



City of Las Cruces[®]

Development Review Committee Agenda

The Development Review Committee (DRC) will consider the following agenda on 06/08/2022 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. MINUTES FOR 04/27/2022

Documents:

[04-27-22 DRC MINUTES.PDF](#)

3. Old Business
4. New Business
- 4.1. Mesilla Valley Community Of Hope Master Plan:
 - Review and recommendation of the campus master plan for the Community of Hope campus.
 - The master plan outlines the existing conditions, constraints, and potential options for growth and operations of the campus.
 - Highlights of the plan include recommendations for rezoning, land acquisition, site, infrastructure and facility improvements, and lease amendments.
- 4.2. Case 20CS0500024: Supreme Subdivision No. 1.
 - A request for approval of a preliminary plat for a 4-lot single-family residential development known as Supreme Subdivision No 1.
 - The proposed subdivision encompasses 0.949 ± acres, is zoned R-1aM (Single-Family Medium Density Mobile), is located on the south side of Payan Road and north of Lemo Road.
 - The subdivision proposes to replat one existing residential lot into four new residential lots.
 - Submitted by Borderland Engineers & Surveyors, LLC., representative.
- 4.3. Case 20CS0500119: Mesa Grande Estates Unit 4 Preliminary Plat

- A request for approval of a preliminary plat for an 56-lot single-family residential community known as Mesa Grande Estates Unit 4 Preliminary Plat
- The proposed subdivision encompasses 16.021 ± acres, is zoned R-1ac (Single-Family Medium Density-Conditional) and will be developed in two phases
- The subject property is located on the south of Mesa Monte Drive and west of the future extension of Mesa Grande Drive and east of Mesa Central Drive.
- Submitted by Underwood Engineering, representative.

5. Adjournment

6. Discussion

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

Date Posted: 06/03/2022

1 **DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE (DRC)**

2
3 Following are the minutes from the City of Las Cruces Development Review Committee
4 Meeting held Wednesday, April 27, 2022, at 9:00 a.m. in Room 1158.

5
6 **DRC PRESENT:** David Weir, Deputy Director Community Planning
7 Mark Dubbin, Fire Project Department
8 Meei Montoya, Senior Engineer, Utilities
9 Dominic Loya, MVMPO
10 Katarina Provenghi, MVMPO
11 Gary Skelton, Engineer, Public Works
12 Mike Kinney, Plan Review Engineer, Com. Dev.
13 Jacob Kidd, Environmental Compliant Officer
14

15 **STAFF PRESENT:** Katherine Harrison-Rogers, Senior Planner, Com. Dev.
16 John Castillo, Planner, Community Development
17 Becky Baum, Recording Secretary, RC Creations, LLC
18

19 **OTHER PRESENT:** Paul Pompeo, Souder Miller
20 Mike Johnson, Souder Miller
21 John Moscato, Sierra Norte
22

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

24
25 Weir: Good morning everybody. We have a quorum of the DRC so I'll go ahead
26 and call it to order.
27

28 **2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

29 **2.1 March 23, 2022 Minutes**

30
31
32 Weir: The first item of action are approval of minutes. We have the March 23,
33 2022 minutes. Do I have a motion to approve or motion to amend?
34

35 Dubbin: Move to approve.
36

37 Weir: I have a motion. Do I have a second?
38

39 Montoya: Second.
40

41 Weir: Okay, I'll do just a verbal roll. All those in favor.
42

43 **MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.**

44
45 Weir: All those opposed. So those minutes are approved.
46

1 **2.2 April 13, 2022 Minutes**

2
3 Weir: The second set of minutes we have are April 13, 2022. Do I have a
4 motion to approve or amend?

5
6 Dubbin: I'll make the motion to approve.

7
8 Weir: Do I have a second?

9
10 Skelton: Second.

11
12 Weir: Okay. Again, I'll just do a voice vote. All those in favor?

13
14 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

15
16 Weir: All those opposed? Okay. Those minutes are approved also.

17
18 **3. OLD BUSINESS**

19
20 **4. NEW BUSINESS**

21
22
23 Weir: I have a request to change the order of items to discuss if there's no
24 opposition. Is it all right if we discuss Mesilla Valley Community of Hope
25 Master Plan first? Okay I'll take that as okay.

26
27 **4.2 Mesilla Valley Community of Hope Master Plan**

- 28 • A City contract with Huitt-Zollars to prepare a master plan for the
29 Community of Hope campus to assess its current physical condition
30 and management structure, analyze future development and
31 management options, and recommend a preferred scenario.
32 • The Development Review Committee (DRC) has been asked to review
33 the final document and a provide a recommendation of the report and it
34 recommendations prior to review by City Council.
35 • Highlights of recommendations include:
36 o Rezoning of the properties
37 o Leas amendments.
38 o Site expansion.
39 o Infrastructure/facility improvements.
40 • For the purposes of the DRC, the focus of the review should be on
41 the Conceptual Development Site Plan (Exhibit 7) and the analysis
42 on which the report's recommendation is made.

