



City of Las Cruces[™]

Development Review Committee Agenda

The Development Review Committee (DRC) will consider the following agenda on March 23, 2022, at 9:00 A.M., in Room 1158 located at the City Hall, 700 North Main Street, Las Cruces, New Mexico.

1. Call To Order

2. Approval Of Minutes

2.1. March 2, 2022 DRC Minutes

Documents:

[03-02-22 DRC MINUTES.PDF](#)

2.1.1. March 9, 2022 DRC Minutes

Documents:

[03-09-22 DRC MINUTES.PDF](#)

3. Old Business

3.1. Case 22CS0500012: Camino Hills Subdivision Master Plan

- A request for approval of a Final Site Plan, known as Camino Hills Subdivision
- The proposed subdivision encompasses 10.954 ± acres, is zoned R-1a (Single-Family Medium Density), is located west of Spitz St and northeast of El Camino Real
- The Master Plan proposes 52 single-family residential lots with five tracts of land for drainage. The master plan shall be required to follow all to develop Hanson Ave and Spitz St.
- Submitted by Sierra Steve Calderazzo, representative.

3.2. Case 21CS0500069: Camino Hills Subdivision Preliminary Plat

- A request for approval of a Preliminary Plat, known as Camino Hills Subdivision
- The proposed subdivision encompasses 10.954 ± acres, is zoned R-1a (Single-Family Medium Density), is located west of Spitz St and northeast of El Camino Real
- The Master Plan proposes 52 single-family residential lots with five

tracts of land for drainage. The master plan shall be required to follow all to develop Hanson Ave and Spitz St.

- Submitted by Sierra Steve Calderazzo, representative.

4. New Business

4.1. Tierra Del Sol Subdivision - 21CS0500097, 22CS0500018, & 22SU0501235

Clarify cross-section requirements for:

1. Skylark Lane from Tierra Escondida to Mesa Rd.
2. Mesa Dr. from Skylark to Central Rd., and
3. Central Rd. from Mesa Dr. to the west end of this development.

This affordable housing subdivision includes 18 single family lots and a park to be developed by the City. The preliminary plat has been approved by the DRC and P&Z.

Documents:

[11-03-21 DRC MINUTES.PDF](#)

5. Adjournment

6. Discussion

The City of Las Cruces does not discriminate on the basis of race, religion, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, color, ancestry, serious medical condition, national origin, age, or disability in the provision of services. The City of Las Cruces will make reasonable accommodation for a qualified individual who wishes to attend this meeting. Please notify the City Community Development Department at least 48 hours before the meeting by calling 528-3043 (voice) or 1-800-659-8331 (TTY) if accommodation is necessary. This document can be made available in alternative formats by calling the same numbers listed above.

Date Posted: March 18, 2022

1 **DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE (DRC)**

2
3 Following are the minutes from the City of Las Cruces Development Review Committee
4 Meeting held Wednesday, March 3, 2022, at 9:00 a.m. in Room 1158.

5
6 **DRC PRESENT:** David Weir, Chief Planning Administrator
7 Rocio Nasir, Senior Engineer, Utilities
8 Tony Trevino, Engineering Administrator, Public Works
9 Hector Terrazas, Engineer, Public Works
10 Mike Kinney, Project Manager, Community Development

11
12 **STAFF PRESENT:** John Castillo, Permit Tech, Community Development
13 Steve Pacheco, Senior Engineer, Public Works
14 Vincent Banegas, Planner, Community Development
15 Becky Baum, Recording Secretary, RC Creations, LLC

16
17 **OTHER PRESENT:** Mike Johnson, Souder Miller
18 Brice Ortiz, Souder Miller

19
20 **1. CALL TO ORDER (9:02 a.m.)**

21
22 Weir: Okay, well it's 9:02. So if you don't mind, I'll call the meeting to order. We
23 have a, I'm not exactly sure how we have a quorum, but we do have a
24 quorum of the DRC.

25
26 **2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – None**

27
28 Weir: So we don't have any minutes ready for today.

29
30 **3. OLD BUSINESS - None**

31
32 Weir: And we don't have any old business.

33
34 **4. NEW BUSINESS**

35
36 **4.1 3497 Northrise - Design Standard Variance**

- 37
- 38 • A request for approval of a variance from the design standards for
underground storm water storage
 - 39 • Applicant is proposing to include storm water capacity created by
40 utilizing stone aggregate located beneath underground storage
41 chambers.

42
43 Weir: So the first business is the 3497 Northrise. There was a request for
44 design standards variance to the onsite stormwater drainage. So Mr.
45 Kinney can you give an overview of what's being proposed and if you have
46 any other comments you want to make.

1
2 Kinney: Yes sir. This is the request for Section 32-103.6.1 and 6.1A I guess. Has
3 to do with underground storage. So the code reads there is no credit
4 given for rock voids. This particular system that was proposed by Souder
5 Miller is an AVS StormTech system called MC-4500 chamber. They don't
6 call it tanks; they call it chamber. And the system is kind of a, for lack of a
7 better description, to me is like a hybrid between storage tanks and a
8 French drain, percolation system. And as part of the design of the actual
9 system, I called AVS and talked to them. In their cut sheet they were
10 indicating that they have what's called minimum installed storage, which is
11 greater than the volume of the chambers, which the installed storage
12 includes the fill, which is a stone between the chambers and the end caps
13 which has a 40% stone porosity. Section 32-103.6.1A talks about no
14 credit for the rock voids. And so I suggested having a DRC meeting to
15 discuss this because it's not, typically it's kind of like I said a hybrid
16 between underground storage and also a percolation system, which
17 includes the storage capacity includes the rock voids 40% of the rock
18 voids. And from that design if they just had to go with straight chambers
19 with no credit, they wouldn't be dealing with 67 or 68.
20
21 Johnson: Correct.
22
23 Kinney: Of those chambers and including the voids they can reduce it down to 40
24 to 41, which will reduce the overall ... will the footprint still be the same?
25
26 Johnson: Similar. Yes, I think it'd just be kind of (*inaudible*) somewhere so probably
27 might lose some of the outer chambers.
28
29 Kinney: And significantly reduce the cost. Significantly.
30
31 Weir: Does anyone have any questions of Mike?
32
33 Johnson: Let me kind of backup and kind of just be full transparent here. When this
34 subdivision was originally designed it was a pond. The owner at the time
35 came, and the reason that the capacities are so great for such a small lot
36 is because it's also taking into account the private roads that are running
37 between Wendy's to the north and then Mister Car Wash to the south.
38
39 Trevino: Okay, so this isn't just the volume from the site.
40
41 Johnson: It's not just post minus pre that we have to ... right. So it is this.
42
43 Weir: So Mike Johnson you want to give an overview.
44
45 Johnson: Well I mean Mike pretty well hit it on that. So we were asked several
46 years ago by the owner to make this a developable tract. Take it from a
47

1 tract to a lot to be developed. And we did that at the time, Jeremy, I think
2 it was Jeremy required us to give examples of how we would make it a
3 developable lot and still maintain the ability to retain the ponding on the
4 site. And so we gave him a couple options, quite frankly, and being fully
5 transparent, what's happening now wasn't one of the options. It is being
6 fully utilized more so than we had anticipated. So we've been asked to
7 come in and design this at this point. We took that through, we were able
8 to make it a developable lot. Refile the plat. So now we're at the point
9 where we're trying to put a two story building that's going to be a
10 pharmacy on the site. Being tasked with, take care of all the drainage.
11 Needless to say the owner when he saw what we were doing, came pretty
12 well unglued, I guess just for lack of a term, because these chambers are
13 about \$1,500.00 each, not including installation, construction, so 68 of
14 them is easily over \$100,000.00 just to buy your materials.

15
16 Trevino: So that's why this makes it, so this was supposed to be the ponding
17 planning for that whole subdivision right there.

18
19 Johnson: For lot 2 pretty much, yes.

20
21 Trevino: And then so develop it. Okay, so nothing's going to be discharged off the
22 lot. Everything stays there.

23
24 Johnson: Yes. And so we would like to come, and Mike described it pretty well,
25 right now the design we have for 68 chambers is just accounting for the
26 chamber's capacity not the rock stone void that come up in between when
27 you look at some of these designs for the area. So having done that, and
28 using the online calculation as well as doing them in longhand, Brice in our
29 office, we come up with similar results where we can potentially reduce it
30 to 41, if we can get concurrence of the committee.

31
32 Weir: Mr. Terrazas.

33
34 Terrazas: Mike Johnson. Yes, because I was going to ask, this for the whole
35 development, right? I know your guys are proposing to develop for the
36 east, lot 3.

37
38 Johnson: It's not for lot 3.

39
40 Terrazas: Okay. So that's not going to be in the long game.

41
42 Johnson: No. It's basically for the roads you see, not for the road that would
43 potentially come back between Dutch and Mister Car.

44
45 Terrazas: And those are developed. *(inaudible)*.

46

1 Johnson: That drainage will go somewhere else.
2
3 Terrazas: Okay.
4
5 Johnson: It's just this road, this road coming into here.
6
7 Trevino: And does that road accept anything from the Wendy's or the ...
8
9 Johnson: No. They're still responsible just like any other commercial development
10 to keep their ponding on site.
11
12 Trevino: Okay.
13
14 Kinney: And the Dutch Brothers.
15
16 Johnson: There is an easement right here, a utility easement. The water comes
17 down this road and kind of comes in at that point.
18
19 Kinney: And Dutch Brothers has a separate pond.
20
21 Johnson: Yes.
22
23 Trevino: That's just, there's nothing, that's extra, there's nothing kind of (*inaudible*)
24 to those basins right there.
25
26 Johnson: No. Not from Bataan or for Rinconada or Northrise.
27
28 Trevino: As long as you put fillable fill around it, around the chamber so the rock
29 doesn't get into it. Just joking.
30
31 Terrazas: And that's a follow up question I had, as far as maintenance because I
32 think that's what ends up being like, how do we maintain it? It is going to
33 be private property. It's a French drain like kind of thing. How does the
34 City not become liable when this sediments (*inaudible*) in two years, three
35 years?
36
37 Pacheco: Well, we'd like to see is some kind of O&M that would run with the land
38 that would say you know this is our maintenance schedule so you can
39 have the, whoever owns it in the future take it to them and say this is you
40 know part of that lot and you're required to maintain this schedule.
41
42 Trevino: Are those roads private or City.
43
44 Johnson: They're private.
45
46 Trevino: Okay.

