The following agenda will be considered by the Planning and Zoning Commission of the City of Las Cruces, New Mexico, at a public hearing held on January 25, 2022 beginning at 6:00 p.m. in Council Chambers at City Hall, 700 N. Main Street, Las Cruces, New Mexico.

1. Call To Order
2. Conflict Of Interest
3. Election Of Officers
4. Approval Of Minutes
   December 28, 2021

Documents:

12-28-21 PNZ MINUTES.PDF

5. Public Participation
6. Postponements - None
7. Discussion

7.1. Realize Las Cruces Development Code Update:
   A discussion with Planning and Zoning Commission, staff and the consultants, Freese and Nichols, about the progress of land development code rewrite and upcoming efforts.

8. Consent Agenda

8.1. Metro Verde Arcadia Phase 2 And Phase 3 Final Site Plan: A Request For Approval Of A Final Site Plan, Known As Metro Verde Arcadia Phase 2 And Phase 3, Located Within The Metro Verde South Planned Unit Development (PUD). The Proposed Subdivision Encompasses 33.77 ± Acres, Is Zoned PUD (Planned Unit Development), Is Located At The Southeast Corner Of Red Hawk Golf Road And Arroyo Road. The Final Site Plan Proposes 147 Single-Family Residential Lots, One (1) Tract Of Land Dedicated For Drainage And One (1) Park. The Final Site Plan Shall Be Required To Follow All Requirements Of The Metro Verde PUD Concept Plan. Submitted By Sierra Norte Development Inc., Property Owners. Council District 6. (21ZO3000123)

8.2. Metro Verde North Phase 1 Final Site Plan: A Request For Approval Of A Final Site Plan, Known As Metro Verde North Phase 1 Located Within The Metro Verde South Planned Unit Development (PUD). The Proposed Subdivision Encompasses 18 ± Acres, Is Zoned PUD (Planned Unit Development), Is Located West Of Sonoma Ranch Boulevard. The Final Site
8.3. 4010 Senna Drive Zone Change Request: A Zone Change From A-2 (Rural Agricultural District) To RE (Residential Estate) For Property Located At 4010 Senna Drive. The Property Is ± .78 Acres And Is Within Council District 2. Submitted By James Chantrill, Property Owner. (Case # 21ZO0500138)

Documents:

4010 SENNA DRIVE STAFF RPT.PDF

9. Old Business

9.1. 1016 Hickory Drive Special Use Permit Request: A Special Use Permit Request For A Penal Related Transitional Home For Women (Half-Way House) In A R-1a (Single Family Medium Density Residential) Zoning District Located At 1016 Hickory Drive. The Property Is Approximately ± 0.224 Acres In Size And Is Within Council District 4. Submitted By Teresa Medina, Property Owner. (Case # 21ZO1000105)

Documents:

1016 HICKORY DRIVE JAN STAFF RPT PDF.PDF

10. New Business

10.1. Metro Verde Planned Unit Development (PUD) Consolidated 12 Year Update Concept Plan Amendment: A Concept Plan Amendment To Consolidate The Various Amendments And Update The Development Objectives Originally Approved For The Metro Verde And Metro Verde South PUD Concept Plans. This Amendment Covers All Lands Within The Metro Verde And Metro Verde South Concept Plan Boundaries Encompassing ± 2, 123 Acres, Generally Located And Bounded By Dragonfly Boulevard (North), Engler Road/Thurmond Road (South), Jornada Road (East) And City Limit Boundary (West). The Zoning Of All Applicable Lands Is Planned Unit Development (PUD). The Proposed Amendment Addresses A Variety Of Development Related Topics Which Help Aid In Determining The Appropriateness Of Development In Context To Area Surroundin

Documents:

METRO VERDE CONSOLIDATED 12 YEAR CONCEPT PLAN STAFF REPORT.PDF

10.2. 2700 N Main Zone Change: A Request For A Zone Change From R-1a (Single-Family Medium Density) To Multiple Zones In Seven Planning Areas As Well As A Request To Vary From The Front Setbacks To Allow For Front Setbacks Of 5-10 Feet. The Property Is ± 75 Acres And Is Located At The Southeast Intersection Of N Solano Drive And N Main Street At 2700 N Main Street In Council District 1. Submitted By Tetrad Property Group. (Case # 21ZO0500112) The Requested Zones Are:

- Area 1A (Open Space District) - 5.32 Acres, OS-R/ R-2 (Open Space Recreation/ Multi-Dwelling Low Density)
- Area 2A (Flex District) - 6.31 Acres, R-3/ O-2/ C-2 (Multi-Dwelling Medium Density/ Office Professional – Limited Retail Service (Neighborhood)/ Commercial Medium Intensity)
- Area 3A (Apodaca Preserve) - 5.58, OS-R/ R-2 (Open Space Recreation, Multi-Dwelling Low Density)
- Area 3B (Cottage Residential) - 11.46 Acres, R-1b/ R-2 (Single Family...
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PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
FOR THE
CITY OF LAS CRUCES
City Council Chambers
December 28, 2021 at 6:00 p.m.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:
Sharon Thomas, Chair
Harvey Gordon, Vice-Chair
James Bennett, Member
Luis Armando Guerrero, Member
LaVonne Muniz, Member
Enrico Smith, Member

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT:
Vanessa Vega, Member

STAFF PRESENT:
Larry Nichols, Director Community Development Department, CLC
Katherine Harrison-Rogers, Senior Planner
Vincent Banegas, Interim Planner
Roberto Cabrillo, CLC Deputy City Attorney
Adrian Guzman, CLC Communications
Becky Baum, Recording Secretary, RC Creations, LLC

I. CALL TO ORDER (6:00)

Thomas: Good evening and welcome to the Planning and Zoning Commission. Today is December 28th and the time is 6:00 p.m. We need to start with calling the meeting to order, but we have two commissioners who want to participate by phone. So can I have a motion to allow them to do that? It's Commissioner Vega and Commissioner Muniz.

Gordon: All right I'll make a motion that we allow Commissioner Vega and Commissioner Muniz to participate by telephone.

Bennett: I'll second.

Thomas: Thank you. So we have a motion and a second to allow two commissioners to participate by phone. Could we have a roll call?

Baum: Board Member Bennett.

Bennett: Yes.

Baum: Board Member Guerrero.
Guerrero: Yes.

Baum: Board Member Smith.

Smith: Yes.

Baum: Board Member Gordon.

Gordon: Yes.

Baum: Board Member Vega. Board Member Vega can you hear us? Board Member Muniz.

Muniz: Yes.

Baum: Thank you.

Thomas: Can some work on getting Board Member Vega connected?

H-Rogers: Chairwoman Thomas. We are trying to get her to connect. She's connected, she just can't hear any of us. So they're trying to reestablish that connection.

Thomas: Thank you for that information.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a. October 26, 2021

Thomas: Okay, the next item on our agenda is approval of the minutes from November 23, 2021. I need a motion and a second to approve the minutes.

Bennett: I make a motion that we approve the minutes from the previous meeting.

Guerrero: I'll second it.

Thomas: Okay, we have a motion and a second to approve the minutes from November 23rd. Is there any discussion?

I have something I want to bring up. Mr. Nichols mentioned on page 16 about the public outreach and the developers and builders who are now our ad hoc committee working on the land development code. I just want to state my opposition to that. I don't think that a special interest group like that should be involved in the actual writing of the code. They were
involved when we worked on the comprehensive plan. And now all that
the consultants are charged with is writing the land development code to
meet the comprehensive plan. And we don't, I spoke to people from
AARP and the bicycle group and Safe Routes to School and American
Heart Association, and they all feel like if the homebuilders get to be an ad
hoc committee that's actually involved in the writing of the code, that they
all should be able to be there as well. So I want to state my opposition
and give the floor to anyone else who wants to state their opposition or
approval, or if we want to as a commission say that we don't approve of
that.

Gordon: I happen to agree with you. The problem with, to put it bluntly is that they
march to the beat of their own drum. And I don't think they care very
much about the City.

Thomas: I can't hear you. Can you get a little closer?

Gordon: I said, I happen to agree with you. I feel that basically to put it bluntly, like
I said, is that the builders, they just march to the beat of their own drum.
And pretty much inconsiderate sometimes of what is good for the City, just
for them.

Guerrero: I agree as well. I mean as much as I understand that some of the home
builders have experience, obviously they have experience in development.
I do feel like there should be a voice more of the people of Las Cruces as
well. So I oppose as well.

Thomas: Thank you.

Muniz: Sharon.

Thomas: Yes.

Muniz: Yes. I also agree with you.

Thomas: Thank you Commissioner Muniz. Any other comments? Yes, Mr. Nichols.

Nichols: Thank you Madam Chairman, Commissioner. Larry Nicholas Community
Development. The announcement that I made at that meeting, and then
showed up in the minutes, was information that was brought forward. The
Mayor, Mayor Miyagishima and the City Manager, Mr. Pili, had met with
the developers, the ad hoc committee requestees and they agreed to form
this committee to work with the land development code. And that's the
reason that it was presented to you. But I'll carry the information.
Obviously, this is being broadcast publicly and on the minutes, but I will
carry the information back to the Mayor, City Manager about your comments. Thank you.

Thomas: Thank you. I've been in communication with the Mayor all day. And the other groups would like to meet with the Mayor and the City Manager as well. They just want that to be on the record also. Okay, so we need a vote on the approval of the amendments.

Baum: Board Member Muniz. Board Member Muniz

Muniz: Approve.

Baum: Thank you. Board Member Vega. Board Member Vega. Board Member Bennett.

Bennett: Yes.

Baum: Board Member Guerrero.

Guerrero: Yes.

Baum: Board Member Smith.

Smith: Yes.

Baum: Board Member Gordon.

Gordon: Yes.

Baum: Chairperson Thomas.

Thomas: Yes.

Baum: Thank you.

III. CONFLICT OF INTEREST
At the opening of each meeting, the chairperson shall ask if any member on the Commission or City staff has any known conflict of interest with any item on the agenda.

Thomas: Next is conflict of interest. Does anybody have a conflict of interest with any of the items on the agenda tonight? No. Seeing none. Commissioner Muniz do you have any conflicts?

Muniz: No.
Thomas: Commissioner Vega, are you on the line yet? No.

IV. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Thomas: Okay, we'll go on to public participation. This is for anybody who wants to speak about something that is not on the agenda. If you're here to speak about something on the agenda, we ask that you would wait until that item comes up and we have the presentation. So is there anyone here to speak on something that's not on the agenda? Okay, seeing none.

V. CONSENT AGENDA

Thomas: There's nothing on the consent agenda.

VI. OLD BUSINESS - NONE

Thomas: And there's no old business.

VII. NEW BUSINESS

1. Ellora Vista Subdivision Master Plan: A request for approval of a master plan known as Ellora Vista Subdivision. The master plan proposes the development of 94 single-family lots with one tract dedicated to the City of Las Cruces for drainage and utilities to be developed. The subject properties encompass 18 +/- acres, is zoned R-3 (multi-dwelling medium density) and is located west of Jornada Road and north of Peachtree Hills Road. Submitted by Legacy Acquisitions LLC, Representatives. Council District 5. (21CS0500086)

Thomas: So we will go to new business. Agenda item 7.1 Ellora Vista Subdivision Master Plan.

Gordon: Commissioner Thomas. I think we're going to have to vote on these two items together. And we're going to see the presentation of these two items together, but we're going to vote.

Thomas: Thank you. Yes. There are two items that have to do with this subdivision. So first we need a motion to say that we can discuss them together. But we will vote on them separately. But I need a motion to say we'll discuss them together.

Bennett: I make a motion that we discuss 7.1 and 7.2 together.

Smith: I second the motion.

Thomas: Okay. Roll call.
Baum: Board Member Muniz.

Muniz: Yes.

Baum: Thank you. Board Member Vega. Board Member Bennett.

Bennett: Yes.

Baum: Board Member Guerrero.

Guerrero: Yes.

Baum: Board Member Smith.

Smith: Yes.

Baum: Board Member Gordon.

Gordon: Yes.

Baum: Chairperson Thomas.

Thomas: Yes.

Baum: Thank you.

Thomas: Okay. And now we have a presentation.

H-Rogers: Good evening, Members of the Commission. This particular presentation is for the Ellora Vista Subdivision. This is both a master plan and a preliminary plat. And as you indicated Chair Thomas, these would be voted on separately, however they are related.

So the site consists of about 18 acres. It's west of Jornada Road and north of Peachtree Hills Road, just east of the school there as well as south from a multifamily development that's to the north. It's currently zoned R-3 and it is vacant and undeveloped. Here is a picture of the site in question. As you can see the school is here to the west. There's another school up here to the north, and in just north of it is that small multifamily development that I had mentioned. And the Metro Verde development that we're all familiar with you can see is very nearby to the south of Peachtree at this location.

Again, just a zoning map so you can see the types of zones that surround that. Again multifamily, there's some single-family where the schools are
located, the PUD, which is Metro Verde, and a holding zone to the south. Currently, there are two parcels, and they're interested and they're proposing 94 single-family lots and then one tract that is dedicated for drainage and utilities. Based on staff's review, we saw that it met the requirements of the Subdivision Code, the Design Standards, Active Transportation Plan and Elevate Las Cruces. This is listed as part of the suburban place type and so the lot sizes, the layouts, and the uses are within that place type character.

Here's an example of what's being proposed. This specifically is a preliminary plat but it doesn't differ wildly from the master plan, it's just much more clear. On this you can see the roadways intersecting over here, and then it loops. And then out of consideration for the development to the south, the developer is placing that roadway adjacent to the lot to the south so that it would make development much more cohesive moving forward.

Reviews were sent to all the relevant agencies and departments. All of those reviewing agencies and departments did support the project. During their reviews they didn't note anything that would indicate that there were any need for mitigation or any negative comments. Notice was sent to the surrounding properties. There was one phone call with just some general questions about the development, what they were doing. The Development Review Committee also reviewed the project, that was on December 8, 2021. And after some short discussion did recommend approval. Staff is recommending approval based on the findings that this complies with the, that the master plan and the preliminary plat comply with one another. They both comply with all the requirements of the Zoning Code and the Subdivision Code, Elevate Las Cruces and the Design Standards. And of course the Development Review Committee did approve the master plan and preliminary plat.

It should be noted that ... I just lost my train of thought, excuse me for that. So your options tonight are to vote "yes," which would approve, to vote "no" to deny, "yes" with conditions, or vote to table. Please note that denial would require new information or facts that weren't otherwise identified in the staff report or during the discussion tonight. So with that, I'm open to questions. And the engineer as well as the applicant are here to answer any additional questions on this. Ultimately, the reason that the master plan is being done and again they look very, very similar is simply because the number of lots associated with that exceeds 40. And so they're required to do a master plan in addition to this preliminary plat. Moving forward if this were to be approved, they could proceed with a final plat and then construction drawings.

Thomas: I have one question. This roadway that's on the southern side.
H-Rogers: Yes ma'am.

Thomas: Is this so there will be connectivity to any future development?

H-Rogers: Yes ma'am. That was the intent.

Thomas: Okay. So I'm very happy to see that. It's a problem we have in many parts of the City where we have subdivisions that are not connected to one another, so all the traffic goes out onto one road or people have to go out on that road to go in the next subdivision. And I hope going forward we're not going to do that anymore.

H-Rogers: And I would like to point out, the applicant worked long and hard to try to negotiate some connections to the school property that's just to the west. And unfortunately, based on a number of factors, that was not viable. However, they made their best attempt to try to create that connectivity.

Thomas: But there are sidewalks right, that go down to the corner.

H-Rogers: That is correct.

Thomas: And around the corner and up the ...

H-Rogers: That is correct.

Thomas: Okay. Yes, so, because when the Peach, when that elementary school was first built there was no sidewalk up to the school. There were roads, but no sidewalks.

H-Rogers: So any development associated with this, if there are any missing sidewalks at least adjacent to this property, they will develop those and then Peachtree has sidewalks as well.

Thomas: Okay. Thank you very much.

H-Rogers: You're welcome.

Thomas: Commissioners. Questions, comments? No. Anyone in the public who wants to comment on this proposal? Okay, so now we'll have to go back for separate votes. So we need a motion to approve 7.1 and a second. We'll vote on that and then we'll need a motion for 7.2 and to vote on that.

H-Rogers: And Madam Chair, Members of the commission. Just to be clear, the master plan is the first vote, the preliminary plat is the second vote.
Thomas: For the master plan.

Guerrero: I'll make a motion to vote on both of those. Do I have to mention them individually or?

Thomas: Yes, we should do them individually.

Guerrero: Okay so, okay perfect. So I make a motion to vote on 7.1 and 7.2.

Thomas: Just say 7.1.


Bennett: I second.

Thomas: Okay. Any more discussion from the Commissioners? Okay. And have a roll call

Baum: Board Member Muniz.

Muniz: Yes. Based on staff findings and discussion this evening.

Baum: Thank you. Board Member Vega. Board Member Bennett.

Bennett: I vote yes. Meets Elevate Las Cruces, current Zoning Codes, along with the increased connectivity.

Baum: Board Member Guerrero.

Guerrero: I vote yes as well, based on the staff recommendations and it meeting the comprehensive plan.

Baum: Board Member Smith.

Smith: I vote yes based on meeting staff recommendation and it also complies with the Elevate Las Cruces comprehensive plan.

Baum: Board Member Gordon.

Gordon: I vote yes based on findings, staff recommendations and comprehensive plan. Yes.

Baum: Chair Thomas.

Thomas: I vote yes based on site visit and staff recommendation and the nice connectivity. And just for the record I want to read what it says in Elevate
Las Cruces, continuation and projection of streets; as development occurs existing streets should be extended, and when an adjacent area is undeveloped, the right-of-way layout should provide for the possible future continuation of the street, or in this case a street that will sort of be shared between the two developments. So, yes. So it passes six/nothing

2. **Ellora Vista Subdivision Preliminary Plat:** A request for a preliminary plat known as Ellora Vista. The proposed subdivision encompasses 18 +/- acres, is currently zoned R-3 (multi-dwelling medium density). The preliminary plat proposes 94 single-family residential lots and a tract dedicated for drainage and utilities to be developed. Submitted by Souder, Miller and Associates, Representatives on behalf of Tierra Del Sol Housing Corporation. (21CS0500087)

Thomas: I need a motion now for 7.2.

Bennett: I make a motion to approve 7.2.

Thomas: Is there a second?

Guerrero: I second it.

Thomas: Any more discussion? Can we have a roll call?

Baum: Board Member Muniz.

Muniz: Yes based on staff recommendations.

Baum: Board Member Vega. Board Member Bennett.

Bennett: Yes, based on staff recommendation.

Baum: Board Member Guerrero.

Guerrero: Yes, just like last the last one, based on staff recommendations and meaning the comprehensive plan.

Baum: Board Member Smith.

Smith: I vote yes, based on staff recommendation and also compliance with the thoroughfare plan.

Baum: Board Member Gordon.

Gordon: I vote yes, based on staff recommendations, and it complies with Elevate Las Cruces.
Baum: Chair Thomas.

Thomas: I vote yes based on site visit, staff recommendations, and Elevate Las Cruces. Motion passes six to zero.

3. **Bumble Bee Learning Center Master Plan:** A request for approval of a master plan known as Bumble Bee Learning Center. The master plan proposes the development of two commercial lots and one multi-family residential lot that will be developed in phases and/or lot line adjustments for future commercial and residential uses. The subject properties encompass 5.64 +/- acres, is currently zoned $-2 (multi-dwelling low density) and is located west of Holman Road and north of Bataan Memorial West. Submitted by Souder Miller and Associates, Representatives. (21ZO0500020)

Thomas: Next, we now have two more items that we want to discuss together. So can I have a motion to discuss 7.3 Bumblebee Learning Center master plan and 7.4 Bumblebee Learning Center zone change.

Gordon: All right I'll make a motion that we deal with items 7.3 and 7.4. That we'll vote on separately.

Thomas: Okay. Is there a second to discuss together but vote separately?

Bennett: I second.

Thomas: Okay. Any discussion? Can we have a roll call?

Baum: Board Member Muniz.

Muniz: Yes.

Baum: Board Member Vega. Board Member Bennett.

Bennett: Yes.

Baum: Board Member Guerrero.

Guerrero: Yes.

Baum: Board Member Smith.

Smith: Yes.

Baum: Board Member Gordon.
Gordon: Yes.

Baum: Chair Thomas.

Thomas: Yes. We have a presentation. Yes.

H-Rogers: We do. Members of the Commission, Chair. This is Katherine Harrison-Rogers. This particular project is similar to the last one in that there is a master plan, however, instead of a preliminary plat associated with it, there are multiple zone changes. Any subdivision would occur if this is approved and at a later date. Ultimately, this particular property is also vacant and undeveloped. It's about five and a half acres. It's located west of Holman Road and north of Bataan Memorial West with frontage along the Bataan Memorial. It's currently zoned R-2 which is a multifamily low density zoning district.

Here's the map. You can see that the R-2 is surrounded on all sides by R-2, however, there is some commercial and higher intensity multifamily nearby. Again, here's an aerial, you can see the nature of development in that area. Of course there's a school, some single-family residential subdivisions, some vacant properties. And then when you get across the road or across the interstate, it's not an interstate, but across the highway Bataan Memorial, there is some limited sort of commercial development.

This master plan and corresponding zone change is proposing two commercial parcels and one multi-dwelling parcel to be again subdivided in the future. The zone change request is from R-2 to C-3, which is a high intensity commercial, and also R-2 in some of the areas, so maintaining that zoning that's already there. The commercial zoning districts will be fronting Bataan Memorial West where high intensity commercial uses are generally appropriate and recommended in both Elevate Las Cruces and our current Zoning Codes. The multi-dwelling residential land uses will be near Holman Road, they don't front Holman Road exactly but they will be near Holman Road. And the applicant is placing conditions upon themselves for limited land uses. Those limited land uses were outlined I believe in Attachment 3 of the report, to try to mitigate any potential high intensity impacts on the neighborhood that already exists out there. They're proposing that this will be phased and most likely subdivided through the alternate summary subdivision process, which is an administrative process.

During our review staff did determine that it did meet our Subdivision Code requirements for the master plan, the Design Standards, as well as the Zoning Code as amended. Ultimately, what they're proposing, you can see here that the two properties along Bataan are being proposed as
commercial. This last property, number three, would be, excuse me, I
misspoke. Number one would be residential, two and three would be the
commercial properties.

Now, the Development Review Committee did review this on December
8th, specifically for the master plan, not for the zoning because ultimately
they don't have control over projects outside of the subdivision process.
After some minor discussion, it was recommended for approval. It should
be noted that the applicant did go through the early notification process to
alert the neighbors and provide them an opportunity to express their
feelings about the zone change and the master plan. City staff did receive
some input from the public, basically with concerns about future
commercial development and the intensity near their neighborhood. And
as I had stated before, the applicant did provide some limited uses to try to
address those concerns.

Now, Planning and Zoning is the final authority on the master plan.
However, Planning and Zoning is a recommending body to City Council,
so ultimately for the zone change that will go to City Council. However the
master plan would be approved at this level. I do recommend again
individual motions for each proposal as we did on the last project. And
staff is recommending approval of the master plan, and then approval with
conditions for the zone change, specifically the conditions limiting those
uses as outlined in Attachment number 3 of your staff report. And this is
based on staffs findings outlined here and also reiterated in the staff
reports that were provided to you. And again, the conditions based on
what's in Attachment 3 of the staff report. Your options tonight are to vote
"yes," vote no," "yes" with conditions, or to table. And of course the
applicant, Souder, Miller is here to address any questions you may have.
And I do believe there are members of the public here who'd like to speak
to this as well.

Thomas: Thank you Katherine. So maybe we should discuss the master plan first
and then the zone change, or what order are they?

H-Rogers: So Madam Chair, Members of the Commission. The master plan in terms
of voting would need to be voted upon first, the zone change would come
second. However, I think you could discuss them simultaneously and
make a determination on that because one dictates the other ultimately,
they do influence one another.

