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
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DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE (DRC)

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

DRC PRESENT: David Weir, Chief Planning Administrator
Rocio Nasir, Senior Engineer, Utilities
Tony Trevino, Engineering Administrator, Public Works
Hector Terrazas, Engineer, Public Works
Mike Kinney, Project Manager, Community Development

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

OTHER PRESENT: Mike Johnson, Souder Miller
Brice Ortiz, Souder Miller

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

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

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – None

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

3. OLD BUSINESS - None

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

4. NEW BUSINESS

4.1 3497 Northrise - 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.

Weir: So the first business is the 3497 Northrise. There was a request for design standards variance to the onsite stormwater drainage. So Mr. Kinney can you give an overview of what's being proposed and if you have any other comments you want to make.
Yes sir. This is the request for Section 32-103.6.1 and 6.1A I guess. Has
to do with underground storage. So the code reads there is no credit
given for rock voids. This particular system that was proposed by Souder
Miller is an AVS StormTech system called MC-4500 chamber. They don't
call it tanks; they call it chamber. And the system is kind of a, for lack of a
better description, to me is like a hybrid between storage tanks and a
French drain, percolation system. And as part of the design of the actual
system, I called AVS and talked to them. In their cut sheet they were
indicating that they have what's called minimum installed storage, which is
greater than the volume of the chambers, which the installed storage
includes the fill, which is a stone between the chambers and the end caps
which has a 40% stone porosity. Section 32-103.6.1A talks about no
credit for the rock voids. And so I suggested having a DRC meeting to
discuss this because it's not, typically it's kind of like I said a hybrid
between underground storage and also a percolation system, which
includes the storage capacity includes the rock voids 40% of the rock
voids. And from that design if they just had to go with straight chambers
with no credit, they wouldn't be dealing with 67 or 68.

Correct.

Of those chambers and including the voids they can reduce it down to 40
to 41, which will reduce the overall … will the footprint still be the same?

Similar. Yes, I think it'd just be kind of (inaudible) somewhere so probably
might lose some of the outer chambers.

And significantly reduce the cost. Significantly.

Does anyone have any questions of Mike?

Let me kind of backup and kind of just be full transparent here. When this
subdivision was originally designed it was a pond. The owner at the time
came, and the reason that the capacities are so great for such a small lot
is because it's also taking into account the private roads that are running
between Wendy's to the north and then Mister Car Wash to the south.

Okay, so this isn't just the volume from the site.

It's not just post minus pre that we have to … right. So it is this.

So Mike Johnson you want to give an overview.

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

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

Johnson: For lot 2 pretty much, yes.

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

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

Weir: Mr. Terrazas.

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

Johnson: It's not for lot 3.

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

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

Terrazas: And those are developed. (inaudible).
Johnson: That drainage will go somewhere else.

Terrazas: Okay.

Johnson: It's just this road, this road coming into here.

Trevino: And does that road accept anything from the Wendy's or the …

Johnson: No. They're still responsible just like any other commercial development to keep their ponding on site.

Trevino: Okay.

Kinney: And the Dutch Brothers.

Johnson: There is an easement right here, a utility easement. The water comes down this road and kind of comes in at that point.

Kinney: And Dutch Brothers has a separate pond.

Johnson: Yes.

Trevino: That's just, there's nothing, that's extra, there's nothing kind of (inaudible) to those basins right there.

Johnson: No. Not from Bataan or for Rinconada or Northrise.

Trevino: As long as you put fillable fill around it, around the chamber so the rock doesn't get into it. Just joking.

Terrazas: And that's a follow up question I had, as far as maintenance because I think that's what ends up being like, how do we maintain it? It is going to be private property. It's a French drain like kind of thing. How does the City not become liable when this sediments (inaudible) in two years, three years?

Pacheco: Well, we'd like to see is some kind of O&M that would run with the land that would say you know this is our maintenance schedule so you can have the, whoever owns it in the future take it to them and say this is you know part of that lot and you're required to maintain this schedule.

Trevino: Are those roads private or City.

Johnson: They're private.

Trevino: Okay.
Pacheco: They're private.

Trevino: Right, so that way when it comes back to us in the future, (inaudible) everything it goes to that lot, they're going to be responsible for all that drainage from the roadways.

Johnson: Now I know that I'm trying to think how would we do that.

Trevino: That would be …

Johnson: Well, there's some kind of agreement with the owners on the roadway.

Trevino: Covenants.

Johnson: Yes, I don't know if it quite called a covenant, but I think there's something there that …

Weir: Is there joint use on the parking lots and maintenance of those?

Johnson: Well I think each of the owners are responsible for their share of maintaining the roads in some form. I'd have to go back to, if it's an HOA agreement or I don't know, I'd have to go back to Dr. Padila and see. But maybe we could add that to that.

Nasir: it was included on the plat note that each one of them is responsible for the road. Not necessarily, I don't think it's specified on the plat how it will be maintained, but definitely I believe on the plat it was shown to be private and …

Johnson: Right.

Terrazas: For right now, there's nothing on the plat that says, for the pharmacy the new platted one that went through maybe a month ago. It doesn't say anything about maintaining that right.

Johnson: I don't think so, no.

Terrazas: So I think that's what Steve and Tony and everyone's kind of alluding to. We're going to have some kind of agreement that that owner is going to maintain it even though he's getting water from all these other private developments.

Trevino: Yes, or if it's (inaudible) or whatever. But it's going to be in the best interest, that places the whole right there so if those things aren't infiltrated
more they’re going to be underwater. Then it can be discharged anywhere, just (inaudible).

Nasir: That's what's happening there on we're Texas Roadhouse is happening. So we get a phone call every so often that we need to go and clean it out and then we let them know that that's private property and they have to do it. So they actually have gone in and cleaned it up every so often whenever they realizes there's, when the property owner is from California. Whenever they flood their own parking lot, because it doesn't come out of the parking lot.

Trevino: Right. Yes, so like hey we're in a foot of water here. That's yours, it's not our stuff.

Nasir: Yes.

Trevino: That makes them want to clean up faster so I don't have an issue. And I think ...

Johnson: We could add that to the plat. I mean we've added easements to plats just by legal description, so I'm sure you could add something saying.

Trevino: Mike I guess.

Weir: Or you could file it as a separate, just make it a …

Johnson: That's what I meant.

Weir: We have record on it.

Trevino: I'm just surprised that this is the first time I've seen this, because this was always my fight with the City when I was in private.

Johnson: What's that? Because of that.