1
2 Pacheco: They're private.
3
4 Trevino: Right, so that way when it comes back to us in the future, (*inaudible*)
5 everything it goes to that lot, they're going to be responsible for all that
6 drainage from the roadways.
7
8 Johnson: Now I know that I'm trying to think how would we do that.
9
10 Trevino: That would be ...
11
12 Johnson: Well, there's some kind of agreement with the owners on the roadway.
13
14 Trevino: Covenants.
15
16 Johnson: Yes, I don't know if it quite called a covenant, but I think there's something
17 there that ...
18
19 Weir: Is there joint use on the parking lots and maintenance of those?
20
21 Johnson: Well I think each of the owners are responsible for their share of
22 maintaining the roads in some form. I'd have to go back to, if it's an HOA
23 agreement or I don't know, I'd have to go back to Dr. Padila and see. But
24 maybe we could add that to that.
25
26 Nasir: it was included on the plat note that each one of them is responsible for
27 the road. Not necessarily, I don't think it's specified on the plat how it will
28 be maintained, but definitely I believe on the plat it was shown to be
29 private and ...
30
31 Johnson: Right.
32
33 Terrazas: For right now, there's nothing on the plat that says, for the pharmacy the
34 new platted one that went through maybe a month ago. It doesn't say
35 anything about maintaining that right.
36
37 Johnson: I don't think so, no.
38
39 Terrazas: So I think that's what Steve and Tony and everyone's kind of alluding to.
40 We're going to have some kind of agreement that that owner is going to
41 maintain it even though he's getting water from all these other private
42 developments.
43
44 Trevino: Yes, or if it's (*inaudible*) or whatever. But it's going to be in the best
45 interest, that places the whole right there so if those things aren't infiltrated

1 more they're going to be underwater. Then it can be discharged
2 anywhere, just (*inaudible*).
3
4 Nasir: That's what's happening there on we're Texas Roadhouse is happening.
5 So we get a phone call every so often that we need to go and clean it out
6 and then we let them know that that's private property and they have to do
7 it. So they actually have gone in and cleaned it up every so often
8 whenever they realizes there's, when the property owner is from
9 California. Whenever they flood their own parking lot, because it doesn't
10 come out of the parking lot.
11
12 Trevino: Right. Yes, so like hey we're in a foot of water here. That's yours, it's not
13 our stuff.
14
15 Nasir: Yes.
16
17 Trevino: That makes them want to clean up faster so I don't have an issue. And I
18 think ...
19
20 Johnson: We could add that to the plat. I mean we've added easements to plats just
21 by legal description, so I'm sure you could add something saying.
22
23 Trevino: Mike I guess.
24
25 Weir: Or you could file it as a separate, just make it a ...
26
27 Johnson: That's what I meant.
28
29 Weir: We have record on it.
30
31 Trevino: I'm just surprised that this is the first time I've seen this, because this was
32 always my fight with the City when I was in private.
33
34 Johnson: What's that? Because of that.
35
36 Trevino: The volume (*inaudible*). That was a constant fight. So, yes, no, I have, I
37 think that's the way it should be. It's already developed around that area.
38 And I think we should start utilizing this system the way it's designed to be
39 by the manufacturers. I mean we never have, we never allowed them to
40 do private. But that's how these systems work and with the maintenance,
41 I think before with the fast development to the west, to east, whatever, all
42 the dirt clogging up. I think we get some kind of agreement there, they're
43 in hole, are they going to (*inaudible*). I think that's something we should
44 probably add to the design standards where that's accommodated for, if
45 there's maintenance and everything and allow it moving forward.
46

1 Nasir: That's probably something that we need to keep an eye on with the rewrite
2 that we're having. Because I know that the original standards were written
3 before all of this new technology is coming along. Because they wanted
4 to make sure that it doesn't get clogged and then you know with the old
5 systems. You're right with the new systems, yes, but the design standards
6 have never been changed.
7
8 Trevino: We revised that verbiage for this. Yes, so that way we don't.
9
10 Johnson: I seem to remember there was some arguments about it at the time. Was
11 it with Robert? Yes, so okay, my brain's not going too bad.
12
13 Trevino: It was always going to you guys in Public Works up there.
14
15 Johnson: Yes.
16
17 Trevino: Wait did, but you always said no way. And now you're asking for it. It was
18 your department wasn't it?
19
20 Johnson: I stand corrected. Yes sir. See I remember people coming to me and
21 arguing about that.
22
23 Trevino: What was your answer?
24
25 Kinney: I have one question.
26
27 Johnson: We had a discussion but I guess it stayed, right.
28
29 Kinney: I have a question.
30
31 Johnson: Yes sir.
32
33 Kinney: Mr. Johnson. In the event that there is some sort of say storm greater
34 than 100 years, what provisions are for overflow?
35
36 Johnson: Well, the way it's been described to me is if this system is full that that the
37 water will just pass, it bypass it.
38
39 Kinney: Bypass.
40
41 Johnson: Yes.
42
43 Kinney: So where will it go? Will it stay on the lot or?
44
45 Johnson: It's going to be designed around to here, to there. I mean, if you have a
46 greater than 100 year flood.

1
2 Trevino: The whole thing is ...
3
4 Johnson: It's going to flow. Yes.
5
6 Kinney: Yes. So there's provision for discharge for.
7
8 Johnson: Yes, I would say so.
9
10 Kinney: Emergency discharge.
11
12 Trevino: Over the curb and into the road.
13
14 Kinney: 100 year flood, we've got better things to worry about.
15
16 Trevino: But, and that's a difference Mike, because when they are just holding
17 what's the post, the pre, then on the bottom they'll have a discharge to
18 kind of commit that. This is just one holding pond. This is no (*inaudible*)
19 near. So it's in a hole so.
20
21 Kinney: Yes.
22
23 Trevino: So greater than 100, it's just going to fill up. At that point everything's
24 going to be underwater.
25
26 Pacheco: And it floods them out. That's private. Not our responsibility.
27
28 Kinney: So and then roadside swale that's along, that's going to go away, or it'll
29 still be there?
30
31 Johnson: I don't think that's going to be, that's our landscaped area. So I'd say it's
32 probably still going to be there. We're not getting into it with any tanks or
33 anything.
34
35 Weir: So I have a procedural question for all the DRC members. Are you
36 comfortable acting on this today or would you like to see how the
37 agreement's going to be put together and table this to a future DRC
38 meeting? Or are you comfortable?
39
40 Terrazas: Mr. Chair. I would want to postpone it until we get something in place.
41 That way we can all review it and make sure that's all, operation manual
42 but I think we are in agreeance kind of that we can move forward with this
43 once that's all.
44
45 Johnson: Not really because we're going to have to redesign it anyway.
46

1 Terrazas: More a clear direction.
2
3 Johnson: When you say, you just want to say, they're responsible to maintain this,
4 create some kind of a schedule, twice a year.
5
6 Trevino: Whatever manufacturer recommends.
7
8 Johnson: Okay. All right. We can put that.
9
10 Trevino: But it needs to run with the land not the owner.
11
12 Johnson: Right. Well, we can put it, (*inaudible*) what to put on plats. We can put it
13 on the plat.
14
15 Weir: Also do a deed right and transfer.
16
17 Johnson: Yes.
18
19 Terrazas: And the other thing is, if you can find out any information about, this pond
20 was going to service five lots, something like that. Because then if it
21 becomes an issue later.
22
23 Johnson: What's servicing the road, basically.
24
25 Terrazas: No, I know that but, you say you're going to look to if there's a covenants
26 about sharing all this pond and maintenance of the pond. I don't know
27 how that pond's maintained now.
28
29 Kinney: It's got the drainage basins shown.
30
31 Johnson: Yes, I see what you're saying if there's something that exists.
32
33 Terrazas: Yes, like right now if that pond, let's say we didn't do this, if that pond
34 needs to be maintained, who's maintaining it?
35
36 Johnson: Right. Okay.
37
38 Pacheco: Give us a history of it.
39
40 Johnson: Yes. That'll work.
41
42 Trevino: So how can you, just a question. And I'm just kind of just from the
43 standpoint to kind of help them out. Is that going to postpone you guys
44 another month to come over here and then resubmit it again? Or is that
45 something you can work out with Mike in the meantime. Because that's
46 just some informational areas that Mike can look at. I don't know.

1
2 Terrazas: Two weeks Tony. We do it every two weeks, DRC.
3
4 Nasir: No actually it's every week now.
5
6 Terrazas: There you go.
7
8 Trevino: You can come back next week and get this, so it doesn't slow down.
9 Okay.
10
11 Johnson: No that's fine. Like is say we're going to have to redesign and we can
12 move on with the fact that we can go with the lesser tanks.
13
14 Trevino: So you work on the design you can bring the agreement in and just have
15 that agreement come to DRC while he's talking to design.
16
17 Johnson: No, that's fine. We got a rider amendment for the work so you guys add a
18 little more work, we add a little more cost.
19
20 Terrazas: Either pay you or pay (*inaudible*).
21
22 Johnson: You know we just eliminated 27 tanks too so, that's a lot of money.
23
24 Kinney: All right so the consensus of the DRC is for approval, but we want some
25 additional information, documentation.
26
27 Weir: Okay. If that's the case, you don't have anything else. You don't want to
28 discuss it anymore; I'd entertain a motion to postpone until the March 9th
29 DRC meeting.
30
31 Johnson: How about could I call and tell you when.
32
33 Weir: Sure.
34
35 Johnson: I appreciate the quickness but I'm just not sure I'm going to get.
36
37 Trevino: I don't want to hear you guys, we're slowing you down, nothing. I know
38 you developers say the City does this and does that.
39
40 Terrazas: Mr. Chair.
41
42 Johnson: Let's go ahead do March 9th and I'll call you and let you know for sure.
43
44 Weir: Okay.
45
46 Johnson: I'll let you know for sure if it's not going to work.

1
2 Weir: I have a motion to table from Mr. Terrazas. Do I have a second?
3
4 Kinney: Second.
5
6 Weir: I have a second from Mr. Kinney. All those in favor?
7
8 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.
9
10 Weir: All those opposed? Okay, we're currently postponed until March 9th. So
11 we'll see you next Wednesday, if not sooner.
12
13 Johnson: You got it. At least maybe then I can bring you what the covenants say in
14 the subdivision. Something we can talk about other than *(inaudible)*.
15
16 Weir: And thank you all for coming on short notice. We've had some staff
17 absences and Mike and I were really scrambling to get this agenda
18 together Friday.

19
20 **5. ADJOURNMENT (9:20 a.m.)**

21
22 Weir: Meeting adjourned.
23
24
25
26

27 _____
28 Chairperson

1 **DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE (DRC)**

2
3 Following are the minutes from the City of Las Cruces Development Review Committee
4 Meeting held Wednesday, March 9, 2022, at 9:00 a.m. in Room 1158.

5
6 **DRC PRESENT:** Mark Dubbin, Fire Department
7 Rocio Nasir, Senior Engineer, Utilities
8 Dominic Loya, MVMPO
9 Hector Terrazas, Engineer, Public Works
10 Mike Kinney, Project Manager, Community Development
11 John Castillo, Permit Tech, Community Development
12

13 **STAFF PRESENT:** Katherine Harrison-Rogers, Planner Senior, Com. Dev.
14 Becky Baum, Recording Secretary, RC Creations, LLC
15

16 **OTHER PRESENT:** Randy Farmer, Genesis Builders
17 Barry Prah, Genesis Builders
18 J.G. Rodriguez, Genesis Builders
19 Steve Calderazzo, CCG
20 Mike Johnson, Souder Miller
21

22 **1. CALL TO ORDER (9:00 a.m.)**

23
24 H-Rogers: I'd like to bring this DRC to order.
25

26 **2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – February 23, 2022**

27
28 H-Rogers: We have some minutes from February 23, 2022. Are there any edits,
29 modifications, discussion about those? No. Seeing none. Do I have a
30 recommendation for approval?
31

32 Nasir: So moved.
33

34 H-Rogers: Is there a second?
35

36 Terrazas: Second.
37

38 H-Rogers: Very good. All those in favor?
39

40 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.
41

42 H-Rogers: Any opposed. Motion passes.
43

44 **3. OLD BUSINESS - None**

45
46 **3.1 3497 Northrise - Storm Water Design Standard Variance**

- A request for approval of a variance from the design standards for underground storm water storage
- Applicant is proposing to include storm water capacity created by utilizing stone aggregate located beneath underground storage chambers.

H-Rogers: All righty. We do have some old business from last week, that would be the first item on our agenda. 3497 Northrise. This is a design standard variance for stormwater drainage calculations. I'm going to go ahead and turn it over to Mike Kinney with engineering so he can discuss what the details are. Michael.

Kinney: Thank you Madam Chair. 3497 Northrise is for the stormwater design standard variances. The system that's being proposed is an underground storage/what I would call French drain type system. And last week we tabled it until Public Works and other members of the board would have an opportunity to review information and also to have the applicant provide O&M, operation and maintenance documentation which Mr. Johnson has provided.

