

**CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE  
LAND USE FACILITATION PROGRAM  
PROJECT MEETING REPORT**

**Project #:** N/A: Pre-Application Meeting, Alameda/Barstow Apartments  
**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:** May 23, 2019  
**Submitted By:** Jessie Lawrence  
**Meeting Date and Time:** Tuesday, May 21, 2019, 6:30 pm  
**Meeting Location:** Classroom 5, North Domingo Baca Multigenerational Center, 7521 Carmel Ave. NE

**Facilitator:** Jessie Lawrence  
**Co-facilitator:** Leslie Kryder

**Parties (individual names and affiliations of attendees are listed at the end of the report):**

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

**Background/Meeting Summary:**

Applicant requests Development Review Board (DRB) approval of Subdivision of 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 one- and two-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, light pollution, population density, traffic congestion, proximity to the school, safety, and impacts on existing property values. A number of neighbors expressed the concern that the number of units would result in unacceptable resident density in the context of the overall area and asked that the developer consider lowering the buildings to two stories, which would help address their parking and traffic concerns and ameliorate the impacts of light pollution, loss of privacy, and loss of mountain views. A summary of all concerns is included in the meeting specifics.

Agreement was not reached on any of the concerns at the meeting. Agent stated that the project team would consider the concerns and communicate with meeting participants about any changes to the planned project.

Follow-up items included:

- Agent agreed to communicate with City Planning to ask about the need for any additional Pre-Application Review Team meeting, though there has been one PRT and additional communication with City Planning.
- Agent agreed to communicate with City Planning about neighbors' concerns about a traffic impact analysis or a neighborhood traffic study. Agent did not agree to voluntarily complete a traffic impact analysis.
- Agent agreed to check requirements in the IDO regarding control of light from parking and preventing light from shining into neighbors' property.

### **Outcomes:**

#### ■ Areas of agreement

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

#### ■ Unresolved issues and concerns

- Principal concerns include:
  - The higher density apartment complex is incompatible with the surrounding residential area. Neighbors would like to see less density and a lower height.
  - Additional traffic from the project would exacerbate existing traffic issues, especially with regard to nearby school pickup and drop-off. Neighbors would like to see a traffic impact analysis.
  - Many neighbors felt the designed on-site parking was insufficient and would not provide enough parking spots for the planned units.
  - Light from parking cars would overflow from the project parking areas to adjacent yards because the cars point to the neighbors' property and the light would shine over the existing wall.
  - There is not enough pedestrian safety, especially because of the number of children and other pedestrians around the school.
  - New residents of the apartments and the construction workers would create new risks to the safety of existing residents. A neighbor requested that in addition to background checks for residents, all construction workers should be required to pass background checks.
    - Related to the safety concern, a neighbor requested considering gating the community to increase safety and prevent traffic from cutting through.

#### ■ Other Key Points

- A meeting participant expressed concern that the meeting process under the IDO does not give neighbors enough information about a proposed project and has very bounded time constraints, making it difficult for neighbors to learn about plans and creating a bias in favor of developers.

## 1) **Meeting Specifics**

### a) **Overview of Proposed Project**

- i) Jim Strozier, Principal of Consensus Planning and Project Agent, introduced the project team: himself and Michael Vos from Consensus Planning, Project Architect Dave Hickman, and Developer/Applicant Phil Lindborg and Zack Snyder.

### ii) **Application Process**

- (1) This is a pre-application meeting.
- (2) Following this meeting, the planning team will assemble an entire package and submit it to the City.
- (3) The application will probably be submitted to the DRB on May 31. The hearing is typically held 3½ weeks after application.
- (4) The DRB consists of members from a number of City of Albuquerque departments as well as the Water Utility Authority (WUA).
- (5) The DRB will hold a public meeting. Neighborhood associations will be notified when the application is made and the public hearing date is set. Neighbors can provide testimony at the hearing and also submit written comments.
- (6) If there are questions at tonight's meeting for which the Agent doesn't have an answer, Agent will distribute copies of information obtained subsequently via this report's email list.