Trevino: The volume (inaudible). That was a constant fight. So, yes, no, I have, I think that's the way it should be. It's already developed around that area. And I think we should start utilizing this system the way it's designed to be by the manufacturers. I mean we never have, we never allowed them to do private. But that's how these systems work and with the maintenance, I think before with the fast development to the west, to east, whatever, all the dirt clogging up. I think we get some kind of agreement there, they're in hole, are they going to (inaudible). I think that's something we should probably add to the design standards where that's accommodated for, if there's maintenance and everything and allow it moving forward.
Nasir: That's probably something that we need to keep an eye on with the rewrite that we're having. Because I know that the original standards were written before all of this new technology is coming along. Because they wanted to make sure that it doesn't get clogged and then you know with the old systems. You're right with the new systems, yes, but the design standards have never been changed.

Trevino: We revised that verbiage for this. Yes, so that way we don't.

Johnson: I seem to remember there was some arguments about it at the time. Was it with Robert? Yes, so okay, my brain's not going too bad.

Trevino: It was always going to you guys in Public Works up there.

Johnson: Yes.

Trevino: Wait did, but you always said no way. And now you're asking for it. It was your department wasn't it?

Johnson: I stand corrected. Yes sir. See I remember people coming to me and arguing about that.

Trevino: What was your answer?

Kinney: I have one question.

Johnson: We had a discussion but I guess it stayed, right.

Kinney: I have a question.

Johnson: Yes sir.

Kinney: Mr. Johnson. In the event that there is some sort of say storm greater than 100 years, what provisions are for overflow?

Johnson: Well, the way it's been described to me is if this system is full that that the water will just pass, it bypass it.

Kinney: Bypass.

Johnson: Yes.

Kinney: So where will it go? Will it stay on the lot or?

Johnson: It's going to be designed around to here, to there. I mean, if you have a greater than 100 year flood.
Trevino: The whole thing is …

Johnson: It's going to flow. Yes.

Kinney: Yes. So there's provision for discharge for.

Johnson: Yes, I would say so.

Kinney: Emergency discharge.

Trevino: Over the curb and into the road.

Kinney: 100 year flood, we've got better things to worry about.

Trevino: But, and that's a difference Mike, because when they are just holding what's the post, the pre, then on the bottom they'll have a discharge to kind of commit that. This is just one holding pond. This is no (inaudible) near. So it's in a hole so.

Kinney: Yes.

Trevino: So greater than 100, it's just going to fill up. At that point everything's going to be underwater.

Pacheco: And it floods them out. That's private. Not our responsibility.

Kinney: So and then roadside swale that's along, that's going to go away, or it'll still be there?

Johnson: I don't think that's going to be, that's our landscaped area. So I'd say it's probably still going to be there. We're not getting into it with any tanks or anything.

Weir: So I have a procedural question for all the DRC members. Are you comfortable acting on this today or would you like to see how the agreement's going to be put together and table this to a future DRC meeting? Or are you comfortable?

Terrazas: Mr. Chair. I would want to postpone it until we get something in place. That way we can all review it and make sure that's all, operation manual but I think we are in agreeance kind of that we can move forward with this once that's all.

Johnson: Not really because we're going to have to redesign it anyway.
Terrazas: More a clear direction.

Johnson: When you say, you just want to say, they're responsible to maintain this, create some kind of a schedule, twice a year.

Trevino: Whatever manufacturer recommends.

Johnson: Okay. All right. We can put that.

Trevino: But it needs to run with the land not the owner.

Johnson: Right. Well, we can put it, (inaudible) what to put on plats. We can put it on the plat.

Weir: Also do a deed right and transfer.

Johnson: Yes.

Terrazas: And the other thing is, if you can find out any information about, this pond was going to service five lots, something like that. Because then if it becomes an issue later.

Johnson: What's servicing the road, basically.

Terrazas: No, I know that but, you say you're going to look to if there's a covenants about sharing all this pond and maintenance of the pond. I don't know how that pond's maintained now.

Kinney: It's got the drainage basins shown.

Johnson: Yes, I see what you're saying if there's something that exists.

Terrazas: Yes, like right now if that pond, let's say we didn't do this, if that pond needs to be maintained, who's maintaining it?

Johnson: Right. Okay.

Pacheco: Give us a history of it.

Johnson: Yes. That'll work.

Trevino: So how can you, just a question. And I'm just kind of just from the standpoint to kind of help them out. Is that going to postpone you guys another month to come over here and then resubmit it again? Or is that something you can work out with Mike in the meantime. Because that's just some informational areas that Mike can look at. I don't know.
Terrazas: Two weeks Tony. We do it every two weeks, DRC.

Nasir: No actually it's every week now.

Terrazas: There you go.

Trevino: You can come back next week and get this, so it doesn't slow down. Okay.

Johnson: No that's fine. Like is say we're going to have to redesign and we can move on with the fact that we can go with the lesser tanks.

Trevino: So you work on the design you can bring the agreement in and just have that agreement come to DRC while he's talking to design.

Johnson: No, that's fine. We got a rider amendment for the work so you guys add a little more work, we add a little more cost.

Terrazas: Either pay you or pay (inaudible).

Johnson: You know we just eliminated 27 tanks too so, that's a lot of money.

Kinney: All right so the consensus of the DRC is for approval, but we want some additional information, documentation.

Weir: Okay. If that's the case, you don't have anything else. You don't want to discuss it anymore; I'd entertain a motion to postpone until the March 9th DRC meeting.

Johnson: How about could I call and tell you when.

Weir: Sure.

Johnson: I appreciate the quickness but I'm just not sure I'm going to get.

Trevino: I don't want to hear you guys, we're slowing you down, nothing. I know you developers say the City does this and does that.

Terrazas: Mr. Chair.

Johnson: Let's go ahead do March 9th and I'll call you and let you know for sure.

Weir: Okay.

Johnson: I'll let you know for sure if it's not going to work.
Weir: I have a motion to table from Mr. Terrazas. Do I have a second?

Kinney: Second.

Weir: I have a second from Mr. Kinney. All those in favor?

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

Weir: All those opposed? Okay, we're currently postponed until March 9th. So we'll see you next Wednesday, if not sooner.

Johnson: You got it. At least maybe then I can bring you what the covenants say in the subdivision. Something we can talk about other than (inaudible).

Weir: And thank you all for coming on short notice. We've had some staff absences and Mike and I were really scrambling to get this agenda together Friday.

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

Weir: Meeting adjourned.

Chairperson
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE (DRC)

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

DRC PRESENT: Mark Dubbin, Fire Department
Rocio Nasir, Senior Engineer, Utilities
Dominic Loya, MVMPO
Hector Terrazas, Engineer, Public Works
Mike Kinney, Project Manager, Community Development
John Castillo, Permit Tech, Community Development

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

OTHER PRESENT: Randy Farmer, Genesis Builders
Barry Prahl, Genesis Builders
J.G. Rodriguez, Genesis Builders
Steve Calderazzo, CCG
Mike Johnson, Souder Miller

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

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

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – February 23, 2022

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

Nasir: So moved.