Thomas: Okay. Any questions or concerns or comments from any of the
Commissioners? No. Seeing none.

Muniz: Madam Chairman.
Thomas: Yes.

Muniz: Yes. I'd like to ask a question. And it's in regard to the commercial part of the plan. I'd like to know what type of buildings are being built for commercial. When I asked that question, what are they going to attract supermarkets, another dollar store, a thrift store? What are they being built to attract? I'd like to hear from the builder or the person asking for the zone change improvement.

H-Rogers: Madam Chair. If I might,

Thomas: Yes,

H-Rogers: The applicant is here today and does have a presentation. I think that may clarify.

Thomas: Yes, that would be great.

Pompeo: Good evening, Madam Chair, Commission. My name is Paul Pompeo with Souder, Miller and Associates. And we are here to present this case on behalf of the owner.

Thomas: You know the drill.

Pompeo: Yes ma'am.

Thomas: Do you swear and affirm the testimony you're about to give us the truth and nothing but the truth under penalty of law?

Pompeo: Yes, I do.

Thomas: Thank you.

Pompeo: Thank you Madam Chair and Commission for the opportunity to present this to you tonight. I do have a presentation so as to not be repetitive I'll skip to, the staff's presentation was quite comprehensive, so I'll skip to the good parts. What you see before you adjacent to Holman Road and US Highway 70 is the subject property. There is a zone change.

Muniz: Madam Chair. I can't hear him at all.

Pompeo: How about now?

Muniz: No.
Thomas: Can you get a little closer to the microphone? I don't know, maybe you need to take your mask off.

Pompeo: If it's okay I'll take my mask down. Once again the property is located off the northwest corner of Holman Road and US Highway 70. The property is currently zoned R-2. This plan seeks to keep a portion of it zoned R-2 and other portions modified to C-3. For the record, I'd like to point out that the C-3 designation is wholly because of the size of the lots. If we were not talking about one acre lots then the appropriate zoning would be C-2. But we're limited to C-3 because of the lot size.

This is the proposed Master Plan showing the three lots being created as Katherine mentioned by subdivision process at a later date. I did want to make one modification to staff's presentation; right now that property is zoned R-2 and it's kind of an odd shape here but you can see on the screen. We are proposing to keep this property that's in the northeast quadrant or section that will stay R-2. The C-3 properties that front Bataan that are more appropriate for those uses because they take access directly off Bataan.

We're getting

Thomas: We're getting an awful lot of feedback. I don't know. I don't think it's you. Do you think it's the open line to Commissioner Muniz?

H-Rogers: Commissioner Muniz. Can you mute your phone please?

Muniz: On mute.

H-Rogers: Is that better? I think that's better.

Thomas: I think so. Yes. Thank you.

Pompeo: Okay. Thank you Madam Chair, Commission. As I was pointing out that on the actual zone change, R-2 will stay in the quadrant in the upper northeast section and the zone change to C-3 is for this these two parcels here that front Bataan Memorial as that's more of an appropriate use pursuant to the comprehensive plans and Elevate Las Cruces to have commercial uses that front that section of Bataan. A question was asked as to what is anticipated to be there, one of the tracts, the tract to the west will be that of the learning center as it's been presented in the applicant's presentation. The C-3 to the east will be general neighborhood commercial type uses. So they could be freestanding stores or things of that nature. But I'd like to point out with the property only being slightly over, I think this tractor is 1.2 acres in size, those uses are limited as far as square footage and intensity of use. So with that, Madam Chair, that
concludes my presentation. I would be happy to answer any questions that this Commission might have. And I would also like the opportunity at a future to respond to anybody that may be speaking about this case.

Thomas: Thank you very much.

Gordon: I have a question.

Thomas: Yes.

Gordon: What access will be available to get to R-2?

Pompeo: Well, Madam Chair, Commission. There will be a single driveway that is proposed in this section here off Bataan Memorial that will be applied for and permitted through the New Mexico Department of Transportation. And that will be the primary access to these properties. There is no plans at this time currently today to do any development on the R-2 tract to the back.

Gordon: But if there is and say you’re going to put some houses or something in there, then how are they going to get out? How fire going to get there? Police?

Pompeo: Well, in order to develop this and to your point, if there was going to be a multifamily even low density residential in this area, there would have to be multiple access routes. So when this property R-2 goes to be developed, they’re going to have to figure an access through the adjacent property out to Bataan so thereby having two separate and distinct access points.

Gordon: Do they own the adjacent property?

Pompeo: No, they do not.

Gordon: What happens if the owner doesn't want to give them an easement?

Pompeo: Well, I believe that pursuant to the fire code we'd be, the property ends up being undevelopable in the back if we can't secure those other access. Because I don't I believe based on my working relationship with Las Cruces Fire Department that they would have to have that access. So if they cannot secure it, then they're limited on what they can do with the property.

H-Rogers: Commissioner Gordon, Members of the Commission. I would like to point out that during any sort of subdivision process, staff would have to ensure that legal access is provided to all properties. So in terms of a commercial
or multifamily development, that could be a 50 foot driveway easement leading to that back property. And we would ensure that that would occur during the subdivision phase of this as is required by code.

Gordon: Okay, thank you.

Thomas: I'm not sure I understood that Katherine. Can you, so would that road go through the lot 2 over to three or?

H-Rogers: So during any sort of subdivision process, Madam Chair, Members of the Commission, staff would ensure that if this were to be subdivided off as its own property, that there would be an easement providing access from Bataan Memorial to this R-2 property, or as an alternative, another access secured through the adjacent, the adjoining property. But that would have to occur in order to subdivide this. They would have to provide legal access and staff would ensure that at the time of subdivision.

Thomas: But that legal access could come off of Bataan Memorial.

H-Rogers: It could.

Thomas: It could.

H-Rogers: Via an easement in one of the C-3 properties.

Thomas: Okay. Thank you. Any more comments from up here? Okay. Are there people here who would like to speak?

Pompeo: Thank you your Madam Chair.

Thomas: Can you raise your hand so I can see how many people want to speak? Okay, we're going to limit comments to three minutes. So if you want to come down. We'll start on the left here, so the first, yes you're the first person on the left. If you want to come down here. Can you state your name?

J. Bulla: My name is John Bulla.

Thomas: Okay, I need to swear you in.

J. Bulla: Yes ma'am.

Thomas: Do you swear and affirm the testimony you're about to give is the truth and nothing but the truth under penalty of law?

J. Bulla: Yes ma'am.
Thomas: Thank you. Go ahead.

J. Bulla First of all, just to kind of go over what was recently discussed. Concerns were not just sent by phone calls, they’re also by e-mails by numerous members of the neighborhood. When you talk about commercial's already established in the area, it is on the other side of US 70 not on the north side of US 70. Also, you went through slide nine very quickly, I really would like to know what was on that slide. And lastly when you talk about general store, when you talk about a general residential store, there’s still no solid what kind of store. We don’t know.

So with that being said, I also would like to, as we talked about purpose, authority,. and scope of zoning condition, Section 38.2 purpose of intent, I’d like to figure out mitigate congestion in the streets and public ways. Right now with the two elementary schools on Holman Road there’s so much congestion in the morning and afternoon when schools are in session. There is no police there to monitor/control that traffic, so building a commercial into that area would be even more harmful for congestion. Secure safety from fire, floodwaters, panic, and other dangers, we're already next to a flood zone, so by building commercial properties there increased water. What are we going to do for flooding there? Promote health and general welfare. By bringing in commercial, even a daycare center, learning center, you're going to have diapers, you going to have food waste, which is going to attract vermin, snakes, spiders, scorpions, other trash. There's already feral hogs running around from construction going on north of Holman. There's already javelinas running around from the construction going on north of Holman. So what are we going to do to protect the neighborhood there? Prevent overcrowding of land. Sorry, that kind of speaks for itself. Approving this is going to overcrowd that property by going into a commercial zone. Facilitate adequate provisions, transportation, water, sewage, schools, parks, and other public requirements. So how are you going to, with all the congestion already going on with the two elementary schools, the WIC program out there, how are you going to facilitate being able to provide transportation safely, not only for the residents of the area, but new people coming to the area? Also, there’s so many more things I can go over but I'm limited on time. But lastly, as far as the neighborhood itself is concerned, when that was designed and approved, our neighborhood was supposed to have a park and sidewalks. We have yet to receive that. So how are we going to be able to facilitate this when the City's responsibility still hasn't been met to what was promised to us as residential occupants of that area? Thank you.

Thomas: Thank you. Okay, next row on the left side. There’s somebody. Row three did you want to come? Yes.
Augustyniak: Hi, my name is Mark Augustyniak. I live back in the neighborhood.

Thomas: Okay. Do you swear and affirm the testimony you’re about to give is the truth and nothing but the truth under penalty of law?

Augustyniak: I do.

Thomas: Thank you.

Augustyniak: Well my question is looking up there at his thing, the middle property, what's going in there? We don't even know what kind of commercial building’s going in there. Okay, you're going to throw something in there. It's going to devalue our property value. Okay. Number one. Number two, what's it going to do for crime? Where's the closest police station to that area? There's not one. So you're taking chance of raising the crime rate. I mean it's just, it's a train wreck, the whole thing. How do you propose to police that area when we barely get policed right now? Answers?

I mean, they're not even telling us what's going to go in that middle piece of property, some commercial building. There going to be a three story, four story building. They're not saying. So what's going to go in there? You're going to have a daycare going on the left, I understand that, and housing on the right. What about that middle piece of property? What are we going to stick in there? And what's it going to do to our neighborhood as far as crime and property value going down because they're going to stick something there that we don't know, what? Don't we have a right to know what's going to go in there? That's all I've got to say. Thank you.

Thomas: I think I understand that the lot on the left is housing and the middle lot is the learning center.

Augustyniak: I'd still like to see a more, you know exactly what's going to go in there. Because we don't know what kind of building they're going to stick in there. Is it going to be a four story building? They're not telling us that.

Thomas: Well, those kinds of things will be decided later on in the process …

Augustyniak: Well I'm just saying …

Thomas: And they'll work with staff.

Augustyniak: I just think it'd be nice to know a little bit more, because we live in that neighborhood. We got to deal with these things. Like I said, law
enforcement out there is very nonexistent. I mean you don't see patrols coming through there as it is now. I've been there almost 15 years.

Thomas: Okay. Thank you.

Augustyniak: Thank you.

Thomas: Anyone else on the left hand, my left hand side? Yes. One, two, three, row four.

V. Bulla: My name is Veronica Bulla.

Thomas: Can you pull the microphone down?

V. Bulla: Hi. Veronica Bulla.

Thomas: Do you swear and affirm that the testimony you're about to give is the truth and nothing but the truth under penalty of law?

V. Bulla: I do. I'm just going to read the letter that I sent in response to this whole debacle here. To Whom It May Concern. I am writing in reference to your letter which proposes rezoning the above noted property from residential multidwelling low density zone R-2 to commercial high intensity zone C-3. C-3 zone permits a wide range of high intensity commercial activities generating large amounts of traffic serving a wide region of the City. As a homeowner in this immediate area I would be directly impacted by this proposed zoning change. And I'd like to state a few things. Firstly, we purchased this property outside of the valley in a strictly residential area to enjoy the joys and comforts of bright starry night skies, views of the Organ Mountains, less traffic, more space, convenience to shopping without congestion and traffic. Your plan will have severely damaging consequences for our neighborhood. Secondly, your proposal if allowed will negatively impact my neighborhood and community with respect to the commercial parking lot lighting, increased traffic, noise, garbage, vermin, snakes, crime, dumpster garbage pickup times and noise at who knows what hour, vendor deliveries, food, trash and refuse being left about by patrons of the commercial spaces. And also this would establish a toehold and open up our entire residential community to more and more commercial building. What happens when they decide to sell this property at some point and that person doesn't respect their limits, then what happens to our community?

Also, this has effect on our values as other members of the community have said. And as a homeowner it also affects our ability to enjoy our investment as we intended. Who wants to live by a storage facility that's in between their house and their view of the majestic Organ Mountains?
He talked about the Bumble Bee Learning Center, storage units, small commercial shopping center, which brings up daycare supplies like food, garbage, trash diapers, wipes, gloves. Peak traffic congestion at a daycare drop off and pickup impacting commuting traffic in the immediate area where there are already two elementary schools and WIC side by side just a block away. Additional traffic and nonresident parking in residential areas on our street and Calico due to the proximity, overflow parking leaving our, we don't have any sidewalks. Where are they going to park? Commercial dumpsters being picked up, banging around loudly, crime, environmental disturbances from vehicle exhaust fumes, loitering, car lights, engine noises. I realize that you and your client purchased this property knowing that it was residential. There's plenty of commercial property kitty-corner across on the other side. Thank you

Thomas: Anyone else on my left side? Okay. One, two, three, four, five, row five.

C. Main: My name is Carol Main and I live on Calico.

Thomas: Okay. Do you swear and affirm that the testimony you're about to give is the truth and nothing but the truth under penalty of law?

C. Main: Yes.

Thomas: Thank you.

C. Main: Okay, the proposal we all received in August is not what they is putting before a vote has changed. We weren't notified of the change till we got the letter about this meeting. We haven't seen your Attachment 3. There seems to be some confusion between what this gentleman just said and what the Chairman understands what the three parcels are. I understand the one right behind my house from what he said is the R-2 one. You think it's the daycare. The original proposal said storage. So we need some concrete clarification on what the three parcels are because Sharon Thomas is not understanding what I understand based on what this gentleman just said 10 minutes ago. That's all I say.

Thomas: Thank you. Would you like to respond to that about what the three lots are? Maybe I'm misunderstanding.

Pompeo: Thank you Madam Chair. To clarify, on the map before you on the screen, there was an original proposal I think when this project first started that had, they were going to, we were going to do C-3 on all of the parcels. That has changed. On this tract here which is the upper northeastern region, that will remain R-2. The two tracts as shown to the southwestern area of the property that both front Bataan Memorial are being requested to change to C-3. So C-3 on the two pieces that front Bataan, R-2 in the
upper, the eastern section, so this basically, this R-2 remains unchanged. There is no zone change requested for this parcel in the back.

Thomas: Okay I stand corrected. So the two parcels that front on to Bataan Memorial are the two commercial.

Pompeo: Yes.

Thomas: And the one that's further back is the one that remains residential.

Pompeo: That is correct Madam Chair.

Thomas: Okay. Thank you.

Pompeo: Thank you.

Thomas: Okay, anybody else on that side? Okay.

PERSON IN THE AUDIENCE SPEAKING, NOT AT THE MICROPHONE.

Thomas: Yes. No, could you come, you have to come down to the microphone because we have to record everything. Sorry.

G. Main: My name is Gerald Main. That's my wife just asking the question. The question she wants …

Thomas: Okay. Do you swear to and affirm that the testimony you're about to give is the truth and nothing but the truth under penalty of law?

G. Main: I do.

Thomas: Thank you.

G. Main: The question she has is, is precisely which plot is the daycare going on? With some confusion about that. Also, my question is exactly what are they going to do or put on the section that is going to remain R-2? That's my question for the …

Thomas: Say the last part again. What's going to remain R-2?

G. Main: We would like to know precisely what is going to go, what is being proposed for construction on the R-2 zoned plot. Okay.

Thomas: Okay. Thank you.
G. Main: Also and we'd like clarification on exactly which part of the C-3 is the daycare going on?

Thomas: Okay. I think Katherine is going to answer your question.

H-Rogers: Chair Thomas, Members of the Commission. As I understand it this western most C-3 parcel would be the daycare. At this point in time, there are no proposals for the R-2. However, from a land use standpoint in zoning it could be developed as multifamily, it could be developed as townhomes, it could be developed as single-family residential.

G. Main: Thank you ma'am.

Thomas: Anyone else on my left hand side? Yes, do you want to come down?

Ambriz: My name is Eileen Ambriz. I'm a resident of the area there.

Thomas: Okay, do you swear and affirm the testimony you're about to give is the truth and nothing but the truth under penalty of law?

Ambriz: I do.

Thomas: Thank you.

Ambriz: So a couple of questions that I have is they keep talking about the size of the commercial lots. That they are limited to what can go there because of the size of them, because it's only five acres. So you have the C-3, which is smaller than you know the one furthest, what would that be west, is smaller than the larger one. Nothing is planned for the larger one, but the Bumble Bee is already for this smaller lot. Is this going to be a small, tiny little learning center? Because I live right behind, I mean that is right behind my house and it's not very big when you factor in parking and you factor in playground size and the building size and trash, it's not very large. So how far is this going to be from the easement there? The other thing is there's, most of it's the size. If R-2 is as big as it's looking, that C-3 zones are not very big at all. So I don't understand what they try, they're going to try and squeeze in there. Also where the C-3 that is where the traffic merges on to 70 and there are tons of accidents there. Tons. There's so many accidents up on 70 that the traffic gets routed on to Bataan Memorial all the time. And this is during the you know our workday where traffic backs up. How are we going to get out of there when people are trying to get out of daycares and dollar stores or whatever it is that's going to be there? The noise, the lights, the just everything going on, even if it's just during daytime hours. I just don't understand with the size of those lots what you think you're going to shove in there. It's just, it doesn't seem ideal.
Thomas: Thank you. Katherine, could you give us any information on how large a building can be? Thank you.

Pompeo: Thank you Madam Chair. As previously noted that with the C-3 designation, the minimum lot size is going to be one acre and it'll probably be larger than that. By the time we factor in playground area, parking, the building, stormwater management, and also remembering that there's quite an extensive buffer between the residential area and the C-3 pursuant to the Zoning Code, the lot will start to grow in size. It will probably in all likelihood split the distance between the most easterly property line here and the westerly property line here by the time that's all factored in.

PERSON IN THE AUDIENCE SPEAKING, NOT AT THE MICROPHONE.

Pompeo: I hear a lot of mumbling, but I'm not quite understanding what they're saying. This piece of property here totals 5.46 acres. It's approximately three-ish acres in here. And once again by the time you factor in having to put a dual driveway here that will serve both properties, the building, the parking lot, stormwater management, setback, landscaping and buffering, it leaves you with basically two lots. So that's what we're proposing to do pursuant to the master plan. The master plan shows three total lots.

Thomas: So are you saying that this furthermost to the west lot, that when the Bumble Bee Learning Center and everything that goes with it will require that that lot become bigger?

Pompeo: I don't see based on all the requirements that I've listed to you that that type of facility would with all of those requirements would fit exactly on one acre in size. I'm suggesting that that lot will probably grow in size to accommodate all the things previously listed. But it will just be a single building learning center, which will go on that property. But to properly design it, it will probably be slightly larger than an acre. That will leave the balance of this property probably 1.2, 1.3 acres that's left on C-3 here, that will be left for another C-3 use.

Thomas: Okay, so the line between those two lots is going to shift.

Pompeo: This …

Thomas: Most likely.

Pompeo: Yes, Madam Chair. We placed a lot, a line on here so we could depict that on the master plan to clearly indicate that we were going to have two lots in this area. There's nothing magical about the location of that line
right now other than to depict that there will be two C-3 lots in the future, at
some future date.

Thomas: And do you know how tall the building will be?

Pompeo: I do not anticipate, just based on that facility, especially the learning center
it will be a single storey building. We must remember that the current R-2
two zoning on that allows for 35 foot structures. So that's allowed by
Zoning Code as we sit here tonight. I am not anticipating, if you look at
other small neighborhood commercial uses throughout the outskirts of
town, I used to live off a Parkhill and Del Rey, there's a Dollar General
there, as an example. We don't have any specific uses. But once again,
that's a single storey building. So we're not anticipating any multi story
buildings on the property. Now, when we get to the R-2 that may be a
different story. I don't know what's proposed for that later on in the future
sometime. But I'm only speaking of the C-3 uses.

Thomas: Okay. Thank you very much.

Pompeo: Thank you Madam Chair.

Thomas: Yes. Would you like to come down? Did you speak once already?

J. Bulla: Yes ma'am.

Thomas: Can we wait until everybody else speaks?

J. Bulla: By all means.

Thomas: Anybody else on the left side? Okay, you want to come down.

Rabey: My name is Bill Rabey:

Thomas: Do you swear and affirm the testimony you're about to give is the truth and
nothing but the truth under penalty of law?

Rabey: Yes I do.

Thomas: Thank you.

Rabey: My problem, I only got one question on the residential property. Is there
anything in place to protect us from getting us a zone eight housing?

Thomas: On getting what kind of housing?

Rabey: The housing, what is that, housing, low income housing.
Thomas: I don't know if there's anything in place at this point. Katherine, can you answer that?

H-Rogers: I think the gentleman's referring to Section 8 housing. There's no proposal for that nor can we discriminate against that type of housing in any particular location.

Thomas: Thank you. Okay, anybody else on my left side? Okay, so go to the right. Okay, row three.

Breitag: Good evening. My name is Brian Breitag.

Thomas: Do you swear and affirm the testimony you're about to give is the truth and nothing but the truth under penalty of law?

Breitag: I do.

Thomas: Thank you.

Breitag: I just had a few questions concerning the changes that have happened since we were just contacted by this meeting. Already the proposed shopping center is not going to happen now. Okay. Just there's been so many changes that, how can we even make a decision here at this time? Okay, but let's get back to the Bumble Bee daycare center. My property is on the north side of that. And I was told by the planners that they would have a 15 foot easement with a wall. And I would request that that wall would be eight foot. Do I have an input in that? Can we make some type of determination? And if they do this, could that wall be eight foot?

Also, the distance between my property and the wall is 15 feet. Is that going to be cleaned out and maintained by the Bumble Bee Learning Center and/or, who me? I don't think I'm going to. One more thing is the lighting. I'm an amateur astronomer, I like to set up my telescope. And a parking lot for a business is going to throw that all out the door. Now there's zoning requirements that the shades would be installed. I would sure hope that that would happen. I think, and I think that everybody here would agree with me, that this should be tabled until we have a better understanding of what we're going to do here. Thank you.

Thomas: Okay. Do we have any answers to these questions about the easement?

H-Rogers: Chair Thomas, Members of the Commission. We have requirements in our Zoning Code for buffers between certain types of uses. And so generally when you have single-family residential uses against commercial uses, there's a recommended buffer of what we call a type A
screen, which is a completely opaque screen, it can be through fencing, walls, a combination of walls and landscaping, and a number of other things. And there is also generally a setback associated with that. It's not necessarily an easement per se, but it is a setback. And the residences adjacent to it would not be responsible for any sort of maintenance of any areas, that would be entirely up to the property owner.

Thomas: Thank you. Anybody else on my right hand side? One, two, three, row five.

Venegas: Hi, my name is Renee Venegas.

Thomas: Hi. Do you swear and affirm the testimony you're about to give is the truth and nothing but the truth under penalty of law?

Venegas: I do. Hi, my property right now it looks like it's going to be a boundary on two of those. I'm right split in the middle of it. My biggest concern is we're not getting the whole story and that concerns me. I feel like something's going to pop up and surprise us later on and I don't like that. Right now we deal with a lot of traffic. There's two schools right there. My son attended one. Traffic is ridiculous, sometimes just to get out of Calico to take him across the street because I cannot allow them to walk there. There's no sidewalks. There's no way to go around a car. Only two cars fit on that road. You try to get onto Bataan Memorial after that in the morning, your line is going to go all the way past the school, sometimes up to Peachtree. We can't even get out of there. You can see there is a line where people have made their own way. They will drive through there. They will go through there and that's also on the side of my home. That third piece of land, are they going to cut through that property to get through to Calico to go around? Are they going to come through there? I just know it's going to be worse than that as we go along. If you look at Porter and Bataan Memorial, they've set up some plastic barriers to prevent people who make the U-turns, make their own ways. I can see that happening here. That's going to be too much traffic to handle. The people coming off of 70, the people coming off of Holman, the people trying to turn around right there at the underpass. There is no sidewalks. There's nothing right there to give anybody any way to get through to there. So that whole R-2 is going to be a mess if you have to go through Bataan Memorial and add more traffic to that. I just going to state I don't like this, I don't like the way it sounds and it's too much. I don't know, it's just, it sounds like there's something going on (inaudible). I just don't want to be surprised by it. Thank you.