### iii) **Zoning**

- (1) The property is currently vacant and zoned MX-L (mixed use -- low intensity). Permissive uses include a variety of retail uses, including office space and multi-family residential.
- (2) Building height limit in MX-L is 35 ft. This proposal is for buildings 35' tall.

### iv) **Design**

- (1) This complex is intended to appeal to young professionals.
  - (a) Rents will be \$1,600 and up.
  - (b) The project is amenity intense.
  - (c) The project is currently named "The Monet."
- (2) The property is located at the SE corner of Barstow and Alameda.
- (3) The buildings will be situated along Alameda with parking and landscaping on the south side of the property.
- (4) The application will include a site plan with building footprints and dimensions, a building elevations plan, a landscape plan, a grading and drainage plan, and a conceptual utilities plan.
  - (a) The plan is developed in consultation with the Fire Marshall's office to determine fire flow requirements. Fire flows are the primary driver of water needed to serve the project.
  - (b) They obtain a water and sewer statement from the WUA.
  - (c) The building elevation plan shows dimensions and elements of the buildings, including doorways and windows, materials and colors.
- (5) Building will take place in three phases from west to east.
  - (a) In Phase 1, the western apartments and community building are constructed.
    - (i) The community building connects the Phase 1 building to the Phase 2 building. It is 2 stories high.

1. The leasing office and a community room space will be put the community building
  - a. The community room space will also function as an art gallery.
  - b. The community room space is a place for outreach to the surrounding community and community events.
2. The long room on the west side is a digital golf simulator room.
3. Upstairs there's a party room and fitness center and outdoor decks overlooking the pool.
  - (ii) The swimming pool area is also part of Phase 1.
- (b) The second building is Phase 2.
  - (i) In between the Phase 2 and Phase 3 buildings there will be a an outdoor recreation space with a park area, putting green, fire pit, lawn and sitting areas.
- (c) In Phase 3 there's bike storage and work space for tenants, dog wash center, dog run, and maintenance building.
- (d) In total, there are 93 units.
  - (i) Each unit gets covered parking, and there is also open parking.
- (6) Alameda will be widened as part of this project to 2 lanes in each direction. Barstow will also be widened.
  - (a) City street designs exist from the Alameda/Barstow corner to the east edge of the proposed project.

## 2) Questions and Concerns

### a) Regarding the Application Process

- i) Question from a meeting participant (Q): A participant asked if public comment would have any material effect on DRB decisions, and if not, what's the point of this meeting?
  - (1) The Agent stated that the comments received in this meeting are documented and the report is sent to the DRB.
  - (2) The DRB is charged with considering an application based on the rules in the zoning ordinance about permitted uses.
  - (3) Multi-family use is allowed on a property zoned MX-L as this one is.
- ii) Q: What percentage of complexes that get to this point are not approved by the City?
  - (1) The presenters did not have that information.
- iii) Q: Have any of Consensus Planning's application been denied by the City?
  - (1) The Agent stated, yes, but not very many. However, many projects are modified between the original application and what is finally approved. Some more than others. It depends on lots of factors. Very few are flat out denied, provided the plans are in compliance with the zoning to start with.
- iv) Q: What does the low intensity of MX-L mean?
  - (1) The Agent explained that there are several types of mixed use zoned. MX-T is transitional, then low intensity, medium intensity, and high intensity. It generally relates to height and intensity of uses that are allowed permissively.
- v) Q: A participant stated that the Agent had a pre-review team meeting with the City last August. He wondered why they are now planning to submit an application to the DRB next Friday without an additional Pre-Application Review Team (PRT) meeting as

requested by Racquel Michel, with the Planning Department's Transportation Development group.