Johnson: There was a concern is that the system wouldn't be maintained since it was privately owned. So we've written, I think it looks like most of you have that out in the world there, the City world. We looked at two different ways to enforce that, one was to put it on the plat, and the second was to provide a deed restriction, which we believe will be the easier one, would be the deed restriction. So we've provided kind of just a little draft we proposed to be filed as part of the deed. Obviously, I think this should be referenced to the O&M manual. So then I'd like permission to get out of jail and move forward.

H-Rogers: All righty. Well, let me look to other staff to see if there are any additional comments. I'm going to look at traffic to see.

Terrazas: There's no issues with traffic, I just want to get Mr. C's input on it. That's for Public Works. Yes.

Pacheco: I just wanted to ask that they add something in the, well actually the deed the front end manual for the manufacturer is added to the O&M, the sheet that was written up. And also that you add something in there that the inspections are submitted to the City of Las Cruces.

Terrazas: The semiannual ones.

Pacheco: Yes. So that we can, or some kind of language in there that you know that we want to see that it's being maintained is, I'm not sure how to do that exactly.

1
2 Johnson: You're quickly creating work for us.
3
4 H-Rogers: Steve, would you say that some sort of condition that indicates that the
5 semiannual inspection report be provided to the City for review?
6
7 Pacheco: Yes.
8
9 H-Rogers: Or reference.
10
11 Johnson: To whom?
12
13 H-Rogers: Public Works.
14
15 Johnson: Steve Pacheco.
16
17 H-Rogers: Just Public Works.
18
19 Pacheco: Public Works and something also that if we can inspect it, we can have
20 access to it to go and take a look at it.
21
22 Johnson: City can have, be granted access when requested.
23
24 Pacheco: Yes.
25
26 Terrazas: And Steve I have a follow up question if that's all you had. Are we okay
27 with doing a deed restriction or do we want it to be in the plat? I mean.
28
29 Pacheco: I think the deed restriction will work. I haven't, I'd like to see it before you
30 file it.
31
32 Johnson: Okay. No that's fine.
33
34 H-Rogers: I might recommend ...
35
36 Johnson: Add these conditions in, let you file it. I mean sorry, that you. You cal file
37 it too if you want.
38
39 Pacheco: Not file anything.
40
41 H-Rogers: So I'm understanding that you will work with Public Words to make sure
42 that the language is suitable.
43
44 Johnson: That's fine.
45
46 H-Rogers: Prior to filing.

1
2 Johnson: That's fine. And a plat, just had to go get all the signatures and everything
3 that we agreed to.
4
5 H-Rogers: Anything else Steve?
6
7 Pacheco: That was all I have.
8
9 H-Rogers: Okay. I'm going to look at some of the other staff just to see if there are
10 any other comments or concerns. Fire.
11
12 Dubbin: No comments.
13
14 H-Rogers: All right. Very good. And I'm going to look to Planning. No comments.
15 All right. And Utilities.
16
17 Nasir: No.
18
19 H-Rogers: We do have MPO here, but I imagine that they're not, no comment on
20 drainage.
21
22 Loya: No comment.
23
24 H-Rogers: All right. With that, is there anything else you'd like to add Mr. Kinney or
25 the applicant?
26
27 Kinney: No ma'am.
28
29 H-Rogers: Is there a motion for this variance?
30
31 Terrazas: Motion to include all the items that we discussed, and then a motion to
32 approve with conditions that we get that provided and engineering or
33 public works for reviews it and accept it.
34
35 H-Rogers: Very good. Is there a second?
36
37 Kinney: I'll second.
38
39 H-Rogers: All right. All those in favor.
40
41 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.
42
43 H-Rogers: Any opposed? Motion passes unanimously..
44
45 Johnson: Thanks to everybody.
46

1 **4. NEW BUSINESS**

2
3 **4.1 Case 22CS0500012: Camino Hills Subdivision Master Plan**

- 4 • A request for approval of a Final Site Plan known as Camino Hills
5 Subdivision.
6 • The proposed subdivision encompasses 10.954 +/- acres, is zoned R-
7 1a (Single-Family Medium Density), is located west of Spitz St. and
8 northeast of El Camino Real
9 • The Master Plan proposes 52 single-family residential lots with five
10 tracts of land for drainage. The master plan shall be required to follow
11 all to develop Hanson Ave. and Spitz St.
12 • Submitted by Sierra Steve Calderazzo, representative.
13

14 H-Rogers: All righty. Second item on the agenda is new business. We have Camino
15 Hills Subdivision Master Plan as well as the Camino Hills Subdivision
16 Preliminary Plat. I'm going to look to staff, did you want to discuss those
17 together or separately?
18

19 Castillo: Discuss them together.
20

21 H-Rogers: Absolutely. So I'm going to go ahead and turn that over to planning. And
22 we have John Castillo.
23

24 Castillo: We have a request today for a master plan and a preliminary plat known
25 as Camino Hills Subdivision. The proposed subdivision encompasses
26 10.954 acres. It's currently zoned R-1a, which is our single-family medium
27 density. It's located west of Spitz Street and northeast of Camino Real.
28 The master plan proposes 52 single-family residential lots with multiple
29 tracts of land for drainage. The master plan and preliminary plat are
30 going, will be required to develop Hansen Street and build out a portion of
31 Spitz.
32

33 H-Rogers: All righty. I'm going to turn to the applicant to see if you have anything
34 you'd like to discuss before I turn it over to staff.
35

36 Calderazzo: Nothing to discuss other than just painless, request for pain free operation,
37 Katherine. That's it.
38

39 H-Rogers: Okay. Thank you. So I'm going to go ahead and go around the room to
40 look to staff to see if there are any comments or concerns related to the
41 submittal. And I'm going to start with traffic.
42

43 Terrazas: I think we had a comment before. There is no planned future connection
44 to Camino Real, right.
45

46 Calderazzo: No. No sir.

1
2 Terrazas: That was my only concern, just having that access. And the other, well
3 my other concern was and I don't know if it got noted in the plat, those lots
4 abutting Spitz that you're developing, they won't have direct access to
5 Spitz, they're going to have to use Johnny Lee.
6
7 Calderazzo: Sure. Okay.
8
9 Terrazas: That's just, we don't want to have them all individual access. But that's all
10 I had as far as traffic.
11
12 H-Rogers: Now, do you recommend adding that as a plat note. Sometimes we do do
13 that because there shouldn't be direct access.
14
15 Terrazas: Yes.
16
17 H-Rogers: That's *(inaudible)*.
18
19 Terrazas: Yes, that'd be my recommendation.
20
21 H-Rogers: All right. Very good. And anything else in traffic?
22
23 Terrazas: That's all I have.
24
25 H-Rogers: Okay. I'm going to look to Fire, Mark Dubbin.
26
27 Dubbin: I think the applicant has addressed all of the concerns from the previous
28 review. So no issues at this time.
29
30 H-Rogers: Okay. Very good. MPO.
31
32 Loya: MPO has no comment on it.
33
34 H-Rogers: All right. And I'm going to look to Mr. Kinney with Engineering.
35
36 Kinney: Thank you, Madam Chair. I have one question about the curve down
37 here. That meets, I don't recall right off the top of my head the radius of
38 that. If it is 50 foot or less then you will have to get a variance from
39 *(inaudible)*.
40
41 Calderazzo: What would the minimum be here. What was the minimum radius you
42 would want to just eliminate having to do a variance?
43
44 Kinney: 50 or less.
45
46 Calderazzo: 50 or less here. On the inner radius or this on?

1
2 Kinney: Centerline radius.
3
4 Calderazzo: Centerline radius. That's the only sheet I didn't print was the curve data.
5
6 Kinney: Okay, that's fine. I just don't recall what that is.
7
8 Calderazzo: I'll verify it. I'll email it to you. Is that okay? I can send to you.
9
10 Kinney: That's fine.
11
12 Calderazzo: C four.
13
14 Kinney: C four is a 50 foot radius.
15
16 Calderazzo: So we're good.
17
18 Kinney: So that will require a variance.
19
20 Calderazzo: I thought you just said 50 or less.
21
22 Kinney: 50 foot or less.
23
24 Calderazzo: So that's 50 foot.
25
26 Prah: 49'11" and 15/63.
27
28 Calderazzo: I got you. Okay.
29
30 Kinney: If I read it correctly, it I interpret it correctly, a 50 foot, one inch was not
31 required.
32
33 Calderazzo: I got you.
34
35 H-Rogers: Anything else from engineering?
36
37 Kinney: I don't know if, as I sit here I don't receive a master drainage report for
38 that.
39
40 Calderazzo: The master drainage report is existing from the previous design set and
41 we had discussed a while back being able to use that original master
42 drainage report from Donohue.
43
44 Kinney: Okay.
45
46 Calderazzo: Does that, does that ...

1
2 Kinney: Has it been submitted for them to do Excella.
3
4 Calderazzo: It's not uploaded into Excella exact because you guys have, I think you all
5 have possession of it. So I'll have to work through that. Let me figure out
6 where it is. To be honest with you I don't I don't have the master change
7 report that was done previous.
8
9 H-Rogers: It's possible that we don't even have that file anymore.
10
11 Calderazzo: Okay.
12
13 H-Rogers: It's past our retention.
14
15 Calderazzo: Okay.
16
17 H-Rogers: But we would have to look into that. Michael, anything else?
18
19 Kinney: No, that's it.
20
21 H-Rogers: Okay. And Planning.
22
23 Castillo: At this time Planning still does have some outstanding issues with the
24 preliminary plat. So Easton Lane that goes east to west, we have
25 requested that it be changed to match the Dyne Road that, or Dyne. And
26 that we also have requested to ensure that all the lots will be buildable. I
27 know there were some previous ones located towards Hansen that were
28 ...
29
30 Calderazzo: This one.
31
32 Castillo: A bit smaller than ...
33
34 Calderazzo: Than the 5,000. It's just one or two I think.
35
36 H-Rogers: And those would require a formal variance unless they're modified
37 because the zoning requires it.
38
39 Calderazzo: Right but he was supposed to move that over. There's clearly a
40 discrepancy between center line on these lots here And that'll just resolve
41 it. I mean, we can resolve that.
42
43 H-Rogers: Okay.
44
45 Calderazzo: They all should be 5,000 minimum. Okay.
46

1 Castillo: Yes, other than there are minor comments to the cover sheets that
2 needed to be addressed.
3
4 Calderazzo: Okay.
5
6 Castillo: Planning did notice that there was discrepancy between acreages on the
7 title block, the dedication block, and within the notes.
8
9 Calderazzo: Acreages.
10
11 Castillo: Yes.
12
13 H-Rogers: Yes, Mr. Kenny.
14
15 Kinney: I didn't want to interrupt.
16
17 Castillo: No, you're good.
18
19 Kinney: Thank you Madam Chair. Just I was curious as to what the status is of the
20 preliminary plat in Excella (*inaudible*). Has it been approved or is it still in
21 the revisions required?
22
23 H-Rogers: I'm going to turn to John Castillo to answer that question.
24
25 Castillo: At the moment it's still under revisions required, as well as the master
26 plan. At the time of submission there are two applications in Excella, one
27 should be labeled as master plan, which is the more recent one, the
28 22CS0500012. And then the preliminary plat which is the ...
29
30 Kinney: This one here.
31
32 Castillo: The earlier case.
33
34 H-Rogers: Any other questions Mr. Kinney?
35
36 Kinney: Just procedural as to the, when this come before the DRC, shouldn't
37 everything in Excella through the various reviews and stuff, should that be
38 taken care of first?
39
40 H-Rogers: In a perfect world, yes. But sometimes if the applicant requests to move
41 forward, this board can hammer out some of those issues and details,
42 ultimately. But yes, there is due process and ultimately if the applicant
43 chooses to move forward, then we move them forward. That doesn't
44 necessarily mean that this board recommends approval. But yes,
45 sometimes this board is used to at least try to resolve some of those
46 issues.