43
44 Weir: So, Natalie or Katherine, do either one of you want to give an overview of
45 what's taking place?
46

1 Green I can give a little background history. So as many of you may know, the
2 City of Las Cruces is the owner of this, it used to be seven, now I think it's
3 upwards of 10 or 11 acres on 999 West Amador or near 999 West
4 Amador. There are five alliance agencies that do service provisions for
5 people experiencing homelessness and low to moderate income
6 individuals. They lease the facility at no cost from the City in exchange for
7 providing those services And so we have the master lease with the Mesilla
8 Valley Community of Hope and then they sublease to the other individuals
9 on the campus. And so it's been that way for quite some time. A lot of
10 times the nonprofits go after legislative funding to rehab the facilities and
11 so that always presents a challenge because we're responsible for
12 implementing those projects and those fundings. And so as part of their
13 sort of operations, we requested that they do a master plan before they
14 solicit any more legislative funding for rehabilitation.

15
16 And so this has been sort of many years in the making. And then
17 coincidentally, around the same time the City purchased the Brewer's Oil
18 field, and the Horse N Hound, one for the Casa de Peregrinos food pantry
19 expansion and then potential expansion of the campus. And so now we
20 own a pretty substantial piece. And so we wanted to include that in the
21 master plan.

22
23 As part of the master plan the consultant also evaluated the management
24 structure, how our relationship works with the nonprofits, how is it? Is it
25 working well with work orders and facility requests? And then how's the
26 whole lease stuff working? So they've done both a review of like the
27 physical structure of the campus, and then the management structure. So
28 they've made a number of recommendations. Back in 2011, 2012, maybe
29 we did a ...

30
31 H-Rogers: 2013

32
33 Green We did a PUD. So as part of, we did a PUD when there would be created
34 Camp Hope, and so they built some additional structures on the property
35 and some pad sites and tent sites. And so when we did the PUD, it did
36 not encompass three other surrounding parcels that we now own. And so
37 that was also included.

38
39 The consultant has made a number of facility recommendations. And they
40 also did some conceptual planning around what the campus could look
41 like as it expanded. There is one project that Amador Health got money
42 for that's going to be added to the front of their building and take up some
43 of the landscaping space. And so that only adds to the need for a master
44 plan, so they sort of stopped plopping these buildings everywhere without
45 considering parking and funding and all the other fun stuff we like to
46 consider.

1
2 And so in the packet and if can get up I'll pass my surface around, is sort
3 of what the final conceptual plan looks like. And so the consultant met
4 with each of the agencies and sort of asked them like, what's your ideal?
5 What would it look like? So Jardin de los Niños is at capacity, a lot of the
6 services being provided are like incongruent. So you have Camp Hope,
7 and people using the day shelter, while you have a daycare next door.
8 You also have Amador Health added some substance use and harm
9 reduction services, so like a needle exchange and that's also right next to
10 the daycare. So the campus master plan sort of resolves some of those
11 incompatible uses. And it recommends about \$25 million worth of
12 improvements to the campus overall.

13
14 So this conceptual plan does take into account the 0.7 acres, 0.7 of an
15 acre here and then the added Horse N Hound, and Brewer's Oil piece.
16 The recommendation is to reorient. So the food pantry now resides here,
17 it's moving here, and that project is under construction to reorient
18 Community of Hope as they take over the entire building, so their main
19 entrance is sort of this way, away from the existing childcare center.
20 There's a lack of current parking. Maybe in a little bit we can pull up
21 Google Earth map. There's a lot of parking occurring back here. And so
22 one of the recommendations is to explore a possible acquisition
23 opportunity here so we can have that continuous emergency access to the
24 backside of the building. So this is a potential acquisition piece. The
25 current camp sort of extends out this way and so they're hoping to add
26 additional parking. In the future, if there was a magic wand and we had all
27 the money in the world, ideally we would like to see the daycare move to
28 this area. They're at capacity now, they could potentially double their
29 classrooms. And then that would move sort of that incompatible use out
30 of the main campus for your other issues that are occurring. And then
31 because we did purchase this land with the trust fund, at least some of it
32 will be permanent supportive housing for people experiencing
33 homelessness. And so this is just like the ideal concept plan. And then
34 the other recommendations are to redo the leases to better outline sort of
35 the maintenance issues, to clean up the zoning so it has a continuous
36 zoning designation, and then to also replat because when we acquired
37 this small piece right here, we never replatted it into one.