- (1) The Agent stated that they had already met separately with Raquel Michel outside the PRT process.
- (2) The Agent agreed to call and ask Racquel Michel if they needed a PRT meeting.
- vi) Q: Is this project happening for sure or just a potential project?
  - (1) The Facilitator clarified that it's a potential project.
- vii) Q: Who's responsible for making sure that the proposed uses are implemented and maintained?
  - (1) The Agent stated that a property management company will be responsible to manage those areas.
  - (2) Q: And if that doesn't happen, does it have to go back to the Planning Department?
    - (a) The Agent stated that if it doesn't happen, tenants won't pay the rent, etc.
- viii) Q: What's the timeline for approval of the project?
  - (1) The Agent stated that there are lots of steps before construction begins. It may be possible to start in 2019, but it really depends on all the approvals.
- ix) Q: How long will it take to build the entire project, Phases 1 through 3? And what about noise to neighbors behind wall?
  - (1) The Agent stated that typically after initial site work is completed, Phase 1 usually is done in 5-6 mos. All phases would generally take 15 to 18 months.
- x) Q: On the east side of the property line is an office building?
  - (1) The Agent confirmed this.
- xi) Q: What happens if it becomes apparent that changes to the plan are needed after the site plan has been approved?
  - (1) The Agent explained that generally, if a minor change is required, then that is typically done administratively by City department staff. If a major change is required, then the project goes back to the DRB, public meeting process, etc.
    - (a) Less than 10% impact is considered a minor change.
- xii) Q: How many stories is each building?
  - (1) As a whole, there are 3 3-story buildings.

**b) Regarding Traffic Impacts**

- i) Q: As part of this project will Alameda be widened to two lanes in both directions?
  - (a) The Agent confirmed that's what the City has planned, both sides of Alameda will be widened.
  - (b) It is likely that the impact fees from this project will pay for the south side and the City will pay for the north side.
- ii) Q: Do you have an approved traffic and noise study available?
  - (1) The Agent explained that this project does not meet threshold to require a traffic study. With the new IDO there are new thresholds for traffic studies. Under the old system, a traffic study was required when the complex exceeded 300 units. With IDO, the threshold is 100 trips during either AM or PM peak hours. This project is significantly below the threshold under either criteria.
  - (2) Additionally, he stated that the City does not require a noise study.
- iii) Q: We're talking about adding 150 cars coming and going during school hours. It will more than double the traffic in the area. Will there be any concessions to help with safety of school children?

- (1) The Agent stated that part of the design process is creating an infrastructure list of improvements needed in the public right-of-way. The list, which also includes storm drains, roads, water sewer, etc., is reviewed by DRB. The developer must have a financial guarantee in place so that if something happens to them before the project is completed, the City has funds to complete. The City will probably require the developer to do quite a bit. It's going to add more control to the area.
- iv) Q: Would you consider doing a current traffic impact analysis for this area?
- (1) The Agent wasn't sure what that would entail. He offered to talk with the City Traffic Engineer and explained that in some cases the City does neighborhood traffic studies.
- (2) Q: We're asking for a traffic impact analysis of the morning and evening rush looking toward installing a traffic light at the intersection of Alameda and Barstow. Will the developer do a traffic impact analysis and if warranted a financial guarantee for a traffic signal at Alameda and Barstow?
- (i) The Agent stated that they would not make that commitment.
- v) Q: How will so many cars be able to exit from the complex through the two exits at the high traffic times? There might be 20 cars lined up. It will be impossible to get out.
- (1) The Agent agreed to reach out to Racquel Michel at the City. He stated that there are existing issues outside of what this project will generate. And they are not necessarily things a traffic study will examine.
- vi) Q: Although the developer thinks of Alameda as a road to nowhere, for me it's a road to my house. I don't want all these people coming to my house.
- (1) Agent stated that the size the City is designing for Alameda implies a long road at a high rate of speed. The design team felt that a slower paced road would be more appropriate.
- vii) Q: Are they planning on keeping the bike lanes and extending them? It's illegal to park in a bike lane, so there would be no place to park on Barstow or Alameda?
- (1) Agent stated, yes, the bike lanes will remain, and yes, there will be no parking on Barstow and Alameda.
- (2) The project team had suggested creating parking spaces along Alameda rather than two lanes of traffic as another use of the space, but the City did not agree with this suggestion.
- viii) Q: When you put in a stop light as is expected at Alameda and Barstow, it's like Christmas—the light will shine into back yards. The signal is needed, but it will impact us residents. The parking is a real problem.
- (a) The Agent noted this concern.