1
2 Kinney: Okay.
3
4 H-Rogers: Does that answer the question? John, are there any other comments or
5 concerns or modifications required?
6
7 Castillo: At this moment I don't have any comments related to the master plan as I
8 haven't had a moment to take a look at it. But when I get a chance to look
9 at those, I would probably address those with the developer.
10
11 H-Rogers: Very good. And Utilities.
12
13 Nasir: As far as the plat, I have several comments that need to be addressed.
14 One of them is if there's going to be tract dedicated to the City or to
15 Utilities need to be specified and they're not on the plat. And also we
16 would like to have a note that we haven't, most of the plans which is the
17 subdivider is responsible for utilities stub outs. Subdivider is responsible
18 for utility stub outs. And for providing any and all easement necessary to
19 provide utility service to lots contained herein or something similar to that.
20 And on previous, for the master, that's it for the plat.
21
22 For the master plan I have made comments before as far as the utilities
23 master plan, and all of that. And as it was mentioned the preliminary plat
24 and the master plan are being reviewed. And on the master plan nothing
25 on the comments that I have made before have been addressed.
26
27 H-Rogers: All right. Thank you. All righty. Yes sir.
28
29 Kinney: Thank you Madam Chair. I don't know if this is the proper time to offer this
30 out. I know that this has gone, this zone has gone through multiple
31 reviews.
32
33 H-Rogers: Yes sir.
34
35 Kinney: And rather than just have it you know through electronic revisions that
36 require emails and stuff like that, I'd recommend staff and the developer
37 with his engineer or surveyors have a sit down meeting and just hammer
38 out all of these issues.
39
40 Calderazzo: I second that.
41
42 H-Rogers: That's an excellent idea. Very good. All righty. So we have a couple of
43 options here. I'm going to speak first and then I'll turn it over to you as the
44 applicant. So at this juncture based on a number of components that are
45 still not resolved, and are actually required by code, I would consider this,
46 at least the master plan portion incomplete. I don't think that you want to

1 move forward with a recommendation on that because that goes to
2 Planning and Zoning and they consider that pretty carefully. I would
3 recommend that perhaps we table this so that we can have that meeting,
4 reconvene with those resolutions and so that everybody's on the same
5 page. But I'm going to look to you applicant and hear what you have to
6 say.

7
8 Calderazzo: That's a great plan. I think one final you know, I mean obviously, the
9 process got askew. You know we were out of order in submission and
10 this kind of thing has created a lot of problems, a lot of comments and
11 different phases of this thing. So that is the best way I think to move
12 forward. And just one final sort of group meeting, I'll have the engineer
13 and the surveyor there and we can move this thing forward.

14
15 H-Rogers: Very good. So I'm going to, is there anything else you'd like to add before
16 I go to vote?

17
18 Calderazzo: No ma'am. That was painless.

19
20 H-Rogers: All righty. So I'm going to look to staff to see if there's a motion, approval,
21 denial, or for tabling? Yes, sir.

22
23 Kinney: Madam Chair. I make the motion to table.

24
25 H-Rogers: Yes sir.

26
27 Kinney: I guess tentatively for next week's DRC.

28
29 H-Rogers: Okay.

30
31 Kinney: Contingent upon if we're able to get everything taken care of, if not we'll
32 have to move to the following week just on how fast things go.

33
34 H-Rogers: Very good. So I'll take a second to that.

35
36 Terrazas: Second.

37
38 H-Rogers: Very good. And is there all the "ayes" on the table?

39
40 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

41
42 H-Rogers: Okay. Are there any "nays?" With that the project has been tabled. And
43 I will look to the project planner to schedule a meeting with all the
44 applicable people so that we can have everyone in the room to take a look
45 and resolve any of these lingering issues, as well as see if we can pull any

1 of the old files to see if there's any old drainage reports or other
2 documentation that can be utilized as part of this.

3
4 Calderazzo: And I'll see if I can get ahold of that drainage report myself. All right, and if
5 can't, just real quick question on the drainage report specifically. So if
6 there's one that exists, I think there is, we can use that, right, I mean
7 nothing has changed on that property from the original submission of, you
8 know there was a design for that subdivision, there was a lot of
9 parallelograms and all kinds of crazy things going on. But the drainage
10 report should be sufficient if it's okay.

11
12 Kinney: It may need to be updated.

13
14 Calderazzo: Okay.

15
16 Kinney: And it depends on, I've seen in several of the drainage, older drainage
17 reports or the storm, the synthetic storm that they used to calculate was
18 based upon what's called a typical type 2 storm, which is not what's
19 required by code. So it the report may need to be updated or revised and
20 updated.

21
22 Calderazzo: Okay.

23
24 Kinney: And the final drainage report would need to be submitted, which can be
25 based upon the master drainage report, assuming there is no change
26 needed to be done to the master drainage report.

27
28 Calderazzo: Okay.

29
30 H-Rogers: We'll see what we have in our files. We'll take a look.

31
32 Calderazzo: Okay. Cool. Thank you very much Katherine. Thank you all.

33
34 Kinney: Get this going.

35
36 Calderazzo: All right. Appreciate it.

37
38 **4.2 Case 21CS0500069: Camino Hills Subdivision Preliminary Plat**

- 39 • A request for approval of a Preliminary Plat known as Camino Hills
40 Subdivision.
- 41 • The proposed subdivision encompasses 10.954 +/- acres, is zoned R-
42 1a (Single-Family Medium Density), is located west of Spitz St. and
43 northeast of El Camino Real.
- 44 • The Master Plan proposes 52 single-family residential lots with five
45 tracts of land for drainage. The master plan shall be required to follow
46 all to develop Hanson Ave. and Spitz St.

- Submitted by Sierra Steve Calderazzo, representative.

SEE ABOVE DISCUSSION.

4.3 Permit # 22Cb0501270 - Bobren Center Phase 2 - 1323 E. Lohman (corner of Solano & Lohman)

- A request for approval for a right-turn only exit, driveway (onto Solano), which will be located less than 250 feet from Lohman (as required by Sec. 32-404.2.g).
- Issues for consideration in Phase 2.
 - Acceleration lane warrant
 - Provide queuing analysis at proposed access points, Solano/Lohman. Espanola/Lohman.
 - Provide traffic weaving analysis.
 - Provide TIA to address site access as well as internal circulation for current and phase 2 (future development).

H-Rogers: All righty. So one last item on the agenda. And that is the Bobren Center Phase 2, request for a right turn only exit driveway onto Solano. And I'm going to go ahead, and I'm not really quite sure if it was you Hector, or so I will go ahead and turn to Mr. Kinney to go ahead and give a description of the project.

Kinney: Thank you, Madam Chair. This is for the Bobren Center Phase 2 for the permit number 22CB0501270. It's a request for approval for a right turn only exit driveway onto Solano. That driveway will be located less than 250 feet from Lohman Avenue, as required by code which requires 250 feet. It's going to be more like 70 to 80 feet. And along with that, the applicant is also asking for consideration relief from some of the other requirements that were put on Phase 2 as a result of traffic's approval for Phase 1. Phase 1, some of the conditions that they, that traffic required was, one was to have a ITE trip generation rates, which were submitted on the final plan on I think sheet 1.0. As to whether or not those items are accurate or not, I'm not going to address that right now.

And the other issue is that we're an acceleration warrant, providing a queuing analysis for close access points of traffic alleviating analysis and TIA. Traffic Impact Analysis to address the site access as well as internal circulation and the applicant is seeking relief from those as well. In some of my discussions with Traffic last week, there was a consensus among the group as to what traffic section would like to see. I don't know if it's the time to bring that up or not.

Terrazas: Sure.

1 Kinney: The traffic section was agreeable to have the right turn exit only driveway
2 to be approved with that on the condition that a one foot wide curb,
3 concrete curb would be installed between the boundary lines at Solano
4 and Lohman down to the northern boundary line along Solano.
5

6 Terrazas: Madam Chair. Let me expand on that. So I know the request is to get a
7 variance from what code is. The reason we have that is because we don't
8 want to increase safety issues out there. We have, I'm pretty sure
9 everyone knows we have an issue with Si Señor and how that backs up.
10 I'm glad that you're proposing just an exit only because that's going to not
11 cause the same thing issue that we have at Si Señor. We can kind of
12 mitigate that. And this is something that we discussed would be to
13 mitigate. The traffic concern would be because of the steep exit only, if
14 we don't have any kind of mitigation measures here, people will start using
15 that as an entrance. Of course we can't control what people do, so that's
16 the best measure. So that's something that we're proposing.
17

18 Farmer: I don't know that you could enter that, but it's your opinion. If you go look
19 at that and see if you can enter in that. It'd be really hard; you'd go over
20 all the curb. Because you've got these curbs running just like this one, this
21 one's built just like that.
22

23 Terrazas: I understand that. I understand that.
24

25 H-Rogers: Can you state your name for the record?
26

27 Farmer: Yes. Randy farmer.
28

29 Terrazas: Mr. Farmer. I'm just talking about traffic going south on Solano, it'd be a
30 straight shot. So, like Mr. Kinney mentioned, if mitigation measure in this
31 case would be concrete header curb be put here to alleviate that. Then
32 Traffic will be amicable to approve that. Without that, we would need a
33 reasoning, technical reasoning on why the 250 feet can't be met. And I
34 understand you're landlocked with that.
35

36 Like Mr. Mike said, I did review the trip generation. There's a couple of
37 comments here. The square footage is wrong because it's only for Phase
38 2, it should be for Phase 1 and 2. And then of course, we got to use the
39 latest one. And then if you use the latest one actually reduces your trips.
40 Because it's 8/20 it was like 40,000 feet or bigger. And if you use the
41 latest one, it's for a smaller strip mall. So that actually helped. So I kind of
42 looked at it already, it doesn't create such an issue. If it was like a fast
43 food restaurant, we wouldn't be talking just mitigation, there would be a
44 whole different thing. But looking at that, traffic's okay with waiting all the
45 other ones as long as we put the mitigation measure here, and we

1 probably just steepen this a little bit more, that way we don't have people
2 trying to, even northbound trying to do that.
3

4 Dubbin: I have a question for traffic actually. Can we put the header curb, if the
5 client agrees, can we start it further back so that we can still have that left
6 turn? Because it's going to make it very difficult to.
7

8 Terrazas: Yes. So for that we'll work with the engineer of record. If this is something
9 that they can move forward with, and we'll probably have them build it roll
10 over, 25 feet from this. So Fire won't have issue.
11

12 Dubbin: I wouldn't want an official record that said it had to be built like right there.
13

14 Terrazas: Right. Right. So yes, but for this something where we can accommodate
15 mountable rollover curb.
16

17 Dubbin: Okay. Thanks.
18

19 Kinney: So if I understand correctly, paraphrasing what Traffic section would be
20 comfortable with was building the header curb there along Solano. Then
21 the other items as far as just other, having to update the trip generation on
22 the plan, the other issues that they're asking relief from.
23

24 Terrazas: Yes. So just ...
25

26 Kinney: Traffic ...
27

28 Terrazas: To just clear it up.
29

30 Kinney: Not insist upon those.
31

32 Terrazas: Right. Well, I would just want the updated trip generation for the latest
33 edition with 8:22 on the plans as you have it now, just updated. And then
34 of course the mitigation measures, all the other stuff, the full TIA access
35 would be waived.
36

37 H-Rogers: I'm going to go; I know that we've got a couple of staff members that may
38 have some interest in this. I'm going to go ahead and open it up to staff
39 for discussion. Fire, did you have any other concerns or questions about
40 this as long as the rollover curb is addressed and you don't have issues
41 with the trucks turning at that location?
42