Thomas: Anybody else on my right side? Okay, so you wanted to make a second comment.
J. Bulla: Thank you Lady Chair. Yes, my name is John Bulla. I'd like to go back to Article II Administration of Zoning Code, Section 38-10. It is required for neighborhood group notice of area meeting shall be the responsibility of the applicant or representative for the proposal to conduct a meeting, supply any and all materials necessary to convey development parameters as applicable. I feel that he has failed to provide all information necessary to make a vote on this. I do not agree that we should table this, I feel we should deny. There has been multiple statements/comments made to prove that this has been very ill planned. And changes have been made without the neighborhood being informed of the changes even before this meeting. And due to the negligence, this plan should be denied. Thank you.

Thomas: Okay, I would like to point out that our staff and this Commission have to abide by whatever the ordinances are as to the City. And if developers or someone with a project meets all the requirements in our ordinances, we're bound to allow it. We cannot make decisions based on something other than what's in our ordinances. Okay, any final comments or questions from up here on the Commission?

Gordon: I do.

Thomas: Yes, go ahead.

Gordon: Right now I'm not very happy with what I'm hearing to be very honest with you. A lot of comments from the presenter and from (inaudible) are very vague. Things like we expect this or we're thinking of doing that. Not only that I think number one that I would require that there be a condition with this if we do approve it, that there should be an easement now allowing access to that R-2 property. That's number one.

Number two, I think perhaps if we talk about a buffer to the neighborhood, I mean you're not going to put up a 30 foot wall. But there are trees and there are other things, but they should be very specific at what will protect the residents from having to look at the Bumble Bee Center. I don't think the Bumble Bee Center as a whole will not be ugly, it'll just be a one story building that is going to be a learning center. But right now they're moving lines, they don't know how big this is going to be. And to me this is just very confusing.

What I would like to see happen here is, I don't think that we should vote no at the moment, although I'm thinking of that, but I would like to see this perhaps, you can't table this. If we table it, it'll never come back. But I would like to perhaps think about maybe a postponement to the developer to come back with very specific information as what they are planning on doing. I think the residents have a right to feel that they are being put
under a cloak here in not knowing what's going on. And I think that they have a very good reason to speak as they did. So that's my feelings.

Thomas: Commissioner Gordon. I think we can table to a date specific. It doesn't have to just go away.

Gordon: Well that's fine too. But a postponement will do the same thing. It gives them time to come back. And I think not only to come back to us, but they should go back to the neighborhood. I think they should have some kind of a neighborhood meeting perhaps where the residents can get together with the owners of the property or the developer and try to pinpoint down exactly what they're planning, and if they can do that and come to some agreement, arbitrate this issue or whatever you want to call it, that would be fine too. But I don't think they should just come back to us with what they're planning on doing. The residents have the right to know before we do. So if they want to postpone it, table it to a date specific, fine. I mean, sorry to table it to a date specific, that's fine. They want to postpone it to a date specific, that's fine also. But keeping in mind I think this one is, this is what should be. There's too much concern here. There's just not one or two people getting up who are a little bit annoyed, which what we usually get. But I think there are some very, very specific concerns here, that we should give them the benefit of being able to know what's going on.

Thomas: So if you want to table ... you have to make that motion if you want to table it.

Gordon: Well, I think we have to wait till we hear from everybody.

Thomas: Thank you. Let's do that. Okay.

Smith: I have two concerns. One looking at the west side of the C-3 property. It looks like it's pretty close to a couple of residences there. I think one of the residents was here. It's her, it abuts up to her property. I know there was discussion of a 15 foot buffer, is that going to be sufficient based on what I'm looking at here to provide enough distance between the homeowners property and whatever building would be their (inaudible) wall. Just looking at this 15 feet would not seem sufficient to provide distance from a property where it would not impact the homeowner.

Thomas: Thank you. Moving down, Commissioner Bennett.

Smith: Sorry, I have one more.

Thomas: You have one more. Sorry.

Smith: I do have one more.
Thomas: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: That was a mouthful. I wasn't sure you wanted to address that one at a time. But I'll go and provide my second concern. Just have a question. Has there been a traffic study concerning the high volume of traffic on Bataan Memorial West? A number of residents have talked about how much traffic is in that area. I'm familiar with that area. I was a former Las Cruces police officer a long time ago, and this is before many of these homes were even built, and even then there was traffic issues. So I can imagine over the last 15 years that traffic has increased. So I was just wondering if there's been any type of traffic study over the past 10 years, even within the last five years, considering the amount of development that's being proposed in this area.

H-Rogers: Chair Thomas, Members of the Commission. I can answer one of the questions and then we'll defer to the applicant on the other because Bataan Memorial and Highway 70 are outside of our jurisdiction. It's the jurisdiction of the State. But Mr. Pompeo can answer that.

In terms of buffering, we do have some built in buffering matrices outlined in our code, in terms of the options of what to do from certain uses to other types of uses. And in this case, there's an option. We double checked the matrix just to make sure. There's actually an option that's listed there. The option is a 10 foot setback and a fully opaque screen or wall, or a 15 foot setback and a semi opaque screen or wall. So those are the options listed in the code. Now if this Commission feels as though that's not sufficient, of course you have the authority to add conditions for additional buffering and other types of screening mechanisms.

Smith: Thank you.

Pompeo: Madam Chair, Commissioners. We have not performed a detailed traffic analysis on this yet. However, in order for us to get a driveway permit from the NMDOT that site threshold analysis would be required at that time. I would like to point out we have an eight lane highway with 44,000 trips per day capacity in this area. And right now traffic volumes in that area are floating around 5,000 trips per day. So the overall roadway network is capable of handling the traffic from this area. The State of New Mexico spent quite a lot of money building that US Highway 70 grade separations.

The schools do generate a lot of traffic in the areas when they're letting schools in and out. I would like to point out Madam Chair, if you look at Elks Drive, there's Jornada Elementary. It's four lane divided. So it's basically five lanes of traffic. I live in that area. It gets congested when
the students are being dropped off, and the students are being picked up. That's just a fact of life we live with every day. That doesn't have anything to do with this commercial site because it takes all access to the commercial lots come off Bataan, do not touch Calico, do not touch Holman Road. Thank you.

Thomas: Could you refer again to what you said about Highway 70? Some approval has to come from NMDOT.

Pompeo: Yes Madam Chair. Access to the two proposed commercial lots are off Bataan Memorial West. That roadway, that frontage road is under the jurisdiction of the New Mexico Department of Transportation. So if this project were to be approved we would have to go to the NMDOT and get a driveway permit, shared driveway permit for both lots, that would require a site threshold analysis as part of that application process.

Thomas: Okay, so that's all in the hands of NMDOT at this point.

Pompeo: Yes.

Thomas: Okay. Thank you.

Pompeo: Thank you Madam Chair.

Thomas: Okay, moving to Commissioner Guerrero, did you have comments?

Guerrero: Yes. So I don't know, this is, I'm kind of the same place, some of my colleagues because this is a. I feel like we're experiencing a sort of growing pains in Las Cruces right now. I mean my neighborhood is the same way. I live, right between Las Colinas and Metro Verde. There's tons of development there. Sonoma Ranch gets packed every morning because of what's, whatever, I forget the name of the school that's there, Starbucks, there's a bunch of stuff. And so like I really I sympathize with this. I mean you know it's just like Gordon said, it's not like it's one you know disgruntled neighbor, it's multiple people. And you know so I feel like if we are going to keep presenting things like this, because it is going to happen you know I mean the City is going to grow, we're going to need more commercial properties, more residential properties. I mean that's just a fact of where we're at right now. I just feel like we need smarter development, and we need consultation with the neighbors as well. I mean this is their daily life. They have to stay, you know they're going to have to drive by, see this, experience this, live with the traffic. I think they should be more consulted as well. I also you know I have the same concerns as some of my colleagues have as well, is you know as far as what the, like what is this is going to be used for? So you know I just, I mean I'm inclined to vote no. I don't know, I might vote to table it just
because I just feel like there needs to be more consultation and more thought as far as some of these properties that, of this kind that we're seeing.

Bennett: And I'm echoing the same statement.

Thomas: Commissioner Bennett.

Bennett: I'm just echoing the same sentiments. I have concerns with traffic and quite a bit with this. So I just feel like we need a better picture of what exactly is going on here.

Thomas: Thank you. Commissioner Gordon.

Gordon: I don't, no one has said anything yet but I'm just curious, just a matter of question. What are they going to be teaching here? And who is going to be being taught? Can somebody tell me what kind of learning center this is?

Thomas: Do you have some information from the applicant?

Pompeo: Madam Chair. Unfortunately as the engineer on this project I don't know exactly what the ages are, younger children for that type of learning center activity, but I cannot answer that question directly.

Gordon: It is possible this is nothing more than a daycare center.

Pompeo: Well, it's for younger children. The owner has it framed as a learning center. So that's why the application and the documentation state that.

Gordon: Again, see this is very, very vague. You can't answer specifically. We'd be thinking about two different things, a learning center I think perhaps older children who can come before and get like say a prekindergarten or whatever, preschool.

Pompeo: My understanding is it is in that range. I will read a statement that the owner has had previously prepared. Bumble Bee Learning Center offers a quality daycare, much like their Santa Teresa and surrounding areas. We strive to provide the best childcare ranging from age from newborns to school aged children. We offer infant and toddler care, multiple two year classrooms, preschool prep, and prekindergarten programs. So that is the age range of the people that will be utilizing this facility.

Gordon: So aside from newborns, I don't think they're going to be teaching them how to read. But I think for the older children are going to be there. Is there going to be a limit to how many children are going to have in this
facility? Talk about it, if this is really a daycare center where people who work have to drop off their children for somebody to take care of them all
day long. This is a misnomer in my mind. This call it a learning center to me is, this is nothing more than a daycare center. I, you can't tell me that there's going to be some learning here for children who are newborns or one year old or perhaps one and a half year olds. How old there's going to be and how many children are going to be there? How much traffic is going to be generated by people coming in early in the morning to drop off their children? How many people are going to be there in the evening to come pick them up? See, there's so much information that we don't have that I feel that this is something that we have to be provided with more information. Sorry.

Pompeo: Madam Chair, Commissioner Gordon. I understand that the information you want and we can seek to get that information. As far as the operation of the facility, my understanding is that is purely licensed and regulated by the State of New Mexico. So how many children or capacity and things like that, it's all based on the size of the building and whatever those licensing standards are of which I am not aware of.

Gordon: But I believe we do have the right to know that. We can use that number of children to determine whether or not we feel that this is a viable opportunity for someone to put up this, they want to call it a learning center, if it's going to create a lot of problems because of traffic and age, are they going to have, I know they have to be licensed by the State, they have to have certain regulations. If that's the case, if it's going to be this type of thing, we would also like to know are there going to be a medical facility if somebody gets sick? Is it going to have an opportunity for somebody to be there to take a child for medical care? Are they going to be licensed, maybe a nurse or someone on staff to watch out for this? Are there going to be licensed teachers? Or is this just people coming in and watch these kids for eight hours? That's just my feelings. I just would like to know these things. We have approved on many occasions daycare centers where all this information has been provided to us. And right now we're, for example when we've approved daycare centers, we also learned for example how big the building was, how big the parking lot was going to be, how much traffic was going to be done you know in the morning and in the evening. It's just a lot of misinformation that I just feel very uncomfortable with.

Pompeo: Madam Chairman and Commissioner Gordon. I think, as I stand before you tonight the question I have in my mind is, is it is C-3 the appropriate zoning land use designation for this property pursuant to the Zoning Code and Elevate Las Cruces and other master planning documents. The getting into the details about building size and square footages and parking lots and things seems to be something where we're putting the
cart before the horse. You're asking for the owner to go through all of these designs and such. I mean past just general statements before knowing that we even have the right via the zoning to even utilize this property for that use.

Gordon: I'm not questioning the zoning here. I would like to have enough information for me to approve this.

Pompeo: And that's what I'm seeking I guess. And I was going to follow up with a question to you is if we're going to table this case in order for us to get more information, than other than what you've spoken of, if there's any other items that we have then we can certainly bring that back to you.

Gordon: I also brought up the item of a condition of this if we do approve it for now to have an easement so that there is going to be access to that R-2 property. Right now there's nothing in there that's specific. They're just saying, oh we have a way to get there. Well, I would want to make sure that they exactly have the right given to whatever is going to be in that property for a way to get out of it to the access road. Right now you're not showing me anything. You're saying well we can give them access. I want to specific about an easement or right-of-way to get into that property. That would be a condition. But I still think that there's a lot of things that I'm not, I don't think that I could at the moment feel comfortable. Listen if you want me to approve this master plan, I think I'm entitled to know a lot of this information before I can make a decision. Otherwise, why bother coming here? Just put the plan in and we would automatically say yes.

Thomas: Katherine. Did you want to respond to that?

H-Rogers: Madam Chair, Members of the Commission. I do want to point out that during your consideration for a project such as this, it's about a range of uses and not one specific use and the impacts that perhaps that range of uses could bring. And I also want to clarify that during the subdivision phase of any project, one of the requirements of staff as mandated by the Design Standards has to do with access. And so they could not subdivide these properties without staff ensuring that there is either right-of-way or a perpetual easement. And so that's part of the process during the subdivision phase. So I do want to be clear that this is not just about a daycare, but it's about the entire range of uses that could occur on the property.

Thomas: And are you, Katherine, can I ask you a question?

Gordon: Me too, but go ahead.
Thomas: And we got this whole list of uses and a whole bunch of them were crossed out. And so the ones that were left on that list, that's the range of uses you're talking about.

H-Rogers: Madam Chair, Members of the Commission. Yes ma'am. That is correct. Because I would point out that, let's just say theoretically that the zone change was to be approved, but Bumble Bee Learning Center decided to relocate somewhere else. Well, the property is then open for any of those uses that are listed in that land use table that was provided in attachment number three.

Thomas: Even the ones that were crossed out.

H-Rogers: Not the ones that are crossed out.

Thomas: Not the ones that are crossed out.

H-Rogers: Those would be eliminated.

Thomas: So that that goes with the approval, the limited uses.

H-Rogers: That's correct.

Thomas: Okay.

Gordon: Katherine. Please excuse me for a moment. But just I want to follow up with that. Then what was the point of even bringing this up as a Bumble Bee Learning Center? Just approve it as a C-3? Why put that in here? What was the purpose?

H-Rogers: Commissioner Gordon, Members of the Commission. I believe that the intent was just to provide just a little bit more clarity about what they wanted to do on the property in terms of their immediate plans.

Nichols: Madam Chairman and Members Commission. Larry Nichols Community Development. Thank you everyone for making their comments tonight, both the public and the Commission. I can add a few of my comments as the Community Development Director. We have repeatedly a number of occasions, we have a developer come to us that has identified a parcel of land that he thinks has potential to enhance the neighborhood and the overall City development. But in order to do that, he needs to know that his project would have the proper zoning. Otherwise, he said if I can't get this zoning, I have no interest in that development. So the zoning comes first, and then he can begin to tell us, I have this particular project in mind. It might be a learning center, it might be a restaurant, it might be professional offices, it might be a cinema, it could be a number of items
that are allowed in that particular zoning. And then once they identify as
that project, what type of building is going to be, then our ordinances as
the Commission Chair said here tonight, our ordinances come into play.
Those ordinances are zoning and land use and building codes and fire
codes and utility requirements. All of those come into play. They submit
their plan and then we see that they meet the requirements of those
ordinances. That's when you get the answers that some of the questions
you've been answering tonight. But the zoning for the developer, the
zoning is paramount, because without the zoning he has no potential to
increase development of commercial and residential land use.

I just wanted to make a few of those comments to kind of explain why at
this stage of the proposal or the request we can't provide the
developer/applicant is not able, unable to provide the specific answers
that you're asking about. Once the zoning is there and he knows the
building type, then these answers can be provided. Thank you Madam
Chair.

Thomas: And will any of this future planning come back before this board or the City
Council? And will any of this future planning once they see what's
allowed, will any of that come back then to this board or to the ... I think
that's what they want to know.

H-Rogers: Madam Chair, Members of the Commission. Unless they're pursuing a
multi lot subdivision on this property, the answer is most likely no. If they
subdivide this using the alternate summary method, one by one, individual
lots, that's entirely administrative and there wouldn't be an additional
review by this particular Commission. It should be pointed out that the
zone change however, will have an additional review by City Council.

Thomas: Okay. Any more comments or suggestions on what we should do from
people up here? Do we want to table this for them to bring back more
information or do we want to take a vote?

Gordon: I like to have a motion to table it to a date specific.

Thomas: Okay.

Bennett: I second.

Thomas: What date should we set?

Gordon: I'd like to know whether or not I can make that conditional upon the fact
that the applicant has to try to make an effort to contact the residents who
live alongside this project. I mean I think that when they're going to come
back to us at least they'll be here with some information as to what they
would at least be able to object to or approve. I don't know if that's possible.

Thomas: Probably not. Legal, do you have anything to say about that? Do you want to say that again Commissioner Gordon?

Cabello: Chair.

Thomas: What you were asking if it was possible to do for legal.

Cabello: Chair, Council. I'm not sure you could actually require them to meet. I mean it would be good idea for the developer to meet with the neighborhood. I'm not sure that's a requirement you can make that force them to meet.

Gordon: All right then I have another question. If we approve the master plan which is item number three, or whatever it is on the, 7.3. If we approve 7.3 which is the master plan, the approval then would have to be for a zone change, again then that, how would we be able to vote yes on that without having information as to what these people want to know. I mean then I would have to say no. What happens if I say no on 7.4 and say yes on 7.3? Can you answer that question Legal or Katherine?

H-Rogers: Chair, Members of the Commission, Commissioner Gordon. I think that, the master plan is the basis for why, one of the supporting documents for why you would then support a zone change. It would be hard to defend a master plan that outlines specific uses and then not recommend approval of a zone change with the same uses. It does …

Gordon: So then what would happen at, let's say for example we vote yes on both. All right, now we've approved the master plan and we've approved a zone change. At this point when does the neighborhood have another bite at the apple?

H-Rogers: Commissioner Gordon. The neighborhood would have an opportunity at City Council to voice their opinion and their concerns and ultimately City Council could then make a determination on the zone change. It's a bit of a conundrum because if they deny the zone change yet there's an approved master plan specifying those types of uses, it would force the applicant then to one, either appeal to district court, or to revise their master plan, come back to this Commission with a revised master plan and a different zoning proposal to match that master plan.

Gordon: So it seems to me, let me think about this for a second before I say something. It seems to me, well what happens if we vote yes on the master plan and no on the zone change. In other words they don't get a
zone change, correct. Which means that the property will stay what it is. Now can they, I know then they can still go to City Council, correct.

Thomas: The zone change also goes to City Council, correct. Yes.

H-Rogers: Yes. Madam Chair, Members of the Commission. The zone change whether or not you recommend approval or denial would move forward to City Council unless then the applicant withdraws their application.

Gordon: Well, it seems to me sometimes I wonder why we sit here. If that's what it basically, every time we have a zone change. We've already had one reversed on us about three months ago, that we denied something and they said it was okay. So I don't know. All right, let it go forward. I'll see what happens. I'll decide how I'm going to vote.

Thomas: Any more comments or suggestions or motions from other Commissioners? Did you want to add something, Katherine?

H-Rogers: Not an addition. But I do want to remind you that there's already a motion on the table to essentially postpone this to a date certain however, I don't know that that date certain was ever specified.

Thomas: Did you make that motion to postpone to a date?

Gordon: I think I did, but not with a date certain. We didn't decide on that.

Thomas: You didn't pick a date.

Gordon: No.

Thomas: So it wasn't completed and I don't think there was a second.

Gordon: I don't, yes I don't even think there was a vote.

Thomas: Pardon?

Gordon: James did a second.

Thomas: You second.

Bennett: Yes.

Thomas: Okay.

Gordon: We get a roll call.
Thomas: We need to say what the date is.

Gordon: I don't have a calendar.

Thomas: Well …

Gordon: How much time, how much time does, well if we postpone this to a time certain, what is the applicant going to come back to us with that he, what, he hasn't already given to us tonight. I'm looking to find out more information. If he's going to come back with the same information we're going to be in the same point we are right now. It will be redundant.

Katherine, Madam Chair, Members of the Commission. Aside from the applicant maybe being able to procure some additional details about the one proposal which is the daycare center, I'm not quite sure what else they could provide you. We must remember that a master plan is a conceptual plan in terms of general uses, densities, phasing, things of that nature. And then again zoning is a range of uses. It's not about one specific use per se. So I'm not entirely certain what they could bring you unless you're asking for some specific details that maybe they could work on in the interim. I would like to point out that the January meeting is January 25. I'm not certain of the February meeting. Do you know? I do not have a calendar on me.

Gordon: I don't think that we should postpone this to January. I have an idea of what the agenda is going to be for January and I don't know if we'll have time to discuss this. If anything I would like to do it in February. But if I look at the summary of the case provided to us, it says that the zone change request is associated with the Bumble Bee master plan. They're very specific about using that term again, and seeks to increase development of commercial and residential land uses. That's very, very general. If it was just a case of rezoning this to be commercial, then they should have said we just want to do commercial. They don't have to tell anybody what it is. Is that true?

H-Rogers: Commissioner Gordon, Madam Chair, Members of the Commission. Ultimately, it's interesting, it depends on what the Commission requests. Sometimes commissioners want specificity. It sounds like maybe this evening, they wanted less specificity. I'm not entirely certain. Sometimes zoning is very speculative, sometimes it's not. In this case there is a specific use in mind. Do they have to tell us? No, the answer is that applicants don't. However, sometimes it does help.

Gordon: And I agree with you. And that's what we asked for. I think that we, I think I would like to have that information so it would help me to make a
decision. I mean I feel for these residents. They have, I think they have a
very strong argument.

Thomas: Okay, so date specific probably should not be any later than the January
meeting.

Gordon: No, don't do January.

Thomas: Pardon?

Gordon: Knowing what I know about what's going to happen in January don't do it
in January. We'll be here till three o'clock in the morning.

Thomas: Well it's true, it's a packed agenda for the January meeting.

Gordon: I mean is there any problem with doing it for February?

Thomas: Let's ask the applicant.

Baum: Madam Chair. That would be February 22nd.

Thomas: Thank you.

Baum: You're welcome.

Pompeo: Madam Chair. If it is the will of this Commission that we go to February,
then we'll go to February. And I will seek to get as much information as I
can to submit it back to staff. I don't know about meeting with the
neighborhood again. I do believe that I due owe the information that they
seek. I will say that after meeting with the neighborhood we retracted the
intensity of this development, but then come to this meeting and be
accused of changing what we submitted to them. What I mean, we tried
to reduce the scope of that. So I will, within the next, if we postpone to the
February the 15th, over the next two weeks we'll make another submittal
to staff that will have as much clarification as we can provide on the items
Commissioner Gordon that you've asked for.

Gordon: Okay. But you realize we did not accuse you of that.

Pompeo: No, no, no. No. No. Clarification, comments from the neighborhood, I
understand where they're coming from. There was a number of people
that spoke to the fact that we had tried to pull the wool over their eyes or
changed up what we were doing, etc. When we first met with the
neighborhood there was going to be a shopping center, the whole, all of
this property was going to be C-3. And we retracted that. Not only did we
do that, we went back into the C-3 uses and struck a number of those
uses in attempt to downgrade the intensity of the uses that can be on that property. So yes, things did change. But in my opinion it changed to the benefit of reducing the scope and magnitude of the zone change.

Gordon: Well I don't think, I don't think the residents agree with you but that's fine.

Pompeo: Well other than …

Gordon: If the Commission is agreeable, then why don't we just make that decision now and we don't have to continue this discussion because we're not getting anywhere.