**c) Regarding Parking and Light**

- i) Q: How does the parking work along the wall with residential houses right behind it? What are the safety protocols? How to make sure cars don't run through the wall into yards behind?
- (1) Along the south edge there will be covered parking, then a gutter, then a landscape strip, then the wall. The wall will not be higher than it presently is. The current wall will stay. There could be two walls, depending on where the property line is.
- ii) Q: The plan is for roughly 2 spaces per unit. What if there are more cars than spaces?
- (1) One hundred fifty spaces are planned for the 93 residential units.
- (2) The expectation is that each 1 unit has one car.

- (3) Each unit is assigned one covered space. The remaining spaces are first come first serve.
- (4) Many neighbors were concerned that this was insufficient parking because many people own more than 1 car.
- iii) Q: The parking is inadequate for the 2 bedroom apartments, even for 1 bedroom apartments. Plus the residents will have friends. Most couples will have 2 cars regardless of the number of bedrooms.
- iv) Q: With regard to the IDO what are the rules about light spilling over from the parking area into neighbors' houses?
  - (1) The Agent explain that in any kind of parking situation, there's a 5 ft buffer, then the parking space. The IDO doesn't cover separation, whether there's a wall, etc.
  - (2) Q: Would you please check on that?
    - (a) The Agent agreed to double-check on the IDO requirements.
- v) Q: Does the City's review evaluate the headlights of people pulling in and out?
  - (a) The Agent explained that the wall will be 6 ft high. Not many headlights reach 6'.
  - (b) The grades of Alameda will not change much from what is there now. The building terraces step downward along the grade.
- vi) Q: What is the distance from the parking area through the buffer to neighboring properties?
  - (1) There will be lighting under the parking covers. Typically the covers are about 8 ft high.
  - (2) With regard to lighting, there are requirements to prevent light pollution onto other properties.
  - (3) To prevent night sky pollution all fixtures must point downward, not up toward the sky.
  - (4) There are provisions which prevent light spillage onto neighboring property. During review they make sure that's the case. With covered parking it's relatively easy because usually the lighting points inward into the site, not outward.
- vii) Q: The uncovered parking spots on site—are they free to use by public or will permits be required?
  - (1) The Agent responded that he can't foresee the situation 10 years hence.
    - (a) Agent commented that they had proposed to add 43 more parking spaces along Alameda, but because of the type of street Alameda is, the City would not approve it.
- viii) Q: The fact that the developer is proposing to add additional parking spots implies an acknowledgement that there's a need for more parking.
  - (1) The Agent replied that they did not state a need for more parking spaces. It was an idea to decrease the width of Alameda since it's a street that ends in this area and gets very little traffic, and use the space for parking instead.
- ix) Q: A participant, speaking on behalf of the District 4 Coalition Zoning and Development Committee, said that parking and traffic as explained tonight are unrealistic. The IDO and City processes will let these problems (that the agent doesn't have to address) be carried on the back of the neighborhoods. This approaches criminal neglect by design.
  - (1) The committee has not been able to get any response from City.
  - (2) The new IDO does not address the problems this project creates.

- (3) The Agent responded that the IDO changed how they have to deal with certain aspects of zoning. For instance, the traffic study criteria stayed, but it changed some of the criteria.