H-Rogers: Is there a second?

Terrazas: Second.

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

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

H-Rogers: Any opposed. Motion passes.

3. OLD BUSINESS - None

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.
Johnson: You're quickly creating work for us.

H-Rogers: Steve, would you say that some sort of condition that indicates that the semiannual inspection report be provided to the City for review?

Pacheco: Yes.

H-Rogers: Or reference.

Johnson: To whom?

H-Rogers: Public Works.

Johnson: Steve Pacheco.

H-Rogers: Just Public Works.

Pacheco: Public Works and something also that if we can inspect it, we can have access to it to go and take a look at it.

Johnson: City can have, be granted access when requested.

Pacheco: Yes.

Terrazas: And Steve I have a follow up question if that's all you had. Are we okay with doing a deed restriction or do we want it to be in the plat? I mean.

Pacheco: I think the deed restriction will work. I haven't, I'd like to see it before you file it.

Johnson: Okay. No that's fine.

H-Rogers: I might recommend …

Johnson: Add these conditions in, let you file it. I mean sorry, that you. You cal file it too if you want.

Pacheco: Not file anything.

H-Rogers: So I'm understanding that you will work with Public Words to make sure that the language is suitable.

Johnson: That's fine.

H-Rogers: Prior to filing.
Johnson: That's fine. And a plat, just had to go get all the signatures and everything that we agreed to.

H-Rogers: Anything else Steve?

Pacheco: That was all I have.

H-Rogers: Okay. I'm going to look at some of the other staff just to see if there are any other comments or concerns. Fire.

Dubbin: No comments.

H-Rogers: All right. Very good. And I'm going to look to Planning. No comments. All right. And Utilities.

Nasir: No.

H-Rogers: We do have MPO here, but I imagine that they're not, no comment on drainage.

Loya: No comment.

H-Rogers: All right. With that, is there anything else you'd like to add Mr. Kinney or the applicant?

Kinney: No ma'am.

H-Rogers: Is there a motion for this variance?

Terrazas: Motion to include all the items that we discussed, and then a motion to approve with conditions that we get that provided and engineering or public works for reviews it and accept it.

H-Rogers: Very good. Is there a second?

Kinney: I'll second.

H-Rogers: All right. All those in favor.

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

H-Rogers: Any opposed? Motion passes unanimously..

Johnson: Thanks to everybody.
4. NEW BUSINESS

4.1 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.

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

Castillo: Discuss them together.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Calderazzo: No. No sir.
Terrazas: That was my only concern, just having that access. And the other, well my other concern was and I don't know if it got noted in the plat, those lots abutting Spitz that you're developing, they won't have direct access to Spitz, they're going to have to use Johnny Lee.

Calderazzo: Sure. Okay.

Terrazas: That's just, we don't want to have them all individual access. But that's all I had as far as traffic.

H-Rogers: Now, do you recommend adding that as a plat note. Sometimes we do do that because there shouldn't be direct access.

Terrazas: Yes.

H-Rogers: That's (inaudible).

Terrazas: Yes, that'd be my recommendation.

H-Rogers: All right. Very good. And anything else in traffic?

Terrazas: That's all I have.

H-Rogers: Okay. I'm going to look to Fire, Mark Dubbin.

Dubbin: I think the applicant has addressed all of the concerns from the previous review. So no issues at this time.

H-Rogers: Okay. Very good. MPO.

Loya: MPO has no comment on it.

H-Rogers: All right. And I'm going to look to Mr. Kinney with Engineering.

Kinney: Thank you, Madam Chair. I have one question about the curve down here. That meets, I don't recall right off the top of my head the radius of that. If it is 50 foot or less then you will have to get a variance from (inaudible).

Calderazzo: What would the minimum be here. What was the minimum radius you would want to just eliminate having to do a variance?

Kinney: 50 or less.

Calderazzo: 50 or less here. On the inner radius or this on?
Kinney: Centerline radius.

Calderazzo: Centerline radius. That's the only sheet I didn't print was the curve data.

Kinney: Okay, that's fine. I just don't recall what that is.

Calderazzo: I'll verify it. I'll email it to you. Is that okay? I can send to you.

Kinney: That's fine.

Calderazzo: C four.

Kinney: C four is a 50 foot radius.

Calderazzo: So we're good.

Kinney: So that will require a variance.

Calderazzo: I thought you just said 50 or less.

Kinney: 50 foot or less.

Calderazzo: So that's 50 foot.

Prahl: 49'11” and 15/63.


Kinney: If I read it correctly, if I interpret it correctly, a 50 foot, one inch was not required.

Calderazzo: I got you.

H-Rogers: Anything else from engineering?

Kinney: I don't know if, as I sit here I don't receive a master drainage report for that.

Calderazzo: The master drainage report is existing from the previous design set and we had discussed a while back being able to use that original master drainage report from Donohue.

Kinney: Okay.

Calderazzo: Does that, does that …
Kinney: Has it been submitted for them to do Excella.

Calderazzo: It's not uploaded into Excella exact because you guys have, I think you all have possession of it. So I'll have to work through that. Let me figure out where it is. To be honest with you I don't I don't have the master change report that was done previous.

H-Rogers: It's possible that we don't even have that file anymore.

Calderazzo: Okay.

H-Rogers: It's past our retention.

Calderazzo: Okay.

H-Rogers: But we would have to look into that. Michael, anything else?

Kinney: No, that's it.

H-Rogers: Okay. And Planning.

Castillo: At this time Planning still does have some outstanding issues with the preliminary plat. So Easton Lane that goes east to west, we have requested that it be changed to match the Dyne Road that, or Dyne. And that we also have requested to ensure that all the lots will be buildable. I know there were some previous ones located towards Hansen that were ...

Calderazzo: This one.

Castillo: A bit smaller than ...

Calderazzo: Than the 5,000. It's just one or two I think.

H-Rogers: And those would require a formal variance unless they're modified because the zoning requires it.

Calderazzo: Right but he was supposed to move that over. There's clearly a discrepancy between center line on these lots here And that'll just resolve it. I mean, we can resolve that.

H-Rogers: Okay.

Calderazzo: They all should be 5,000 minimum. Okay.
Castillo: Yes, other than there are minor comments to the cover sheets that needed to be addressed.

Calderazzo: Okay.

Castillo: Planning did notice that there was discrepancy between acreages on the title block, the dedication block, and within the notes.

Calderazzo: Acreages.

Castillo: Yes.

H-Rogers: Yes, Mr. Kenny.

