

CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD

M I N U T E S

January 15, 2020

Agenda Item 4
Project Number 2019-002184-Site Plan

MEMBERS:

Jolene Wolfley, Chair
Jeanne Wolfenbarger, Transportation
Kris Cadena, Water Authority
Shahab Biazar, City Engineer/Hydrology
Jacobo Martinez, Code Enforcement
Cheryl Somerfeldt, Parks and Recreation

STAFF PRESENT:

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

DRB Minutes, Agenda Item 4
January 15, 2020

CHAIR WOLFLEY: We are on Item Number 4, which is Project 2184, which is also Site Plan 2019-379. And this is Guardian Storage at 4909 Juan Tabo, Northeast.

And I'll let your team get gathered up here.

MR. STROZIER: Okay.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: And once again, if anyone wants to speak on any item on the agenda, if you're not the applicant. Just go over to Ms. Angela Gomez, over there, and she can have you sign up to speak for public comment.

Okay. Please introduce yourselves, and connection to the project.

MR. STROZIER: All right. Jim Strozier, with Consensus Planning, agent for the application.

MR. LOPEZ: And I'm Jesus Lopez with RESPEC Engineering, civil.

(Witnesses sworn.)

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Thank you. You both have sworn in. Go ahead and give us an update.

MR. STROZIER: Thank you, Madam Chair and Board Members. We provided a supplemental submittal with responses to the previous comments and an updated infrastructure list and updated drawings. I know we -- we did receive the additional comments, and so we are -- we're looking at those. We just wanted to make sure we're all on the same page as -- as far as those go.

With regard to the site plan, one of the significant changes, and I'll talk about this a little bit, is the request to dedicate the 10 feet of additional right-of-way along Juan Tabo; understanding is that is still the request from DMD, that we do that. There is -- we will be submitting a plat for that, hopefully by this next Tuesday, for the meeting on the -- the DRB meeting on the 29th.

So before we get too into this, we understand that we will need to defer this item in order for the plat to catch up and so that they can be heard together. But we did want to just make sure that we were all on the same page relative to the comments and our responses to them.

So with that, we needed to adjust the grading and drainage plan in order to accommodate the additional right-of-way, because that additional right-of-way comes out into that existing current steep slope that drops down into the property, so we've adjusted that to reflect that.

We have also adjusted the plans to reflect -- and this is in response to some of the water authority's comments, I believe, at the last meeting, and that is, we have added a retaining wall portion along the west property line that allows that slope to be less steep on the landscape buffer, and then we've added a wall on top of that for a combined height of 6 feet.

In our comments, we did propose an option of having a combination of retaining wall and open fence along that edge. My understanding is that we can't do that. I think if -- and our feeling was that that would just be nicer adjacent to the trail. But if there's no way to accomplish that, then we have shown the 6-foot wall on our plans at this time.

**DRB Minutes, Agenda Item 4
January 15, 2020**

Let's see. I think -- we also brought a copy of the Fire One. I believe, Jeanne, you had asked about the fire approval, and I don't think that that was included in the original submittal set, but we do have that. And -- and we'll make sure that there's a copy in the file. We brought it with us today.

MS. WOLFENBARGER: Okay.

MR. STROZIER: And then, with regard to parking bumpers at the loading area, I think that was the -- a comment that we received, and we're okay with that. We just -- they need to -- we need to be careful. They create kind of -- in that loading zone, it creates a parking hazard a lot of times. But we -- but we also understand we don't want people driving into the building so -- so we -- we will -- we will put that -- show those on the -- on the plan moving forward.

I think -- oh, the only other -- I know we were in discussions about the nonpotable line and the pressure, and we got information regarding that the pressure is actually is adequate. Our original indication was that the pressure was not going to be high enough to allow the irrigation to actually utilize that line, but we understand that, based on additional research from the water authority, that there is the amount of pressure that we need for the irrigation, and so we've adjusted the utility plan to reflect that.

I think that's my update.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Thank you.

Let's hear board comments. Water authority.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay. So based on your comments, we did have notes to provide (inaudible). (Inaudible).

MR. STROZIER: Right.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Like you said, there's --

MS. GOMEZ: David, mic.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Mic? Oh, sorry. There? There? No. Hello. There? There we go.

Okay. So like you said, the operation drainage pressure is 106 to 125 psi, so you might need like a pressure reducing. I'm not sure what your system looks like. But when the pump starts, it's up to 150 psi.

Service connection needs to go, I guess, east to Juan Tabo. There's an 8-inch nonpotable line.