**d) Regarding Density**

- i) Q: A neighbor expressed concern that this project will have about five times the number of dwelling units as nearby properties. It doesn't seem like the low intensity use implied by the MX-L designation.
  - (1) The Agent explained that the IDO treats some of these issues very differently than before. The old zoning had density limits. The IDO does not have density limitations. Rather, it's based on a balance between building area and the parking required. This project does not involve a change to the requirements.
  - (2) The property to the south was zoned for single family homes and that's what was built.
- ii) Q: What's the ratio of 2-bedroom to 1-bedroom units?
  - (1) The Agent said it's about 2 to 1, with more 2-bedroom than 1-bedroom units.
- iii) Q: What is square footage of the apartments? Ninety-three units on 3.7 acres doesn't seem so luxurious. Why so many units?
  - (1) There are 1 and 2 bedroom units, approximately 700 sq ft and 900 sq ft respectively.
- iv) Q: A neighbor said that she lives right across the street from the proposed entrance at Alameda. The lights coming out of that exit are shining directly into her house. It's a problem.
  - (1) She wanted to know if people will be parking in front of her house, and possibly wandering around her property?
  - (2) When people pull out the lights will shine directly into her house. She doesn't feel she should have to live on a \$750,000 property right across from a huge eyesore that also causes light pollution.
  - (3) She's also concerned about people from other areas, for example, the South Valley, being drawn to her neighborhood.
  - (4) The Agent explained that the purpose of this meeting is so the design team can hear the concerns and consider ways to address them. He said that they will take these comments into consideration.
- v) Q: Would the developer please consider changing the design to two- and three-bedroom apartments, and making the buildings only two stories high? It seems more luxurious. It still will bring in income for the owner.
  - (a) The Agent noted the request.
- vi) Q: A neighbor stated that many of the concerns expressed at this meeting would be mitigated by lowering the buildings to 2 stories. That should be the developer's priority.
- vii) Q: Several participants expressed opinions about the project as a whole, including:
  - (1) No one said, "we don't want apartments," but several said "we want fewer apartments." Please take that seriously.
  - (2) There isn't nearly enough parking. Reducing the size to two stories would solve that problem.
  - (3) The project is designed to fit too many people in such a small area and doesn't fit with rest of neighborhood.
  - (4) This neighborhood is a family area and the apartments should be geared toward families, not singles.



**e) Regarding Proximity to the School**

- i) Q: A neighbor was concerned about the interaction between the project exit onto Barstow and the school. Cars park all along that street for picking up the kids. What's going to prevent cars exiting the development and running into kids? It's a hazard.  
(1) The Agent said they will examine the design from that perspective.
- ii) Q: A neighbor is concerned about this project exacerbating problems that already exist at the school. With this project, there will be even more excess cars which will park on the street.  
(a) The Agent noted this concern.
- iii) Q: A neighbor was concerned that this development might result in APS changing the lines of where the school districts are.  
(1) The Agent responded that while APS is not part of the City, they are a commenting agency on all applications that go through the DRB. They are the ones who decide about school districts and capacities.  
(2) He said he doesn't yet know the answer because the review hasn't happened yet. He doesn't expect this project to cause a boundary change, but APS will do a review.

**f) Regarding Elevation, Layout, and Appearance**

- i) Q: The design looks industrial, not homey.
- ii) Q: A neighbor is concerned about loss of privacy with eyes from the third story looking into back yards.
- iii) Q: Where do the dumpsters go?  
(1) The Agent pointed on the drawings. Five dumpsters are shown, two along the south wall and three along the eastern edge.
- iv) Q: What about the appearance of the other side of the street (away from the development)? There's a divot in front of my house that my friends have to avoid.  
(1) Agent stated that they are responsible for things on the south side of the roadway—the sidewalk, etc. It gets turned over to the city upon completion. The City is responsible to build out the other side of the street. But eventually the City owns and maintains both sides.
- v) Q: From what you presented tonight, I don't have a sense of what you will actually submit. There's a 25 ft grade change from west to east across the property. Will buildings be at current grade or will the land be built up?  
(a) Agent said, the grade changes continually across the property. No tall wall or podium will be built. The maximum height anywhere from ground to rooftop will be 35 ft.
- vi) Q: How will drainage be affected by 3- vs 2-story buildings? Do the buildings have slanted roofs, gutters?  
(1) The roofs are slanted, but low pitch roofs. There will be a drainage plan to mitigate storm water. The regulations are much more stringent than 10 to 15 years ago. The storm water calculation is based on the footprint of the roofs. Changing from 3 to 2 stories won't affect that.
- vii) Q: When there's a storm, where does the water drain to?  
(1) The property drains to the west. There are step down areas all along the property to slow water down before it exists the property. The regulations control the rate of discharge from the property. It cannot leave the property any faster than when it was just dirt. It won't be a deluge.

viii) Q: A neighbor pointed out that the project would block their view of the mountains and the city. That's a loss to the houses of the area.