Thomas: There's a motion on the floor is to postpone this to the February meeting which is February 22nd. We have a motion and a second. Can we have a roll call?

Baum: Board Member Muniz.

Muniz: Yes.

Baum: Board Member Vega. Board Member Bennett.

Bennett: Yes.

Baum: Board Member Guerrero.

Guerrero: Yes.

Baum: Board Member Smith.

Smith: Yes.

Baum: Board Member Gordon.

Gordon: Yes.

Baum: Chair Thomas.

Thomas: Yes.

Baum: Thank you.

Gordon: Madam Chair.

Thomas: Okay thank you.
Gordon:  Madam Chair.

Thomas: Thank you to the people from the neighborhood for coming. I think that you did lay out the things you wanted to know. I think that has to do with more about what kind of a center that Bumble Bee Center is, more about traffic, more about the buffers between the commercial and the neighborhood. And so we'll expect to hear more about that in February. Thank you.

4. **Bumble Bee Learning Center Zone Change:** A proposed zone change request from R-2 (multi-dwelling low density) to R-2 (multi-dwelling low density) and C-3 (commercial high density) on a property encompassing 5.64 +/- acres and located north of Bataan Memorial West and west of Holman Road. The zone change request is associated with the Bumble Bee Master Plan and seeks to increase development of commercial and residential land uses. Submitted by Souder, Miller and Associates, representatives. Council District 5. (21ZO0500020)

POSTPONED UNTIL FEBRUARY 22, 2022.

5. **1240 S. Valley Drive Special Use Permit Request:** A Special Use Permit (SUP) to allow for a deviation of 200 feet to the required 300-foot buffer distance for cannabis retail establishments from a single-family residential zoning district. The subject property encompasses + 0.99 acres and is zoned C-2 (commercial medium intensity) and is within Council District 4. Submitted by Desert Peaks Architects for Everest Cannabis Co. (21ZO1000109)

Thomas: Okay, the next item is ...

Gordon: 7.5.

Thomas: 7.5. I need a motion and a second to approve the Special Use Permit on South Valley Drive.

Gordon: I make a motion that we approve the Special Use Permit for the property and the opening of a store on South Valley Drive.

Thomas: Is there a second?

Smith: I second.

Thomas: Okay. We have a presentation from Mr. Banegas.

Banegas: Yes ma'am. Madam Chair, Members of the Commission. Vincent Banegas Interim Planner. The Special Use Permit this evening involves
The property located at 1240 South Valley Drive. It is indeed a Special Use Permit and I'll explain why here in a minute. It involves case number 21ZO1000109.

Current conditions related to the project or the property in question. It's currently zoned C-2, which is our medium intensity commercial, it's intensity not density. It is currently developed as a small four suite retail node or center. And the property, in this case the, not only the property but the suite is located on the northwest corner of Aspen Avenue and South Valley Drive. And it is roughly 0.225 acres in size, if you round up. The surrounding property, there is a mixture of uses and zoning to the west and northwest of the site, you have single-family residential property in the R-1a district. Directly north of the subject property is multifamily uses, apartments in this case and zoned R-3. And elsewhere along Valley Drive, certainly across the street further south of the subject property wrapping around Avenida de Mesilla you have commercial zoning and commercial uses, and you have a mix of not only C-2 but some C-3 zoning as well.

This is a zoning map showing the subject property, it is outlined in red and hatched as shown on the map. And again your multifamily component is directly north. This is the R-1a single-family residential neighborhood. And you'll notice that this parcel which is single-family is the adjoining neighbor to the subject parcel. And it is the juxtaposition of these two properties that require the consideration of the SUP. Elsewhere you have the C-2 as indicated, and further along Avenida de Mesilla you have C-2 and C-3.

This is an aerial view of the subject property. The little or the small business node component sits on the property in this fashion. And again, your residential neighborhood west-northwest of the site. Just south of there is a gas station located south of the subject property. And you do have shared access not only off of Valley Drive but into or across property boundaries to help with traffic pattern/traffic flow on site. And you do have ingress/egress pursuant to code off of Aspen Avenue for that subject property.

In terms of history, the property was subdivided with its southern neighbor in 2008. And later was developed as the commercial property we see today, that took place roughly four years later after subdivision activity occurred. At the time all development requirements were met. Certainly at the time of construction for that commercial node or development, all the parking, all the building codes, all the buffers and screens that are required in our code. We heard about the screens this evening. Those were in place and are today. The property has been zoned C-2 since pre-1970. And we say pre-1970 because 1969 was our base zoning that we
started from, we sprung forth with all our zoning history. So it certainly has been around for a while in terms of C-2 zoning for that site. The building itself was built approximately 110 feet from the adjacent R-1 zone, the property that I showed you on the map. And that is the shared property line that is in question for this is SUP.

In terms of the proposal, the applicant, which is Everest Apothecary Inc. and Desert Peak Architects on behalf of them, have submitted a request for an SUP to place a retail cannabis store at this location. And again it would be in suite D of that building. The buffer distance between cannabis store perimeter and the closest single-family residential zoning district boundary is approximately 110 feet. In terms of the current code that which was adopted by City Council not too very long ago, 300 feet is required. Because of that discrepancy, a Special Use Permit is now being sought and is an element for approval for this proposal. All other buffer distances are met and those distances refer to the boundary of operation for the retail cannabis store to other retailers and also to school and daycare property. The proposed use will have to follow all remaining CLC, assuming it gets approved, will have to follow all CLC requirements and State of New Mexico regulation governing cannabis uses and related activity. This is a kind of a modified site plan showing again the subject property adjacent to the neighborhood. They identified roughly 66 feet from the boundary of operation for the retail cannabis site to the R-3, but again it's 110 feet from that same perimeter over to the nearest portion of the R-1a zoning district, and that's the 110 feet which is required to be 300 feet.

A couple of photos showing the site. I know these were taken in the summer, but it kind of illustrates the point that I'm going to try to make here, and that is the fact that you have the existing development, you have parking already in place, here's that shared access point to the neighbor to the south, which is the gas station, you have clearly the required landscaping element. And you begin to see some of these trees along here that serve as the buffer or screen to the residential properties due north, in this case those apartments. This is a shot looking down Aspen Avenue from about the intersection of Valley Drive, and you can see that the site or the subject property that I'm pointing to with this cursor is already well hidden by those trees. And then of course further down on Aspen, this is the subject residential property, the R-1a property that is within the 110 foot distance to the subject building. And certainly from that angle you can see that there's quite a bit of distance separated by a drainage pond for drainage from the commercial property, you got parking lot, and then you got the back of the building. The front of the building of course and is facing Valley Drive.
In terms of notice, notice was sent to surrounding property owners. To date two e-mails were received, one was included in your packet, the other one I handed out this evening, and one phone call was received, all objecting to the proposal. The objection cited basically further encroachment of nonresidential use into the residential development located west of the subject property. And there were also concerns about what the proposed use might bring in terms of people that use drugs or the opportunity for increased traffic accidents and injuries because of the location, and the anticipated traffic that would be brought into the site and brought into the neighborhood etc. So those were some of the concerns that were cited.

In terms of recommendation and findings of fact, staff recommends approval of the proposal. The findings are as follows, again going back to the distance or buffer requirements for the proposed use, all other distances are met, excepting the residential distance that I've talked about. You have property that meets current screening and buffer requirements. Going back to those photos I illustrated that some of the screens do a pretty decent job of at least buffering any visual impact and potential any noise impact to the surrounding properties. And those measures of course are to mitigate some of those development impacts that come with commercial development. Also, there's a relatively high degree of compatibility with other commercial properties along Valley Drive in context to what you see on the subject site. And the ingress/egress on that site is intended to mitigate traffic impacts to the residential neighborhood. It was a required element in terms of the building permit process for a commercial building, such as what you see there today.

Proposal also meets the purpose and intent of Section 38-2. the requirements or the elements of that section are identified in your packet. And it's safe to say without any doubt that the proposal must meet any other Zoning Code requirements required by the City of Las Cruces and of course the State of New Mexico. Those must be followed for any cannabis related use. There are several goals, policies., and actions that are also identified in your report that are consistent with the SUP, with Suburban Place Type. And just to reiterate, Suburban Place Type is characterized by low to moderate residential densities with intermixed areas of commercial development, and there's single-family, multifamily, retail office, institution, and public uses are a component of that mixture.

Yes. In summary in terms of the goals and policies and some of the actions, it's safe to say that mixed use neighborhoods are mentioned in those goals and supporting policies that I presented in your packet. You also have expanding economic opportunities that are promoted both at a regional and national level. You have increases to employment opportunities to increase economic security amongst individuals in the
community. And locating businesses along key corridors and major thoroughfares is a component of our comprehensive plan as well.

And this evening, you have the following options, you can vote "yes" and approve, vote "no" and deny, just recognize that denial will mean you'll have to come up with your own findings of fact to support that action, you could vote "yes" with condition, and I would strongly suggest that you add those conditions in your motion please so that they can be recorded as an element for approval, should you take that route, or you could vote to table. And that concludes staffs presentation, Madam Chair. And I'll stand for any questions you may have.

Thomas: I have a question Mr. Banegas. I was told that there are other cases like this where people who are planning to open a cannabis store had already purchased property or made arrangements or set up a lease or something before the City put out its regulation, it's 300 feet regulation. Was I misinformed or is that part of the problem here that when the decision was made to open the store in this location the City's ordinance for cannabis had not yet been determined?

Banegas: Madam Chair. To the best of my knowledge, I know the buffer distance criteria, that was something that was discussed at some length and certainly at the Council level, something that was later asked of staff to build into the proposed ordinance. In terms of specifically whether or not people bought or secured lease on property prior to, I'm not privy to that. But we are holding meetings at present every week, in meeting with cannabis related potential businesses to discuss opportunities and how the code reads and how the law currently reads in context to the City Zoning Code. And one of the elements that's identified in that code is, is if you're less than the 300 feet to single-family residential zoning district boundaries, you do have the opportunity to seek a Special Use Permit, which is what we're talking about this evening.

Thomas: Okay, thank you for that information. Any other questions or comments? Any comments from the public? Okay, let's take, start on this side and we'll start in row three.

Gilboard: Thank you.

Thomas: And your name is?

Gilboard: Mark Gilboard.

Thomas: And do you swear and affirm the testimony you're about to give is the truth and nothing but the truth under penalty of law?
Gilboard: I do.

Thomas: Thank you. Go ahead.

Gilboard: Madam Chair and Members. Want to say first and foremost that Everest Cannabis Company is a provider of jobs. We hire locally, and we hire a diverse staff that reflects the values and (inaudible) of the community. Our employees spend their money in the community, they pay taxes, attend events in Las Cruces and they add to the tax base for the City. I also want to say that we take pride in being good neighbors, our patients love us and we provide a safe legal way for people to find relief. We opened our existing dispensary in March of 2020. To my knowledge there have been no complaints, no increase in any concerns in the area. We are good neighbors to the Jimmy John's sub place, the Dunkin' Donuts, there are doctors' offices where our existing location is on Lohman. We opened, and I wanted to mention that cannabis customers are not what most people think; they're you know your neighbors, your doctors, your teachers, maybe even friends. They’re professionals who spend on average you know over $60 a transaction, that’s our average transaction. And they go enjoy our outdoor activities. And they are not a detriment to society, which is a common misconception. I’m the director of retail strategy for Everest Cannabis Company. I invite your questions about any of our retail operations. We will have standard business hours. Our existing location is 9:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. And so we anticipate standard business hours at this location. And that’s all I have for you.

Thomas: Thank you. Questions or comments? Yes. Commissioner Gordon.

Gordon: Yes I have just a simple question. Is, I know what's happening now in New Mexico, and of course in many other states with these new cannabis stores or retail outfits or whatever you want to call it being open. How does that relate to people who hold medical cannabis cards? Because you can go to a place here in Las Cruces now Sacred Garden or something like that it's called, all my neighbors go there. They will have medical cannabis cards.

Gilboard: Yes.

Gordon: In order to come to your establishment do you need to have that card?

Gilboard: That's correct. Yes, until the law changes and gets implemented in April of 2022. Currently only medical card holders that are certified through the program in the State of New Mexico are able to enter and purchase cannabis.
Gordon: So my feeling is that the type of person who’s going to enter your establishment to buy something is not the type of person that people think is going to be going there who is a dope addict or for better lack of a definition. I have, I know of my neighborhood alone there’s at least five or six people who have (inaudible) it and they all swear by it. You know people have these terrible problems with pain and nerve problems and they all use it and swear by it. To me it’s a godsend. I think it was just an interesting program on CNN this weekend where now they are using cannabis to treat children who have, what is it, who have ...

Gilboard: Epilepsy.

Gordon: Pardon?

Gilboard: Epilepsy.

Gordon: No, not only epilepsy, but who are autistic. Thank you. I'm sorry, lost my train of thought. Autistic and they’ve shown amazing results with the use of cannabis. So I know about from experience and from my friends and what I've seen it's, to me it's about time.

Thomas: Any other comments or questions from the Commissioners? Okay.

Gilboard: Thank you.

Thomas: Anyone else who wishes to speak? Okay, again on that, one, two, three, four, row five.

Kirk: Trishelle Kirk.

Thomas: Do you swear and affirm the testimony you’re about to give is the truth and nothing but the truth under penalty of law?

Kirk: Yes.

Thomas: Okay, go ahead.

Kirk: And I am the CEO of Everest. And thank you for your consideration tonight. I can provide some clarification on the timing of our lease. It was signed on July 13th. And I believe the new zoning laws that we’re currently requesting a Special Use Permit went into effect in early September. And so we did have a lease in place. We have been licensed and in good standing with the State of New Mexico, the Department of Health, and the Cannabis Control Division since 2016. We currently operate seven dispensaries throughout New Mexico. We’ve been in Las Cruces as Mark said for over a year and a half. And you know we just
really look forward to continuing to grow in the Las Cruces market and really be part of the community here in Las Cruces. And I'm available for any additional questions.

Thomas: Thank you. Any questions? Thank you for your comments. Okay, wait, too confusing. Who's already been up here?

King: Good evening, Chair Thomas and Members of the Commission. I am …

Thomas: What's your name?

King: Jefferson King.

Thomas: Okay, do you swear and affirm the testimony you're about to give is the truth and nothing but the truth under penalty of law?

King: I do.

Thomas: Okay.

King: As the director of marketing and store development for the company, I'm here to make comment that we put a lot of effort and design into the look and feel of our stores. We make sure that our environment is very inviting, and also very professional. Our stores are extremely well lit. And we follow all of the security guidelines that are given from currently from the CLC.

So, and as for any concerns regarding stigma, I would just like to speak to what Mark mentioned that our cannabis customer is the professional, it is the younger patient, it's the older patient, it's the single mother, it's me standing before you. So just wanting to let you know that we are looking forward to bringing a lot more business to this area. And we think that our presence there will make the area much improved.

Thomas: Thank you.

King: Thank you.

Nichols: Madam Chair.

Thomas: Wait, could you come back to the microphone for a minute? I think there was a question.

Nichols: Thank you Madam Chairman, Commission.

King: Yes.
Nichols: Yes sir. You mentioned that you were the director of marketing. Is that correct?

King: Yes.

Nichols: Could you expand a little bit? This particular facility, will it be involved in what type of cannabis licensure? Is it retail sales? Is it growth? Is it extraction? Is it laboratory? What is the, your business?

King: Strictly retail sales.

Nichols: Strictly retail. Thank you.

King: Okay.

Thomas: Thank you. Okay, we're on row one, two, three, four, five. Okay.

De La O: Hello. Austin De La O.

Thomas: And do you swear and affirm the testimony you're about to give is the truth and nothing but the truth under penalty of law?

De La O: Yes ma'am.

Thomas: Thank you.

De La O: Okay, so I just wanted to start out by thanking you guys for coming. I am an assistant manager at our current location off of Lohman that we have. We've been there for a little over two years, going on two years almost. It's really nice working there. I don't feel like I would have the benefits currently that I have right now without this job available to me. I've lived here all my life. I've been a resident of Las Cruces 27 years. Pay my taxes every year. You know doing good stuff. Just trying to you know make a good living. I don't feel the benefits that this company gives me though I would be able to fully find elsewhere. They're very professional, they do everything simple. We have good rapport with the community and stuff. We have people that look forward to coming and seeing us. It's nothing harmful like they were saying. It's something that you know everybody, not everybody but a large amount of the community uses right now. And I don't see a large uptick in crime. A lot of my family, I'm kind of like the black sheep of the family, everybody is law enforcement or military. I'm the only one that kind of went this route, so it is a little bit different. And they come to me with questions and stuff. None of them are bad people, they're just looking to make their lives a little bit better. They have pain management that they're trying to assess. They have
sleep deprivation, things that they don't need to go and seek out other medication when they already went the legal route of attaining a card and going through the board and the systems that are required. You know what I mean? So there's leaps and ways to prevent bad people from kind of attaining this type of product.

Another good thing that I think would be really positive for the community, I've lived here all my life like I said, is the taxes that it's going to bring in. I visit a lot of different places. I've gone to places where it's legal and places where it's not, and you can definitely see, sometimes day and night the difference in the community. Like the highways, just everything built up, the people that it brings in for visitation purposes and stuff like that. There's a lot of money to be made, which I know isn't everything. But you know, the cannabis portion brings everyone kind of closer together and then the money is just extra you know. That's always an added bonus. And that's all I really have to say. I'm very thankful for everything I have.

Thomas: Thank you very much for your comments.
De La O: Yes ma'am. Thank you.
Thomas: Anyone else over here? Okay, one, two, three, I think you're on row six or seven.
Smead: Hello, my name is Cole Smead.
Thomas: Do you swear and affirm the testimony you're about to give is the truth and nothing but the truth under penalty of law?
Smead: Yes ma'am.
Thomas: Thank you.
Smead: Awesome. I just wanted to come up here today and talk to all of you about how awesome Everest has been for the community aspects. I know personally since I've just grown up here, I've been along here a long time. It's been really nice to see them trying to get us to reach out to other businesses, to reach out to other people in our communities, to try to set something up that's bigger than just ourselves, but instead working towards a greater future for just Las Cruces in general. Joining the company it was heavily emphasized to me that the community outreach was important and that what we were building was so much more important than just a business. One thing that I love to point out to people that are coming into our store for the first time or just coming around, is that we have hundreds of reviews on Google and they're all super high like 4.9 stars is our average right now. And the reason that is, is because we
do try to build a community with every single person who comes into our store. It's really amazing to see, and I've never worked in sales, I've worked in multiple fast food, I've worked in a couple other jobs. I've never seen the type of relationship that we've been able to build with our clientele and the people in our City that I have been able to build while I've been at Everest Apothecary. that was all

Thomas: Thank you very much. Any more comments? The next to the last row.

Stoops: Name is Ryan Stoops.

Thomas: Do you swear and affirm the testimony you're about to give us the truth and nothing but the truth under penalty of law?

Stoops: Yes.

Thomas: Thank you.

Stoops: My name is Ryan Stoops. Of course I've lived in, down and around in the New Mexico area for a little over 15 years. I am currently a homeowner and a guest advisor at Everest Cannabis Co. Currently, right now my biggest thing that I see with the way that we actually run our company is we're very big on integrity. We're also very big on sustainability. Everything that we do we try to make sure that it's completely organic. We try to minimize as much waste as possible. So there's not usually any issues with like floating containers, bags, or anything like that that you may see, like contraband wise. Everything that we do we keep clean, we maintain, and we try to make sure that everything is above standard or even more so by the book. We try to keep things of course you know with the way that we actually run our company, we are hugely bound to New Mexico and the way that we actually run things. Of course, most of our stuff is up north at the moment, but we are trying to basically expand and create more of a home down here in southern Mexico. Providing some of the highest quality of both customer service, sales, and of course cannabis that we can provide for our community. The biggest things of course that I see are the actual benefits that we do to our patients, basically providing everything that we can between the knowledge that we actually get, especially researching and making sure that we have everything available for our patients primarily because that is our main focus that we actually have in a company. We try to take care of every patient's needs, basically one on one for the most part. We even make sure to actually keep everything separate. There is a full on waiting lobby between, we try to make sure everything is sectioned off so that there is no cross contamination or anything. We take care of it all, in house sanitizing all. Thank you.
Thomas: Thank you very much for your comments. Anyone else? Okay, we'll come back to Commissioners. Any more comments up here or questions, discussion? Yes Commissioner Guerrero.

Guerrero: Yes. I just, so I want to make a comment real quick because I mean first of all you know just so everybody in the public knows, cannabis is legal in New Mexico. I mean it will be you know as of April whenever the law is enacted. But at the same time you know like, we get e-mails like this and I'm not going to read the whole e-mail. This was written by somebody that clearly doesn't you know I guess, subscribes to old ideas about cannabis. You know list a whole bunch of things that are side effects. Those are the same or worse as alcohol and there is a gas station around the corner from here, there's one across the street that sell alcohol. So you know it's like picking and choosing just because of something that you heard was really bad back in the day isn't fair to businesses like this one. I mean clearly they have a really big staff, very knowledgeable. You guys all seem amazing. I don't have a medical card, but whenever it's retail I may stop by and visit, I mean who knows, right. But you know like, I think we really need to remind people it's like you know legalization of cannabis is a law in New Mexico now, and we are going to see more like this. You know so I mean it just is what it is. Brings businesses, brings employment, brings diverse, young employment which is what we need in New Mexico. So you know I just want to remind people of that, that yes, I mean sometimes, are there myths that exist about things, yes there's myths that exist about everything. I mean McDonald's you know can kill you as well and people use it all the time and that's not illegal. You know diabetes, and obesity is not illegal. So you know just want to remind people of that, is like there's pros and cons to everything.

Thomas: Thank you. Any more comments from Commissioners? Commissioner Smith.

Smith: Just to tag on to my colleague, just to (inaudible). You know I also read this e-mail and you know I'm familiar with that area. I live nearby within a mile of this proposed site. And you know that neighborhood, I'm familiar with the neighborhood, and there have been businesses there before. I've been living in that area for over 20 years. And I know at one point there was a Verizon store there. And there's been a couple of other businesses there. So you know that neighborhood, they're used to retail. They're used to you know commercial businesses being there. And so that's something that they're familiar with. The difference now is that you know there's a cannabis store coming in and so they have this idea that it's going to bring in drug addicts, it's going to bring in you know problems in that area. And of course we know now, especially over the years of how cannabis is being used medically and scientifically that that's not the case. So I still want to be sensitive to you know the neighborhood and the
neighbors so they can understand that we’re not sitting here just you know to approve something just because it’s a viable business you know for a tax base and for the City of Las Cruces. This is a company and many of the cannabis companies that are starting to open in Las Cruces are very professional and they brought in their entire staff to make that point. And so I feel that it is important that the concerns of the neighborhood are addressed and that they do understand that this is not … I lived in New York City for eight years. And I used to ride my bike in areas where there were crack houses. And some of the comments that I've read in this particular e-mail is something I'm familiar with like from a crack house. And this is not a crack house. And so I think as these type of businesses continue to grow in Las Cruces, it’s important for the residents of the City to understand that these are beneficial businesses for the community and for the City. And we have laws and ordinances that will make sure that these businesses are run in a very professional way.

Thomas: Thank you. Any more comments? Yes Commissioner Gordon.

Gordon: just want to correct myself. It wasn't on CNN it was on 60 minutes on CBS. And I think that if anybody is watching this meeting tonight, if they have the opportunity, for example if you are on Comcast, you can go to demand and bring up this 60 Minutes story about the use of cannabis. And I have to tell you, you could almost bring yourself to tears to see what this is able to do.

Thomas: Thank you. Any more comments? Okay. Roll Call.

Baum: Chairperson. The motion was made prior to hearing Mr. Banegas' statement concerning conditions. I didn't know whether those needed or didn't need to be included in the motion.

Thomas: Mr. Banegas.