Please, on the site plan, indicate which fire hydrant -- hydrants are public or private. That wasn't -- it wasn't there.

MR. LOPEZ: Sorry. Can I get clarifies on -- on that one?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes.

MR. LOPEZ: I had spoken with -- or, I had spoken with Mr. Cadena --

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay.

MR. LOPEZ: -- and he was allowing us to do an 8-inch stub off

**DRB Minutes, Agenda Item 4
January 15, 2020**

the 16 on Osuna --

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay.

MR. LOPEZ: -- to avoid the work on Juan Tabo. And so adding that 8-inch stub, with a cap, then would allow us to tie that service line to that. Is that still an option?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: His comment here is to connect to the 8-inch on Juan Tabo. We don't want to do connections to any 16-inch --

MR. LOPEZ: Well, I'm sure that's why he had originally allowed us to do an 8-inch stub with a cap and then tie the service to that.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Right. Sounds like the 8-inch is actually there for connection already. So we would want to avoid that. But I would ask if you would talk to him about it, because that is his requirement.

Anything else on that?

MR. LOPEZ: No.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: You're good?

MR. LOPEZ: That's all I have.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay. So for -- on the site plan, there's some hydrants, because call out public or private. It looks like that wasn't clarified.

Previous correspondence with the engineer stated historically the site flows were 4.5 for cfs, which some of it historically flowed across the water authority property adjacent. That is now apparently reduced to .29 cfs. We want to confirm that there are will be no erosion issues with you. I don't know what that flow looks like.

MR. LOPEZ: Yeah, no, we -- it's -- the drainage plan kind of spells it out.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Right.

MR. LOPEZ: And that's correct, we had -- originally, because of those steep slopes, we did have kind of gravel to protect erosion there --

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Right.

MR. LOPEZ: -- but with that wall, we might -- at this point, we're not -- we might not even be draining anything into the -- the water authority's property. We're going to be doing a (inaudible) south. And then just for emergency purposes, we'll turn some blocks on that wall in case it ever gets backed up or something, (inaudible), but --

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay.

MR. LOPEZ: -- we're not anticipating actually any flows now of water.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So there shouldn't be any -- any erosion issues, then?

MR. LOPEZ: Correct, that's (inaudible).

DRB Minutes, Agenda Item 4
January 15, 2020

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay. Okay. That's it for me, yeah.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Code enforcement.

MR. MARTINEZ: Thank you.

Jim, as we -- you mentioned, we did talk about the opaque wall, and we had a conversation about it. It pretty clear in the IDO that an opaque wall is a "shall" on those properties that are abutting a residential zone

MR. STROZIER: Right.

MR. MARTINEZ: -- property.

MR. STROZIER: So if I might just --

MR. MARTINEZ: Mm-hmm.

MR. STROZIER: -- have a request that as -- as the -- as the planning department is looking at technical edits to the IDO, that that's maybe something that gets addressed. Because this is -- we've had this problem a couple of times where we have a lot of the water authority properties that have existing reservoirs like this one. It's not -- it -- the conversion was to residential zoning, and so that -- those requirements come into play. But there -- in this case, I would say it's actually inappropriate to do what we're going to have to do, and it's going to create a worse situation. And so if the planning department could take a look at that as part of the technical edits.

I think we have situations where some of like CNM, Montoya campus is zoned R-1, the water authority properties are zoned R-1, I think maybe some of the PNM. So those utilities are allowed uses in the residential zones, so they got converted that way, but they created this unintended consequence of us having to -- to do things, like in this situation, that don't really make sense.

MR. MARTINEZ: I agree. Thank you.

MR. STROZIER: Okay. Thanks.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Parks department.

MS. SOMERFELDT: We have no objection. It's just noted that street trees are required on Juan Tabo, which I see there. And that any disturbance to the multi-purpose trail on the -- to the south would be -- it would be required to be remedied by the developer.

We have several comments on record from the strategic planning and design division and open space division citing whether -- why this wasn't an acquisition priority. So I just wanted to note that if anyone wanted to review those, those are on the record for this case.

MR. STROZIER: Thank you.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Hydrology.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Hydrology has (inaudible) conceptual grading and drainage plan with engineer stamp date of January 9, 2020. There is no objection to the infrastructure list.

DRB Minutes, Agenda Item 4
January 15, 2020

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Transportation.

MS. WOLFENBARGER: Hi, Jim. You've already mentioned the 10-foot right-of-way dedication, which was my major comment, and the Fire One plan. And also, I just had left- -- leftover comments from last time that -- that were pretty minor.

MR. STROZIER: We realize that we -- we have those details and we realize that we did not update the sheets to include those. So we will make sure that that is done.

