integrated Development Ordinance. Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Pope, did you have any questions? And once again, this is time for you to be able to ask questions, clarify anything that you've heard.

MR. POPE: Just a point of clarification to make -- make sure I understood the applicant.

The stated purpose of this facility is storage only? And there is no option either allowed by the city or intent by the applicant for any other use such as homeless or hazardous waste, et cetera?

And if that clarification that I've obtained is accurate, then our primary purpose of being here has been achieved.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Yes, the zoning -- the Integrated Development Ordinance, it lists the uses, and then as -- that are appropriate in MX-L, and then once they go through and get a conditional use permit, they're restricted to only that use on the property.

Do you have anything else to add, Mr. Martinez?

MR. MARTINEZ: Just the definition out of the IDO for self-storage, so that you're aware.

Self-storage is a use consistent of three or more individual small, self-contained units in a building that are leased or owned for the indoor storage of businesses and household goods or contractor spots.

That's the specific use that's going to be placed on this. If there's another use, it's got to -- that you're going to want to achieve in the future, they've got to go through the correct procedure. And it -- (inaudible) permitted use on that zone.

MR. POPE: That clarification helps a lot, and will help me interacting with our members.

The second one, to make sure I understood, this property is not part of the floodplain?

MR. BIAZAR: Not -- not the property itself. It is next to a floodplain.

MR. POPE: It's next to it, but not part of it?

MR. BIAZAR: Not part of it, yes.

MR. POPE: That also was clarification that would have helped us up front, had we known that. Thank you very much.

MR. BIAZAR: No problem.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. And I just have one more comment that I didn't bring up, was Number 15 on the planning comments. Please provide elevations of the horizontal profile.

I think anything you can do to sort of show how your building

**DRB Minutes, Agenda Item 1
December 18, 2019**

fits into this site would help the -- the board and the neighbors to understand what it's going to look like. Because my understanding is you're going down a few feet. Could you explain that really quickly?

MR. STROZIER: So and -- and thank you, Madam Chair. Yes. So the -- so the elevation of Juan Tabo on the -- on the east side of the site is approximately 18 feet higher than the finished floor elevation of the building.

So from Juan Tabo -- and we did provide, I believe, as part of our application, a drawing that we prepared that showed the elevation with the landscaping both from Juan Tabo and Osuna, that shows that slope that comes down. And so from Juan Tabo, it basically appears to be a single story meeting -- if we didn't for some reason, I'll make sure that we -- that we get a copy --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: I think you might have had some materials in the ZHE application that was part of --

MR. STROZIER: This was done as part of the site plan --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Was part of the --

MR. STROZIER: -- exercise. It's not in the -- in the site plan drawings, but it was an -- an exhibit. And I -- we will check to make sure that you have that and -- and -- and that that's available for the public to see as well. Because that exhibit shows -- I think shows what you're trying to get at. And then we -- we will also provide some better cross-sections with the grading and drainage plan that show that relationship as well.

But basically, from Juan Tabo, the Juan Tabo edge, it basically appears to be a single-story building with street trees along that edge. And then on -- on Osuna, kind of starts at the east end of the building, it sort of is below that slope. And then by the time it gets to the west end of the property, it's a grade, basically, where our driveway and the office is. And so we did -- we did prepare an exhibit. I'll make sure that we actually --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay.

MR. STROZIER: -- provided that to you. It may have been left -- we may have forgotten to attach that to our application. But we will -- we will make sure that it -- it gets added.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay.

MR. STROZIER: And I think that -- I think that will address the concerns expressed about the context of the site relative to the grades of the surrounding streets and the neighbors across the street.

So the neighbors across the street --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Would you be able to -- I'm sorry. Let me let you finish.

MR. STROZIER: So the -- so kind of similar to that, in sort of the opposite direction, is that the -- the existing houses on the north side of Osuna, at the east end, they're raised significantly above the grade of Osuna, and that kinds of comes down also. We didn't show that in that exhibit, but that's -- also part of the context is that the -- there's elevation for those houses above the grade of Juan -- of Osuna and Juan Tabo

**DRB Minutes, Agenda Item 1
December 18, 2019**

on -- most pronounced at the east end of the subdivision, and then it kind of comes down to grade also, as you travel west.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Is there a way to get that material to the neighborhoods? Maybe at least through Mr. Pope?

MR. STROZIER: If we have their contact information, we can coordinate with Ms. Gould and -- and make sure we have contact information, and we can certainly send that out to -- to everyone.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. I think those exhibits would be very helpful.