38
39 H-Rogers: I believe there are separate pieces up here as well.

40
41 Green Yes.

42
43 H-Rogers: And then just to note this, people would have received recently a plan
44 review for this particular piece. It is moving forward.

45

1 Green And then they just got \$700,000 or a million dollars to add on to the front,
2 where there's existing, it's their existing landscaping area.
3
4 Weir: And so Natalie what you'd like the DRC to do is endorse this plan or ... so
5 that you have official action by a City body that it's been reviewed and
6 looked at and we support.
7
8 Green Yes, because it's City owned property it doesn't always necessarily come
9 to you guys to look at, so we wanted to make sure that we got you guys
10 input before it becomes official. A lot of the permitting I think goes to the
11 state and CID, and it doesn't necessarily come through the City.
12
13 Weir: And so another question I had Natalie, as the master plan was being
14 developed, the consultants touched base with the departments and got
15 input from that.
16
17 Green They did. Most of that was led by Eric Martin. And he had a number of
18 stakeholder meetings. Anthony and I sort of picked up the ball after Eric
19 retired and so we're just kind of pushing it over the finish line. So if you
20 don't like it we'll just blame Eric.
21
22 Dubbin: I don't know that, was Fire involved in that.
23
24 Green I'd have to go back and look at (*inaudible*).
25
26 H-Rogers: Yes, they were if I recall.
27
28 Dubbin: Was someone from Fire there?
29
30 H-Rogers: I'm pretty sure. Yes.
31
32 Dubbin: Okay.
33
34 H-Rogers: There were several meetings, but yes, it may have been Cody, it may
35 have been someone else.
36
37 Dubbin: Okay.
38
39 H-Rogers: But yes. Yes, I just wanted to make sure MRH was (*inaudible*).
40
41 Green I want to say Paul.
42
43 Dubbin: He'd be my first choice.
44
45 Weir: So what I'd like to do is kind of treat this like a normal case the DRC looks
46 at and so I'll open it up to any of the DRC members, if you have any
47

1 questions or any comments or any issues that you think need to be I
2 guess given by today and could be incorporated or as the master plan. So
3 Natalie I assume after we look at this, at some point in time City Council
4 will need to look at it and take action, endorsement or approval.

5
6 Green That is our intent is that it would go to Council to kind of give their final
7 blessing. So the way it sits now, and one of the reasons we even bought
8 the Horse N Hound is because you have huge 18 wheelers coming down,
9 parking, dropping off food. They're obviously using the back for parking.
10 There was a lot of ponding and flooding issues in this area. In fact, this
11 property owner, occasionally when it rains, pumps out his water. I think
12 this will be the deep end from their water. Pump his water into our
13 campus. They're using this all backside for parking. And if they build, well
14 they are building that one building, it blocks off any ...

15
16 H-Rogers: Circulations.

17
18 Green And then each of the agencies have a substantial amount of storage
19 containers that they're using. And so this purchase would also facilitate
20 maybe some joint storage opportunities. And so the other suggestion that
21 I didn't cover is the soup kitchen is sandwiched in between Amador Health
22 two facilities. And so Amador Health has gotten money to rehab this
23 facility and this facility and half the roof and half the roof, but they're kind
24 of in the middle. And so can they move out to this portion and better, they
25 work closely with Casa de Peregrinos and food services, so it would make
26 more sense for them to also move out. And then Pamela can take over
27 the entire building and then hopefully that'll limit her desire to continue to
28 expand outside of her acceptable footprint. And so I know Jardine is
29 looking at still moving, but they need some playground equipment. And
30 then there's been a lot of deferred maintenance. And so the consultant is
31 also recommending some capital infrastructure projects, like improving the
32 electrical and the parking lot, a lot of the landscaping has become very
33 ugly and is gone.

34
35 H-Rogers: Or was cut down by adjacent property owners..

36
37 Green Yes, prior executive director's cut down some of the trees or off the Horse
38 N Hound cut down all the trees along the driveway as well.

39
40 H-Rogers: I know some of the things that were discussed was potentially having
41 some sort of cross access and maybe long term that will be looked into.
42 But it really is problematic because of EBID and then the FYI stuff over
43 here.

44
45 Dubbin: That was my question. It would be good, especially with the truck traffic
46 and then the fabric to have access to from Valley.