Banegas: Yes, just to clarify Madam Chair, Commissioners,. All I was stating is that if there are conditions please include them in your motion. Staff didn't recommend any conditions be added.

Thomas: Okay. Thank you.

Baum: Thank you. Board Member Muniz.

Muniz: I vote yes. And the reasons for my voting is cannabis is really helped some of my family members who have suffered with cancer. And I've seen it gave them a little life. So I give it a big yes.

Baum: Board Member Vega. Board Member Bennett.
Bennett: I vote to approve based on staff recommendation and site survey.

Baum: Board Member Guerrero.

Guerrero: I as well approve to, or vote to approve based on staff recommendations, and as well as you know just bringing jobs and the diverse workforce to Las Cruces.

Smith: Board Member Smith.

Smith: I vote yes based on staff recommendation and also based on site visit.

Baum: Board Member Gordon.

Gordon: I vote a very strong yes based on staff recommendations. I wish you success in this operation. And go ahead and I know that you will bring tremendous, tremendous relief to a lot of people who suffer. And have no other recourse but to use cannabis. Believe me when I tell you I have so many friends who rely on this to get a night's sleep, to be free of pain. It's amazing what this product does. Even a simple use perhaps maybe of just CBD, which is a nothing as compared to what cannabis in your retail store could do. But if they have to take that extra step and go get themselves a medical card, then it's something that they have to do. It's just unbelievable. I don't hear anybody say anything negative. So again I vote a very strong yes. And good luck.

Baum: Chair Thomas.

Thomas: I also vote yes, based on staff recommendations and site visit. And so the motion passes six to zero.

VIII. COMMISSION COMMENTARY

Thomas: Next on the agenda is commission commentary. Thank you very much for coming and sharing your information with us and we wish you all success.

Gordon: Now commission comments?

Thomas: Yes. Commissioner Gordon.

Gordon: Yes, I have, I think which is a very apropos statement to make. Knowing that Commissioner Thomas is that this is her last meeting. I have to tell you two years ago when she joined the P&Z I was so thrilled to know that someone of her stature and knowledge and history in the City and being a council woman, being on a lot of commissions, and it's just amazing how
much she has been able to enlighten us in many cases. So we will miss you. And I can only say that we have to hope that everything goes well for you. You know, you take care of your problems. And again we will miss you. And I'm sorry that you are leaving.

Thomas: Thank you for that. I will miss everybody as well.

Guerrero: I have an additional comment as well. you know, just …

Thomas: Yes.

Guerrero: Same thinking Commissioner Thomas. But also you know I mean, this has been a really great commission. You know we've gained a few new members such as Rico, and as well as Commissioner Vega this year. And I'm excited you know for I guess the fresh, I guess maybe like a fresh 2022 in this commission. I've been on it for three years. And you know I've seen a lot of things and I've seen our City continue to grow. And you know I just want to remind people again you know what we saw today was just an example of growing pains. And we're going to have to continue dealing with this for a while. And the new code is going to be hopefully coming in soon and I'm really excited that we all get to be a part of that as well.

Thomas: Thank you. Okay, I just want to say as many of you know, I've tried to retire several times and it never seems to work out. So my husband and I retired early from Michigan State because he was diagnosed with leukemia. And our adult kids already lived here and were running our café, so we decided to move here. And I thought that I was, I was looking forward to getting back to pottery. I used to be a potter and maybe doing some yoga. So I didn't bring a pottery wheel, but I brought all my tools and my clay and my glaze formulas. And then I met Jeff Steinborn. And he and Karen Paris were setting up a little group to study comprehensive plans. And there were I don't know, eight or 10 of us. I don't think any of us knew what a comprehensive plan was let alone what made a good one. But we learned a lot. Several people from that group have actually ended up running for office. Nathan Small, Gill Sorg, you'll recognize the names. I think we all got inspired by Jeff. Then there was a group that wanted Ken Miyagishima to run for mayor. And he said he wouldn't do that unless he knew who was going to run for his seat. And so they asked me to go meet with them. And I met with them and then he won and announced at his party that night that I was going to run for his seat. So then I had a new career.

So I wanted to learn more about planning. I spent a lot of time with my daughter who's a planner, and I started going to conferences. And I have to say that my husband, who's watching, put up with a lot over the years.
He learned to get those rotisserie chickens from Albertsons and find stuff to go with them, did a good job on the meals. He put up with a lot of conferences and meetings, and got very adept at saying, wait you need to talk to that person over there. So it was kind of a two person job. So but we just didn’t get to the comprehensive plan, we did a strategic plan. But comprehensive plan didn’t come along. The county got a grant, they did their comprehensive plan. I worked a lot on that and also on the implementation. So I kept hoping that we were sometime going to do that, but it didn’t look like it was going to happen. So I retired from the City Council. And then lo and behold the City decided to do a comprehensive plan. So when I had the opportunity to join this group you know that was, I jumped at that opportunity because that's what I’d been wanting to do from the very beginning when I first became a part of the City Council. So I say that I want to thank all the Commissioners, several of you who are up here worked on the comprehensive plan. You all put in extra-long hours you know just to make sure we had a good plan. I think we have a good plan. And I want to thank you all for doing that. As you’ve pointed out, there’s still work to be done, the implementation is coming and you’re going to be seeing a lot of drafts. And so I would like to be here to do that but my family health issues don’t make that possible. So my charge to you is that you make sure the comprehensive plan gets implemented when all those drafts come forward and that you pay attention. So I hope you'll be very familiar with the comprehensive plan and see that the implementation really does live up to what we all put into the comprehensive plan. So that's my charge to you. And in the meantime, I think I'm going to go look for a potter's wheel.

IX. STAFF ANNOUNCEMENTS

Thomas: Staff announcements.

H-Rogers: Larry, if you if you don't mind.

Nichols: Yes, please go ahead.

H-Rogers: Okay. Madam Chair, Members of the Commission. I do want to let you all know that January, as had been stated previously during this meeting, is going to be a very, very full agenda. Of course we had the tabled item related to the halfway house, there is going to be a zone change related to the Old Country Club property, and there is also going to be a discussion item related to where we are in terms of the drafting of the Realize Las Cruces Development Code. Our consultants will be in town to talk about where we are and how we're proceeding. And so just want to remind you that it's going to be a long night, but hopefully a good night. So there's that.
And also just wanted to thank you very, very much Commissioner Thomas. It's been really nice to work with you over the last several years. And we're going to miss really your care and passion for what we all do. And you know it's my profession, and I've appreciated that you really do care deeply about it. So thank you.

Thomas: Thank you. And you know and I want to say that that I've really enjoyed working with the staff over all these years, too. It's been a lot of years I've seen staff come and go and I find the staff to be very accomplished and professional and helped me learn more and more about how all this works. So I really appreciate the work the staff does.

Nichols: Thank you Madam Chair. Larry Nichols Community Development. I had four items announcement, but Katherine has covered all of them. So I won't labor any further on that, except for the last one. And that is with this meeting tonight Chair Thomas is tending her retirement and will be soon passing the gavel to another member of the Commission. We want to express our sincere appreciation for your years of service to the City of Las Cruces, both on the City Council and on this Commission. And your public service is a very challenging endeavor but I can't think of any more rewarding one than public service, which you have given many, many years and hours. So we want to thank you sincerely from the City, and the Community Development staff for your sage advice and direction and decision making. And as you broaden your perspectives and look for new horizons, we wish you all the best. Thank you Chairman.

Gordon: One last thing before you retire, you have to sign a lot of mylars

Thomas: What did you say? I'm sorry.

Gordon: I said before you retire you have to sign a lot of mylars.

Thomas: You're stacking up the mylars for me right before I can leave. Yes, well, I have to say you know I thought retirement would be much different than what it turned out to be. It's like having a whole nother career and a whole nother life, and it's been exciting and wonderful. Thank you all.

X. ADJOURNMENT (8:30)

Thomas: I'll entertain a motion to ..,

Gordon: I make a motion we adjourn.

Thomas: Is there a second?

Guerrero: Second it.
Thomas: All those in favor say "aye."

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

Thomas: We're adjourned.

Chairperson
Case 21ZO0500138: Senna Drive Rezoning

Staff Contact: Vincent Banegas, (575) 528-3058, vbanegas@las-cruces.org

Owner: James Chantrill

Representative: Same

District: District #2

Site Address: 4010 Senna Drive

Existing Zoning: A-2 (Rural Agricultural District)

Request: Rezone from A-2 (Rural Agricultural) to RE (Residential Estate)

Related Applications: N/A

Staff Recommendation: Conditional Approval

Summary of Case 21ZO0500138:
A request to approve the rezoning of property from A-2 (Rural Agricultural District) to RE (Residential Estate), located at 4010 Senna Drive. The property is ± .78 acres (portion presently within the city limits) and is within Council District 2. Submitted by James Chantrill, property owner.

Summary of Recommendation:
Staff is recommending CONDITIONAL APPROVAL based on the findings listed below:

- The portion of property under consideration has a non-conforming zoning designation that no longer exists in the 2001 Las Cruces Zoning Code, as amended. Prior to development, an appropriate zoning district designation needs to be established pursuant to code. The RE district designation is the most appropriate zoning district given the surrounding area.

- The subject property falls within the Suburban place type. This place type is characterized by low to moderate density residential land uses intermixed with areas of commercial development. This place type is consistent with the what the RE zone provides.
• The proposed zone change request is supported by the Elevate Las Cruces Comprehensive Plan and meets the purpose and intent of the 2001 Zoning Code (2001 Zoning Code, Section 38-2).
• The subject property (portion) is part of a parcel that was split at the time an annexation was processed in the area. The portion in the city limits is reflected in County Assessor records as ± .78 acres. The portion outside the city limits is ±1.03 acres. A need to replat the lot along the city limit boundary is necessary to avoid development conflicts in the future.
• The surrounding area is developed as large lot single-family development consistent with the RE zoning district.

PROPOSAL AND LAND USE HISTORY

DETAILED DESCRIPTION:
The property owner, is seeking rezoning from A-2 to RE in that the present A-2 district designation is non-conforming and does not exist within the 2001 Las Cruces Zoning Code, as amended. The A-2 district existed in earlier zoning codes having been eliminated under the current 2001 zoning code regime. At the time of code adoption, a two-year grace period allowed any non-conforming zoning to remain in full force and effect until rezoning or conversion of zoning took place. Staff initiated rezoning/conversion efforts for related properties and encouraged property owners to come forward with requests of their own to bring about compliance with the 2001 district standards. Due to the sheer number of properties that needed adjustment, staff could not reach out to all applicable property owners within the time frame provided even after extending the time frame for compliance. Originally, the A-2 district was typically used to zone agricultural land. Later, it was also used as a type of holding zone when property owners were not certain as to the zoning district desired. Changing the zoning to RE will correct this zoning non-conformity.

The annexation that created the need herein stated was called the I-10 and I-25 Interchange Annexation. The annexation occurred in 1968 containing ± 920 acres.

LAND USE HISTORY:
The subject property was created as part of the Las Alturas Estates Block A Subdivision filed in 1965. Ultimately, the property was developed as single-family (portion in the county) in 1973. Based on information from the applicant, the structure has burned down.

ZONING DECISION CRITERIA AND POLICIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>DOES IT COMPLY?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Character and Compatibility</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevate Las Cruces Comprehensive Plan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thoroughfare Plans</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose and Intent of the Code: Section 38-2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria for Decisions: Section 2-382</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER AND COMPATIBILITY:
In large part, the area surrounding the subject property consists of large lot residential uses. This development pattern exists both north, south and east of the subject property. To the immediate west sits I-25 and NMSU. Zoning is consistent with much of the existing development in that many of the lots outside the city limits are zoned DL-1 (Low Density Residential). R-1aC, R-1a zoning sits to the north of the subject property and A-2, R-1a exists to the south. Given the development pattern described, there should be no impact to the surrounding neighborhood in terms of character and compatibility.

COMPLIANCE WITH ELEVATE LAS CRUCES COMPREHENSIVE PLAN:
According to the Future Development Map in the Elevate Las Cruces Comprehensive Plan, the subject parcel falls within the Suburban Neighborhood Place Type. The Suburban Neighborhood Place Type is characterized as providing low-to-moderate density residential land uses intermixed with area of commercial development.

The following goals, polices, and actions from Elevate Las Cruces are relevant to the proposed Zone Change:

- **Community Environment:**
  - Policy CE-3.2 – Allow for a mix of development type and intensity along major thoroughfares that reflects surrounding urban, suburban, and rural contexts.
  - Policy CE 5.1.2 – Provide gradual transitions between developments with residential lots of varying size and building heights.
    - Goal CE-4: Develop mixed-use neighborhoods that incorporate a wide range of recreational, commercial, employment, and civic uses.
      - Policy CE-4.2 – Incorporate employment and shopping nodes into new and redeveloping neighborhoods to provide residents with convenient access to services.

- **Community Prosperity:**
  - Goal CP-9: Housing Diversity – Provide a diverse range of housing options to accommodate residents at all stages in life.

- **Community Livability:**
  - Goal CL-2: Strengthen neighborhood condition through improvements to the built-environment.
    - Policy CL-2.2 – Encourage redevelopment of vacant properties within neighborhoods.

As the uses surrounding the subject property are congruous to the suburban comprehensive plan place type and well supported by various comprehensive goals and policies, staff feels the application is justified and should pose no conflict with the existing neighborhood.
COMPLIANCE WITH MPO THOROUGHFARE PLAN:
Senna Drive is a local roadway that the subject property fronts and is more than adequate to accommodate any proposed single family residential development that this pending rezoning action may facilitate in the future. Senna Drive intersects west of the subject property with Las Alturas Drive, a minor arterial which basically serves as a frontage road for I-25. Senna Drive has approximately 25 feet of pavement within approximately 60 feet of right-of-way. There are no curb, gutter or sidewalks along the roadway.

CONSISTENCY WITH PURPOSE AND INTENT OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE:
Per Section 38-2: The intent of the Zoning Code is to encourage the most appropriate use of land and to promote the health, safety, and general welfare of the community for the purpose of improving each citizen's quality of life. The regulations relevant to the proposed zone change include:
   A. Ensure that all development is in accordance with this Code and the Elevate Las Cruces Comprehensive Plan and its elements.
   B. Encourage innovations in land development and redevelopment.
   C. Give reasonable consideration to the character of each zoning district and its peculiar suitability for particular uses.
   H. Encourage the conservation of energy in the use of structures, buildings, and land.
   J. Improve the design, quality, and character of new development.
   K. Encourage development of vacant properties within established areas.
   L. Ensure that development proposals are sensitive to the character of existing neighborhoods.
   N. Conserve the value of buildings and land.

Review by City of Las Cruces staff determined the proposed zone change would not adversely impact the surrounding area. Future uses that may be authorized by the proposed district will be in keeping with the surrounding area as per section 38-2 of the 2001 Zoning Code, as amended. Additionally, the proposed action will eliminate the property’s non-conforming zoning. If the condition as stated earlier is applied, it will also rectify the issue involving a parcel that is split by the city limit line at the time of annexation.

CRITERIA FOR DECISIONS:
Per Section 2-382 of the Las Cruces Municipal Code, the Planning and Zoning Commission shall determine the following:
   A. The Planning and Zoning Commission shall review the comprehensive plan, and other applicable plans and codes and determine whether the request will:
       1. Impair an inadequate supply of light and air to adjacent property or otherwise adversely adjoining properties.
       2. Unreasonably increase the traffic in public streets.
       3. Increase the danger of fire or endanger the public safety.
       4. Deter the orderly and phased growth and development of the community.
       5. Unreasonably impair established property values within the surrounding area.
       6. In any other respect, impair the public health, safety, or general welfare of the city.
       7. Constitute a spot zone, and therefore, adversely affect adjacent property
values.
8. Be in harmony with the purpose and intent of the zoning code, sign code, design standards, and other companion codes.
B. The commission shall take care that the development of the city, in accordance with present and future needs, best promotes the health, safety, morals, order, convenience, prosperity, and general welfare of the people. It shall also promote efficiency and economy in the process of development.
C. The commission shall encourage the proper use and development of land, shall seek to create and maintain an aesthetic urban setting, and protect and preserve the quality of the water, air and other environmental, natural, historical and cultural resources for the city.
D. The commission shall use the comprehensive plan as a guide in making all future decisions concerning land use and development, and in the financing and location of capital improvements.
E. Before taking any action concerning land use and development and financing and location of capital improvements, the commission shall review the relationship between the proposed action and the comprehensive plan.

Upon internal review, Staff did not identify any issues that would deter the Planning and Zoning Commission from making a conditional affirmative recommendation to City Council regarding the zone change request. Staff also considered the Criteria for Decisions stated above during the internal review process and has deemed the zone change request appropriate with a recommendation of conditional approval.

DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS
SITE COMPLIANCE FOR USES UNDER CURRENT ZONING:
The subject property is currently zoned A-2. The portion of property under consideration is approximately .78 acres in size. The remainder of the lot is 1.03 acres. Combined, the acreage meets the requirements of the defunct A-2 district. If the subject parcel (portion in the city) remains as is, future development will be hampered in that the lot is split by the city limit line and the zoning is defunct. What is being requested via this proposal would be required at the time of any future development proposal. Taking care of related issues now, resolves several problematic nuances for the property owner.

SITE SUITABILITY FOR USES UNDER PROPOSED ZONING:
If the subject property (.78 acres portion), is rezoned and subsequently replatted pursuant to the staff requested condition, both portions will meet the lot size requirements of the RE district and the DL-1 district (portion remaining in the county). Staff feels that the change in zoning designation will in no way impact the surrounding area. Access to the property will remain as it has been for several years.

ADEQUACY OF PUBLIC FACILITIES AND SERVICES:
City water, gas currently serves the property and will not be negatively impacted by the zone change request and any resulting development. Septic tanks provide the means for sewer service and the resulting lot sizes (per the recommended condition) should accommodate lot size standards established by New Mexico Environment Department (NMED). Senna Drive as indicated earlier does not have the typical roadway cross-section of other local roadways in the city, but provides adequate paved access to residential lots along the roadway.
STAFF AND PUBLIC COMMENTS

PUBLIC NOTIFICATION AND INPUT:
Notification letters were mailed to property owners within 500 feet. Staff has not received any input at the time this report was written.

STAFF COMMENTS:
No reviewing department had any negative comments nor have any reviewing staff objected to the proposed rezoning.

ATTACHMENTS:
1. Zoning Map
2. Aerial Map
3. Department Review Comments
ATTACHMENT 1

Zoning Map

Note: Subject parcel is outlined in red.
ATTACHMENT 2
Aerial Map

Note: Subject parcel is outlined in red.
ATTACHMENT 3
Department Review Comments

Department:  Planning
Status:  YES W/ Contingency

Department:  NMDOT
Status:  NOT REQUIRED

Department:  Long Range Planning
Status:  YES

Department:  Transportation
Status:  YES

Department:  Engineering
Status:  YES

Department:  Utility
STATUS: YES

Department:  Fire
Status:  YES

Department:  MPO
Status:  YES
Planning & Zoning Commission 1/25/2022
CASE 21ZO1000105: SPECIAL USE PERMIT

STAFF CONTACT: Vincent Banegas, (575) 528-3085 vbanegas@las-cruces.org

OWNER: Teresa Medina

REPRESENTATIVE: Same

DISTRICT: District #4

SITE ADDRESS: 1016 Hickory Drive

EXISTING ZONING: R-1a (Single-Family Medium Density Residential)

REQUEST: Special Use Permit (SUP) to allow/establish a penal related transitional home for women (half-way house).

RELATED APPLICATIONS: N/A

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Conditional Approval

SUMMARY OF REQUEST CASE 21ZO1000105: A SUP request for a penal related transitional home for women (half-way house) in a R-1a (Single Family Medium Density Residential) zoning district located at 1016 Hickory Drive. The property is approximately ± 0.224 acres in size.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION: Staff is recommending CONDITIONAL APPROVAL based on the findings listed below:

- The existing structure is a single-family home that will still be considered as such under the applicable codes whether the case is approved or denied. The applicant proposes no exterior modification to the property that would indicate the use to be anything other than a single-family home.
- The proposed use meets various relevant Comprehensive Plan goals and policies (see Compliance with Elevate Comprehensive Plan section) which speak to housing types, housing opportunities for transitory populations, and promoting efforts for holistic social services.
- Operational measures are proposed to be implemented to ensure house and neighborhood safety and compliance with house rules. Adherence to established rules will follow a zero-tolerance policy. Said measures are proposed to address visitors, vehicle parking, drug testing, video monitoring, curfews, etc.
• The 2001 Las Cruces Zoning Code, as amended allows consideration of specific SUP approval periods in part to limit long term impacts a proposed use may generate. If concern exists over the operation of the home in the manner described for an extended period of time, a condition speaking to this may be applied at the time of motion/voting action.

**PROPOSAL AND LAND USE HISTORY**

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**
The applicant/owner of property located at 1016 Hickory Drive recognized a need for group home related housing to serve the needs of women being released by New Mexico’s penal system. In the City’s zoning code, the term used is Halfway House and is defined as “a residential facility located in a structure or dwelling or any living unit thereof designed, used, or intended to be used as human habitation, the principal use or goal of which is to serve as a place for persons seeking rehabilitation, recovery, or counseling from any physical, mental, emotional, penal or legal infirmity, in a family setting, as part of a group rehabilitation recovery program.” In early October, 2021, the property owner applied for a Special Use Permit (SUP) for a Halfway House to be located at 1016 Hickory Drive; an existing single-family home in an R-1a zoning district. The permit calls for the allowance of 6 to 7 recently released women to occupy the 3 bedroom + 1 converted garage/bedroom home at any given time. It is anticipated that each resident will stay for a period of 3 to 9 months prior to leaving and continuing their re-introduction efforts elsewhere. During this time, persons are expected to work or attend school, receive counseling, receive personal finance education and financial planning guidance, attend Bible studies and self-help groups, attend religious services, and participate in volunteer community work. The home is identified by the applicant as a Non-profit operation receiving funding from private donations, and funds obtained through the resident’s fee obligation.

Prior to actual submittal, the property owner met with staff to discuss the possibility for such a use in context to the zoning of the property, it’s location and relevance to the City’s zoning provisions. At that time, the applicant was made aware of the related provisions particularly those involved with Early Notification. Early Notification is a form of notification to surrounding property owners by the applicant when a potentially contentious case is being proposed. The applicant carried out this effort finding significant opposition to the proposed land use. All correspondence from both the early notification and City notification efforts have been included in your respective packets.

This case went before the Planning and Zoning Commission at the November 23, 2021 regular meeting. Due to errors in notification, staff asked for postponement of the case. As a result, the Planning and Zoning Commission postponed the case to the January 25, 2022 meeting.
LAND USE HISTORY:
The existing parcel is ± 0.224 acres in size and located within the Glendale Gardens Unit 1 subdivision. The parcel is developed as a single-family home. It is zoned R-1a as is the bulk of the surrounding neighborhood.

ZONING DECISION CRITERIA AND POLICIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>DOES IT COMPLY?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Character and Compatibility</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevate Las Cruces Comprehensive Plan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose and Intent of the Code: Section 38-2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria for Decisions: Section 2-382</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER AND COMPATIBILITY:
The proposed halfway house (transitional group home) will have a look and feel much like other homes in the area. Please be advised that from the perspective of both building and zoning codes used by the City, the structure and its use will remain largely as a single-family house. It is the purpose of the home that is really at issue in this case. As per the applicant, no changes to the homes exterior (other than maintenance and upkeep) will be made resulting in the home and its use blending in with other homes surrounding the subject location. Any resident owned vehicles will be kept on-site thereby minimizing any visual vehicular impact that parking on street may create. Agency representatives will park on-street, but this is anticipated to be infrequent thus, minimizing area traffic and roadway impacts.

COMPLIANCE WITH ELEVATE LAS CRUCES COMPREHENSIVE PLAN:

Policy CE-4.1: Encourage a variety of housing types into new and redeveloping neighborhoods to provide options for all ages and incomes throughout the city.