43 Dubbin: No, no, no other concerns.
44

45 H-Rogers: And I'm going to look to long range planning who is here as well.
46

1 Miller: Yes, I did kind of have a broad question about the site plan. I'm not sure if
2 this has been discussed previously. Kind of speaking from the
3 Comprehensive Plan, obviously, you know we support increased infill
4 development. But this particular location is the potential location for a
5 neighborhood center and the intersection of two mixed use corridors. The
6 recommendations of the Comprehensive Plan do discuss activating that
7 pedestrian access to development along these corridors. I know there's a
8 lot of questions about queuing here, so I am curious if any discussion has
9 taken place about this arrangement of parking in the front right directly off
10 of the sidewalk, as opposed to pushing the parking in the rear, pushing
11 this exit further back. I know there could be some issue with proximity to
12 that alley, but that could assist with those queuing questions. It'd be
13 interesting with that group and then you all have to ...
14
15 Terrazas: Madam Chair.
16
17 Miller: Any thoughts on that?
18
19 Terrazas: And Mark. I think we have discussed this on the Phase 1, on the first
20 portion that's already built out. And that was something that I think the
21 applicant looked at and they didn't want to go for that. As far as
22 engineering and traffic, we would have been fine for them to have access,
23 shared access for that alley, because that alley's going to always have to
24 have access for all the utilities that are in there. But I don't think that I'll
25 leave it up to the applicant, I don't want to (*inaudible*).
26
27 H-Rogers: So as I understand we don't have any regulations in place at this point in
28 time to request that or ask them of that and they designed the site and a
29 portion of its already constructed. And unfortunately moving that building
30 to a different location would interrupt a lot of things that have already,
31 infrastructure that's already been put in place.
32
33 Miller: Existing utilities. Okay. I was just curious.
34
35 H-Rogers: But I would agree with your assessment, and we as staff actually had that
36 discussion early on.
37
38 Miller:
39
40 H-Rogers: A good solution to it, push those buildings to the front.
41
42 Miller: Got you. Yes, I don't put anything further at this point.
43
44 H-Rogers: Okay. MPO any concern concerns?
45

1 Loya: We do not have any concerns as long, because that is a very short
2 section, as long as there's like no crossing traffic. So mitigation measures,
3 we would support it.
4

5 H-Rogers: Very good. Planning.
6

7 Castillo: At this moment, I don't have any questions for, No questions or
8 outstanding comments.
9

10 H-Rogers: And Utilities.
11

12 Nasir: We have no issues. We definitely will support what staff recommends.
13

14 H-Rogers: And Engineering, I'm going to go back to you. Were there any other
15 lingering issues?
16

17 Kinney: No, ma'am other than initially my thought process was to possibly ask the
18 applicant to install the vertical delineators, plastic work, like they have
19 similar to, on Solano running north/south there in front of Si Señor or in
20 other places in town. My understanding from speaking with the Traffic
21 engineer and with Hector is that those devices are considered temporary.
22 There's process in the works with Public Works through the CIP process
23 to install a header curb on Solano in front of Si Señor and also in other
24 places in town. So that's the reason for the request for the header curb,
25 because that's a permanent (*inaudible*).
26

27 H-Rogers: Okay. Any other comments from staff? Are there any comments from the
28 applicant?
29

30 Farmer: Yes. Okay. It's really not this. It's every single one. Every single job
31 we've done. We've come, we come in here and talk to staff and they say
32 yes, we want to infill, we want infill, we want infill. And I come every time
33 and I say okay, here's what we're thinking over here. We did the Taqueria
34 Chavez and we ended up having to buy the lot next door. We ended up
35 taking the neighbor's drainage. We ended up doing everything you know
36 that you guys asked for that we could do to get it and it worked out great.
37

38 Every lot that we have not a single lot has 250 feet to put that entrance in.
39 You know the entrance is not, all the lots that are designed in the infill
40 don't have that from the corners. Not a single one. Good instance is we
41 did the Pioneer Bank. And we had some issues all the way, even all the
42 way till the final on the exit that'd been there for 20 years. And we moved
43 it and then in moving it then we didn't meet the thing and so we had to go
44 back and you know we moved it because that's what was asked of us and
45 we moved it, and then we ended up at the end having to put up a no turn
46 right, no left turn out of that entrance and we did that.

1
2 But I mean, it's every single one of these. And the reason is because they
3 have the rules and the rules don't meet any of this that we've got here.
4 And so it's not like we're expecting them to just say the rules not there, the
5 rule is there. But we have worked tirelessly to make these as safe as we
6 can.

7
8 And we noticed when we were doing this in Phase 1, the traffic coming in
9 and out of this works really well. The problem is the people that want to
10 go north end up coming out this way. And you can look at all your traffic
11 statics and everything, this is where all the accidents are, right, here's
12 where the accidents are. So we thought, okay let's just go ahead and
13 block that off, we'll just not make that exit, we can do that. We can not
14 make that exit. That will be fine with us. You know this may cost us so
15 much that that's our only option is to just go ahead and block the exit off
16 and just have the back end right there and that would be fine. But that's
17 forcing the people out from this right here to go north. And that may be
18 what you'd like. I'll do it. This right here, if you've come out to this
19 intersection at any point in time, this up here, these people are coming
20 down and they're coming off that thing and a lot of them are going to turn
21 on Solano. So they're coming in, and there's, and you can't see because
22 of how this is, the way it is back that way. So that is not, so we can just
23 cut that off. If that's the so desire. We've already removed four entrances
24 in the Phase 1 like they wanted and we're removing another one here,
25 which then we have really no access off of Lohman except this one which
26 we have. There's a decel lane here all the way up past the gas station.
27 And it's marked off here so you don't really have any cars coming up here.
28 This is (*inaudible*) prior to us even going in there. So this is a very safe
29 exit.

30
31 We looked at this as being a very safe exit because this has a stoplight
32 and this has a stoplight. And anytime you want to pull out of there, it's no
33 issue. We didn't ever consider anybody pulling into that thing, but to cut
34 that street and put that curb in there it's going to cost us more than most of
35 the project so we would probably just chop that off. But that will force
36 everybody out that entrance.

37
38 Prael: Which might be better.

39
40 Farmer: Yes, which might, which is going to make that worse. We are very aware
41 of what happened here. Because we don't want that to happen anywhere.
42 And that's what we've, if you'll look at every project we have done, we
43 have tried to mitigate and make it as safe as we can, but we also try to
44 build out these projects. And see these alleys, it says that you can't use
45 those as paved ways. And so you know, and right now if you'll look on
46 that they've got all the dumpsters and everything for this and this. And the

1 reason we chose that in the first place is this is going to make this
2 business dangerous and this business dangerous if we tried to use that as
3 a dual access right there. And so we looked at all the ways we could do
4 this and we thought the best thing was to, you know we had no problem
5 blocking out the things on Lohman because nobody wants out there on
6 Lohman and basically that's what you're asking for even up on Northrise
7 and everything is no access coming out, just on the side streets. And so I
8 think that's a good idea.
9

10 But I don't see how we can continue to do these, especially with the
11 engineers because they're going to all give up on us. Because what they
12 do is they draw it and it's denied, and we know it's going to be. You know
13 we know pretty much it's going to be denied because there's nothing to
14 meet. And we need some kind of form of way to come to the City and say
15 what will meet and then if you ask for 20 studies about how to do it, it
16 becomes cost prohibitive and the engineer doesn't know, you know when
17 he redraws and redraws and redraws you know he estimates the job in the
18 beginning and doesn't get paid. And so it doesn't make it any easier on
19 him. It doesn't make it any easier on us, except for what will happen is we
20 can have other people build the infill and I think we as a team have been
21 really careful at building every one of those infills and trying to make them
22 as safe as we can, but they're never going to meet the code. They're
23 never going to. We started on Solano, we built a strip center on Solano
24 and the first thing they wanted us to do was replace the water lines in the
25 street. And I'm going like we don't even, you know utilities came back and
26 asked us if we'd replace the water, and I go no. And so we said we'll just
27 give up on the project.
28

29 But I mean everything, there's demands made upon us to fix problems that
30 were already there. And I don't know how we can fix those problems. So
31 I have lots of other examples, but it's every single one we come into to try
32 to do the infill. So we need a step to make that happen. Do we go to the
33 DRC first? Because even if we ask for a variance, the problem is the
34 variance, it doesn't pass the code. So they've got to deny it. I mean, they
35 vote, you know I'm looking at it and I'm saying, okay I mean, I'm not
36 blaming them for denying it, I'm just saying, what do we do? How do we
37 make this so it really works and is still safe? And to me this was the safest
38 way to do it. But I mean that concrete thing is going to make it cost
39 prohibitive for our owner. And so what we'll probably do is just block out
40 that exit. And then we'll also kill this exit because if we put them out, if we
41 don't kill that exit it's going to be a nightmare. Right now people still turn in
42 that. There's no way they can touch this one. This one if you try, I don't
43 know that I could get in there backwards the way we did it. You maybe
44 ought to try it because I don't think you can. And I just think the steep as
45 we're making those that would be very dangerous to pull in there. Maybe

1 somebody'd try it, but we could also put no entrance sign out there. And
2 so it's up to you guys.

3
4 H-Rogers: No, I appreciate your comments. And yes these infill sites can be really
5 tricky. And ultimately I think the City just wants to see that sometimes
6 we've got these really bad situations and to make them better, and I think
7 you're trying to do that. And so we appreciate that. And moving forward
8 as we rewrite the codes; we've been considering how to at least make
9 some of these infill sites a little bit easier to develop while still improving
10 that situation. But we'll see what happens. And I encourage you to take
11 part in assisting us during that review when those drafts get out for review,
12 and make commentary. Because it's really important since you're one of
13 the primary people that does (*inaudible*) these.

14
15 Farmer: The problem with those drafts remember is we need to actually, we can't
16 go through and just spin our wheels because everybody, our time is all we
17 have. We're just billing for time. We may build, but we're billing for time.
18 And so I know we've had a couple of people come to us and ask for other
19 things to get rebuilt over here. I said don't touch them, because that's
20 going to require, it's going to demand a decel lane, and you don't, first of
21 all you don't own the property next to you, so how do you go about putting
22 in a decel lane over there when they go to rebuild over there? And how
23 do you, you know because that's what it calls for. And that's what you
24 want. And they only have access off of Amador. And there's some down
25 the way, and they only have access off of Amador, and so how do you put
26 a decel lane? I mean you know so what we need to do is bring to the
27 property and say, okay what are you guys going to require on this
28 property? And we need to be able to have somebody say, okay this is
29 what we're going to require, and knowing, so that we can then go forward
30 and not do something or do something. Because you're going to end up
31 with some properties that can't be rebuilt.

32
33 H-Rogers: So I know that Michael had a comment and then Mark.

34
35 Kinney: I had a couple of comments left. Thank you Madam Chair. I believe Mr.
36 Farmer you mentioned something about cutting the asphalt to install the
37 curb. My understanding in speaking with traffic, is it possible to dowel
38 into, the dowel rebar into the ... is that correct?

39
40 Terrazas: Yes, I mean it's been done that the asphalt's not cut in, it's (*inaudible*)
41 concrete, anchored in.

42
43 Farmer: It's only a foot wide.

44
45 Terrazas: It is a foot, well typically we would just prefer back to back curb.