1
2 Green And FYI is looking at doing something on the backside, so that may give
3 us an opportunity to do that.
4
5 H-Rogers: Yes, it would.
6
7 Green They are installing a second driveway from Amador to the private drive on
8 the left, my direction is left, of the Horse N Hound building.
9
10 Dubbin: Okay. Who owns that narrow parcel between FYI ...
11
12 Green The City.
13
14 H-Rogers: We own this.
15
16 Dubbin: Okay.
17
18 Weir: And that's part of the replatting efforts.
19
20 H-Rogers: It'd have to be, and I don't think we rezoned that. Did we?
21
22 Green No.
23
24 H-Rogers: Yes, so it'd have to be rezoned.
25
26 Green It wasn't included in the PUD and it needs to be. It was supposed to be
27 replatted when we acquired it. And then they tried to do a lot of the utility
28 and document the utility easements, and that is also sort of a mess
29 because we didn't own the other parcels, so they all come through the
30 driveway. And I know FYI has a lot of trouble with their sewer and their
31 sewer lines. So improvements to the utilities could eventually be a project
32 as well.
33
34 Weir: Mark were there other comments that you wanted to make?
35
36 Dubbin: No. No I'm sure Paul or Cody's weighed in on that. Thanks.
37
38 Weir: Okay. Mike, you had wanted to make comments or.
39
40 Kinney: Just I think Natalie covered some of it but like landscaping. I know that for
41 quite, for several years the existing landscaping, what does exist out there
42 doesn't meet code. And are they planning on bringing all that up to code?
43
44 Green Are they? Probably not. Are we as the City, it's a recommended project
45 that we could undertake as part of the capital improvement plan.
46

1 H-Rogers: And I would say improvements, not necessarily up to code, because I
2 don't know that there's actually available land or monies to do that in the
3 end, but it will be improvements to.
4
5 Green But I would hope that Public Works as part of the Horse N Hound consider
6 some of those landscaping, but don't hold me to that one.
7
8 H-Rogers: There's no one from public works.
9
10 Kinney: That could be an awful lot of money. That's for sure. How about on the
11 property to the north? The two properties, which are on either side. Not
12 that one, but right below it, those two. Is the City actively negotiating to
13 buy them back?
14
15 Green Yes.
16
17 H-Rogers: Yes. We owned them once.
18
19 Green So, we have our first appraisal. We're looking at the second appraisal.
20 Normally, I don't think we would have considered it but based on Pamela's
21 activities, at this point it's just necessary to have that access.
22
23 Kinney: Because I know that when I was involved as a project manager in Public
24 Works for that they're going to add that dental clinic without acquiring that
25 property, then there would be no way to get circular traffic around the
26 original building that was built back in the early '90s.
27
28 Green Yes and the parking is definitely under sized given their expansion. I
29 mean St. Luke's used to be a five person volunteer clinic, it now staffs like
30 30 people and is open full time.
31
32 Kinney: And I know that with Mr. Dubbin before the south portion of the client
33 building where you have the dogleg right on the southern portion, right
34 there that road there, and they have parking there. A pumper can't get
35 back there. And that's where the fire department connections are, on the
36 back of the building, and there's no access around the building.
37
38 Dubbin: Yes, it's kind of in a bad spot.
39
40 Kinney: I know, for the master Plan that's a good idea to try to acquire the
41 property, but if it's never acquired then we still have a safety issue.
42
43 Green We have a willing seller.
44
45 Kinney: Just got to agree on a price.
46

1 Green Yes.
2
3 Kinney: That's good.
4
5 Green And Council to agree to the funding.
6
7 Kinney: And drainage has been a problem out there, but I believe ...
8
9 Green Yes.
10
11 Kinney: Hopefully, that got resolved. And you're saying now that the owner of the
12 property ...
13
14 Green So they are recommending ...
15
16 H-Rogers: See all the water. That's all water.
17
18 Kinney: Well somebody needs to look at the, has streets maintenance looked at
19 the ...
20
21 Green They tried to resolve some of it, and they have, but when they, so this
22 actually used to be the ponding for this.
23
24 Kinney: Right.
25
26 Green There was a channel here and they ...
27
28 Kinney: Right. And they blocked it off. And we put in a drop inlet right there at that
29 corner.
30
31 Green Yes.
32
33 Kinney: And now it's ponding again.
34
35 H-Rogers: It's clogged I'm sure.
36
37 Kinney: That's part of it clogged.
38
39 Green So he put concrete here to block off the ponding that way and then
40 actually when his area floods, he gets a sump pump and pumps it into our
41 driveway, which is just ...
42
43 Kinney: Yes, I just, okay. Somebody need to ...
44
45 Green But I think Public Works ...
46