Kinney: I didn't want to interrupt.

Castillo: No, you're good.

Kinney: Thank you Madam Chair. Just I was curious as to what the status is of the preliminary plat in Excella \textit{(inaudible)}. Has it been approved or is it still in the revisions required?

H-Rogers: I'm going to turn to John Castillo to answer that question.

Castillo: At the moment it's still under revisions required, as well as the master plan. At the time of submission there are two applications in Excella, one should be labeled as master plan, which is the more recent one, the 22CS0500012. And then the preliminary plat which is the ...

Kinney: This one here.

Castillo: The earlier case.

H-Rogers: Any other questions Mr. Kinney?

Kinney: Just procedural as to the, when this come before the DRC, shouldn't everything in Excella through the various reviews and stuff, should that be taken care of first?

H-Rogers: In a perfect world, yes. But sometimes if the applicant requests to move forward, this board can hammer out some of those issues and details, ultimately. But yes, there is due process and ultimately if the applicant chooses to move forward, then we move them forward. That doesn't necessarily mean that this board recommends approval. But yes, sometimes this board is used to at least try to resolve some of those issues.
Kinney: Okay.

H-Rogers: Does that answer the question? John, are there any other comments or concerns or modifications required?

Castillo: At this moment I don't have any comments related to the master plan as I haven't had a moment to take a look at it. But when I get a chance to look at those, I would probably address those with the developer.

H-Rogers: Very good. And Utilities.

Nasir: As far as the plat, I have several comments that need to be addressed. One of them is if there's going to be tract dedicated to the City or to Utilities need to be specified and they're not on the plat. And also we would like to have a note that we haven't, most of the plans which is the subdivider is responsible for utilities stub outs. Subdivider is responsible for utility stub outs. And for providing any and all easement necessary to provide utility service to lots contained herein or something similar to that. And on previous, for the master, that's it for the plat.

For the master plan I have made comments before as far as the utilities master plan, and all of that. And as it was mentioned the preliminary plat and the master plan are being reviewed. And on the master plan nothing on the comments that I have made before have been addressed.

H-Rogers: All right. Thank you. All righty. Yes sir.

Kinney: Thank you Madam Chair. I don't know if this is the proper time to offer this out. I know that this has gone, this zone has gone through multiple reviews.

H-Rogers: Yes sir.

Kinney: And rather than just have it you know through electronic revisions that require emails and stuff like that, I'd recommend staff and the developer with his engineer or surveyors have a sit down meeting and just hammer out all of these issues.

Calderazzo: I second that.

H-Rogers: That's an excellent idea. Very good. All righty. So we have a couple of options here. I'm going to speak first and then I'll turn it over to you as the applicant. So at this juncture based on a number of components that are still not resolved, and are actually required by code, I would consider this, at least the master plan portion incomplete. I don't think that you want to
move forward with a recommendation on that because that goes to Planning and Zoning and they consider that pretty carefully. I would recommend that perhaps we table this so that we can have that meeting, reconvene with those resolutions and so that everybody's on the same page. But I'm going to look to you applicant and hear what you have to say.

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

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

Calderazzo: No ma'am. That was painless.

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

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

H-Rogers: Yes sir.

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

H-Rogers: Okay.

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

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

Terrazas: Second.

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

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

H-Rogers: Okay. Are there any "nays?" With that the project has been tabled. And I will look to the project planner to schedule a meeting with all the applicable people so that we can have everyone in the room to take a look and resolve any of these lingering issues, as well as see if we can pull any
of the old files to see if there's any old drainage reports or other
documentation that can be utilized as part of this.

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

Kinney: It may need to be updated.

Calderazzo: Okay.

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

Calderazzo: Okay.

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

Calderazzo: Okay.

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

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

Kinney: Get this going.

Calderazzo: All right. Appreciate it.

4.2 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.

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.
  o Acceleration lane warrant
  o Provide queuing analysis at proposed access points, Solano/Lohman. Espanola/Lohman.
  o Provide traffic weaving analysis.
  o 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.
Kinney: The traffic section was agreeable to have the right turn exit only driveway to be approved with that on the condition that a one foot wide curb, concrete curb would be installed between the boundary lines at Solano and Lohman down to the northern boundary line along Solano.

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

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

Terrazas: I understand that. I understand that.

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

Farmer: Yes. Randy farmer.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Dubbin: Okay. Thanks.

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

Terrazas: Yes. So just …

Kinney: Traffic …

Terrazas: To just clear it up.

Kinney: Not insist upon those.

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

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

Dubbin: No, no, no other concerns.

H-Rogers: And I'm going to look to long range planning who is here as well.
Miller: Yes, I did kind of have a broad question about the site plan. I'm not sure if this has been discussed previously. Kind of speaking from the Comprehensive Plan, obviously, you know we support increased infill development. But this particular location is the potential location for a neighborhood center and the intersection of two mixed use corridors. The recommendations of the Comprehensive Plan do discuss activating that pedestrian access to development along these corridors. I know there's a lot of questions about queuing here, so I am curious if any discussion has taken place about this arrangement of parking in the front right directly off of the sidewalk, as opposed to pushing the parking in the rear, pushing this exit further back. I know there could be some issue with proximity to that alley, but that could assist with those queuing questions. It'd be interesting with that group and then you all have to …

Terrazas: Madam Chair.

Miller: Any thoughts on that?

Terrazas: And Mark. I think we have discussed this on the Phase 1, on the first portion that's already built out. And that was something that I think the applicant looked at and they didn't want to go for that. As far as engineering and traffic, we would have been fine for them to have access, shared access for that alley, because that alley's going to always have to have access for all the utilities that are in there. But I don't think that I'll leave it up to the, I don't want to (inaudible).

H-Rogers: So as I understand we don't have any regulations in place at this point in time to request that or ask them of that and they designed the site and a portion of its already constructed. And unfortunately moving that building to a different location would interrupt a lot of things that have already, infrastructure that's already been put in place.

Miller: Existing utilities. Okay. I was just curious.

H-Rogers: But I would agree with your assessment, and we as staff actually had that discussion early on.

Miller:

H-Rogers: A good solution to it, push those buildings to the front.

Miller: Got you. Yes, I don't put anything further at this point.

H-Rogers: Okay. MPO any concern concerns?
Loya: We do not have any concerns as long, because that is a very short section, as long as there's like no crossing traffic. So mitigation measures, we would support it.

H-Rogers: Very good. Planning.

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

H-Rogers: And Utilities.