Policy CL-18.1.2: Support State Health and Human Service programs and facilities as a means of offering their availability, including encouraging public and private partnerships as a means of meeting the needs of the community.

Policy CP-1.2: Support efforts at local middle schools, high schools, NMSU, Dona Ana Community College, and other entities that improve workforce readiness and cultivate a skilled workforce.

Action CP-1.2.1: Support local programs that provide employment, volunteer opportunities, and/or training to citizens.

Goal CP-8: Special Housing Needs – Ensure that the housing needs of traditionally underserved populations are met.

Policy CP-8.1: Support efforts to provide transitory populations permanent, stable homes.
Policy CP-9.1: Encourage the use of alternative housing types, styles, and living arrangements to provide additional housing opportunities.

Policy CP-10.1: Promote efforts to provide comprehensive and holistic social services that are centered on individuals with mental health or behavioral challenges and their families.

Policy CP-10.2: Support programs that improve the health and wellness for all residents.

Policy CP-11: Underserved Populations: Develop and support programs that provide assistance to traditionally underserved populations.

Community Vision, "...Las Cruces is an inclusive community...Pg. 18

Vision Subcomponent: Las Cruces as a Livable Community – "...provide our residents with feasible options to live, work, and play in Las Cruces regardless of personal means or stage in life..." Pg. 19

Vision Subcomponent: Las Cruces Leverages Social Partnerships – "...social service partnerships to broaden access to resources that provide a firm foundation for our residents’ daily well-being and long-term personal and professional growth." Pg. 20

The proposed special use permit is supported by several goals and policies outlined in Elevate Las Cruces as listed above. The project is suitable based on its visual compatibility with the surrounding neighborhood.

CONSISTENCY WITH PURPOSE AND INTENT OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE:
The Purpose and Intent Statements relevant to the proposal are:

• Ensure that all development is in accordance with this Code and the Las Cruces Comprehensive Plan and its elements, which are designed to:
  • Mitigate congestion in the streets and public ways.
  • Prevent overcrowding of land.
  • Avoid undue concentration of population.
  • Control and abate the unsightly use of buildings or land.

• Give reasonable consideration to the character of each zoning district and its peculiar suitability for particular uses.

• Encourage development of vacant properties within established areas.

• Ensure that development proposals are sensitive to the character of existing neighborhoods.

• Conserve the value of buildings and land.

• Mitigate conflicts among neighbors.
As mentioned above, The City of Las Cruces determined that the proposed use would not adversely impact the surrounding area, appears to be compatible with surrounding residential uses, and would be in harmony with the purpose and intent of the 2001 Zoning Code, as amended. Several conditions listed later in this report may help minimize concerns involving the proposed use.

**CRITERIA FOR DECISIONS:**
- Impairment of adequate supply of light and air to adjacent property;
- Unreasonable increase in potential traffic;
- Increase the danger of fire or endanger the public safety;
- Deterrent of orderly and phased growth;
- Impairment of the public health, safety or general welfare of the city;
- Establishment of a spot zone; or the
- Contradiction of the purpose and intent of the zoning code, sign code, design standards and other companion codes.

Based upon a review of the proposal and applicable regulations and policies, City Staff did not identify any of the issues listed above associated with the proposed SUP. The proposed use will be established in accordance with all state, federal, zoning, fire, and building requirements and meets the criteria for decisions ensuring the health, safety, and welfare of the general public.

**DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS**

**SITE COMPLIANCE FOR CURRENT USE:**
The subject property is currently zoned R-1a (Single-family Medium Density Residential), encompasses +/- 0.224 acres, and is developed as a single-family home with an attached non-compliant accessory dwelling unit. The site can be used as a halfway house pursuant to special use permit provisions. All applicable building, zoning, and fire codes must be met.

**SITE SUITABILITY FOR PROPOSED USE:**
Section 38-54 B, Special Use Permits, of the City of Las Cruces 2001 Zoning Code, as amended, requires halfway homes to be approved through the SUP process. The property should be able to accommodate the intended use. A permit will be required for any interior improvements that will have to be made to make the structure suitable for the use and code compliant. Any such effort is recommended to take place following consideration of the SUP and prior to the use of the structure as the intended use.

**ADEQUACY OF PUBLIC FACILITIES AND SERVICES:**
City water, gas and sewer already serve the site and are adequate for the proposal. Hickory Drive, Sequoia Avenue, Aspen Avenue, and other neighborhood roadways are classified as local roads, providing direct adequate paved access to residential properties. These roads include curb, gutter, sidewalk, lighting, and asphalt pavement.

**FLOOD PLAIN:** The subject property is not located within the Flood Zone.
STAFF AND PUBLIC COMMENTS

PUBLIC NOTIFICATION AND INPUT: Early notification and City notice of a Public Hearing was mailed to property owners for the November 2021 meeting date. It was later confirmed that a problem with mail-out notification took place resulting in the need to postpone the case. As a result, the Commission voted to postpone the case till January 25, 2022. New notice was carried out for the January meeting. All property owners within 500 feet of the subject property were mailed appropriate notice. In terms of input, staff received considerable commentary from area residents (13 emails/letters, 4 phone calls) from the first notice/meeting effort. All but one commenter opposed the proposal. No new correspondence has been submitted at the time of report writing from the second notice effort. It should be noted that no meeting between the applicant and the neighborhood was held pursuant to the early notification process for either the November meeting or the January meeting. Said meeting is not mandatory but recommended should the neighborhood request one.

STAFF COMMENTS: In carrying out related research into similar cases approved elsewhere in the city, please consider the following. Staff found four other halfway homes that were approved in Las Cruces through the SUP process. All were approved from 1996 to present. The one that is most like the case at hand involves property located at 1975 Anderson Drive. That case was approved in 2013. In trying to obtain information from the Police Department regarding calls received on the four locations, staff was advised that only information from 2020 to present could be compiled. To date, only data on the Anderson property was provided. The applicable database showed only one alarm call which PD felt was the result of an incorrect key code entry. Should the information for the other locations be provided prior to the P&Z meeting, staff will advise on what the data shows.

Given the summary provided, and with adherence to the conditions staff recommends the Commission consider below, staff feels that the property can be used to accommodate the proposed use without significant impact to the health, safety and welfare of both proposed occupants and area residents. The conditions are as follows:

1. No exterior modification of the residence shall be made that significantly announces the use as anything other than a single-family home.
2. An on-site resident advisor be required to ensure compliance with all applicable house rules and requirements established adhering to a zero-tolerance policy.
3. Only visitors from outside agencies providing training, education, and related assistance are allowed. Legal, law enforcement and judicial representatives are exempt from this provision.
4. All resident parking (anticipated to be minimal) will be off-street parking.
5. The applicant proposed operational measures involving curfews, video monitoring, and random drug testing shall be established and/or conducted to help maintain order within the home and help with the compliance all established rules and laws.
6. The use shall comply to all zoning, building and companion codes as deemed necessary by City Staff. The former garage which was converted to a “studio apartment” prior to the acquisition of the property by the applicant, will have to be brought into compliance with zoning code provisions. Further, adherence to all State/Federal requirements related to transitional housing shall be followed as applicable.

7. Staff recommends that approval for this case be for no more than 3-years with an opportunity to renew via Planning and Zoning Commission consideration thereafter. Renewal shall occur prior to expiration of the initial SUP approval.

ATTACHMENTS:
1. Zoning Map
2. Aerial Map
3. Applicants Documents
4. Department Review Comments
5. Public input
ATTACHMENT 2

Aerial Map

Note: Subject parcel is outlined in red.
To The Las Cruces City Planning Authorities:

My name is Teresa Medina and this is the project for the new single-family home at 1016 Hickory Drive. I plan on making a low-profile Transition Home (halfway House) for a select group of 6-7 women that are exiting jail/prison and re-entering into society. This Non-Profit home will be supported by private donations and the residents' Transition-House Living Fees.

The women will be selected through screening and interviews. This home will be run on strict Christian values and close supervision. The women will be supervised by qualified house monitors that know and are trained to deal with the needs of these women. Curfews, cameras, random drug and alcohol testing, limited time out of the house, and other restrictions will apply to maintain an Alcohol/drug free environment in the home and the neighborhood. Traffic will not be expected to increase because there will be NO visitors (family, friends or children) and only a few residents may have cars, however that use may also be a restriction until earned. The house has two driveways and can park up to 10 cars if needed, but not anticipated.

The women will reside there for 3 to 9 months with a focus on permanently returning to society as independent productive citizens. They will be expected to work/attend school, receive counseling, apply financial planning, attend Bible Studies, Self-Help groups, various church services and participate in Volunteer Community work. The main goal for each woman is to heal from the past and change themselves for a strong future as they acclimate back into society.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions. I am happy to answer.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Teresa Medina
ATTACHMENT 4
Staff Review Comments

Advanced/Current Planning: Approved with Contingency.
- Any exterior modification of residence that significantly announces the use as anything other than a single-family home is discouraged.
- The proposed use meets various relevant Comprehensive Plan goals and policies which speak to housing types, housing opportunities for transitory populations, and promoting efforts for holistic social services.
- As stipulated by the applicant, an on-site resident advisor needs to ensure compliance with house rules adhering to a zero-tolerance policy.
- The only visitors to the home will be those representing outside agencies that may provide training, education, and related assistance. Legal, law enforcement and judicial representatives are exempt from this provision.
- All resident parking (anticipated to be minimal) will be off-street parking.
- As per the applicant, curfews, video monitoring, and random drug testing will be established and/or conducted to help maintain order within the home and help enforcement all established rules.
- The use shall comply to all building and companion codes as deemed necessary by City Staff. The former garage which converted to a "studio apartment" prior to the acquisition of the property by the applicant will have to be brought into compliance with zoning code provisions. Further, adherence to all State/Federal requirements related to transitional housing shall be followed as applicable.
- That approval consideration be considered for no more than a 3-year period with an opportunity to renew via Planning and Zoning Commission consideration. Renewal shall occur prior to expiration of the initial SUP approval.

Engineering: No review necessary

Fire: Approved with contingency
- In accordance with IBC Chapter 3, Residential group r-4 occupancies require the installation of a fire sprinkler system prior to occupancy.

MPO: No review necessary

Utilities: Approved
ATTACHMENT 5

Public Input
## Petition to Vote Against

A special use permit request for a penal related transitional home for women (half-way house) in a R-1 (Single Family Medium Density Residential) zoning district located at 1016 Hickory Drive

We, the undersigned, are concerned citizens who urge our leaders to act now and DENY the special use permit requested.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PERSON NAME</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11-15-21</td>
<td>Karen Farmer</td>
<td>1008 Sycamore Dr.</td>
<td>Against the transitional home for women</td>
<td>Teresa Medina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15-21</td>
<td>Mark Farmer</td>
<td>1008 Sycamore Dr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15-21</td>
<td>Debbie Bosley</td>
<td>1001 Sycamore Dr.</td>
<td>Unsafe for elderly &amp; children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15-21</td>
<td>Ken Bosley</td>
<td>1001 Sycamore Dr.</td>
<td>Too many kids/elderly should not be together</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15-21</td>
<td>Lindsay Hampton</td>
<td>1001 Sycamore Dr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15-21</td>
<td>Rick Hamilton</td>
<td>1005 Sycamore Dr.</td>
<td>Unsafe for children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15-21</td>
<td>Teresa E. Green</td>
<td>1016 Sycamore Dr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-19-21</td>
<td>Paul Hohl</td>
<td>1017 Sycamore Dr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-17-21</td>
<td>Joe G. Alexander</td>
<td>1012 Hickory Dr.</td>
<td>Not the place for it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-18-21</td>
<td>Richard Allard</td>
<td>1017 Hickory Dr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15-21</td>
<td>Dennis Hargrave</td>
<td>1013 Hickory Dr.</td>
<td>Do not want it in the neighborhood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15-21</td>
<td>Esmiralda Martinez</td>
<td>1000 Sycamore Dr.</td>
<td>Immigrant, don't feel safe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15-21</td>
<td>Terry Turner</td>
<td>1004 Sycamore Dr.</td>
<td>Do not want it in our neighborhood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15-21</td>
<td>E. J. Turner</td>
<td>1004 Sycamore Dr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15-21</td>
<td>Stella Estacado</td>
<td>1785 Sycamore Dr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15-21</td>
<td>Ira Neff</td>
<td>1013 Sycamore Dr.</td>
<td>Wrong place for it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15-21</td>
<td>Diana Neff</td>
<td>1194 Sequoia Ave.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-16-21</td>
<td>Dashawn Calaway</td>
<td>1007 Sycamore Dr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-16-21</td>
<td>Jose E. Martin</td>
<td>1001 Sycamore Dr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-16-21</td>
<td>Robert Martin</td>
<td>1021 Sycamore Dr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-16-21</td>
<td>Scott Boyle</td>
<td>1007 Hickory Dr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-16-21</td>
<td>Adam MacDonald</td>
<td>1005 Hickory Dr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-14-21</td>
<td>Briana Macdonald</td>
<td>1005 Hickory Dr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>PRINTED NAME</td>
<td>ADDRESS</td>
<td>COMMENT</td>
<td>SIGNATURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/17/21</td>
<td>Richard Medina</td>
<td>1705 Aspen Dr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/17/21</td>
<td>Margo Medina</td>
<td>1705 Aspen Dr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/17/21</td>
<td>Gray Peters</td>
<td>1705 Aspen Dr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/17/21</td>
<td>Anna Battle</td>
<td>1714 Aspen Dr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/17/21</td>
<td>Victor Guzman</td>
<td>1720 Aspen Dr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/17/21</td>
<td>FERNK G Thủ</td>
<td>1725 Aspen Dr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>PRINTED NAME</td>
<td>ADDRESS</td>
<td>COMMENT</td>
<td>SIGNATURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/17/21</td>
<td>Patricia Snyder</td>
<td>1741 Aspen Ave.</td>
<td>I don't think the neighbors would be happy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/17/21</td>
<td>Francisco Macias</td>
<td>1731 Aspen Ave.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/17/21</td>
<td>Joe Stamos</td>
<td>1201 Saratoga Ave.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/17/21</td>
<td>Tim Hines</td>
<td>1601 Saratoga Ave.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/17/21</td>
<td>Natalie Marques</td>
<td>1512 Saratoga Ave.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/17/21</td>
<td>Arel Hulbert</td>
<td>1512 Saratoga Ave.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/17/21</td>
<td>Ramon Moneta</td>
<td>1512 Saratoga Ave.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/17/21</td>
<td>Lewis M. Elia</td>
<td>1623 Saratoga Ave.</td>
<td>Walking through problems with TPD, NO SUPPORT.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/17/21</td>
<td>Tamara A. Gomez</td>
<td>1605 Tamarack Dr.</td>
<td>We would like to maintain our neighborhood.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/17/21</td>
<td>Cecel E.; 1605</td>
<td>1605 Tamarack Dr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/17/21</td>
<td>Alice Penagos</td>
<td>1504 Stewart Dr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/19/21</td>
<td>Jose E. &amp; Nationa</td>
<td>1709 Aspen Ave.</td>
<td>Las Cruces <a href="mailto:remodel@gmail.com">remodel@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/19/21</td>
<td>Marnie M.</td>
<td>1737 Aspen Ave.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/19/21</td>
<td>Eva Rodriguez</td>
<td>1025 Sycamore Dr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/19/21</td>
<td>Daniel V.</td>
<td>1025 Sycamore Dr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/19/21</td>
<td>Alfred &amp; Flores</td>
<td>1701 Aspen Ave.</td>
<td>We don't want this in our neighborhood.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Fred)</td>
<td>1701 Aspen Ave.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/19/21</td>
<td>Onalise Flores</td>
<td>1701 Aspen Ave.</td>
<td>TOTALLY AGAINST THIS!!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hi Teresa,

My name is Scott Boyle and I live at and am the owner of 1009 Hickory Dr. I received your request on September 13, 2021, for comments regarding changes to the zoning/permitting to allow for 1016 Hickory Dr., Las Cruces, NM 88005 to be turned into a transition home. I would like to first begin by thanking you for the countless volunteer service hours that you have done at the county detention center over the last 8 years as well as your desire to help ease the transition of former inmates back into society. With that being said, I respectively object to this proposal as I have a variety of concerns/objections.

Below I briefly address some of the concerns I have regarding this request.

1) This proposal runs a risk of influencing the property value in the neighborhood as well as limit the resale capability especially to those with a family with young children. Las Cruces housing market has recently seen an outward increase of property value ranging from ~30 to 40% within our neighborhood alone over the past year. This is informing us that Las Cruces and our neighborhood is becoming a more desirable place to live and inserting a transition home can drastically hurt this. As a recent 1st time home buyer, I can attest that both relators and myself, as a buyer, look heavily into the neighborhood and surrounding homes, in which if a home like this was found it would raise flags if not deter me from purchasing.

2) I have concerns over the safety of the neighborhood both for myself and my family as well as all the other families in the neighborhood especially ones with children.

3) I am uncomfortable with any amount of people in this proposal, but with that being said 6-7 unrelated individuals is especially unreasonable request for a 4 bedroom house. I have concerns over the potential for increase traffic both within the neighborhood and specifically on Hickory Dr. A major appeal for living both on this street and neighborhood is the lack of traffic and peaceful neighborhood.

4) Although it sounds like a plan has been derived to reduce the potential risk of relapse (i.e., drugs, alcohol, violence) there is still a probability of occurrence especially with the proposed number of individuals living there. A scientific study conducted in New Mexico and published in 2015, found that most women even ones who participated in programs such as this would find themselves back in trouble with a probability of as high as 40% returning to prison of which 16% were due to new crimes (Denman 2015). These values are frankly too high for comfort thus I do not believe the risk outweighs the reward.

5) There was no mention or indication of the vetting or selection process that would occur when choosing the individuals to live there. There was also no mention of the qualification of mentor that would be residing there.

6) Quick turnover of people within a house changes the dynamics and culture of the neighborhood. In my opinion, the benefit of living in a neighborhood is not dealing with people moving in and out all the time as well as getting to know one another. Especially being able to help one another out during difficult times.

7) This proposal includes an impact to a neighborhood in which you no longer reside and therefore do not have to deal with the day-to-day consequences of what is to occur.
To conclude, the appeal of this neighborhood when I first moved in was: 1) the location; 2) the community; 3) the quiet and peaceful nature of the neighborhood; 4) the feeling of both myself and family are safe. In this proposed plan, all these items that brought me to this neighborhood would be jeopardized thus making the proposal unrealistic or unappealing. I would much prefer this house either being continued to be rented out to families or sold. Thus once again, I respectfully reject this proposal and wish for this plan to not move forward.

Best regards,

Scott Boyle

Scott Boyle
Re: Rezoning at 1016 Hickory Drive
1 message

Tue, Sep 21, 2021 at 9:21 AM

Tiffany Becker <tiffanybecker112980@gmail.com>
To: tarryous@gmail.com
Cc: vbanegas@las-cruces.org, jcastillo@las-cruces.org

City Zoning Commission
Las Cruces City Hall
700 N. Main Street, Suite 1100
Las Cruces, New Mexico 88001

Teresa Medina
1842 Embassy Drive #2
Las Cruces, NM 88005

RE: Glendale Gardens Rezoning

Dear Ms. Teresa Medina and City Council,

I, Jacqueline F. Sanders, have lived in the Glendale Gardens neighborhood since October 1968. I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed rezoning at 1016 Hickory Drive (Teresa Medina). I am an 86-year-old widow who lives alone and have always felt safe in my neighborhood. It should be the goal of your council to preserve existing neighborhoods so that our kids, grandkids and great grandkids can enjoy riding a bike, walking the dog or for us elderly persons just going out for our daily walk and exercise.

Nearly all residents in the Glendale Gardens neighborhood are completely opposed to the addition of a transitional house that would provide a residence for individuals who have been released from a correctional facility. The main factors for the opposition of the rezoning are for our safety, children's safety, elderly safety, our community's safety. Also, potentially lowering the property value of our existing community and probable increase in crime.

From recent meetings and discussions with my neighbors, I urge you to disapprove the proposed rezoning. I know my opinions are shared by many who have not been notified and were not able to write letters and emails because they have only just found out by word of mouth. Since hearing about the rezoning, I have started to feel uncomfortable, fearful, anxious, and am not sleeping well at night. I can just imagine what fear and helplessness I will have if this rezoning is approved.

Thank you for your continued service and support of our communities.

Respectfully,

Jacqueline F. Sanders
1020 Hickory Drive
Las Cruces, New Mexico 88005-3017
(Written by Jacqueline F. Sanders and transcribed by granddaughter-in-law Tiffany A. Becker)
Zoning project thoughts
1 message

Kimberly Beasley Legal <KBeasley@beasley-legal.com>
To: tarryous@gmail.com <tarryous@gmail.com>    Mon, Sep 20, 2021 at 4:27 PM

Dear Teresa,

I am writing on behalf of Antonio Perez, 1004 Tamarack Dr. He received your letter describing the proposed use of the house at 1016 Hickory Dr. and asked me to relay for him that, “with me, it’s ok” and that he has no problem with it. Best of luck with your project!

Thank you,

Kimberly Beasley
Paralegal

BEASLEY
LEGAL, P.C.

509 S. Main St. Suite C-1
PO Box 1620
Las Cruces, NM 88004
(575) 528-6782 – Office
(575) 222-1534 – Fax

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender and delete. Please note that any views or opinions presented in this email are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of the company. Finally, the recipient should check this email and any attachments for the presence of viruses. The company accepts no liability for any damage
This is a response to your letter regarding changing our Zoning for this area. I live at 1016 Tamarack Drive and I have lived here for over 50 years. I am not comfortable with this change. I am a widow and I live alone. I do have children who live in Las Cruces, but not near me.

I feel like this will be very hard to control. I have been landlord for over 30 years, and you cannot control the actions of people who live in a rent house. I also feel this will make property values in this area go down. You own one house here and yet you moved to another house in different area.

I am totally against this as are some of my neighbors that I have talked to.

Lynda G. McNeely
-signed-
Hello Ms Medina:
I cannot support your proposal
I have lived on the opposite end of Hickory Drive since 1982.
While your idea of a transition home for women offenders is admirable I do not think it is suited for a family neighborhood. It affects not only the current residents but also those who would wish to live here, and the value of our homes.
We do not know what type of offenders would be living there. Even if visitors are not allowed -- would people not under your rules try to visit? Those are things you cannot control.
There are simply too many variables and unknowns in your proposal for me to be supportive.
Jennifer Huntsberger
Retired scientist and educator.
to Lucia Medina

The proposal you have for the use of your house is ludicrous. We have a nice neighborhood with a lot of nice people, and do not need a house full of jailbirds in it. If you want a place for them to live, let them live with you. We do not need such riff-raff in our neighborhood.
September 14, 2021

Teresa Medina
1842 Embassy Drive #2
Las Cruces, NM 88005

RE: Rezoning 1016 Hickory Drive
Las Cruces, NM 88005

Ms. Teresa Medina and Vince Banegas,

We your neighbors, Fred and Suzie Flores at 1701 Aspen Ave are writing this letter to express our opposition to the proposed rezoning and transition house/halfway house. These transition house/halfway houses have occupants who have committed violent crimes such as murder, rape, child molestation, robbery with violence and various other crimes not to mention addictions. We have lots of children, grandchildren in our neighborhood and elderly people, this is the neighborhood that their parents purchased a home in because they felt that their children would be safe to ride their bikes, to play in the neighborhood streets, this is the neighborhood where the elderly purchased their first home and still live there and with a transition home in our neighborhood I am not sure I as an adult would feel safe to ride a bike or walk my dogs, let alone my children or grandchildren ride their bikes around the block or have my elderly parents live in the neighborhood. It should be the goal of the planning commission and zoning commission to preserve existing neighborhoods from transition houses popping up in our neighborhoods.