1 Kinney: You can call streets to help them or have Peter look at that.
2
3 Green They did something.
4
5 Kinney: Look at that camera here again.
6
7 Green They did something like two years.
8
9 Kinney: Yes, I was the project manager for that.
10
11 Green And I think they've resolved some of it because that pictures from '16 right
12
13 Kinney: Was that a 2016 picture? Okay. Never mind. I'm, so wait a minute.
14 There we go.
15
16 H-Rogers: I don't know why my pictures were back on 2016. Sorry, my apologies.
17 Let's move forward in time.
18
19 Dubbin: Living in the past.
20
21 Kinney: Okay.
22
23 Green It resolved, yes.
24
25 Kinney: I thought it was clogged. Sorry. Roseanne Roseannadana was saying,
26 like, never mind.
27
28 Weir: Anthony, anything you'd like to add?
29
30 Garcia: Not, well. No you guys covered it all.
31
32 Weir: Meei.
33
34 Montoya: Yes. We have reviewed the plan that was submitted. That was not
35 submitted, it was e-mail for the dental clinics. And I will provide a
36 comments back to the department who actually e-mailed the drawing.
37 And then we also have conversation was Public Works for the
38 development of that big empty parcel to see how the utility is going to be
39 extended from Amador, yes into that empty parcel area. So we have
40 some conversation and the Utility would like to, I know that the building
41 and everything will be reviewed by CID, but the Utility for any connection
42 to the City Utility and if the line is going to be extended and maintained by
43 Las Cruces Utility, those plan has to be revealed by Las Cruces Utilities.
44 And as always, that being said that Natalie that you mentioned that the
45 building that has sewer issue, Katherine, can you point to it?
46

1 H-Rogers: Yes. Which is not ours.
2
3 Montoya: Okay. But then we got e-mail, whenever there's a problem, saying that
4 what can you do? What can you do? And actually that building, when it
5 was planned there's a little private grinder station to pump the sewer into
6 the driveway, because when you, pan it down a little bit, yes. So the
7 gravity sewer line end there and there's only about five feet deep. And
8 that is why they need to have a little pump station. And then pump station
9 if you don't maintain it, they are going to give you a problem. But we have
10 a manhole at the corner of Amador and that big empty parcel. We have a
11 manhole right, yes outside the street. That manhole is about 20 feet deep.
12 It's really deep. So I'm thinking that if we can work together to maintain
13 the depths of the sewer line, perhaps that FYI, is that an FYI building, can
14 eliminate their dip station and just drain by gravity. But then you have to
15 keep the sewer deep enough for them to be able to join by gravity, so they
16 can eliminate that lift station and then somehow just drain it much.
17
18 Green And I think given how much lift station as costing them every time they
19 have to get it serviced, they would actually consider connecting if we
20 would grant them.
21
22 Montoya: They should.
23
24 H-Rogers: Mcswain, this is actually a City road and then adjacent to, just so people
25 know, adjacent to EBID. And the problem is Mcswain is on the wrong side
26 of EBID to get any of these.
27
28 Montoya: So all we are asking is that if you have any planned development just e-
29 mail to us or whatever the way that you want that for us to review it. So
30 that way we can work together and solve some previous problem. And so
31 we can take over the line if you want us to.
32
33 Green Yes. And so the Brewer's parcel, the development of that is controlled by
34 the trust fund by the housing section, so we will absolutely include you
35 guys. It's not a, it wouldn't be a Public Works, not that they're not
36 inclusive.
37
38 Montoya: But Public Works is the one ...
39
40 Green We would be inclusive.
41
42 H-Rogers: Yes, Public Works did send that, this one down here to everyone recently.
43 I don't know, did you all from Utilities receive these plans? Because we
44 didn't.
45
46 Montoya: We did.

1
2 H-Rogers: Although we discussed them we didn't actually see the final plans.
3
4 Montoya: We did. We did. And then it's about a month ago Public Work called us,
5 Jennifer Morrow's group called us to show us what the plan for Utility
6 extension to the west of that building. Because they are going to develop
7 a driveway all the way down and they want to know how the utility should
8 be extended. But we haven't seen any plans, we just saw the e-mail.
9
10 H-Rogers: Okay.
11
12 Montoya: So those plans has to come to utility for review so we can work together.
13
14 H-Rogers: Okay.
15
16 Montoya: That's all I have.
17
18 Weir: Okay. Thank you. Gary, anything from Transportation or Traffic and
19 Public Works?
20
21 Skelton: Has a TIA for this development been submitted?
22
23 Green They may have done one for (*inaudible*) but I don't, maybe not.
24
25 Skelton: Okay, with all the changes we've taken place in I don't know if we might
26 need to see that TIA for that development if we have one.
27
28 H-Rogers: So Tony was heavily involved in some of the reviews on this and I'm not
29 really quite sure if you and Hector had those discussions, but you may
30 want to double check him.
31
32 Weir: MPO. Anything?
33
34 Loya: Nothing from MPO.
35
36 Weir: Thank you. Anybody else have any comments or input they want to
37 provide? So I guess that brings us as to is everybody as a group
38 comfortable with the master plan as it is or anything you want to add to it?
39 Do you want another ... What's your timeframe to go forward to City
40 Council Natalie?
41
42 Green I am waiting for the appraisal, the second appraisal to come back on the
43 property before I sort of put this out there because I don't want the seller to
44 think that we absolutely want his property. Know what I mean?
45

1 Weir: So, I guess the DRC members, would you like additional time to review
2 the master plan and so we can table it and then bring it back? Sounds like
3 there's not an issue timewise. If there's no more discussion, I'd entertain a
4 motion to table.