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

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

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

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

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

Every lot that we have not a single lot has 250 feet to put that entrance in. You know the entrance is not, all the lots that are designed in the infill don't have that from the corners. Not a single one. Good instance is we did the Pioneer Bank. And we had some issues all the way, even all the way till the final on the exit that'd been there for 20 years. And we moved it and then in moving it then we didn’t meet the thing and so we had to go back and you know we moved it because that's what was asked of us and we moved it, and then we ended up at the end having to put up a no turn right, no left turn out of that entrance and we did that.
But I mean, it's every single one of these. And the reason is because they have the rules and the rules don't meet any of this that we've got here. And so it's not like we're expecting them to just say the rules not there, the rule is there. But we have worked tirelessly to make these as safe as we can.

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

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

Prah: Which might be better.

Farmer: Yes, which might, which is going to make that worse. We are very aware of what happened here. Because we don't want that to happen anywhere. And that's what we've, if you'll look at every project we have done, we have tried to mitigate and make it as safe as we can, but we also try to build out these projects. And see these alleys, it says that you can't use those as paved ways. And so you know, and right now if you'll look on that they've got all the dumpsters and everything for this and this. And the
reason we chose that in the first place is this is going to make this business dangerous and this business dangerous if we tried to use that as a dual access right there. And so we looked at all the ways we could do this and we thought the best thing was to, you know we had no problem blocking out the things on Lohman because nobody wants out there on Lohman and basically that's what you're asking for even up on Northrise and everything is no access coming out, just on the side streets. And so I think that's a good idea.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Farmer: It's only a foot wide.

Terrazas: It is a foot, well typically we would just prefer back to back curb.
Kinney: Back to back curb. Yes.

Terrazas: So at the top of it, you would see, and Jaime knows what I'm talking about, one and a half foot wide curve, one and a half the other one. So it's three foot wide with the top being six inch, the non-mountable part.

Farmer: Isn't that going to narrow those lanes?


Kinney: But it is possible. I understand, my understanding …

Terrazas: But it is possible …

Kinney: To dowel in rebar into the pavement without having … in other words it's possible do it without (inaudible).

Farmer: You could imagine the traffic analysis we're going to have to turn into to get that blocked off so we can do that.

Terrazas: You mean the traffic control.

Farmer: Yes.

Kinney: Doesn't need to be …

Terrazas: More likely it's just a typical traffic control. I mean …

Farmer: Yes except you have those people coming up on Lohman turning, you know people coming down Amador turning.

Terrazas: Right.

Farmer: So it's that little section of Solano is probably the busiest piece.

Terrazas: It's going to be a mess trying to deal with traffic. As far as the traffic control, I mean I can't speak for that, but it's going back to …

Kinney: It would require a traffic control plan and probably you might have restricted times as to do the construction work. Would definitely (inaudible) during peak hours. But I just wanted to point out that it's my understanding it's possible to (inaudible) without having to (inaudible) you know three, what is it, four feet or more and that overestimate. It's possible to be able to do that.
The other comment is that the existing driveway that is to the west of the exit only driveway on East Lohman, that will, regardless of the decision today from the DRC, that driveway will have to be closed.

Prahl: This one.

Kinney: Yes, the existing one.

Farmer: Well, we have that.

Kinney: It will have to be closed. That would be a condition of approval.

Farmer: So if we just take that exit out, we're good.

Kinney: The right turn, the right out.

Farmer: That's what you want.

Kinney: No.

Farmer: Well, I mean, that's my, I know what I got a preliminary cost on that. And the traffic control is not cheap. And that concrete is not cheap to put out there. And they're worried about how they dowel in there because if they dowel in there, they've doweled it before in the concrete, you get a couple of trucks that ...

Prahl: Wipe it out.

Farmer: It'll wipe it right out. And who's responsible.

Prahl: Parking bumper.

Farmer: It's a parking bumper, really.

Terrazas: So yes, so right now we're discussing options. You discussed that maybe closing it up. If you guys do close it off and you just end up with the two entrances that are there now being used. I'm sorry, the two driveways, one exit only, and the other one that's a double, I would just require that we just update the trip generation anyway. I kind of looked at it already. There's very few trips going out. That's why we're okay, like I mentioned earlier. If it was a fast food restaurant, that'd be a whole different thing. We would still want all the stuff that we requested in the first place. During the first phase, the reason we requested it was because it was a shell building, we really didn't know what was going on here. That's why I went, sometimes you come to us and you tell us well it's a shell building, well.
Farmer: We don't know what's going to go up there.

Terrazas: I understand that. You guys don't know. We don't know.

Farmer: Sure.

Terrazas: Mark's trying to figure out how much to charge you guys for your fire impact fee. It's a moving goalpost. But yes that's why it was requested. But we're looking at the trip generation, it's not that much. That's why we're willing to, if you guys are still wanting to do that, then that mitigation measure would help with that. And now only that as is.

Rodriguez: I do have one question. Jaime Rodriguez, the engineer of record. Hector for the curb, we're not putting in a two way driveway, right. So we're not promoting any entrance so there's, we're not promoting any entrance from either direction. Why is it that the exit only signage, we're steepening the curb angle, the driveway angle with the curbs to promote the right turn exit only. I guess I'm trying to understand where the logic is coming from that there's an assumption being made that someone's going to just, because this isn't a get to the driveway location and make a left turn, this is making a huge assumption that the driver is going to basically take oncoming traffic on and try to cross two lanes of traffic to get into a signed exit only driveway. So I guess my question to you is where is the reasoning behind saying we need a curb to deter someone from doing this when it's not a driveway that's promoting an entrance, it's clearly going to be signed as an exit only and designed and built as an exit only.

Terrazas: Right.

Rodriguez: So that's my big question is where is it, where's, how do we substantiate requesting a stand up curb at this location?

Terrazas: So as far as that the reason.

Dubbin: I'll take that. I mean just I look at the, I hate the curbs. I mean, I'll just tell you. You know they make it very difficult for us.

Rodriguez: Sure.

Dubbin: But I look at the exact exit coming from the tower onto Main. You know that one's side, it doesn't have the nice angle like that, but people are always making a left turn across a four lane road there where it's clearly marked. In front of station one, across the street here. When they installed the CVS, we have a curb that extends all the way to the station one entrance. And people are always turning left, you know within 200
feet of a major intersection and they go around the curb coming into oncoming traffic.

Farmer: And it's a single lane entrance.

Dubbin: Well there's a curb.

Farmer: No, but is there a single lane entrance that they're pulling into that's curbed.

Dubbin: It's double because it encourages a right because …

Pacheco: It's open.

Dubbin: It's coming

Farmer: And it's open. This is a single lane.

Dubbin: I'm just telling you.

Farmer: It's a single lane curbed.

Dubbin: We get a lot of danger lovers that just love to go into oncoming traffic.

Farmer: Well you can't determine; they could go over the curb.