MR. STROZIER: And we'll want to know -- and -- and we -- if we can come up with a list of those individuals, then we can also identify and provide copies or a link to a Dropbox folder for the updated site plan, as well.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Why don't we do this.

Ms. Gomez, do you have just a sheet of paper?

And anyone who is here today that wants to leave your e-mail address, we could send those exhibits to you. And that would include Mr. Pope and Mr. Freeman.

So that'll just be, I guess, up there at the table, if you'd like to get those exhibits. And then they will be part of the city record and can be attainable through -- through Ms. Gould and myself.

MR. STROZIER: Yes.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay.

MR. STROZIER: Okay. That's good. The only other item, Madam Chair --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: You're welcome to send them to whomever you know is interested in the project.

MR. STROZIER: Yes, I will. We will -- we will coordinate and make sure that that happens.

And -- and then the only thing I wanted to mention, that we did receive the comments from some of the outside agencies.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Yeah. Thank you.

MR. STROZIER: And we did review those and really have no -- there's a couple things that we will -- we will respond to in our updated submittal, but we didn't have any questions or clarifications. But that included mid region metropolitan planning organization, the police department CPTED review, AMAFCA, PNM, and DOT. Oh, and APS.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. And just --

MR. STROZIER: Those are the only ones that I have.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: -- for the benefit of the public, CPTED is Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design. And so there were some comments about good natural surveillance techniques to make the property safe related to landscaping and lighting and other things.

**DRB Minutes, Agenda Item 1
December 18, 2019**

And then, with PNM, just a comment about moving a couple of plants and things like that.

MR. STROZIER: It looks like we might have a tree in there, in one of their easements.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay.

MR. STROZIER: So we'll make sure that if that's the case, we get that relocated.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay.

MR. BIAZAR: If I may say something about sections.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Yes, please.

MR. BIAZAR: Make sure that when you prepare your sections, it's based on the latest grading. Because I guess you guys are thinking about doing some modifications to the grading design.

MR. STROZIER: Right (inaudible).

MR. BIAZAR: So --

MR. STROZIER: Okay. We'll make sure that's per the current --

MR. BIAZAR: -- you want to make sure, yeah.

MR. STROZIER: Okay. All right.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. So we're looking at a deferral of this project in order to work on the items we've discussed this morning. Let's look at a time frame for that, Mr. Strozier.

MR. STROZIER: So --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Do you have a time frame in mind?

MR. STROZIER: Well, so I think -- I think probably the main timing issue is responses to the grading and drainage comments and what the turnaround time is to get from RESPEC's standpoint, getting an updated submittal turned in, and then, from city hydrology, what the time period is. I think we got a couple holidays coming up.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Mm-hmm.

MR. STROZIER: But so what that -- I think that would really -- the other changes, we're already in process making those.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay.

MR. STROZIER: And I think we've -- we've got a good handle on them, so --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: So I think --

MR. GRIER: So I think we'll be submitting as soon as the end of the week for our resubmittal on hydrology. So I'd probably take the city engineer's advice on how long he thinks that will be to process.

MR. BIAZAR: We'll need at least a week or so. And given the holidays, I would say probably two weeks before we could take a

**DRB Minutes, Agenda Item 1
December 18, 2019**

look at it.

MR. GRIER: Okay.

MR. STROZIER: So would that put us at the meeting after the 8th?

CHAIR WOLFLEY: I think so, at the least. So like the January 15th or January 22nd.

MR. STROZIER: I think January 15th would be our preference.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. All those in favor of deferring Item 1, Project 2184 and Site Plan 379 to the January 15th meeting of DRB, please raise your hand.

Okay. So you are deferred to January 15th.

MR. STROZIER: Thank you very much.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Thank you.

MR. STROZIER: We look forward to bringing it back to you at that time.

(Conclusion of recording.)

DRB Minutes, Agenda Item 1
December 18, 2019

RE: CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD MEETING MINUTES
OF DECEMBER 18, 2019, Item 1

TRANSCRIPTIONIST'S AFFIRMATION

I HEREBY STATE AND AFFIRM that the foregoing is a correct transcript of an audio recording provided to me and that the transcription contains only the material audible to me from the recording and was transcribed by me to the best of my ability.

IT IS ALSO STATED AND AFFIRMED that I am neither employed by nor related to any of the parties involved in this matter other than being compensated to transcribe said recording and that I have no personal interest in the final disposition of this matter.

IT IS ALSO STATED AND AFFIRMED that my electronic signature hereto does not constitute a certification of this transcript but simply an acknowledgement that I am the person who transcribed said recording.

DATED this 15th day of March 2020.

Kelli A. Gallegos_____

Kelli A. Gallegos