5
6 Kinney: Motion.

7
8 Weir: Do I have a second?

9
10 Montoya: Second.

11
12 Weir: All those in favor?

13
14 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

15
16 Weir: All those opposed? Okay. Just let us know when you're ready to put it
17 back on the agenda and we'll do that.

18
19 Green Yes. I don't know if who from Fire and I'm not sure who from Utilities
20 participated, but there are like utility maps if you have additional
21 recommendations.

22
23 Dubbin: I'll double check.

24
25 H-Rogers: I can go back because maybe some of the old meetings that were
26 scheduled to who was listed on those because I don't recall.

27
28 Dubbin: I'll ask.

29
30 Green I remember Paul for sure. But I don't, the meetings are weird.

31
32 H-Rogers: I second that.

33
34 Garcia: And I'll look into (*inaudible*) documentation and see what he has going too
35 because I have his one page,.

36
37 H-Rogers: Okay. Okay, thank you.

38
39 **4.1 Case 21CS0500140: Sonoma Ranch North Phase 6 Subdivision**
40 **Preliminary Plat**

- 41
42
43
44
45
46
- A request for approval of a preliminary plat for a 62-lot single-family residential subdivision known as Sonoma Ranch North Phase 6 subdivision.
 - The proposed subdivision encompasses 25.09 +/- acres, is zoned r-1a/-1b (Single-Family Medium Density and High Density), is located on the east side of Sonoma Ranch Boulevard.

1 • The subdivision will dedicate a tract of land for a park, and multiple
2 tracts of land designated for drainage and utilities.
3 • Submitted by Souder Miller and Associates, representative
4

5 Weir: So that would bring us to our next case, which is the Sonoma Ranch North
6 Phase 6 Subdivisions Preliminary Plat. Paul, Mike, and John are you
7 ready to discuss now?
8

9 Pompeo: Yes.
10

11 Weir: Okay. Well I'll ask CD John if you can give an overview.
12

13 Castillo: So today we're going to have the Sonoma Ranch North Phase 6
14 Subdivision Preliminary Plat. We're requesting for approval of the
15 preliminary plat. It is a 62 lot single-family residential subdivision, known
16 as Sonoma Ranch North Phase 6. It is approximately 25 acres and in
17 size. It is currently zoned R-1a/R-1b, which is our single-family medium
18 and high density zoning districts. And it's located on the east side of
19 Sonoma Ranch Boulevard. The remaining portion of this subdivision will
20 go ahead and dedicate multiple tracts for drainage and a tract of land for a
21 park.
22

23 Weir: Souder Miller, anything you want to add or comment upon?
24

25 Pompeo: Thank you Mr. Chair. Paul Pompeo with Souder Miller Associates. I think
26 John pretty much summed it up. There is one tract that's open space,
27 recreation, and drainage. Our proposal is to split it into two separate
28 tracts, so two acres will be a park, the rest will be drainage. So we'll have
29 that physical split. So won't have the battle between Parks and Rec and
30 Public Works. Just for the, there is a sewer line that's going to be
31 abandoned and relocated. It's running through the area now taking
32 wastewater from the west of Sonoma Ranch. There are also some
33 commercial tracts that front Sonoma Ranch, but those are not part of this
34 plat. And we'll be continuing to split those out using alternative summary.
35 So with that, that concludes my summary. And I'd be happy to answer
36 any questions that the DRC might have.
37

38 Weir: John, it's been under review. Are there any outstanding comments?
39

40 Castillo: There were outstanding comments from Utilities and Engineering. I did
41 speak with Mike Johnson earlier this week, he was going to provide us the
42 updated plat that address those comments. I haven't checked to see if it
43 was sent out yet for review.
44