Dubbin: Some of them do. To answer your question, people just do it. And no matter how much you try to discourage it's difficult.

Terrazas: Another example with that, we just put some delineators on Idaho between the gas station and that. A lot of people you know when our contractor was putting them up, they're going maybe 150 feet opposite to just go into that gas station to put it. Of course, it's not meant for, it's not designed like this, but now if you think about it, the reason that that medium would help out to discourage people is because if you're going here this way, it's going to be very easily, even with the signs, to just make a left. It's very inviting for southbound traffic. So that need is really to restrict people southbound Solano going in there instead of going all the way around going the other way. And accessing off of Espanola. So that's, I don't know if that answers your question.

Rodriguez: I mean it answered my question in the sense that it's, your guy's experience and opinion, that's where this is coming from obviously is that's what I'm trying to get at. Because the Brake Masters has a. I mean they have a driveway right there off of Solano. They're constantly traffic in and out of that driveway.
Terrazas: Correct.

Rodriguez: So I mean that's just where the questions coming from, is what is this really based on? And I just want to make it clear that if it's something very specific that we can address, a code item or some section of it, then we can speak to that. But I just wanted to make it clear than what we're talking about here is your guy's opinion, granted experience based on other situations, but that's where this is coming from.

Terrazas: Right.

Rodriguez: And it is a very distinct design compared to some of the other locations that we're discussing, because they are entrances as well. So I just wanted to make sure that we're clear on, that we're trying to draw comparisons here, but it's not necessarily the same.

H-Rogers: Yes Fire.

Dubbin: My comment I was going to make earlier was actually to respond to Mr. Farmer's very excellent question about what to do in these projects. And I think probably the best use of your time is what you suggested, to come to DRC early on and get some direction on these. Because they, a lot of them are frankly a case by case sort of a deal because they don't meet the code. So how do we meet the intent. And this is the body to get that direction. So I would encourage you to visit, to get on the agenda for DRC in the future. That's all

Farmer: Yes, I just don't think we're, I still don't understand why that isn't getting granted. Because if you watch all the trucks that deliver to this, they cut right up this alley right here. And so what you're going to do is probably get people coming out here and going this way to miss that.

Prahl: There was a was a business there, in and out right there at one time, too.

Farmer: Yes.

Prahl: When they took that, when they demoed that building, the two building.

Farmer: Yes, the business we had their went both ways.

Prahl: So this is even better than it was.

Farmer: I mean we tried to make it as safe as we could. That exit, I just don't see, I mean for a safe exit, it's a safe exit because of the two stoplights. Because I mean there's lots of time there when there's no traffic going out.
And I don't know how you can tell people, no matter how many signs or barriers or whatever, no matter how far we go down there, if they're really going to try to do that they'll go, they'll start further down. So I just, and that's you know, I'm sure our owner won't write the check.

H-Rogers: So I do have a question for traffic. I'm just curious. Is it possible that if a TIA was done for this, it could state that barrier, the concrete barrier isn't required in between the two lanes?

Terrazas: That could be part of it. I would kind of contest that assumption because going back to why we need this, going back to code. This is arterial like you mentioned, it is very heavy intersection. If we were doing this from scratch, we would have median access control all along Solano. Probably going to feed in every direction.

Farmer: If it wasn't infill.

Terrazas: If it was brand new. So I understand your concern that we're trying to fix stuff that's already there. That's why we're kind of meeting you halfway, if you really need that access. If you don't, if you're saying that it's going to be cut out, that mitigation measure ...

Farmer: Well it isn't we don't need it, it's that you're making it so that it's cost prohibitive.

Prahl: That's more dangerous.

Farmer: That's more dangerous. I just, when you go up there, try it. See how you do.

Terrazas: So you back Chair to that. If the TIA says this is a safer movement than over the there because it's going to cause accidents and that median is not approved then yes that could be a recommendation the TIA. As far as the City accepting it, I don't know if that'd be something I would agree with.

Kinney: I didn't catch that.

Terrazas: I don't think I would agree if a report said that no access control the intersection is safer than one that does have access control.

Farmer: So we'll just submit it back with that gone.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Castillo: I'll get there.

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

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

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

H-Rogers: Sure.

Farmer: Showing that's gone.

H-Rogers: So I would ...

Nasir: So we're denying the variance basically.
H-Rogers: Or you're getting the variance with that access control, and then the updated, correct. You'd be approving the variance with access control and with an updated trip generation.

Terrazas: Yes.

H-Rogers: Yes. Okay. So if I could get a motion on this site plan. And of course if the site plan is modified, then it's a moot point. So that you understand if you come back in and eliminate that, then it's eliminated and your request is …

Terrazas: Chair. I'll try and take a crack at it. I make a motion that if this layout dated, I think the latest layout is 2-7 22 C 1.0, if the exit only onto Solano is to remain, they do mitigation measure including, permanent stand up curb along the frontage side. And that they update the IT trip generation.

H-Rogers: Is there a second on that?

Dubbin: Second.

H-Rogers: All those in favor?

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

H-Rogers: Any opposed? All right, with that motion passes with the conditions. And as I'd stated before, if this gets revised and that access gets eliminated, then we move forward. All right, are there any other comments from the board?

Nasir: I do have one.

H-Rogers: Sure.

Nasir: Madam Chair. I just have a question for the board onto why are we bringing Public Works variances on to DRC?

H-Rogers: That's a really good question.

Kinney: I didn't hear the question.

H-Rogers: I will repeat it for you. The question is why are we bringing Public Works variances to DRC? And essentially there were some internal discussions that this would be a good and formal way to review and/or make a motion on the site variances. Because sometimes they tend to get stuck and
there’s a disagreement amongst departments about how they should be handled. And this way it formalizes that. Does that help?

Nasir: Yes.

H-Rogers: All righty.

Farmer: Thank you, everyone.

H-Rogers: Thank you gentlemen.

Farmer: And thank you, Mark that’s a good recommendation. Because we can spend two weeks kind of just going in circles and circles and goes to Hector and upstairs and down here again. A good solution for everybody.

Dubbin: It doesn’t have to be on the agenda as an action item, it can just be an item for discussion.

H-Rogers: Absolutely.

Terrazas: And if you guys want to just be with me, if traffic is your main thing, just set up a meeting with me.

Farmer: But the problem is how can you approve it because it’s, you know, and then if you go and say we want 20 studies, we’re done because no owner’s going to go in there and start writing a check for all that.

Terrazas: As long as you tell me what you guys are, as close as you can to what it’s going to be. I mean, a fast food place versus a dentist office.

5. ADJOURNMENT (10:00 a.m.)

H-Rogers: Let’s go ahead and adjourn this and then you can control discussion. I’d like to go ahead and get a motion for adjournment.