46

1 Kinney: Back to back curb. Yes.
2
3 Terrazas: So at the top of it, you would see, and Jaime knows what I'm talking about,
4 one and a half foot wide curve, one and a half the other one. So it's three
5 foot wide with the top being six inch, the non-mountable part.
6
7 Farmer: Isn't that going to narrow those lanes?
8
9 Terrazas: Probably. A little bit.
10
11 Kinney: But it is possible. I understand, my understanding ...
12
13 Terrazas: But it is possible ...
14
15 Kinney: To dowel in rebar into the pavement without having ... in other words it's
16 possible do it without (*inaudible*).
17
18 Farmer: You could imagine the traffic analysis we're going to have to turn into to
19 get that blocked off so we can do that.
20
21 Terrazas: You mean the traffic control.
22
23 Farmer: Yes.
24
25 Kinney: Doesn't need to be ...
26
27 Terrazas: More likely it's just a typical traffic control. I mean ...
28
29 Farmer: Yes except you have those people coming up on Lohman turning, you
30 know people coming down Amador turning.
31
32 Terrazas: Right.
33
34 Farmer: So it's that little section of Solano is probably the busiest piece.
35
36 Terrazas: It's going to be a mess trying to deal with traffic. As far as the traffic
37 control, I mean I can't speak for that, but it's going back to ...
38
39 Kinney: It would require a traffic control plan and probably you might have
40 restricted times as to do the construction work. Would definitely
41 (*inaudible*) during peak hours. But I just wanted to point out that it's my
42 understanding it's possible to (*inaudible*) without having to (*inaudible*) you
43 know three, what is it, four feet or more and that overestimate. It's
44 possible to be able to do that.
45

1 The other comment is that the existing driveway that is to the west of the
2 exit only driveway on East Lohman, that will, regardless of the decision
3 today from the DRC, that driveway will have to be closed.
4
5 Prah: This one.
6
7 Kinney: Yes, the existing one.
8
9 Farmer: Well, we have that.
10
11 Kinney: It will have to be closed. That would be a condition of approval.
12
13 Farmer: So if we just take that exit out, we're good.
14
15 Kinney: The right turn, the right out.
16
17 Farmer: That's what you want.
18
19 Kinney: No.
20
21 Farmer: Well, I mean, that's my, I know what I got a preliminary cost on that. And
22 the traffic control is not cheap. And that concrete is not cheap to put out
23 there. And they're worried about how they dowel in there because if they
24 dowel in there, they've doweled it before in the concrete, you get a couple
25 of trucks that ...
26
27 Prah: Wipe it out.
28
29 Farmer: It'll wipe it right out. And who's responsible.
30
31 Prah: Parking bumper.
32
33 Farmer: It's a parking bumper, really.
34
35 Terrazas: So yes, so right now we're discussing options. You discussed that maybe
36 closing it up. If you guys do close it off and you just end up with the two
37 entrances that are there now being used. I'm sorry, the two driveways,
38 one exit only, and the other one that's a double, I would just require that
39 we just update the trip generation anyway. I kind of looked at it already.
40 There's very few trips going out. That's why we're okay, like I mentioned
41 earlier. If it was a fast food restaurant, that'd be a whole different thing.
42 We would still want all the stuff that we requested in the first place. During
43 the first phase, the reason we requested it was because it was a shell
44 building, we really didn't know what was going on here. That's why I went,
45 sometimes you come to us and you tell us well it's a shell building, well.
46

1 Farmer: We don't know what's going to go up there.
2
3 Terrazas: I understand that. You guys don't know. We don't know.
4
5 Farmer: Sure.
6
7 Terrazas: Mark's trying to figure out how much to charge you guys for your firer
8 impact fee. It's a moving goalpost. But yes that's why it was requested.
9 But we're looking at the trip generation, it's not that much. That's why
10 we're willing to, if you guys are still wanting to do that, then that mitigation
11 measure would help with that. And now only that as is.
12
13 Rodriguez: I do have one question. Jaime Rodriguez, the engineer of record. Hector
14 for the curb, we're not putting in a two way driveway, right. So we're not
15 promoting any entrance so there's, we're not promoting any entrance from
16 either direction. Why is it that the exit only signage, we're steepening the
17 curb angle, the driveway angle with the curbs to promote the right turn exit
18 only. I guess I'm trying to understand where the logic is coming from that
19 there's an assumption being made that someone's going to just, because
20 this isn't a get to the driveway location and make a left turn, this is making
21 a huge assumption that the driver is going to basically take oncoming
22 traffic on and try to cross two lanes of traffic to get into a signed exit only
23 driveway. So I guess my question to you is where is the reasoning behind
24 saying we need a curb to deter someone from doing this when it's not a
25 driveway that's promoting an entrance, it's clearly going to be signed as an
26 exit only and designed and built as an exit only.
27
28 Terrazas: Right.
29
30 Rodriguez: So that's my big question is where is it, where's, how do we substantiate
31 requesting a stand up curb at this location?
32
33 Terrazas: So as far as that the reason.
34
35 Dubbin: I'll take that. I mean just I look at the, I hate the curbs. I mean, I'll just tell
36 you. You know they make it very difficult for us.
37
38 Rodriguez: Sure.
39
40 Dubbin: But I look at the exact exit coming from the tower onto Main. You know
41 that one's side, it doesn't have the nice angle like that, but people are
42 always making a left turn across a four lane road there where it's clearly
43 marked. In front of station one, across the street here. When they
44 installed the CVS, we have a curb that extends all the way to the station
45 one entrance. And people are always turning left, you know within 200

1 feet of a major intersection and they go around the curb coming into
2 oncoming traffic.
3
4 Farmer: And it's a single lane entrance.
5
6 Dubbin: Well there's a curb.
7
8 Farmer: No, but is there a single lane entrance that they're pulling into that's
9 curbed.
10
11 Dubbin: It's double because it encourages a right because ...
12
13 Pacheco: It's open.
14
15 Dubbin: It's coming
16
17 Farmer: And it's open. This is a single lane.
18
19 Dubbin: I'm just telling you.
20
21 Farmer: It's a single lane curbed.
22
23 Dubbin: We get a lot of danger lovers that just love to go into oncoming traffic.
24
25 Farmer: Well you can't determine; they could go over the curb.
26
27 Dubbin: Some of them do. To answer your question, people just do it. And no
28 matter how much you try to discourage it's difficult.
29
30 Terrazas: Another example with that, we just put some delineators on Idaho
31 between the gas station and that. A lot of people you know when our
32 contractor was putting them up, they're going maybe 150 feet opposite to
33 just go into that gas station to put it. Of course, it's not meant for, it's not
34 designed like this, but now if you think about it, the reason that that
35 medium would help out to discourage people is because if you're going
36 here this way, it's going to be very easily, even with the signs, to just make
37 a left. It's very inviting for southbound traffic. So that need is really to
38 restrict people southbound Solano going in there instead of going all the
39 way around going the other way. And accessing off of Espanola. So
40 that's, I don't know if that answers your question.
41
42 Rodriguez: I mean it answered my question in the sense that it's, your guy's
43 experience and opinion, that's where this is coming from obviously is that's
44 what I'm trying to get at. Because the Brake Masters has a, I mean they
45 have a driveway right there off of Solano. They're constantly traffic in and
46 out of that driveway.

1
2 Terrazas: Correct.
3
4 Rodriguez: So I mean that's just where the questions coming from, is what is this
5 really based on? And I just want to make it clear that if it's something very
6 specific that we can address, a code item or some section of it, then we
7 can speak to that. But I just wanted to make it clear than what we're
8 talking about here is your guy's opinion, granted experience based on
9 other situations, but that's where this is coming from.
10
11 Terrazas: Right.
12
13 Rodriguez: And it is a very distinct design compared to some of the other locations
14 that we're discussing, because they are entrances as well. So I just
15 wanted to make sure that we're clear on, that we're trying to draw
16 comparisons here, but it's not necessarily the same.
17
18 H-Rogers: Yes Fire.
19
20 Dubbin: My comment I was going to make earlier was actually to respond to Mr.
21 Farmer's very excellent question about what to do in these projects. And I
22 think probably the best use of your time is what you suggested, to come to
23 DRC early on and get some direction on these. Because they, a lot of
24 them are frankly a case by case sort of a deal because they don't meet the
25 code. So how do we meet the intent. And this is the body to get that
26 direction. So I would encourage you to visit, to get on the agenda for DRC
27 in the future. That's all
28
29 Farmer: Yes, I just don't think we're, I still don't understand why that isn't getting
30 granted. Because if you watch all the trucks that deliver to this, they cut
31 right up this alley right here. And so what you're going to do is probably
32 get people coming out here and going this way to miss that.
33
34 Prael: There was a was a business there, in and out right there at one time, too.
35
36 Farmer: Yes.
37
38 Prael: When they took that, when they demoed that building, the two building.
39
40 Farmer: Yes, the business we had their went both ways.
41
42 Prael: So this is even better than it was.
43
44 Farmer: I mean we tried to make it as safe as we could. That exit, I just don't see, I
45 mean for a safe exit, it's a safe exit because of the two stoplights.
46 Because I mean there's lots of time there when there's no traffic going out.

1 And I don't know how you can tell people, no matter how many signs or
2 barriers or whatever, no matter how far we go down there, if they're really
3 going to try to do that they'll go, they'll start further down. So I just, and
4 that's you know, I'm sure our owner won't write the check.
5
6 H-Rogers: So I do have a question for traffic. I'm just curious. Is it possible that if a
7 TIA was done for this, it could state that barrier, the concrete barrier isn't
8 required in between the two lanes?
9
10 Terrazas: That could be part of it. I would kind of contest that assumption because
11 going back to why we need this, going back to code. This is arterial like
12 you mentioned, it is very heavy intersection. If we were doing this from
13 scratch, we would have median access control all along Solano. Probably
14 going to feed in every direction.
15
16 Farmer: If it wasn't infill.
17
18 Terrazas: If it was brand new. So I understand your concern that we're trying to fix
19 stuff that's already there. That's why we're kind of meeting you halfway, if
20 you really need that access. If you don't, if you're saying that it's going to
21 be cut out, that mitigation measure ...
22
23 Farmer: Well it isn't we don't need it, it's that you're making it so that it's cost
24 prohibitive.
25
26 Prael: That's more dangerous.
27
28 Farmer: That's more dangerous. I just, when you go up there, try it. See how you
29 do.
30
31 Terrazas: So you back Chair to that. If the TIA says this is a safer movement than
32 over the there because it's going to cause accidents and that median is
33 not approved then yes that could be a recommendation the TIA. As far as
34 the City accepting it, I don't know if that'd be something I would agree with.
35
36 Kinney: I didn't catch that.
37
38 Terrazas: I don't think I would agree if a report said that no access control the
39 intersection is safer than one that does have access control.
40
41 Farmer: So we'll just submit it back with that gone.
42
43 Terrazas: Okay.
44

1 H-Rogers: So are there any sort of lingering comments. This is, I'm not really quite
2 sure how one would formulate a motion on this. I think it's maybe a menu
3 of options, perhaps.
4

5 Farmer: If we take that access out, my question is, can we go forward?
6

7 H-Rogers: I'm going to traffic and engineering on this one.
8

9 Terrazas: My only concern was that. So for traffic, as long as we update this and
10 that driveway is removed. And that the old legacy driveway south exit only
11 is removed.
12

13 Farmer: It's already in the plats to take out.
14

15 Terrazas: Is removed, that's all my concerns. That's all that would satisfy us. I don't
16 know if Mr. Kinney has anything else. And then as far as everything else,
17 I don't know, I mean I can't speak for Utilities or Fire, all the building.
18

19 Farmer: I'm all done except for you just have to check the corrections. And I just
20 need Stan to check the corrections. We've made the correction and
21 they're already pre-submitted. So I just have, he still has time. I mean I
22 just needed.
23

24 Castillo: I'll get there.
25

26 Farmer: But I just need him and Ben in there, the Corrections have all been made
27 on everything else. So all we need is them to sign off and then we're
28 done. If we actually didn't put anything in on yours, you just, you denied
29 us to go to DRC. So if he's okay with that, we'll just submit that gone.
30 And we're done.
31