If the City of Las Cruces is going to allow you to rezone your property for this type of facility in our community, our neighborhood, then they should also see to the safety concerns of the citizens of our neighborhood. As stated in Ms. Medina’s letter a female Monitor/Manager will reside at the home with 6-7 women coming out of jail. What is her training, how is she going to make us your neighbors feel safe? What bylaws will this facility have, what safe guards will be in place to make sure our community interests are looked after? It is not just the people in this neighborhood that are going to be affected it is in this surrounding area.

The dominant fears motivating such opposition are clear, our children’s safety, our elderly’s safety, our community’s safety as a whole, value erosion and crime, concerns over supervision of residents.

I, Suzie Medina Flores have lived in this neighborhood since 1976, my parents built their home at 1705 Aspen Ave. in 1976 and still live there. My husband and I live next door at 1701 Aspen Ave., we have always felt safe in this neighborhood, having Ms. Medina’s property rezoned to allow a transition house/halfway house will only create our neighborhood to lose its value and its safety for all that live in this neighborhood. My husband, Fred and I are in total opposition in rezoning and absolutely against a transition house/halfway house. We will attend every rezoning meeting along with as many neighbors from Glendale Gardens as possible to protect our safety of our neighborhood and to oppose rezoning and a transition house.

Ms. Teresa Medina, this project you are planning has to many what if at the expense of the Glendale Garden Community. Since this is a sellers’ market why couldn’t you sell the house
and use the money from the sale of the house to purchase a building in the proper zoning and in a better area more suited for a transition house instead of an established neighborhood full of children, grandchildren, young couples starting out and elderly people that have lived in this neighborhood their entire lives? I

Sincerely,

Suzie Medina-Flores, MBA
Fred R. Flores Jr.
Ms. Medina

We wish to OBOSE the request to a halfway house in the middle of our neighborhood where there are young children in. We do not wish to introduce them to this type of environment.

Ms Medina your intentions are good but not in this quiet neighborhood.

Our house burned down in 2008 and we decided to rebuild in the same lot mainly because of our neighbors, Ismaeel (Smily) Medina, Rick, Larry, Karen, and others who helped us made our mind to stay.

Your intentions are good.

Retired Law Enforcement.

Robert Martin

On 09/14/2021 10:48 AM Larry Metz <larryleigh.metz@gmail.com> wrote:

Mrs. Medina,

My wife and I (Larry Metz and Drucillia Metz) also OPPOSE the
request for a Transition Home within our neighborhood. This will bring the home values down and we do not want this type of people within our housing area. We have enough problems within the neighborhood, as it is. We too would like to be invited on any future events, if this request will be moving forward, to our emails above. This will and must be approved by City Council/neighborhood and our City Representative should be involved.
On Tue, Sep 14, 2021 at 10:27 AM Ricardo Rodriguez <Rick_Rodriguez73@hotmail.com> wrote:

Mrs. Medina,

My name is Ricardo Rodriguez, I reside at 1025 Sycamore Drive, I strongly oppose the request of the Transition Home to be located at 1016 Hickory Drive. I have been a resident in the neighborhood for over 18 years and have seen the increase in theft, neighboring disputes and high traffic. The once peaceful neighborhood has now become the central point for unknown visitors. Even though I appreciate your efforts in helping society, our homes and residence are the highest investments we have, to take it a step further, I even oppose the renting of the homes within the area. I am grateful for the neighbors (invested owners) we have and will continue to strive to bring in more into our neighborhood.

I have copied a few of my neighbors and a City Representative on this email. If the request will be moving forward, a public meeting should be held for further commenting. I would appreciate any future proposals and invites sent directly to me at my email address above.

Thank you for your time,
Ricardo Rodriguez
From: Katherine Harrison Rogers  
Sent: Tuesday, September 28, 2021 11:12 AM  
To: Michelle Blackwell  
Cc: Vincent Banegas  
Subject: RE: Transition house at 1016 Hickory/Medina

Thank you for your input regarding the proposal. I have forwarded the information to the project planner and he will incorporate your concerns into any others we’ve received. We will refrain from utilizing your name/e-mail in our reports, but it should be noted that the City is subject to Inspection of Public Records Act (IPRA) and would be legally obligated to provide the email upon formal request by any member of the public.

Regards,

Katherine Harrison-Rogers, AICP  
Senior Planner/Community Development/Planning  
Direct: 575-528-3049 Main: 575-528-3043, krogers@las-cruces.org

From: Michelle Blackwell <meebee83@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Tuesday, September 28, 2021 8:36 AM  
To: Katherine Harrison Rogers <krogers@las-cruces.org>  
Subject: Transition house at 1016 Hickory/Medina

Good morning. I am a resident of this neighborhood and would like to express my opposition to this zone change, however, I feel that I need to remain anonymous. I believe there could be negative ramifications for me, no matter which way the commission chooses to vote. Let me explain.

First and foremost, Ms. Medina is looking at a 3-9 month turnover rate for 6-7 women. That could be as many as 24-30 residents in a year. She states that there will be a zero tolerance enforced for rule violations. So, if we use a 90% rate of adherence to the rules, that is still 2-3 violations within that year, in the best circumstances. As there are many elderly homeowners in our neighborhood. Now we are being asked to have those homes under the daily surveillance of known criminals. It would only take one of the transition home’s residents to have bad intentions to severely affect our homes’ safety. Our schedules, family status, vehicles, pets, etc would be well known and, possibly shared with friends or family of the women who may or may not have less-than-honorable intentions. Again, it would only take ONE incident to put our neighborhood residents in danger.

While I do believe that people, for the most part, deserve a second chance, I do not feel that our little neighborhood would benefit from being the focus of this experiment. Our neighborhood has undergone many growing pains already in recent years. The development of Hickory Circle has increased the very rapid, pass through traffic, especially on Aspen. There is talk of making Burn Lake
a skate park, which would be devastating to our peace and quiet. We are in the direct migration path of the homeless residents of the shelter/tent city residents going to and from the intersections near the highway and Wal-Mart. I truly believe this project would only add to the issues we are now dealing with already.

Again, I wish to remain anonymous. If the commission votes to accept Ms. Medina's project, I fear retaliation for opposing. And, if the commission votes the project down, I am in the same position. This isn't a simple zone change, this is a complete shift in the dynamics of our neighborhood. And, for these reasons, I sincerely hope that the Zoning Commission will vote "NO" on this zoning change request.

Thank you for your time and attention. I am requesting that any and all personal information on this email be redacted before any public publishing. If you need to contact me to verify my identity and/or residency in the neighborhood, please feel free to do so.
Dear Zoning Commission

This e-mail to you is in response to a letter we received from Teresa Medina concerning her property on 1016 Hickory that she is proposing a zoning change for a transitional home for women who had been in jail or prison. She claims she is a religious volunteer at the Dona Ana County Detention Center for the past 8 years. She states that no visitors will be allowed to see the residents during their stay at the home. She must be very naive to think rules will deter outsiders. The homes are close with rock walls for cover. We see a very real danger to homeowners around the transitional home, rules will not keep unsavory individuals away.

We as a neighborhood are experiencing a higher rate of transients and homeless in the area. Ms. Medina does not reside in the neighborhood she wants to impact. We feel the home on Hickory could never have the security required for safety for all. We implore the Commission to deny Ms. Medina's request.

Respectfully,

Mark and Karen Parmeter
Teresa Medina,

Please find our attached letter as we oppose rezoning of 1016 Hickory Dr.

Fred R. Flores Jr.
Suzie Medina-Flores
1701 Aspen Ave.
September 14, 2021

Teresa Medina  
1842 Embassy Drive #2 
Las Cruces, NM 88005 

RE: Rezoning 1016 Hickory Drive 
Las Cruces, NM 88005 

Ms. Teresa Medina and Vince Banegas, 

We your neighbors, Fred and Suzie Flores at 1701 Aspen Ave are writing this letter to express our opposition to the proposed rezoning and transition house/halfway house. These transition house/half way houses have occupants who have committed violent crimes such as murder, rape, child molestation, robbery with violence and various other crimes not to mention addictions. We have lots of children, grandchildren in our neighborhood and elderly people, this is the neighborhood that their parents purchased a home in because they felt that their children would be safe to ride their bikes, to play in the neighborhood streets, this is the neighborhood where the elderly purchased their first home and still live there and with a transition home in our neighborhood I am not sure I as an adult would feel safe to ride a bike or walk my dogs, let alone my children or grandchildren ride their bike around the block or have my elderly parents live in the neighborhood. It should be the goal of the planning commission and zoning commission to preserve existing neighborhoods from transition houses popping up in our neighborhoods.  

If the City of Las Cruces is going to allow you to rezone your property for this type of facility in our community, our neighborhood, then they should also see to the safety concerns of the citizens of our neighborhood. As stated in Ms. Medina’s letter a female Monitor/Manager will reside at the home with 6-7 women coming out of jail. What is her training, how is she going to make us your neighbors feel safe? What bylaws will this facility have, what safe guards will be in place to make sure our community interests are looked after? It is not just the people in this neighborhood that are going to be affected it is in this surrounding area.  

The dominant fears motivating such opposition are clear, our children’s safety, our elderly’s safety, our community’s safety as a whole, value erosion and crime, concerns over supervision of residents. 

I, Suzie Medina Flores have lived in this neighborhood since 1976, my parents built their home at 1705 Aspen Ave. in 1976 and still live there. My husband and I live next door at 1701 Aspen Ave., we have always felt safe in this neighborhood, having Ms. Medina’s property rezoned to allow a transition house/halfway house will only create our neighborhood to lose its value and its safety for all that live in this neighborhood. My husband, Fred and I are in total opposition in rezoning and absolutely against a transition house/halfway house. We will attend every rezoning meeting along with as many neighbors from Glendale Gardens as possible to protect our safety of our neighborhood and to oppose rezoning and a transition house. 

Ms. Teresa Medina, this project you are planning has to many what if at the expense of the Glendale Garden Community. Since this is a sellers’, market why couldn’t you sell the house
and use the money from the sale of the house to purchase a building in the proper zoning and in a better area more suited for a transition house instead of an established neighborhood full of children, grandchildren, young couples starting out and elderly people that have lived in this neighborhood their entire lives? I

Sincerely,

Suzie Medina-Flores, MBA
Fred R. Flores Jr.
Mrs. Medina,

My name is Ricardo Rodriguez, I reside at 1025 Sycamore Drive, I strongly **OPPOSE** the request of the Transition Home to be located at 1016 Hickory Drive. I have been a resident in the neighborhood for over 18 years and have seen the increase in theft, neighboring disputes and high traffic. The once peaceful neighborhood has now become the central point for unknown visitors. Even though I appreciate your efforts in helping society, our homes and residence are the highest investments we have, to take it a step further, I even oppose the renting of the homes within the area. I am grateful for the neighbors (invested owners) we have and will continue to strive to bring in more into our neighborhood.

I have copied a few of my neighbors and a City Representative on this email. If the request will be moving forward, a public meeting should be held for further commenting. I would appreciate any future proposals and invites sent directly to me at my email address above.

Thank you for your time,

Ricardo Rodriguez
**Planning & Zoning Commission 01/25/2022**

**CASE 21ZO: CONCEPT PLAN AMENDMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAFF CONTACT:</th>
<th>Vincent M. Banegas, (575) 528-3085, <a href="mailto:vbanegas@las-cruces.org">vbanegas@las-cruces.org</a></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OWNER:</td>
<td>Sierra Norte Development Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPRESENTATIVE:</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNCIL DISTRICT:</td>
<td>District #5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITE LOCATION:</td>
<td>Lands within Metro Verde and Metro Verde South Planned Unit Development (PUD) bounded by Dragonfly Boulevard (north), Engler Road/Thurmond Road (south), Jornada Road (east) and city limit boundary (west).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXISTING ZONING:</td>
<td>PUD (Planned Unit Development)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REQUEST:</td>
<td>Consolidation and amendment to the Metro Verde and Metro Verde South PUDs thereby making the development and its concept plan known as Metro Verde Planned Unit Development (consolidation and 12-year update).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RELATED APPLICATIONS:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAFF RECOMMENDATION:</td>
<td>Approval</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUMMARY OF REQUEST CASE 20ZO3000083:**

A Concept Plan amendment to consolidate related amendments and update the development objectives originally approved for the Metro Verde and Metro Verde South PUD concept plans. This amendment covers all lands within the Metro Verde and Metro Verde South concept plan boundaries encompassing ± 2,123 acres, generally located and bounded by Dragonfly Boulevard (north), Engler Road/Thurmond Road (south), Jornada Road (east) and city limit boundary (west). The zoning of all applicable lands is Planned Unit Development (PUD). The proposed amendment addresses a variety of development related topics which help aid in determining the appropriateness of development in context to area surroundings, approved development regulations, and approved policy pursuant to the Elevate Las Cruces Comprehensive Plan, and companion plan policy. The development is within Council District 5. Submitted by Sierra Norte Development Inc. for Sierra Norte Land Holdings LLC, property owner.
SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION:
Staff Recommendation: APPROVAL based on the findings listed below:
1. Several major and minor amendments have taken place over the years related to both PUD areas resulting at times in staff uncertainty as to the applicable provisions that pertain to area development. This consolidation seeks to combine all said amendments into concept plan document making further PUD development proposals easier to address.
2. The proposed concept plan amendment is compliant with Section 38-49.
3. More specifically, the proposed concept plan amendment follows earlier efforts to balance flexibility in development to benefits the community receives (Sections 38-49.A.6. and 38-49.B.4.)
4. The proposed concept plan amendment addresses all relevant development related issues in both a specific and conceptual manner as applicable and as addressed in Section 38-49.C.
5. The proposed concept plan amendment is supported by various goals, objectives and policies found with Elevate Las Cruces Comprehensive Plan and companion planning documents.

PROPOSAL AND LAND USE HISTORY
PROJECT DESCRIPTION:
The PUD area is generally located in an area bounded by Dragonfly Boulevard (north), Engler Road/Thurmond Road (south), Jornada Road (east) and city limit boundary (west). The concept plan amendment area encompasses ± 2,123 acres and contains land that is currently developed with many acres undeveloped. The proposed amendment seeks to combine areas within both the Metro Verde PUD and the Metro Verde South PUD. The amendment allows both staff and developer an opportunity to add, remove, clarify, and update development provisions and strategies as originally outlined in the Metro Verde and Metro Verde South PUDs.

As presented, the consolidated concept plan maintains several strategies that were outlined in the original Metro Verde PUD and its major amendment as well as those found in Metro Verde South PUD and its companion amendments. It also, introduces a few new concepts that were not outlined previously. Some of the key strategies addressed include: mixed land use, compact building design/urban form, range of housing choices/opportunities including missing middle housing, affordable housing targets and phasing, walkable neighborhoods, provisions for passive and active recreational opportunities, multi-modal transportation de-emphasizing the automobile, pedestrian safety through design, neighborhood centers/village or town centers (Neighborhood Mixed-Use Nodes) and tying use and design to Elevate Comprehensive Plan concepts and forthcoming Realize Las Cruces development code implementation, architectural design standards, and finally inclusion of 300 acres of land not previously included in either PUD boundary that will require a future amendment to provide appropriate concept planning prior to development.

In terms of provisions eliminated or de-emphasized beyond what may have already been accomplished through ongoing development, elements include: Neighborhood
Mixed-Use Corridor concepts, hybrid form-based code elements, and green building/development strategies.

LAND USE HISTORY:
The area was first annexed in 2006 through two annexation efforts called Sierra Norte Annexation I (± 1964 acres) and II (± 322 acres). Originally, approved through non-PUD provisions, the Sierra Norte annexed areas received approval for the respective master plans seeking development of a premiere golf course to serve as an anchor for a mixed-use development style consistent with and supported by the preceding 1999 Las Cruces Comprehensive Plan. Aside from the development of the golf course as originally conceived, four other major development milestones took place.

Metro Verde became the first PUD approved in the subject area. The Metro Verde PUD was approved in 2008 and contained approximately 187 acres along the northernmost boundary of the proposed amendment area immediately adjacent to the golf course. The PUD introduced elements of “green” development strategies such as water harvesting, and multi-modal transportation that de-emphasized the automobile, mixed-use development, housing variety emphasizing a compact form, and architectural design standards to tie all elements together were promoted.

The second milestone was the approval of the Metro Verde South PUD in 2011. This PUD area contained approximately 892 acres and was generally south of Arroyo Road. This PUD took the concepts of Metro Verde much further incorporating greater emphasis toward walkability, preservation of open space and sensitive environmental areas through design, opportunities for both passive and active recreation, greater emphasis on “green building” strategies, introducing the Neighborhood Mixed-Use Corridor (NMUC) and a hybrid form-based code concept to facilitate development along the corridor.

Originally introduced in late 2001, the Metro Verde PUD amendment #1 became the third milestone and was later approved in 4/2012. This amendment involved approximately 695 acres and included the area addressed in the original Metro Verde PUD adding the golf course and lands immediately south of the golf course. With exception to the NMCU concept and the level of specificity that Metro Verde South PUD talked to, the concepts outlined by this amendment were the same.

Finally, the Metro Verde South PUD, Amendment #5 culminates the significant changes to the Metro Verde PUD properties. This amendment was approved in 2019 and involved approximately 323 acres of land generally located on either side of Sonoma Ranch Boulevard, south of Peachtree Hills Road and north of lands located immediately south of Engler Road. The amendment brought forward clarification of design standards (cul de sac use, road cross sections, etc.), increased affordable housing goals, cleaned up administrative concerns, and introduced additional mixed-use centers that were to use the hybrid form-based code model once established.

As the numbering sequence implies, other amendments (minor) were processed along the timeline identified but did not rise to the level of significance as those
presented. Development in the Metro Verde area continues relatively fast paced to date and has implemented in part some of the strategies outlined in the various PUD documents.

### ZONING DECISION CRITERIA AND POLICIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>DOES IT COMPLY?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Character and Compatibility</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevate Las Cruces Comprehensive Plan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thoroughfare Plans</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria for PUD: Section 38-49 D.(d)(1) b</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER AND COMPATIBILITY:
Much of the area surrounding the proposed Metro Verde consolidation amendment boundary is vacant. Most of the development within Metro Verde has occurred in the southernmost section and it is here where adjacent development outside the boundary exists. From a compatibility perspective however, what is being proposed continues to follow what generally was approved and thus, remain consistent with applicable approved concept plan and adjacent development.

### COMPLIANCE WITH ELEVATE LAS CRUCES COMPREHENSIVE PLAN:
The property is located on in the Suburban Neighborhood Place Type as shown on the Future Development Map in the Elevate Las Cruces Comprehensive Plan. The comprehensive plan has numerous goals, policies and actions that support the proposed amendment and concept plan elements. For the sake of brevity however, the following is a list of some of the key supporting goals and policies only.

#### Goal CE-3: Community Environment - Support community growth through concentrated development at activity centers and along key corridors.
- Policy CE-3.1 – Promote the development of mixed-use centers to support surrounding neighborhoods and serve as focal points for community life.
- Policy CE-3.2 – Allow for a mix of development type and intensity along major thoroughfares that reflects surrounding urban, suburban, and rural contexts.

#### Goal CE-4: Complete Neighborhoods – Develop mixed-use neighborhoods that incorporate a wide range of recreational, commercial, employment, and civic uses.
- Policy CE-4.1 – Encourage a variety of housing types into new and redeveloping neighborhoods to provide options for all ages and incomes throughout the city.
- Policy CE-4.2 – Incorporate employment and shopping nodes into new and redeveloping neighborhoods to provide residents with convenient access to services. Encourage a variety of housing types into new and redeveloping
neighborhoods to provide options for all ages and incomes throughout the city.

- Policy CE-4.3 – Develop street networks that provide connectivity within and between residential areas and supporting centers of activity.
- Policy CE-4.4 – Integrate parks, schools, and other civic space into neighborhoods.

Goal CE-5: Building and Site Design - Establish standards to integrate new development with surrounding built and natural features while mitigating long-term natural resource and climate impacts.

- Policy CE-5.1: Promote building form and scale that complements surrounding neighborhoods and creates strong linkages between the development site, the street, and other public grounds.
- Policy CE-5.2: Utilize building materials that accentuate the city’s cultural and historic heritage and natural surroundings.
- Policy CE-5.3: Ensure that development concepts provide an interconnected network of pedestrian facilities linking streets, buildings, parking, and public gathering space.
- Policy CE-5.4: Provide motor vehicle access and parking options that preserve thoroughfare function and the comfort of pedestrians and bicycles.
- Policy CE-5.5: Incorporate landscaping techniques into new development that are aesthetically pleasing while mitigating environmental impacts.

Goal CE-6: Context Sensitive Street Design – Design streets to support varying levels of pedestrian activity based on the intended built context of surrounding development.

- Policy CE-6.2 – Design and construct city streets that support vehicular, truck, bus, pedestrian, and bicycle travel within the same right-of-way.

Goal CP-7: Attainable housing – Provide affordable, clean, and safe housing options for all residents regardless of income.

- Policy CP-7.1 – Coordinate with local community organizations to provide education and implement attainable housing.
- Policy CP-7.2 – Disperse affordable housing units to promote the development of mixed-income neighborhoods.

Goal CP-9: Housing Diversity – Provide a diverse range of housing options to accommodate residents at all stages in life.

- Policy CP-9.1 – Encourage the use of alternative housing types, styles, and living arrangements as a means to provide additional housing opportunities.
- Policy CP-9.2 – Promote denser housing options in the urban neighborhood, downtown, town centers, neighborhood centers, and mixed-use corridors identified in the future development map.

Goal CL-3: Accessible Parkland – Provide convenient access to a variety of park and open space lands.

- Policy CL-3.2 – Build a community wide network of multi-use trails to support the fitness, recreational, and transportation needs of residents.

Goal CL-7: Transportation -Land Use Connection – Develop an accessible and efficient transportation systems that provides seamless connectivity to surrounding land uses and complements various development patterns.
o Policy CL-7.2 – Promote street interconnectivity within and between neighborhoods, between commercial developments, and within town centers and neighborhood centers.

Goal CL-8: Multi-modal System – Develop an equitable, multi-modal transportation system that presents feasible travel options for residents.
  o Policy CL-8.1 – Design new and retrofit existing streets in a manner that balance the needs of all modes and users.
  o Policy CL-8.4 – Require the inclusion of safe and connected bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure with all new roadways or roadway reconstruction.

Goal CL-9: Transportation Safety – Incorporate public health and safety enhancements into transportation system investments and policies.
  o Policy CL-9.1 – Promote measures to calm traffic, particularly within residential areas.

As shown above, Elevate Las Cruces provides ample support for the Metro Verde consolidated PUD concept planning effort. Said support has remained consistent with all the original concept planning and subsequent amendments to date.

COMPLIANCE WITH THOROUGHFARE PLAN:
Arterials and one collector roadway as defined by Elevate Las Cruces and the Mesilla Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (MVMPO) makeup the significant roadways within the Metro Verde PUD boundaries. Sonoma Ranch, Arroyo Road, and Engler/Thurmond Road serve as the prominent directional roadways within the PUD boundaries. They are major arterials designed with a 120-foot right-of-way cross sections when said roadways fall entirely within the boundaries of the PUD. When adjacent, the developer as per code, is only responsible for their pro-rata share of the roadway and thus, right-of-way widths and anticipated build-out may differ. Other development constraints may also alter design of the roadway at appropriate intersection transitions. Peachtree Hills Road is designated as a minor arterial and is designed with a 100’ right-of-way cross section. Lisa Lane is the sole collector roadway having only a 68-foot right-of-way width which deviates from the typical 85-foot design standard width. Peachtree 100s one thoroughfare as classified by the MPO associated with the proposed final site plan. Sonoma Ranch Blvd. is a minor arterial that is being constructed through the Voluntary Assessment District (VAD). All other roadways are designated as local roadways that vary between 42, 46, 60, and 90 feet in width.