Kinney: (raised his hand).

H-Rogers: And Rocio would you like to second, Mike raised his hand first.

Nasir: Second.

H-Rogers: All right. All those in favor?

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

H-Rogers: That’s unanimous. All right. We are adjourned. Thank you
Chairperson
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE (DRC)

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

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

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

OTHER PRESENT:  Paul Pompeo, Souder Miller
Mike Johnson, Souder Miller

I. CALL TO ORDER (9:02 a.m.)

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

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – October 20, 2021

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

Kinney:  Motion.

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

Dubbin:  Second.

Weir:  Okay.  All those in favor?

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

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

III. OLD BUSINESS - None.

Weir:  Old business, we have none.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

1. Case 21CS0500097: Tierra Del Sol Subdivision
• A request for approval of a Preliminary Plat known as Tierra Del Sol Subdivision.
• The proposed subdivision encompasses 6.09+ acres, is zoned R-1aC (Single-Family Medium Density-Conditional), is located at the northwest corner of Central Road and Mesa Drive.
• The preliminary plat proposes 18 single-family residential lots.
• Submitted by Souder Miller and Associates, representative.

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

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

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

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

Messenger:  This?

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


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

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

Castillo:  Yes.  Well it's just more clarification as to why it went from 50 to 40.  But you've explained that for me.  The other thing that I wanted to discuss too
was just the possible you know ending in the cul-de-sac or possible bulb/hammerhead configuration.

Pompeo: Well, we have it at 40. I mean I can take it to 50 if we have to. We have the lot depths there, it’s just additional paving. And the only reason we’ve done this, and we’ve done it in several other subdivisions in town is just - my understanding and Mark for the Fire I guess you can correct me if I’m wrong, is if this stem is less than 125 foot of depth then we don't have to have the turnaround.

Dubbin: That is correct. It is in compliance with the Fire Code.

Pompeo: So the only other reason we were shying away from any kind of bulb or turnaround is its additional payment and the Utilities, now the gas is looping through the cul-de-sac rather than just a straight line cap. So there’s straight line utilities seems to work out better. So we’d like to leave the stem if we could.

Weir: Mr. Kinney. You have any comment or insights?

Kinney: Is that street going to connect a Mesa Drive?

Johnson: No.

Pompeo: No it is not.

Kinney: It's going to be a dead end.

Pompeo: Yes.

Kinney: Okay. And then the additional right-of-way.

Johnson: Well that was what we were going to talk about.

Kinney: There along Mesa Drive.

Pompeo: Yes. We are dedicating an additional 17 and a half foot of additional right-of-way along Mesa Drive for additional right-of-way dedication.

Johnson: Not for either one of these.

Pompeo: Right. We are granting, there is a 25 foot right-of-way easement on Skylark to the north and we are dedicating the additional 25 foot so give that a 50 foot total for that road. We are not dedicating any additional right-of-way on Central Avenue.
Weir: And that's paved and build out, Central.

Johnson: Right.

Pompeo: Yes.

Johnson: It's already been.

Kinney: We'll contingent on what the development code, as I said sit here off the top of my head I don't know if a cul-de-sac is actually going to, like how it is a requirement. If considering that it doesn't say that you have to have it then I'd be fine with it.

Castillo: So I know in the design standards it talks about hammerheads and cul-de-sacs as being used for the end of roadways. I couldn't find anything in there that says that it's a requirement for it to end that way. I don't know if you were able to find anything Mike. Because I also know that Hector also made that comment in regards to the 40 foot right-of-way and it not meeting the requirements as far as lot size minimums and those kinds of design standards.

Pompeo: I do disclose that the allowance for the 40 foot right-of-way just so we're all clear is, In the design standards it talks about the increased number of off street parking spaces. So if it's of concern we can take that to the 50 on that street section there. As far as the cul-de-sac, bulb, or hammerhead requirements, I know that those are requirements for turnarounds. The only place that I'm aware of where it plainly dictates that is based off of the Fire Code, like Mark had indicated after the 125 feet in the Fire Code we have to have a turnaround. And then I know the design standards speak to maximum length of (inaudible). And then I believe on the hammerheads I think it's limited to 250 foot total depth and it minimizes the number of lots that are on a road that utilizes hammerheads. The last one we did was in Sonoma Ranch North Phase 3, there's one hammerhead in there, but it's limited to I think 250 foot overall depth.

Weir: And the depth on that is this is?

Pompeo: This is 120 feet.

Weir: And you're taking the right-of-way all the way to the property line.

Pompeo: Well, no, we're eliminating the street. So the right-of-way between Mesa Grande Drive and the internal road, there is not a connection there. There is utility easement there to get through. But we're not proposing right-of-way through there so that there's no chance it can be ever opened up as a street.
Weir: Ms. Nasir. Did I say that right?
Nasir: Yes.
Weir: Any comments from Utilities?
Nasir: The only comment that we have is that the master utility plan was not turned in, but it's my understanding that Meei Montoya is working with Mike Johnson on the utility master plan. So other than that we're good. And I know that this is not approved as far as the review, so we're looking at that review before we approve it.
Johnson: We should have that by the end of the week. We've got to have a rough draft under there.
Weir: So in theory maybe you have a conditional approval.
Nasir: Yes.
Weir: Of the master utility plan.
Nasir: Yes. As far as utilities is concerned, the layout we're comfortable with, we just need to look at the master utility plan.
Weir: Back to the street. Are there any operational issues for any of the departments, the way it's designed?
Kinney: Just one question about the stem road, does that give you enough room for your trash truck?
Nasir: Well and that was my next, because I don't know if Meei has seen this to be 40 feet instead of the 50 feet.
Pompeo: Well, if the concern is that width I mean we can go ahead and just alleviate that concern by just making it the 50 feet. We'll just run it out at 50 feet. Because I noticed on the utility plan, I think that's going to probably serve you better because I can then take out one of these manholes that in this alignment so it'd just be a straight shot. So eliminate one of the manholes.
Nasir: Yes. And because I know our trash trucks, they do back.
Pompeo: I had to show them that the trucks did have an R.
Nasir: Yes. And that's what I'm saying. Because it'll be just one or two containers at the end of it which it will be the two houses at the end, because the other two can do it.

Pompeo: Right. They can come in here.

Weir: So Mr. Pompeo.

Johnson: Probably be right there, right.

Nasir: Yes.

Weir: So you're agreed to widen that to 50 feet.

Pompeo: Right. We'll widen it to 50 feet so there's no concerns with trash, solid waste, and there's no concerns with utility operations as far as having that extra manhole there.

Weir: Okay.

Pompeo: So we'll just put it in 50 feet.