MS. WOLFENBARGER: Just updated the details in dimensioning, and that's it --

MR. STROZIER: Right.

MS. WOLFENBARGER: -- pretty much. And the signage as well. That's it.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. For planning, it looks like you've addressed many of our comments. We talked to you, as well, about dimming lights or having motion sensed lights. You've offered an alternative that talks about -- do you want to go ahead and outline that?

MR. STROZIER: Sure. What we have -- what we have done as part of the changes on the -- there's basically -- I don't know how to characterize -- on the display windows, if you will, that are at the corner of Osuna and Juan Tabo, that corner of the building, and we've proposed in response to the concerns that were expressed by the planning department, that those -- that those lights would be dimmed to basically 50 percent at 9:00 p.m., and then down to 25 percent. So another reduction at 11:00 p.m., which tied it -- so we tied it to 9:00 p.m., just because we felt that that was an appropriate time to -- to dim it. And then 11:00 p.m. is when the exterior lighting provisions in the IDO kick in. And so we dimmed it even more at that time. So that was done to address the comment of adverse impact. And we've noted that on the site plan.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Oh, it's noted on the site plan. Perfect. Okay. And is that the only corner where you have windows?

MR. STROZIER: I believe that we've...

CHAIR WOLFLEY: I know you have some of the faux windows --

MR. STROZIER: Right.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: -- that...

MR. STROZIER: There's -- actually, on the -- along the east elevation, the other corner has a smaller area. And that -- the same restrictions would apply --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Would apply there?

MR. STROZIER: -- (inaudible) be there --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay.

MR. STROZIER: -- where those display windows exist.

And then we noted that the spandrel glass that was in those other elements is opaque. So we've noted that on the -- on the elevations, as well. So those areas, I think that had been a

**DRB Minutes, Agenda Item 4
January 15, 2020**

question before. So we identified that on the updated (inaudible), that those windows are opaque.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Remind me, had you shown us signage on your building?

MR. STROZIER: Yes.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay.

MR. STROZIER: So we -- and -- and we have responded to that comment in our memo addressing those comments, but we have identified those.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay.

MR. STROZIER: And I believe we identified the -- the size of those. And with a note, what we've noted on the site plan and the elevation sheet is, that the signage will be based on a sign permit that is separate from the building permit process --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay.

MR. STROZIER: -- and that we've identified. I think we tried to identify that on both the site plan for my -- what we've shown, and then a process for moving forward in the future.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. And I should note that you also provided staff with a horizontal -- horizontal profile of your building, and you provided that as well to members of the public?

MR. STROZIER: Yes.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: So -- okay.

MR. STROZIER: So we did a --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Uh-oh. I see some people shaking their heads yes and no.

So catch him afterward, if you didn't get that --

MR. STROZIER: Right.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: -- and -- because this -- this is not set for approval today. But that was very helpful.

MR. STROZIER: And we did prepare -- we did prepare a rendering that showed the grade change and the facade as it relates to Juan Tabo and the Osuna frontage, to show how that building sat within the -- within the site. And with the landscaping, consistent with the landscape plan, so...

MS. GOULD: Is that (inaudible)?

MR. STROZIER: I think that was part of our original submittal. And then we -- I believe we provided it again as part of our supplemental.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Right. It's possible we neglected to send that to the board members.

MR. STROZIER: Right.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: I -- I thought we did, but we'll make sure, since we have a catch-up time.

DRB Minutes, Agenda Item 4
January 15, 2020

MR. STROZIER: Let -- let me --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: We'll make sure that we --

MR. STROZIER: -- (inaudible) people's e-mails for --

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Yeah.

So, Angela, can you make note of that, that all board members need to get that horizontal profile, which was since our last meeting?

Okay. Did I miss anything, Ms. Gould, or Mr. Rodenbeck?

MS. GOULD: I don't think so.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. We appreciate your attention to many, many details. And in order to deal with your platting action, it looks like you're accepting a deferral to January 29th?

MR. STROZIER: Yes.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Okay. Let's get the board's vote on that.

All right. All those in favor of deferring Item 4, which is Site Plan 2019-00379 to the January 29th meeting of the DRB, please raise your hand.

Unanimous vote to approve Item 4 to December -- or to January 29th.

MR. STROZIER: Okay. Thank you very much.

CHAIR WOLFLEY: Thank you.

(Conclusion of recording.)

DRB Minutes, Agenda Item 4
January 15, 2020

RE: CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD MEETING MINUTES
OF JANUARY 15, 2020, Item 4

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