32 H-Rogers: So what I would recommend that if a motion is made that it's based on this
33 site plan. And so that if a new site plan is submitted eliminating that
34 driveway, then that motion essentially goes away. So the motion needs to
35 be based on this design and this specific request, even if you're choosing
36 to modify it later.
37

38 Farmer: Yes, well we're just going to submit it right back immediately.
39

40 H-Rogers: Sure.
41

42 Farmer: Showing that's gone.
43

44 H-Rogers: So I would ...
45

46 Nasir: So we're denying the variance basically.

1
2 H-Rogers: Or you're getting the variance with that access control, and then the
3 updated, correct. You'd be approving the variance with access control
4 and with an updated trip generation.
5
6 Terrazas: Yes.
7
8 H-Rogers: Yes. Okay. So if I could get a motion on this site plan. And of course if
9 the site plan is modified, then it's a moot point. So that you understand if
10 you come back in and eliminate that, then it's eliminated and your request
11 is ...
12
13 Terrazas: Chair. I'll try and take a crack at it. I make a motion that if this layout
14 dated, I think the latest layout is 2-7 22 C 1.0, if the if the exit only onto
15 Solano is to remain, they do mitigation measure including, permanent
16 stand up curb along the frontage side. And that they update the IT trip
17 generation.
18
19 H-Rogers: Is there a second on that?
20
21 Dubbin: Second.
22
23 H-Rogers: All those in favor?
24
25 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.
26
27 H-Rogers: Any opposed? All right, with that motion passes with the conditions. And
28 as I'd stated before, if this gets revised and that access gets eliminated,
29 then we move forward. All right, are there any other comments from the
30 board?
31
32 Nasir: I do have one.
33
34 H-Rogers: Sure.
35
36 Nasir: Madam Chair. I just have a question for the board onto why are we
37 bringing Public Works variances on to DRC?
38
39 H-Rogers: That's a really good question.
40
41 Kinney: I didn't hear the question.
42
43 H-Rogers: I will repeat it for you. The question is why are we bringing Public Works
44 variances to DRC? And essentially there were some internal discussions
45 that this would be a good and formal way to review and/or make a motion
46 on the site variances. Because sometimes they tend to get stuck and

1 there's a disagreement amongst departments about how they should be
2 handled. And this way it formalizes that. Does that help?
3
4 Nasir: Yes.
5
6 H-Rogers: All righty.
7
8 Farmer: Thank you, everyone.
9
10 H-Rogers: Thank you gentlemen.
11
12 Farmer: And thank you, Mark that's a good recommendation. Because we can
13 spend two weeks kind of just going in circles and circles and goes to
14 Hector and upstairs and down here again. A good solution for everybody.
15
16 Dubbin: It doesn't have to be on the agenda as an action item, it can just be an
17 item for discussion.
18
19 H-Rogers: Absolutely.
20
21 Terrazas: And if you guys want to just be with me, if traffic is your main thing, just set
22 up a meeting with me.
23
24 Farmer: But the problem is how can you approve it because it's, you know, and
25 then if you go and say we want 20 studies, we're done because no
26 owner's going to go in there and start writing a check for all that.
27
28 Terrazas: As long as you tell me what you guys are, as close as you can to what it's
29 going to be. I mean, a fast food place versus a dentist office.
30
31 **5. ADJOURNMENT (10:00 a.m.)**
32
33 H-Rogers: Let's go ahead and adjourn this and then you can control discussion. I'd
34 like to go ahead and get a motion for adjournment.
35
36 Kinney: *(raised his hand).*
37
38 H-Rogers: And Rocio would you like to second, Mike raised his hand first.
39
40 Nasir: Second.
41
42 H-Rogers: Al right. All those in favor?
43
44 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.
45
46 H-Rogers: That's unanimous. All right. We are adjourned. Thank you

1
2
3
4
5
6

Chairperson

1 **DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE (DRC)**

2
3 Following are the minutes from the City of Las Cruces Development Review Committee
4 Meeting held Wednesday, November 3, 2021, at 9:00 a.m. in Room 1158.

5
6 **DRC PRESENT:** David Weir, Chief Planning Administrator
7 Mark Dubbin, Fire Department
8 Rocio Nasir, Senior Engineer, Utilities
9 Mike Kinney, Project Manager, Community Development

10
11 **STAFF PRESENT:** John Castillo, Permit Tech, Community Development
12 Robert Messenger, Active Transportation Coordinator
13 Becky Baum, Recording Secretary, RC Creations, LLC

14
15 **OTHER PRESENT:** Paul Pompeo, Souder Miller
16 Mike Johnson, Souder Miller

17
18
19 **I. CALL TO ORDER (9:02 a.m.)**

20
21 Weir: We're going to go ahead and call the meeting of the DRC to order, 9:01.

22
23 **II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – October 20, 2021**

24
25 Weir: First order of business is approval of minutes from October 20, 2021. Do I
26 have a motion to approve? M

27
28 Kinney: Motion.

29
30 Weir: Motioned by Mike. Do I have a second?

31
32 Dubbin: Second.

33
34 Weir: Okay. All those in favor?

35
36 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

37
38 Weir: All those opposed. Okay, minutes are approved. That's the first for a while.

39
40 **III. OLD BUSINESS - None.**

41
42 Weir: Old business, we have none.

43
44 **IV. NEW BUSINESS**

45
46 **1. Case 21CS0500097: Tierra Del Sol Subdivision**

- 1 • A request for approval of a Preliminary Plat known as Tierra Del Sol
- 2 Subdivision.
- 3 • The proposed subdivision encompasses 6.09 + acres, is zoned R-1aC
- 4 (Single-Family Medium Density-Conditional), is located at the northwest
- 5 corner of Central Road and Mesa Drive.
- 6 • The preliminary plat proposes 18 single-family residential lots.
- 7 • Submitted by Souder Miller and Associates, representative.
- 8

9 Weir: We have one item on new business. It is the Tierra Del Sol Subdivision.
10 John, do you want to introduce this and give your recommendation?

11
12 Castillo: Yes. So this is the Tierra Del Sol Subdivision. Today we are doing a
13 request for approval of a preliminary plat known as Tierra Del Sol
14 Subdivision. This property encompasses 6.09 acres. It is currently zoned
15 R-1aC, which is single-family medium density with a condition. It's also
16 located at the northwest corner of Central Road and Mesa Drive. The
17 preliminary plan proposes 18 single-family residential lots and it's going to
18 dedicate approximately two acres for a park. This was submitted by Souder
19 Miller and Associates, as the representative on behalf of Terra Del Sol
20 Housing Corporation.

21
22 Weir: Okay. Mr. Pompeo, Mr. Johnson. Anything you want to add?

23
24 Pompeo: Thank you. Once again it's an 18 lot subdivision, also has a slightly over
25 two acre tract so we meet the City standard for the minimum park size.

26
27 Messenger: This?

28
29 Pompeo: Yes, it's this whole piece right here.

30
31 Messenger: Wow. Okay.

32
33 Pompeo: Other than that, pretty straightforward subdivision design. There is one
34 element here that I'd like to discuss with, is we do have a stem street that's
35 less than 125 feet, so we don't have to have a turnaround on it. Pursuant
36 to some past subdivisions that we've done in the City because due to the
37 minimum traffic on here, there is a 40 foot right-of-way cross section in the
38 design standards. We're currently showing that at 40 feet right now, just
39 because it's just a short stem with four lots on it. I think that review comment
40 had come up by a couple of the staff members, so I just wanted to make
41 sure that we've discussed that and seeing if that is acceptable to the City.

42
43 Weir: John, I know you had some discussion on that, right.

44
45 Castillo: Yes. Well it's just more clarification as to why it went from 50 to 40. But
46 you've explained that for me. The other thing that I wanted to discuss too

1 was just the possible you know ending in the cul-de-sac or possible bulb/
2 hammerhead configuration.
3
4 Pompeo: Well, we have it at 40. I mean I can take it to 50 if we have to. We have
5 the lot depths there, it's just additional paving. And the only reason we've
6 done this, and we've done it in several other subdivisions in town is just -
7 my understanding and Mark for the Fire I guess you can correct me if I'm
8 wrong, is if this stem is less than 125 foot of depth then we don't have to
9 have the turnaround.
10
11 Dubbin: That is correct. It is in compliance with the Fire Code.
12
13 Pompeo: So the only other reason we were shying away from any kind of bulb or
14 turnaround is its additional payment and the Utilities, now the gas is looping
15 through the cul-de-sac rather than just a straight line cap. So there's straight
16 line utilities seems to work out better. So we'd like to leave the stem if we
17 could.
18
19 Weir: Mr. Kinney. You have any comment or insights?
20
21 Kinney: Is that street going to connect a Mesa Drive?
22
23 Johnson: No.
24
25 Pompeo: No it is not.
26
27 Kinney: It's going to be a dead end.
28
29 Pompeo: Yes.
30
31 Kinney: Okay. And then the additional right-of-way.
32
33 Johnson: Well that was what we were going to talk about.
34
35 Kinney: There along Mesa Drive.
36
37 Pompeo: Yes. We are dedicating an additional 17 and a half foot of additional right-
38 of-way along Mesa Drive for additional right-of-way dedication.
39
40 Johnson: Not for either one of these.
41
42 Pompeo: Right. We are granting, there is a 25 foot right-of-way easement on Skylark
43 to the north and we are dedicating the additional 25 foot so give that a 50
44 foot total for that road. We are not dedicating any additional right-of-way on
45 Central Avenue.
46

1 Weir: And that's paved and build out, Central.
2
3 Johnson: Right.
4
5 Pompeo: Yes.
6
7 Johnson: It's already been.
8
9 Kinney: We'll contingent on what the development code, as I said sit here off the top
10 of my head I don't know if a cul-de-sac is actually going to, like how it is a
11 requirement. If considering that it doesn't say that you have to have it then
12 I'd be fine with it.
13
14 Castillo: So I know in the design standards it talks about hammerheads and cul-de-
15 sacs as being used for the end of roadways. I couldn't find anything in there
16 that says that it's a requirement for it to end that way. I don't know if you
17 were able to find anything Mike. Because I also know that Hector also made
18 that comment in regards to the 40 foot right-of-way and it not meeting the
19 requirements as far as lot size minimums and those kinds of design
20 standards.
21
22 Pompeo: I do disclose that the allowance for the 40 foot right-of-way just so we're all
23 clear is, In the design standards it talks about the increased number of off
24 street parking spaces. So if it's of concern we can take that to the 50 on
25 that street section there. As far as the cul-de-sac, bulb, or hammerhead
26 requirements, I know that those are requirements for turnarounds. The only
27 place that I'm aware of where it plainly dictates that is based off of the Fire
28 Code, like Mark had indicated after the 125 feet in the Fire Code we have
29 to have a turnaround. And then I know the design standards speak to
30 maximum length of (*inaudible*). And then I believe on the hammerheads I
31 think it's limited to 250 foot total depth and it minimizes the number of lots
32 that are on a road that utilizes hammerheads. The last one we did was in
33 Sonoma Ranch North Phase 3, there's one hammerhead in there, but it's
34 limited to I think 250 foot overall depth.
35
36 Weir: And the depth on that is this is?
37
38 Pompeo: This is 120 feet.
39
40 Weir: And you're taking the right-of-way all the way to the property line.
41
42 Pompeo: Well, no, we're eliminating the street. So the right-of-way between Mesa
43 Grande Drive and the internal road, there is not a connection there. There
44 is utility easement there to get through. But we're not proposing right-of-
45 way through there so that there's no chance it can be ever opened up as a
46 street.