Kinney: As far as drainage is concerned on the preliminary plat, didn't see a master drainage report.

Pompeo: We'll have that. Mike and I are finishing up. We're going to have a centralized ponding area here, not part of the park. So it'll be down in this area here, but we'll split it out as a separate tract of land. So we're going to have one regional ponding area for the site. And it will not encroach in the two acre minimum of the park. So make sure I'm clear about that.

Kinney: And also for traffic, I made some red lines on the previous plan about the clear sight triangle.

Pompeo: Yes. And I believe we've added all those in on the different tracts that you had added those.

Weir: So what I hear is that if there's a recommendation for approval, they'll have to be conditioned on approval of the master utility plan, widening of that hammerhead 50 feet of right-of-way, and the plat being modified to provide a tract for overall drainage. Is that correct?

Nasir: Did I hear correctly hammerhead, are you guys putting a ...

Pompeo: No, no we'll just stamp, well add the stamp.
Weir: Okay, excuse me.

Messenger: I’ve got a couple of comments. This is the first time I've seen this so apologies if some of these have already been covered. But Central Road I believe is already built out, correct. So there’s curb and gutter, sidewalk on both sides.

Pompeo: Yes.

Messenger: Will you be doing any, I don't know if there are any improvements on Skylark Lane, so will you be doing like a sidewalk on your side of that or what's the plan for Skylark?

Johnson: (inaudible) to the street. Right there.

Pompeo: Just this piece right here.

Messenger: Okay. So this is not going to get a sidewalk here.

Pompeo: No sir.

Messenger: And then the other question and kind of area of concerns, when you look at this other surroundings around here and maybe people are happy with it, but it seems that it's pretty common where there's areas where there aren't any sidewalks along some of these roads that it just becomes kind of like a dirt parking space for people. What are the plans for this tract? Is that actually going to have any kind of landscaping or sidewalk or? I'm just kind of curious as to what that's going to look like there.

Pompeo: Well based on this Tierra Del Sol, because this is a Terra Del Sol application, so there not based on the monetary limitations and considerations for that organization, they're not proposing any improvements other than the roadway into Skylark. They’re not proposing any improvements along Mesa Drive. So it will just be additional dedicated right-of-way and that’s it.

Messenger: Okay. So it's possible that people may use that as kind of a parking space.

Pompeo: Well we’re having, and I don't know, I believe it's noted on the plat but there's no legal lot access off of Mesa Drive onto these lots, nor is there legal access from Central Road into these lots on this side.

Messenger: So this will just be like a wall.

Pompeo: It'll be a wall and this will be a wall now. Now people though will try it. And they'll put a gate in. But it'll be up to the City to make sure that they don't,
because these are two collector roadways, so we can't have direct lot access to these two roads per code.

Messenger: Okay. So all of your driveways and everything are just going to front onto Tierra Escondida.

Pompeo: Yes. They're all going to be internal. Yes.

Messenger: And then the other question, I know I'm not, but I'm just kind of curious as to you know like the utility, the trash trucks are they going to basically, will this kind of serve as a quasi hammerhead? I mean will they go down here and then they'll just have to back up and come back around, is that how that's going to work for trash?

Pompeo: Well, I'm thinking that they will come in this way, they'll come all the way down grab this side, and then they'll go out and come out this way.

Messenger: Okay.

Pompeo: We'll see how that works.

Messenger: Good think they have like those loud noises when they're doing, when they're backing up, as goofy as that sounds.

Weir: And the Building Code requires that sidewalks adjacent to individual lots be built.

Pompeo: Right.

Weir: So when those houses will be built the sidewalk will be.

Pompeo: All this.

Weir: Well no I'm talking about Mesa.

Pompeo: On Mesa, yes.

Nasir: Along Mesa and along Central.

Pompeo: I think the sidewalk is along Central.

Messenger: So you will be building the sidewalks on the west side of Mesa.

Pompeo: Right. Well, that's code requirements.

Johnson: Yes that'll be part of the building permit for the homes.
Kinney: You mentioned that you're not going to have any improvements of Skylark Lane to the south.

Pompeo: Not from *(inaudible)*. There's an asphaltic surface there that's on this edge that services these four lots. We're going to build this road up to here, up to this curb return, and then that'll be the terminus of our improvements.

Castillo: So, Mike speaking with Natalie Green, this is a City sponsored affordable housing project. So this had been previously brought up between either department directors with Natalie in regards to possibly building out Skylark completely as a City funded project. In regards to where Tierra Del Sol would just have to build their portion of Mesa drive.

Kinney: Mesa Drive and then the stem portion on Skylark.

Castillo: Yes, correct.

Kinney: Okay. I would *(inaudible)* we would primarily address it.

Pompeo: Well, I mean when we come in with the construction drawings I guess that we can. Because I think it needs to be memorialized in the record as to who's agreed to build what and if not, when, and if not, who. All those kind of things.

Weir: I would recommend that as part of DRC recommendation today that we include that portion that Tierra Del Sol is going to build.

Pompeo: Okay.

Weir: Next for those *(inaudible)*.

Pompeo: This one here.

Weir: Yes.

Pompeo: Okay.

Weir: Any other comments from DRC members? Anything else Souder Miller would like to add?

Pompeo: No, I think that's it. I think we covered it all.

Weir: Well, I'll entertain a motion on this preliminary plat.
Kinney: I'll make that motion to approve with all the contingencies, was contingent upon the verification of a cul-de-sac at the end of that stem road, there is not a requirement from the development code.

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

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

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

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

Weir: Yes.

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

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

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

Nasir: Thank you.

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

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

Pompeo: No. We have to build the whole.

Johnson: This one. Okay.

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

Weir: So that's all in the motion for approval?
Weir: Could I have a second?

Pompeo: All of that.

Weir: That's a real technical term.

Dubbin: I'll second.

Weir: Okay. So I have a motion in a second with conditions for approval of preliminary plat, a recommendation to the Planning and Zoning Commission. I'll go ahead and call departments. Community Development, John.

Castillo: Yes.

Weir: Fire Department.

Dubbin: Yes.

Weir: Mike, represent Public Works.

Kinney: Yes.


Nasir: Yes.

Weir: Okay. By four/zero/one the preliminary plat has been recommended for approval. I believe it's been scheduled for the November P&Z.

Castillo: That is correct.

Weir: Okay. And so you submit the and get approvals we'll be all online with that.

Pompeo: All right.

Weir: That was our one item of business today.

V. ADJOURNMENT (09:22 a.m.)

Weir: If there's nothing else the committee wants to discuss, I'll accept a motion to adjourn.
Nasir: So moved.

Weir: Second?

Dubbin: Second.

Weir: All those in favor?

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

____________________________________
Chairperson