**g) Regarding Safety**

i) Q: From the map it looks like there will be a wall around the complex. Is that so?

(1) The Agent explained that there's an existing wall on the south side and they would add a wall along the east edge.

(2) There is not a wall along the streets.

ii) Q: By "existing wall on the south side" does that mean the wall on the back of my property? Why would you use the existing wall?

(1) The Agent explained that between the parking spaces and the boundary there will be a curb, and landscaped area, and the wall.

iii) Q: What is the means of access to the upper floors?

(1) Both stairs and elevators.

iv) Q: I understand that sex offenders are not a protected class of people, which means that applications for residency can be denied to them. What are the plans for background and sex offender checks for the residents of the project and all those workmen who will build it? It's near a school. What is your commitment to this community?

(1) Sandy Salata, a property manager associated with the project, replied that the application process for residents includes a background check and sex offenders are automatically denied.

(a) She did not know about the workmen, but typically construction companies perform background checks on their employees.

(2) Q: I ask that all employees on the construction site be required to pass a background check.

v) Q: Will there be onsite security monitoring the area for the residents? Will there be a set time when the pool closes down, or will parties continue into the night?

(1) Sandy Salata responded that there will be courtesy patrols to monitor on a regular basis after office hours. Typically, 10pm is beginning of quiet hours.

vi) Q: I understand there will be no security fence or gate. That's a security feature that makes this site less luxurious than other nearby properties. People may shortcut by going through the property.

(1) The Agent agreed to review that.

vii) Q: Is there going to be a walkthrough between this site and Tierra Morena to the South?

(1) No.

viii) Q: Regarding the community art outreach, will there be enough parking for community members? Will residents be OK with the public coming there?

(1) The Agent responded, the short answer is that the public would be welcome for specific advertised events and it would be managed by the site manager. It's a private complex and the amenities are for the residents.

**h) Regarding Other Topics**

i) Q: A neighbor expressed unwillingness to endure approximately 18 months of construction time. That's a very long time to have workmen, noise, machinery, etc. in the area.

(1) The Agent responded, typically, the site work is done first—grading, utilities, etc.

Then the buildings come in in phases from west to east. He wouldn't say it won't be disruptive. That's the nature of construction.

- ii) Q: There is a moratorium on building along Alameda on the West Side of Albuquerque. Neighbors have called for a San Pedro/Alameda corridor development moratorium as well.
  - (1) The Agent stated that, based on data provided by the Greater Albuquerque Association of Realtors (GAAR), there is a city-wide housing shortage.
- iii) Q: With so many luxury apartments in this area, why does this need to be built here and now?
  - (1) The Agent stated that, based on data provided by the Greater Albuquerque Association of Realtors (GAAR), there is a city-wide housing shortage.
- iv) Q: What is the latest word from the City on the free zone conversion program?
  - (1) The Agent stated that he understands that the City is processing the voluntary zoning conversions in batches. Batch 1 hasn't yet made it to City Council. When this project application is submitted, it's the conditions in effect at that time of application that apply. The second batch is taking longer than people expected and may be in a few batches.
- v) Q: A neighbor was concerned about how this project will affect property taxes and resale values of existing homes. So many homes will lose their views of the mountains and their privacy. It will drive down property values.
- vi) Q: Will the City raise taxes on homes in the area to pay for the work on the North side of Alameda? There was a bond for about 6 or 7 years for the expansion, but it lapsed. Now there are no funds to put in gutters, sidewalks, etc. there.
  - (1) Another participant responded, the work for the north side of Alameda was ready for bid about 6 months ago. The City had some funding. But it all got tabled when this project appeared on the scene.
- vii) Q: What value does this project bring to the community in exchange for the impacts of this project? There will be a bunch of dumpsters against our wall, our mountain views will be cut off, and there's no traffic plan how to keep the kids safe. In addition our privacy will be compromised by people looking over the wall from their second and third story windows.
  - (1) Agent said that the reason for the meetings is for the developer to learn what's on the community's mind and consider how to respond. It's not fair to say that just because the current plans show things a certain way, it's necessarily cast in stone. The design team will review the pedestrian and safety issues, lighting, dumpsters, fencing, and security and respond back.
- viii) Q: A meeting participant made the following comments about the facilitated meeting process:
  - (1) The developer and agent have been in consultation with City Planning multiple times prior to the first notification of a neighborhood meeting.
  - (2) The plans for this project are well along the development path.
  - (3) This meeting is part of the IDO process and tonight's report will be given to the IDO.
  - (4) To send out a public meeting notification without any information about the project is useless to the neighborhood associations and homeowner associations and is a waste of time in a very time-bound process.
    - (a) This approach is currently allowed by the IDO.
    - (b) Neighbors feel strongly that all technical plan documents should be supplied by the developer/agent to the neighborhood associations at the time the meeting is announced.
      - (i) To not do this is a bias in favor of the developer and agent.