45 Pompeo: Those comments have been addressed and uploaded.
46

1 Weir: So they're still in, need to be reviewed. Go ahead Meei.
2
3 Montoya: Okay. At this time that I believe the resubmittal of the preliminary plat was
4 the conceptual utility plan was just submitted either yesterday or day
5 before yesterday. We had a meeting with Mike maybe two weeks ago.
6 So I don't think we have gotten the time to review that conceptual utility
7 plan per our meeting a couple of weeks ago. So with this DRC, I don't
8 know can we approve that, but we surely will work with the consultant to
9 get it approved. But I cannot say with this, today's DRC I can recommend
10 to approve because I have not seen a conceptual utility plan yet. But we
11 will work with them, if we have any issue we'll call them, we probably won't
12 try to go through another review.
13
14 Weir: Okay. Thank you. Mike you had comments.
15
16 Kinney: Yes, I would refer to Mr. Kidd as to the flood plain questions.
17
18 Kidd: So, I do just have one question regarding tract E. Are you guys planning
19 on going into this 100 year flood zone?
20
21 Pompeo: We're planning to develop this into, this is our stormwater containment
22 area. So, there will more likely than not be construction activities that do
23 go into the boundary of the flood zone that are there. But this will be a
24 drainage tract for stormwater containment for this subdivision.
25
26 Kidd: So the disturbance into this might trigger the need for a Glomar and Lomr
27 for this project, but I believe the flood notes address ... yes, so the
28 comments on this plat do address the need for following the NFIP
29 regulations. So that should be okay. I just wanted to make sure if you
30 guys were going into that flooded boundary or not.
31
32 Pompeo: Well I can see this, we'll try to stay out of it. If not, then we'll have to come
33 back and follow those requirements.
34
35 Kidd: Okay.
36
37 Weir: Okay. Katherine, John, outstanding comments from CD.
38
39 H-Rogers: I just have one comment. And I'm going to look to Gary as well on this.
40 It's not particular to this but the future alternate summary subdivisions for
41 commercial, is there an intent to have shared access on as many of those
42 parcels as possible?
43
44 Pompeo: Yes.
45
46 H-Rogers: Okay. Because I would really encourage you to do that.

1
2 Pompeo: Right, that's been discussed numerous times in the past and we do have
3 joint access on some of the other commercial properties up above. So
4 yes.
5
6 H-Rogers: Okay. Just because it's you know there's this sort of steep slopes.
7
8 Pompeo: Right.
9
10 H-Rogers: And curvature of the road. So thank you very much. I appreciate that. I
11 just wanted to put that on record
12
13 Weir: Gary.
14
15 Skelton: I already spoke to Mr. Johnson about this, they addressed some of the
16 CST or clear sight triangle notifications on some of the corner lots, but
17 there's some additional ones that don't appear to have those and I
18 provided copies of that to see about adding them to the plat. Other than
19 that I don't see any other issues. Be okay with approving with the
20 contingency they address the CST.
21
22 Weir: Mark, Fire.
23
24 Dubbin: Mr. Chairman. I'm look real quick. It' this lot here.
25
26 Pompeo: We put this eyebrow in so we can come in off the, off of here. That's 82,
27 that's 58. So 132. To here Mark or to here. 132 here.
28
29 Dubbin: So we've got to be able to park within 150 feet of what would be the back
30 of the house. So that might put us further away than that.
31
32 Pompeo: Would the, now this acre. I mean this is a larger lot here so it's not 61.
33 There just needs to be a combination on the site plan for that.
34
35 Dubbin: You can probably pay a driveway a certain distance in. So that we knew
36 we'd have paved access to that house.
37
38 Pompeo: Do we just need to put that on as a note to the plat for the, when at the
39 time that the lot development plan for this lot is submitted it has to address
40 that.
41
42 Dubbin: Yes, we can address that later, or we could require that that lot have a
43 sprinklered house on it.
44
45 Pompeo: I just got the no, we'll put the driveway in.
46

1 Dubbin: We could address that later.
2
3 Weir: Mike did you have a comment you wanted to make.
4
5 Johnson: No, I was just going to maybe comment if we possibly could get Meei's
6 conditional approval that we'll address utility plan prior to P&Z get all of her
7 comments which is what May 22nd.
8
9 Weir: Your thoughts on that, if you would prefer?
10
11 Montoya: This DRC can approve the preliminary plat even if still in review.
12
13 Weir: Conditional that all comments are met, because it'll have to go to P&Z for
14 final approval. The other thing we can do is if you think you can get the
15 review done we could schedule for next Wednesday. I don't think that will
16 ...
17
18 Montoya: I think we could, I think we can get it done probably even before Friday,
19 before this week. And we'll call you if there's something that we pick it up
20 in office that we need to talk to you, otherwise we can condition our
21 approval just in writing in Excella.
22
23 Pompeo: Meei, so is it possible today to get conditional approval with that
24 understanding that we'll address any of your comments?
25
26 Weir: What would happen Meei is if they didn't address those comments we
27 wouldn't schedule it for the May P&Z meeting. And so the June before the
28 Planning and Zoning Commission, and we wouldn't even put it on the
29 docket or the agenda, unless all your comments were addressed.
30
31 Montoya: Okay. Yes, I will. I'm okay with that. Because I did not know that we are
32 coming here to approve this. Thought we wanted to come here to talk
33 about this is if it's still pending in the review.
34
35 Weir: We've done that on occasion. But if you were more comfortable we could
36 table today, and I said put it on next Wednesday's meeting minutes. But if
37 it's things that you've agreed to, and you just want to see it corrected, I'd
38 be comfortable.
39
40 Montoya: I think our intention is to get it approved in this review cycle. We just got
41 the review; I believe either yesterday or day before yesterday. So I can go
42 back and work things out with the engineer and then we want to
43 conditionally approve this or just approve this.
44
45 Weir: I would conditionally approve it.
46