1
2 Weir: Ms. Nasir. Did I say that right?
3
4 Nasir: Yes.
5
6 Weir: Any comments from Utilities?
7
8 Nasir: The only comment that we have is that the master utility plan was not turned
9 in, but it's my understanding that Meei Montoya is working with Mike
10 Johnson on the utility master plan. So other than that we're good. And I
11 know that this is not approved as far as the review, so we're looking at that
12 review before we approve it.
13
14 Johnson: We should have that by the end of the week. We've got to have a rough
15 draft under there.
16
17 Weir: So in theory maybe you have a conditional approval.
18
19 Nasir: Yes.
20
21 Weir: Of the master utility plan.
22
23 Nasir: Yes. As far as utilities is concerned, the layout we're comfortable with, we
24 just need to look at the master utility plan.
25
26 Weir: Back to the street. Are there any operational issues for any of the
27 departments, the way it's designed?
28
29 Kinney: Just one question about the stem road, does that give you enough room for
30 your trash truck?
31
32 Nasir: Well and that was my next, because I don't know if Meei has seen this to
33 be 40 feet instead of the 50 feet.
34
35 Pompeo: Well, if the concern is that width I mean we can go ahead and just alleviate
36 that concern by just making it the 50 feet. We'll just run it out at 50 feet.
37 Because I noticed on the utility plan, I think that's going to probably serve
38 you better because I can then take out one of these manholes that in this
39 alignment so it'd just be a straight shot. So eliminate one of the manholes.
40
41 Nasir: Yes. And because I know our trash trucks, they do back.
42
43 Pompeo: I had to show them that the trucks did have an R.
44

1 Nasir: Yes. And that's what I'm saying. Because it'll be just one or two containers
2 at the end of it which it will be the two houses at the end, because the other
3 two can do it.
4
5 Pompeo: Right. They can come in here.
6
7 Weir: So Mr. Pompeo.
8
9 Johnson: Probably be right there, right.
10
11 Nasir: Yes.
12
13 Weir: So you're agreed to widen that to 50 feet.
14
15 Pompeo: Right. We'll widen it to 50 feet so there's no concerns with trash, solid
16 waste, and there's no concerns with utility operations as far as having that
17 extra manhole there.
18
19 Weir: Okay.
20
21 Pompeo: So we'll just put it in 50 feet.
22
23 Kinney: As far as drainage is concerned on the preliminary plat, didn't see a master
24 drainage report.
25
26 Pompeo: We'll have that. Mike and I are finishing up. We're going to have a
27 centralized ponding area here, not part of the park. So it'll be down in this
28 area here, but we'll split it out as a separate tract of land. So we're going to
29 have one regional ponding area for the site. And it will not encroach in the
30 two acre minimum of the park. So make sure I'm clear about that.
31
32 Kinney: And also for traffic, I made some red lines on the previous plan about the
33 clear sight triangle.
34
35 Pompeo: Yes. And I believe we've added all those in on the different tracts that you
36 had added those.
37
38 Weir: So what I hear is that if there's a recommendation for approval, they'll have
39 to be conditioned on approval of the master utility plan, widening of that
40 hammerhead 50 feet of right-of-way, and the plat being modified to provide
41 a tract for overall drainage. Is that correct?
42
43 Nasir: Did I hear correctly hammerhead, are you guys putting a ...
44
45 Pompeo: No, no we'll just stamp, well add the stamp.
46

1 Weir: Okay, excuse me.
2
3 Messenger: I've got a couple of comments. This is the first time I've seen this so
4 apologies if some of these have already been covered. But Central Road I
5 believe is already built out, correct. So there's curb and gutter, sidewalk on
6 both sides.
7
8 Pompeo: Yes.
9
10 Messenger: Will you be doing any, I don't know if there are any improvements on Skylark
11 Lane, so will you be doing like a sidewalk on your side of that or what's the
12 plan for Skylark?
13
14 Johnson: *(inaudible)* to the street. Right there.
15
16 Pompeo: Just this piece right here.
17
18 Messenger: Okay. So this is not going to get a sidewalk here.
19
20 Pompeo: No sir.
21
22 Messenger: And then the other question and kind of area of concerns, when you look at
23 this other surroundings around here and maybe people are happy with it,
24 but it seems that it's pretty common where there's areas where there aren't
25 any sidewalks along some of these roads that it just becomes kind of like a
26 dirt parking space for people. What are the plans for this tract? Is that
27 actually going to have any kind of landscaping or sidewalk or? I'm just kind
28 of curious as to what that's going to look like there.
29
30 Pompeo: Well based on this Tierra Del Sol, because this is a Terra Del Sol
31 application, so there not based on the monetary limitations and
32 considerations for that organization, they're not proposing any
33 improvements other than the roadway into Skylark. They're not proposing
34 any improvements along Mesa Drive. So it will just be additional dedicated
35 right-of-way and that's it.
36
37 Messenger: Okay. So it's possible that people may use that as kind of a parking space.
38
39 Pompeo: Well we're having, and I don't know, I believe it's noted on the plat but there's
40 no legal lot access off of Mesa Drive onto these lots, nor is there legal
41 access from Central Road into these lots on this side.
42
43 Messenger: So this will just be like a wall.
44
45 Pompeo: It'll be a wall and this will be a wall now. Now people though will try it. And
46 they'll put a gate in. But it'll be up to the City to make sure that they don't,

1 because these are two collector roadways, so we can't have direct lot
2 access to these two roads per code.
3
4 Messenger: Okay. So all of your driveways and everything are just going to front onto
5 Tierra Escondida.
6
7 Pompeo: Yes. They're all going to be internal. Yes.
8
9 Messenger: And then the other question, I know I'm not, but I'm just kind of curious as
10 to you know like the utility, the trash trucks are they going to basically, will
11 this kind of serve as a quasi hammerhead? I mean will they go down here
12 and then they'll just have to back up and come back around, is that how
13 that's going to work for trash?
14
15 Pompeo: Well, I'm thinking that they will come in this way, they'll come all the way
16 down grab this side, and then they'll go out and come out this way.
17
18 Messenger: Okay.
19
20 Pompeo: We'll see how that works.
21
22 Messenger: Good think they have like those loud noises when they're doing, when
23 they're backing up, as goofy as that sounds.
24
25 Weir: And the Building Code requires that sidewalks adjacent to individual lots be
26 built.
27
28 Pompeo: Right.
29
30 Weir: So when those houses will be built the sidewalk will be.
31
32 Pompeo: All this.
33
34 Weir: Well no I'm talking about Mesa.
35
36 Pompeo: On Mesa, yes.
37
38 Nasir: Along Mesa and along Central.
39
40 Pompeo: I think the sidewalk is along Central.
41
42 Messenger: So you will be building the sidewalks on the west side of Mesa.
43
44 Pompeo: Right. Well, that's code requirements.
45
46 Johnson: Yes that'll be part of the building permit for the homes.

1
2 Kinney: You mentioned that you're not going to have any improvements of Skylark
3 Lane to the south.
4
5 Pompeo: Not from (*inaudible*). There's an asphaltic surface there that's on this edge
6 that services these four lots. We're going to build this road up to here, up
7 to this curb return, and then that'll be the terminus of our improvements.
8
9 Castillo: So, Mike speaking with Natalie Green, this is a City sponsored affordable
10 housing project. So this had been previously brought up between either
11 department directors with Natalie in regards to possibly building out Skylark
12 completely as a City funded project. In regards to where Tierra Del Sol
13 would just have to build their portion of Mesa drive.
14
15 Kinney: Mesa Drive and then the stem portion on Skylark.
16
17 Castillo: Yes, correct.
18
19 Kinney: Okay. I would (*inaudible*) we would primarily address it.
20
21 Pompeo: Well, I mean when we come in with the construction drawings I guess that
22 we can. Because I think it needs to be memorialized in the record as to
23 who's agreed to build what and if not, when, and if not, who. All those kind
24 of things.
25
26 Weir: I would recommend that as part of DRC recommendation today that we
27 include that portion that Tierra Del Sol is going to build.
28
29 Pompeo: Okay.
30
31 Weir: Next for those (*inaudible*).
32
33 Pompeo: This one here.
34
35 Weir: Yes.
36
37 Pompeo: Okay.
38
39 Weir: Any other comments from DRC members? Anything else Souder Miller
40 would like to add?
41
42 Pompeo: No, I think that's it. I think we covered it all.
43
44 Weir: Well, I'll entertain a motion on this preliminary plat.
45

1 Kinney: I'll make that motion to approve with all the contingencies, was contingent
2 upon the verification of a cul-de-sac at the end of that stem road, there is
3 not a requirement from the development code.
4

5 Weir: Did you want to include the approval of the master utility plan and provide it
6 on the plat the tract for drainage? And that I don't know what the distance
7 of Skywalk improvements would be, but those two lots to the north.
8

9 Kinney: Also contingent yes on that, the master drainage plan revisions. I guess
10 you will be doing one more revision.
11

12 Pompeo: Well, we'll be resubmitting. I mean we need to submit for the drainage and
13 we need to submit for the utilities. So we'll be going through another
14 supplemental before we get to the Planning and Zoning. Yes.
15

16 Johnson: We're still on track for P&Z?
17

18 Weir: Yes.
19

20 Pompeo: So yes, we'll get that in before, we'll get all of this in before the end of the
21 week Dave so that way staff will have enough time to do a review. And then
22 if there's any, if we have any question, if there's still any outstanding little
23 things that are happening after that we can make those adjustments so that
24 we can go to the P&Z with a clean recommendation.
25

26 Nasir: Are you going to tell us what the distance is so can?
27

28 Pompeo: Yes. I had to get my handy dandy scale out.
29

30 Nasir: Thank you.
31

32 Pompeo: So if we go to the end of the curb return from the existing right-of-way line
33 on Mesa Grande on the west side is approximately 170 feet plus/minus. So
34 that's like from the right existing right-of-way line to that curvature right
35 there. So we'd have to build to the curb return.
36

37 Johnson: Half section or the whole road? Just this half, right?
38

39 Pompeo: No. We have to build the whole.
40

41 Johnson: This one. Okay.
42

43 Pompeo: Well I don't think, we don't have to put sidewalks on the other side. We
44 have to put the curb and gutter on both sides, on the sidewalk on this side.
45

46 Weir: So that's all in the motion for approval?

1
2 Kinney: Yes.
3
4 Weir: Could I have a second?
5
6 Pompeo: All of that.
7
8 Weir: That's a real technical term.
9
10 Dubbin: I'll second.
11
12 Weir: Okay. So I have a motion in a second with conditions for approval of
13 preliminary plat, a recommendation to the Planning and Zoning
14 Commission. I'll go ahead and call departments. Community Development,
15 John.
16
17 Castillo: Yes.
18
19 Weir: Fire Department.
20
21 Dubbin: Yes.
22
23 Weir: Mike, represent Public Works.
24
25 Kinney: Yes.
26
27 Weir: Yes. Okay. Parks and Rec is absent. Utilities.
28
29 Nasir: Yes.
30
31 Weir: Okay. By four/zero/one the preliminary plat has been recommended for
32 approval. I believe it's been scheduled for the November P&Z.
33
34 Castillo: That is correct.
35
36 Weir: Okay. And so you submit the and get approvals we'll be all online with that.
37
38 Pompeo: All right.
39
40 Weir: That was our one item of business today.
41
42 **V. ADJOURNMENT (09:22 a.m.)**
43
44 Weir: If there's nothing else the committee wants to discuss, I'll accept a motion
45 to adjourn.
46

1 Nasir: So moved.

2

3 Weir: Second?

4

5 Dubbin: Second.

6

7 Weir: All those in favor?

8

9 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

10

11

12

13

14

15 Chairperson

DRAFT