- (ii) It leaves the neighborhoods in the dark until the actual neighborhood meeting.
- ix) Q: Participants tonight sound like they are willing to accept a few alternatives. Will the developer, Mr. Lindborg, speak to those?
  - (1) Mr. Lindborg responded that he had heard worthwhile comments about some things important to him. He is a local and lives here. He will take the comments into consideration.
- x) Q: How many of these units will be for low income?
  - (1) The Agent stated that none are for low income.

Application Hearing Details

- 1) An application has not yet been submitted for this project.
- 2) Development Review Board Hearing Details:
  - a. The Development Review Board (DRB) was established in March 1982, by Administrative Instruction 8-2. The DRB conducts public hearings on major subdivision actions (where no re-zoning or annexation is required), approves or denies proposed major and minor subdivision actions, vacations of public rights of way or public and private easements, subdivision variances. The Development Review Board is charged with administering the City Subdivision Ordinance as well as other City ordinances and policies applicable to subdivision actions.
  - 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.
- 3) 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.

Any further questions or comments can be referred to:

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

Names and Affiliations of All Attendees:

Adrian Segura	
Amber Le	Nor Este NA
Amy Lazar	Nor Este NA
Anne Downing	Nor Este NA
Brook Bassan	Nor Este NA
Carl Henry	
Dan Regan	District 4 Coalition

Dave Hickman	Jeebs & Zuzu
David & Donna Sauter	Neighborhood residents
Elizabeth Meek	Vineyard Estates NA
Eric Griego	NAA
Gene Brooks	Neighbor
Jan Delaney	Nor Este NA
Janet S McIlwain	
Jason Parkin	
Jeff Blemd	Tierra Morena
Jim Griffee	Nor Este NA
Jim Strozier	Consensus Planning
Jo Sanchez	Neighbor
Joe O'Neill	
Joseph Valdez	
Juanita Duran	Tierra Morena
Justin Horwitz	
Karen Baehr	
Kathleen Butler	Nor Este NA
Kristen Kim	
Larry Caswell	Neighbor
Larry Landini	
Lois Meyer	Neighbor
Lucy Baca	Vineyard Estates NA
Marialuz Scarpa	
Mark Motsko	Nor Este NA
Meifen Zhao	Carrington
Michael O'Dell	
Michael Vos	Consensus Planning
Mildred Griffee	Nor Este NA
Nancy Jones	
Pat Verrelle	Vineyard Estates NA
Paul Scarpa	
Peggy Neff	
Peter Dickens	Nor Este NA
Phil Lindborg	
Philip Le	
Phyllis Landini	
Randolph Baca	
Richard Pfeiffer	
Rob Warder	Vineyard Estates NA
Sandy Salata	
Shannon Baca	NAA
Steve Shackley	Nor Este NA

Steve Wray

Tim Krier

Tom & Dinne Boomershire

Toni Breen

Trish Upton

Nor Este NA

Carrington