1 Montoya: Okay.
2
3 Weir: And it sounds like they have to go through filing that. MPO do have any
4 on the plat.
5
6 Loya: No. No comments.
7
8 Weir: Okay. Mike.
9
10 Kinney: I have a question about like on some of the previous subdivision like
11 Phase 5, it said there was a berm, construction berm built down into the
12 arroyo.
13
14 Pompeo: Yes.
15
16 Kinney: And I did have, for the approval of Phase 5 there were certain
17 contingencies for the approval. I don't know if those contingencies were
18 ever addressed, even though it's in final approval process. But for Phase
19 6, I don't, have you, one of the conditions we'll probably have for
20 construction is a construction easement for, I would assume you were
21 planning on doing the same thing, having a berm down into the arroyo.
22
23 Pompeo: Yes. It's not as pronounced as it is over here. But yes there will be some
24 fill activity going on there.
25
26 Kinney: Okay. We need to get a construction easement for that.
27
28 Pompeo: Okay.
29
30 Kinney: You know I realize that it was done for some of the other phases, but
31 there's you know like the drainage tracts, the drainage tracts run you
32 know, which are dedicated to the City, but technically the City's
33 maintenance responsibility ends at the boundary of the subdivision. And
34 those rundowns continued into the arroyo which is the adjacent property.
35 So some of those do have maintenance issues, right.
36
37 Kidd: It currently is, in previous zones.
38
39 Kinney: And eventually you know they're going to have to be addressed and I just
40 you know now that we're aware of you know those issues and questions
41 and stuff, I just don't want to, I'm not going to vote no for the subdivision.
42 But when it comes to construction and stuff, we're going to have to, that
43 has to be addressed. Because Phase 5 nothing on the contingency to my
44 knowledge had been actually addressed on that.
45

1 Pompeo: Okay. Probably Mike. what will have to happen just right now is that
2 probably myself and Mr. Moscato are going to have to come in and talk to
3 you about those specific items dealing with that berm and the easements
4 and things like that. But we can definitely come in and have that
5 conversation with you. Just make sure we're all up to speed on it.
6
7 Kinney: Okay. Thank you.
8
9 Weir: Any other comments or discussion by DRC members? Anything else the
10 applicants want to mention? John, do you have a recommendation?
11
12 Castillo: I have a recommendation that we approve with the conditions that we
13 meet the utilities comments be addressed prior to going to the Planning
14 and Zoning Commission, as well as (*inaudible*).
15
16 Weir: We've had discussion, we've had recommendation. Do I have a motion to
17 approve Sonoma Ranch North Phase 6 Subdivision Preliminary Plat?
18
19 Kinney: Motion to approve
20
21 Weir: With the conditions that all outstanding review comments will be
22 addressed before going to P&Z.
23
24 Kinney: Yes.
25
26 Weir: Okay. Do I have a second?
27
28 Skelton: Second.
29
30 Weir: I'll go ahead and do a roll call for that. And I'll leave you off to the hook.
31 Mark won't go first. Community Development.
32
33 Kinney: Yes.
34
35 Weir: Okay. Parks and Rec is absent. Public Works.
36
37 Skelton: Yes.
38
39 Weir: Utilities.
40
41 Montoya: Yes.
42
43 Weir: MPO.
44
45 Loya: Yes.
46

1 Weir: And Fire.

2
3 Dubbin: Yes.

4
5 Weir: Okay. So we've made a recommendation to approve the preliminary plat,
6 if all the conditions are met, we'll get it on to the May meeting.

7
8 **5. DISCUSSION**

9
10 Weir: So that brings us to the end. I'm going to change the agenda a little bit.
11 I'm going to have number six discussion before adjournment. Is there
12 anything else the DRC members would like to discuss? Not seen
13 anything

14
15 **6. ADJOURNMENT (9:45 a.m.)**

16
17 Weir: I'll entertain a motion to adjourn.

18
19 Dubbin: So moved.

20
21 Weir: Do I have a second?

22
23 Kinney: Second.

24
25 Weir: Okay. All those in favor?

26
27 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

28
29 Weir: All opposed?

30
31
32
33
34
35 _____
Chairperson