OBJECTIVES OF PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT:
The purpose of a Planned Unit Development (PUD) is to:
   (1) Comply with growth management policy as established in the land use element, other applicable elements, and all companion documents to the comprehensive plan;
   (2) Produce more flexibility in development than would result from a strict application of this Code;
   (3) Permit design flexibility that will encourage a more creative approach to the development of land and that will result in more efficient and aesthetically desirable alternatives to the housing and other development needs of the community;
(4) Permit flexibility in land use, density, placement of buildings, arrangement of open space, circulation facilities, and off-street parking areas, and maximize the potential of individual sites under development;

(5) Promote the infill of vacant land; and

(6) Create developments that balance the benefits to the community with the developer's interests.

Approval of a PUD concept plan (major amendment) must receive a recommendation from the Planning and Zoning Commission to the Las Cruces City Council. City Council is the final authority on the request. Concept Plan recommendations and decisions are based on findings and as presented, the findings show strong support for the pending request.

DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS

SITE COMPLIANCE FOR CURRENT USE:
The subject property within the PUD boundary is roughly 25% developed with the majority of land undeveloped. All applicable properties except for the 300 acres referenced in the report that are being included through this amendment effort are zoned PUD (1,823 acres) and under an approved Concept Plan. Given this fact, the current use is acceptable whether left unchanged or amended as proposed. The 300 acres located directly north of Arroyo Road In relation to all land uses, transportation network and other development elements associated with the PUD

SITE SUITABILITY FOR PROPOSED USE:
In that the current PUD exists, amending the PUD as proposed with inclusion of the 300 acres makes perfect sense. Many of the proposed concept plan elements proposed are in line with previous concept plan approvals. The 300 acre portion directly north of Arroyo Road and presently under consideration for inclusion has multiple zoning designations of split C-3 (Commercial High Intensity)/R-1a (Single-Family Medium Density), R-1b (Single-Family High Density), M-1 (Industrial Standard), R-4 (Multi-Dwelling High Density and Limited Retail and Office), and C-3. Merging this acreage into the Metro Verde proposal will help achieve a consistent development pattern in the area.

ADEQUACY OF PUBLIC FACILITIES AND SERVICES:
City water, sewer and gas serves the Metro Verde development as it exists to date. The concept plan does reflect a public benefit of having Metro Verde established as a zero-carbon development with no new natural gas infrastructure provided for new residential developments with subdivision construction beginning this year. Any applicable utility extension and/or upgrade of service will follow development and be made available as need dictates. Capacity to serve should not be an issue with the proposed built out. All roadways within the development will be constructed by the developer to meet the design standards either already approved by the city and/or proposed via the PUD concept plan.

FLOOD PLAIN: A vast majority of property is not located in a designated flood zone. A relatively small area located near the intersection of Sonoma Ranch Boulevard and Central Avenue has a FEMA designation of A which is indicative of a yearly 1% chance of inundation.
STAFF AND PUBLIC COMMENTS

PUBLIC NOTIFICATION AND INPUT:
Notice of a Public Hearing was mailed to all property owners within 500 feet of the subject property and all property owners within the proposed boundaries. As of this report’s writing, staff has not received any input on the proposal.

STAFF COMMENTS:
No reviewing departments had any negative technical comments on the proposed concept plan amendment. On January 12, 2022, the DRC reviewed the proposed concept plan amendment and recommended unanimous approval to the Planning and Zoning Commission.

ATTACHMENTS:
1. Zoning Map
2. Aerial Map
3. Proposed Metro Verde Planned Unit Development Concept Plan Consolidated 12-Year Amendment
4. Department Comments
ATTACHMENT 1

Zoning Map
ATTACHMENT 2

Aerial Map
ATTACHMENT 3

Proposed Final Site Plan

Vicinity Map

Metro Verde South PUD 05-02

Final Site Plan

The Trails at Metro Site Plan

June 2020

Metro Verde South PUD 05-02

For

53.00 Acres

The Trails at Metro Site Plan

Sheet Index:

ATTACHMENT 3

Proposed Final Site Plan
ATTACHMENT 4
Department Review Comments

Department: Planning
Status: YES

Department: Traffic Engineering
Status: YES

Department: Engineering
Status: YES

Department: Parks and Recreation
Status: YES

Department: Utility Engineering
STATUS: YES

Department: Fire
Status: YES

Department: City MPO
Status: YES

Department: CLC Flood Administration
Status: YES
CASE # 21ZO0500112: 2700 N MAIN REZONING

STAFF CONTACT: Katherine Harrison-Rogers, (575) 528-3049, krogers@las-cruces.org

OWNER:

REPRESENTATIVE: Cassie Paben, Tetrad Property Group

DISTRICT: District #

SITE ADDRESS: 2700 N Main Street

EXISTING ZONING: R-1a (Single-Family Medium Density)

REQUEST: Various Zones (see details below)

RELATED APPLICATIONS: N/A

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

SUMMARY OF CASE 20ZO0500098:
A request for a zone change from R-1a (Single-Family Medium Density) to multiple zones in seven planning areas as well as a request to vary from the front setbacks to allow for front setbacks of 5-10 feet. The property is ~75 acres and is located at the southeast intersection of N Solano Drive and N Main Street at 2700 N Main Street in Council District 1. Submitted by Tetrad Property Group. (Case # 21ZO0500112) The requested zones are:

- Area 1A (Open Space District) – 5.32 Acres, OS-R/ R-2 (Open Space Recreation/ Multi-Dwelling Low Density)
- Area 2A (Flex District) – 6.31 Acres, R-3/ O-2/ C-2 (Multi-Dwelling Medium Density/ Office Professional – Limited Retail Service (Neighborhood)/ Commercial Medium Intensity)
- Area 3A (Apodaca Preserve) - 5.58, OS-R/ R-2 (Open Space Recreation, Multi-Dwelling Low Density)
- Area 3B (Cottage Residential) - 11.46 Acres, R-1b/ R-2 (Single Family High Density/ Multi-Dwelling Low Density)
- Area 3C (Townhouse Residential) – 8.52 Acres, R-4/ C-2 (Multi-Dwelling High Density/Office Professional – Limited Retail Service (Neighborhood))
- Area 4A (Town Center) – 20.00 Acres, C-3 (General Commercial)
- Area 4B (Commercial Center) – 17.90 Acres, C-3 (General Commercial)
SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION:
Staff is recommending **APPROVAL with CONDITIONS** based on the findings listed below:

- The zone change request will allow for the attraction and retention of businesses at this location through the expansion of potential uses while in keeping with the standards of the C-3 zone.
- The expanded uses allowed by this zone change are consistent with existing uses in proximity to the property (2001 Zoning Code, Section 38-33).
- The subject property is located on a principal arterial roadway which is recommended for commercial land uses (2001 Zoning Code, Section 38-32 D).
- The proposed zone change request is supported by the Elevate Las Cruces Comprehensive Plan and meets the purpose and intent of the 2001 Zoning Code (2001 Zoning Code, Section 38-2).

The conditions are as follows:

- **Area 1A (Open Space District)** – 5.32 Acres, OS-R/ R-2 (Open Space Recreation/ Multi-Dwelling Low Density)
- **Area 2A (Flex District)** – 6.31 Acres, R-3/ O-2/ C-2 (Multi-Dwelling Medium Density/ Office Professional – Limited Retail Service (Neighborhood)/ Commercial Medium Intensity)
- **Area 3A (Apodaca Preserve)** - 5.58, OS-R/ R-2 (Open Space Recreation, Multi-Dwelling Low Density)
- **Area 3B (Cottage Residential)** - 11.46 Acres, R-1b/ R-2 (Single Family High Density/ Multi-Dwelling Low Density)
- **Area 3C (Townhouse Residential)** – 8.52 Acres, R-4/ C-2 (Multi-Dwelling High Density/Office Professional – Limited Retail Service (Neighborhood))
- **Area 4A (Town Center)** – 20.00 Acres, C-3 (General Commercial)
- **Area 4B (Commercial Center)** – 17.90 Acres, C-3 (General Commercial)

PROPOSAL AND LAND USE HISTORY

DETAILED DESCRIPTION:
The owner is proposing to remove the conditions of the C-3C zone placed upon it with the approval of Ordinance 2660. The original proposal associated with the zone change was for a grocery. The grocery was constructed on a property further east and the owner of this property developed the site as a small business center containing two buildings. The existing conditions severely limit the uses allowed on the property and the owner has experienced issues leasing the existing suites to prospective tenants based on these limitations. The conditions on the property are:

- The building height shall be limited to a maximum of 25 feet along the southern portion of the building, limited to no more than 30 feet along the northern portion of the building, and restricted to a maximum of one story. A transition between the 25 and 30 feet height limit is permissible.
- A 30-foot wide Type C landscape buffer shall be provided along the southern boundary of the subject property at the time of site development.
- A wall to mitigate sound shall be constructed within the aforementioned 30-foot buffer at the time of site development.
• A small park shall be constructed on the southwestern portion of the property within or near the aforementioned buffer at the time of site development.
• The subject property shall prohibit any temporary uses (except for a temporary construction yard).
• Permitted uses on the subject property shall be limited to:
  o Carpet/Window Treatments
  o Clothing Store
  o Delicatessen, Produce/Meat Market
  o Furniture Store
  o Garden Supply
  o Grocery Store
  o Home Furnishings
  o Plant Nursery
  o Specialty Foods (Bakeries, Confectionaries, etc)
  o Specialty Store (Books, Music, Toys, Sports Equip, Stationary, etc)
  o All uses currently allowed in 02-C zoning
• A portion of Indian Hollow Road adjacent to the subject property has never been dedicated as right-of-way to the City and is still part of the subject property. The applicant shall be required to dedicate the section of the subject property that makes up Indian Hollow Road.
• The applicant shall be required to provide improvements to City standards to Indian Hollow Road including curb, gutter and sidewalk at the time of development of the property.
• As determined by the City of Las Cruces, the developer will be required to close that portion of Indian Hollow Road adjacent to the subject property to through traffic into the Foothills Neighborhood.

At this time, all conditions of the zoning have been met, including the closure of Indian Hollow Rd by the City of Las Cruces. No modifications to the Lohman Avenue Overlay (LAO) are proposed or will occur if the zone change is approved.
LAND USE HISTORY:
The property was originally zoned O-1 and was subsequently rezoned to O-2C via Ordinance 1954 on September 3, 2002 in order to bring the property into compliance with the 2001 Zoning Code. The current zoning district of C-3C was established on September 17, 2012 via Ordinance 2660 for the purposes of allowing a grocery store. Both zone changes were met with concerns from the residential neighborhood to the south and were conditioned to reduce potential impacts of development. The grocery was never constructed, but a business center was established. One active business registration for an insurance company exists for the site.

ZONING DECISION CRITERIA AND POLICIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>DOES IT COMPLY?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Character and Compatibility</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevate Las Cruces Comprehensive Plan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesilla Valley MPO Thoroughfare Plan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose and Intent of the Code: Section 38-2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria for Decisions: Section 2-382</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico Case Law</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER AND COMPATIBILITY:
Lohman Ave is a major east/west commercial corridor that runs through the length of the City. Lohman is dominated by a variety of commercial and office uses, both large and small. The property is adjacent to a bank on the west, business center to the east, restaurants and offices to the north, and multifamily to the south. Although not immediately adjacent, a large single-family neighborhood exists to the south. The property is encompassed by C-3 zoning to the north, west, and east. A small area of O-2 (Professional Office) exists to the southeast, O-1 (Neighborhood Office) to the southwest, and R-4 (High Density Multi Dwelling and limited retail and office) to the south.

The site would be consistent with the surrounding uses and corridor as a whole if the restricted uses were expanded to those of a standard C-3 zone. Several other zoning conditions on the property are related to the site development and were imposed to reduce potential negative impacts of the commercial development to the residential neighborhood to the south. These conditions were fulfilled by the current property owner at the time of development. The final conditions are related to Indian Hollow Rd which is an access point to the neighborhood to the south. The developer fulfilled the obligations related to right of way dedication and improvements and the City fulfilled the condition of closing the road to through traffic. The City installed a gate that can be utilized by authorized City vehicles such as emergency responders.

The removal of the condition related to the closure of Indian Hollow Rd would provide the City the option to reopen the road in the future. The status of this road remains a subject of debate amongst the neighborhood residents and the City has received requests to reopen it as well as fierce arguments on the merits of keeping it closed. While reopening does not impact the physical layout of the neighborhood,
it could shift traffic patterns throughout the neighborhood. These shifts could reduce traffic in some areas and increase it in other parts of the neighborhood. Reopening the roadway could reap benefits in terms of overall connectivity, reduced travel times, increased response times for emergencies, and more diffuse neighborhood traffic patterns.

**COMPLIANCE WITH ELEVATE LAS CRUCES COMPREHENSIVE PLAN:**
The property is located in an area designated as an Urban Neighborhood Place and is identified as a Town Center as shown on the Future Development Map in the Elevate Las Cruces Comprehensive Plan. Urban Neighborhoods include a variety of residential housing types at medium-to-high densities and areas of supporting neighborhood commercial development. The place type includes single-family and multi-family dwelling types, neighborhood retail and office uses and contains many of the City’s established neighborhoods and historic residential areas closer to center city. This place type also supports live-work units. Town Centers include a mix of residential and non-residential land uses that collectively create a vibrant and walkable activity center. Town Centers support institutional, cultural, employment, shopping, and entertainment uses while also providing high-density residential living options to create an energized environment to live, work, and play. Representative land uses for both include single-family residential (attached and detached), multi-family residential, office, retail, and commercial services.

The following goals, polices, and actions from Elevate Las Cruces are relevant to the proposed Zone Change:

- **Community Environment:**
  - Goal CE-3: Centers and Corridors – Support community growth through concentrated development at activity centers and along key corridors.
    - Policy CE-3.2 – Allow for a mix of development type and intensity along major thoroughfares that reflects surrounding urban, suburban, and rural contexts.
  - Goal CE-4: Complete neighborhoods - develop mixed-use neighborhoods that incorporate a wide range of recreational, commercial, employment, and civic uses
    - Policy CE-4.3 - Develop street networks that provide connectivity within and between residential areas and supporting centers of activity.

- **Community Livability:**
  - Goal CL-7: Transportation-land use connection- develop an accessible and efficient transportation system that provides seamless connectivity to surrounding land uses and complements various development patterns.
    - Policy CL-7. 2: Promote street interconnectivity within and between neighborhoods, between commercial developments, and within town centers and neighborhood centers

- **Community Prosperity**
  - Goal CP-4: Diversification - Seek a balance of business recruitment, retention, and expansion to diversify economic opportunities.
    - Policy CP-4 - Support efforts to be regionally and nationally competitive in regard to retaining and growing businesses, jobs, and students.
• Action CP-4.2.2 - Improve administrative process and procedures to eliminate barriers that impede the expansion of office, commercial or industrial developments.

The request to remove the conditions associated with the zoning of the property is not out of context with Elevate Las Cruces. The Regional Commercial place type encourages a diverse assortment of commercial and professional services that would be made available by allowing a broader spectrum of uses. Further, interconnectivity and complete streets is reiterated throughout the document as important goals for which to strive. The removal of the road closure condition would allow the City the flexibility to open Indian Hollow based on this direction.

COMPLIANCE WITH THOROUGHFARE PLAN:
N Main Street and N Solano Drive run adjacent to the property and are both designated as arterials. Arterials are intended to connect activity centers and move large volumes of traffic funneled from other arterials and collector roadways. Samaritan Drive intersects with N Main Street and runs through the property. It and its future extension are classified as a collector, collecting traffic from the existing and proposed local roadways internal to the property. Once the property is subdivided, all roadways will be required to be designed and constructed to meet the Thoroughfare Plan and City’s Design Standards. The proposed zoning designations are consistent with the types of uses recommended for these roadway classifications. Lower intensity uses such as patio homes, townhouses, and low-intensity office uses are recommended along locals; medium intensity uses such as larger office complexes, multi-family residential, and some commercial uses are recommended along collectors; while arterials are intended to service higher intensity commercial uses.

CONSISTENCY WITH PURPOSE AND INTENT OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE:
Per Section 38-2: The intent of the Zoning Code is to encourage the most appropriate use of land and to promote the health, safety, and general welfare of the community for the purpose of improving each citizen's quality of life. The regulations relevant to the proposed zone change include:

A. Ensure that all development is in accordance with this Code and the Elevate Las Cruces Comprehensive Plan and its elements;
B. Encourage innovations in land development and redevelopment;
C. Give reasonable consideration to the character of each zoning district and its peculiar suitability for particular uses;
D. Encourage mixed-land uses to decrease the length of trips for work and/or shopping and encourage the consolidation of trips and alternative modes of travel;
J. Improve the design, quality, and character of new development;
L. Ensure that development proposals are sensitive to the character of existing neighborhoods; and
M. Foster a more rational relationship between different land uses for the mutual benefit of all.

CRITERIA FOR DECISIONS:
Per Section 2-382 of the Las Cruces Municipal Code, the Planning and Zoning Commission shall determine the following:
A. The Planning and Zoning Commission shall review the comprehensive plan, and other applicable plans and codes and determine whether the request will:
1. Impair an inadequate supply of light and air to adjacent property or otherwise adversely adjoining properties.
2. Unreasonably increase the traffic in public streets.
3. Increase the danger of fire or endanger the public safety.
4. Deter the orderly and phased growth and development of the community.
5. Unreasonably impair established property values within the surrounding area.
6. In any other respect, impair the public health, safety, or general welfare of the city.
7. Constitute a spot zone, and therefore, adversely affect adjacent property values.
8. Be in harmony with the purpose and intent of the zoning code, sign code, design standards, and other companion codes.

B. The commission shall take care that the development of the city, in accordance with present and future needs, best promotes the health, safety, morals, order, convenience, prosperity, and general welfare of the people. It shall also promote efficiency and economy in the process of development.

C. The commission shall encourage the proper use and development of land, shall seek to create and maintain an aesthetic urban setting, and protect and preserve the quality of the water, air and other environmental, natural, historical and cultural resources for the city.

D. The commission shall use the comprehensive plan as a guide in making all future decisions concerning land use and development, and in the financing and location of capital improvements.

E. Before taking any action concerning land use and development and financing and location of capital improvements, the commission shall review the relationship between the proposed action and the comprehensive plan.

Staff considered the Criteria for Decisions stated above during the internal review process and has deemed the zone change request appropriate for recommendation of approval. The proposed zoning and the range of uses in conjunction with staff’s recommended conditions adheres to both the Elevate Las Cruces Comprehensive Plan and the Apodaca Blueprint. The various zones requested do not create spot zones as they are similar to those in the surrounding vicinity, transitioning from commercial along N Main Street and N Solano Drive to residential adjacent to the neighborhood to the east. Any future site development will require adherence to the City’s Design Standards and Building Codes to protect the health, safety, and welfare of the City and the nearby residents or businesses. Further, the development of this long vacant property has the potential to spur economic activity at a neighborhood or regional level. Staff did not identify any issues that would deter the Planning and Zoning Commission from making a positive recommendation to City Council regarding the zone change request.

NEW MEXICO CASE LAW:
Staff considers established zoning case law when reviewing whether a zone change should occur. Specifically:
1. There was an error when the existing zoning map pattern was created; or
2. Changed neighborhood or community conditions justify the change; or
3. A different use category is more advantageous to the community, as articulated in the Comprehensive Plan or other applicable City master plan(s), even though criterion (1) or (2) above do not apply because
   a. there is a public need for a change of the kind in question, and
   b. that need will be best served by changing the classification of the particular piece of property in question as compared with other available property.

The property located at 2700 N Main was historically utilized as a golf course, which has been abandoned for several years. A portion of the property was redeveloped with a hospital with several available lots for office and multi-family residential development. Additionally, two public planning initiatives, Elevate Las Cruces Comprehensive Plan and the Apodaca Blueprint, have occurred which specifically recommend a range of mixed uses at this location. Based on these changes and the community’s desire to see the property put in productive use, staff determined a different use category to be advantageous and justified.

DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS
SITE COMPLIANCE FOR USES UNDER CURRENT ZONING:
Under the R-1a zoning designation, this property could be utilized for one single-family home and its ancillary residential structures.

SITE SUITABILITY FOR USES UNDER PROPOSED ZONING:
The zone change request to multiple mixed-use zones would allow the property to be developed and put into productive use. Each planning area could be developed utilizing the design standards of the specified zones. All site development would be designed to meet all requisite infrastructure requirements and constructed by the developer prior to use.

ADEQUACY OF PUBLIC FACILITIES AND SERVICES:
City water, gas and sewer are currently serving the property. Due to the large acreage and range of proposed uses, a Utility Master Plan and a Traffic Impact Analysis will be required prior to any site development. The results of the studies will aid the engineering and site design to ensure that the capacity of services is properly designed and constructed to meet the needs of the development and prevent negative impacts to existing commercial and residential areas.

STAFF AND PUBLIC COMMENTS
PUBLIC NOTIFICATION AND INPUT:
The applicant sent Early Notification letters to surrounding properties prior to the submittal of the zone change. No property owners contacted either staff or the applicant to request a neighborhood meeting within the specified timeframe. However, some residents and members of the Economic Development Policy Review Committee requested a neighborhood meeting be held after the specified timeframe. Staff held a meeting on December 9, 2021, to provide surrounding property owners an opportunity to learn about the request and ask questions. Twelve people attended and topics ranged from issues related to the vacant property such as trespassing, vandalism, and weeds to the range of uses proposed and general questions about the Apodaca Blueprint.
Notification letters were mailed to property owners within 800 feet of the boundaries of the zone change on January 10, 2021. Since the submittal of the application, staff has communicated with several members of the public via e-mail and telephone about the rezoning process, the Apodaca Blueprint, and the components of the zone change. Most inquiries were seeking information and neutral in nature, but some voiced concerns about future impacts to the neighborhood and the development process in general, and a handful expressed support, noting the need to put the property into productive use.

STAFF COMMENTS:
Reviewing departments unanimously recommended approval of the zone changes based on the ability to serve the range of uses proposed at his location. Several departments recognize the scale of the development will necessitate improvements to infrastructure and influence the technical design subdivisions and road alignments among other aspects of the site development. As such, some departments requested contingencies for future site development. Specifically, the Utilities Departments requested a condition that a Utilities Master Plan be provided prior development and the Traffic Section of Public Works requested that a Traffic Impact Analysis be approved prior to any site development.

Current and Long-Range Planning Sections also noted that several conditions, listed at the beginning of this report, should be applied to the development to ensure that it meets the intent of the Apodaca Blueprint, the adopted master plan for the property.

ATTACHMENTS:
1. Aerial Map
2. Current Zoning Map
3. Proposed Zoning Map
4. Apodaca Blueprint Focus Area A Future Development Map
5. Apodaca Blueprint Focus Area A Character Areas
6. Department Review Comments
7. Public Input
ATTACHMENT 1

Aerial Map
ATTACHMENT 2
Current Zoning Map
ATTACHMENT 3
Proposed Zoning Map
ATTACHMENT 4
Apodaca Blueprint Focus Area A Future Development Map
ATTACHMENT 5
Apodaca Blueprint Focus Area A Character Areas
ATTACHMENT 6
Department Review Comments

Department: Planning
Status: YES w/ Conditions

Department: Flood
Status: YES

Department: Long Range Planning
Status: YES w/ Conditions
See Planning Conditions

Department: Traffic Engineering
Status: YES W/ Conditions
  1. APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS THAT TRAFFIC IMPACT ANALYSIS IS SUBMITTED AND CITY APPROVED

Department: Engineering
Status: N/A

Department: Utility Engineering
STATUS: YES w/ Conditions
  1. Please add the requirement of a master utility plan to ACC submittal checklist. The master utility plan should include information of estimated volumes of water demand, gas demand, and wastewater discharge.
  2. Depending on the demands and discharges, offsite utility system improvements may be needed

Department: Fire
Status: YES

Department: City MPO
Status: YES
ATTACHMENT 7

Public Input