DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE (DRC)

Following are the minutes from the City of Las Cruces Development Review Committee Meeting held Wednesday, February 23, 2022, at 9:00 a.m. in Room 1158.

DRC PRESENT:        David Weir, Chief Planning Administrator
                      Code Haver, Fire Department
                      Meei Montoya, Senior Engineer, Utilities
                      Dominic Loya, MVMPO
                      Katarina Provenghi, MVMPO
                      Hector Terrazas, Engineer, Public Works
                      Mike Kinney, Project Manager, Community Development

STAFF PRESENT:      Cilicia Villegas, Economic Development Coordinator
                      Steve Pacheco, Senior Engineer, Public Works
                      John Castillo, Permit Tech, Community Development
                      Becky Baum, Recording Secretary, RC Creations, LLC

OTHER PRESENT:      Ted Scanlon
                      Steve Peale
                      Kevin Salcido

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

Weir: Good morning everybody. We'll go ahead and call the meeting to order. It's 9:01.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – None

Weir: Looks like we don't have any minutes to approve today.

3. OLD BUSINESS - None

Weir: So we have no old business.

4. NEW BUSINESS

4.1 Case 19CS0500098: Westgate Business Park Subdivision No. 2, Replat No. 2 (Replat and Vacation)
   - A request for approval of vacation of a 50-foot right-of-way known as Westway Ave., associated with an administrative replat known as Westgate Business Park Subdivision No. 2 Replat No. 2.
   - The proposed subdivision encompasses 25.59 +/- acres, is currently zoned M-1/M-2 (Industrial Standards), is located west of Motel Boulevard. And east of Westgate St.
• Submitted by Souder Miller and Associates, representative, on behalf of the City of Las Cruces.

Weir: We'll go right to the first business which is Westgate Business Park Subdivision No. 2, Replat No. 2. Which I believe is a replat and the vacation. John, do you want to give an overview?

Castillo: Yes. So this is Westgate Business Park Subdivision No. 2, Replant No. 2. This started back in late 2018 or round 2019/2018. So basically we're requesting an approval for a vacation of a 50 foot right-of-way known as Westway Avenue. It's also associated to an administrative replat known as the Westgate Business Park Subdivision No. 2, Replat No. 2. It's a 25.59 acre property. It's currently zoned to M-1/M-2, and it's located east of Motel Boulevard and west of Westgate. This was submitted by Souder Miller and Associates on behalf of the City.

Weir: John. It went through all its review. Were there any outstanding comments?

Castillo: There were no outstanding comments. All the reviewers give approval on the project. As we're vacating right-of-way we do have to take this to City Council for approval.

Weir: Okay. Cilicia is this your project or anything you want to add?

Villegas: It's not my project. I think that's David's.

Weir: Okay. DRC Members, any comments on the plat and the vacation? None. So John, your recommendation would be approval.

Castillo: Our recommendation is approval.

Weir: Okay. I'll entertain a motion to recommend vacation of the right-of-way in the Westgate Business Park Subdivision.

Terrazas: So moved.

Weir: Do I have a second?

Mt Second.

Weir: I'll go ahead and take a roll vote. Public Works.

Terrazas: Aye.

Weir: Okay. Utilities.
Montoya: Aye.

Weir: Community Development.

Kinney: Aye.

Weir: Okay. And Fire.

Haver: Aye.

Weir: And Parks and Rec I don’t think has anybody here. So the recommendation is approved for 4, 0, 1.

4.2 Case 21CS05001328: October Sky Subdivision

- A request for approval of a non-administrative replat, known as October Sky Subdivision.
- The proposed subdivision encompasses 3.63 +/- acres, is currently zoned R-1a (Single-Family medium Density), is located at 7525 McClure Rd.
- The non-administrative replat proposed to divide on residential lot into two.
- The subdivision proposed one residential to and one tract of land that will be purchased by the City of Las Cruces to utilize for drainage.
- Submitted by Cobb Fendley, representative.

Weir: The second case is October Sky Subdivision. John you want to give an overview.

Castillo: So this is a request for approval of a non-administrative replat known as October Sky. It's located at 725 McClure Road. The proposed subdivision encompasses 3.63 acres, and is currently zoned R-1a. It's taking one residential lot and it's subdividing it into two. One lot will go to the applicant, the other lot will be bought out by the City of Las Cruces to utilize that tract of land for drainage. This was submitted by Cobb Fendley, on behalf of the City and the applicants.

Weir: Okay. Were any outstanding comments?

Castillo: There were no outstanding comments but before the meeting I did receive a phone call that there were some concerns regarding right-of-way that were brought up to Mr. Pacheco by Hector. Do you like to discuss those Hector?

Terrazas: Typically, we all know during subdivision that the City requires the applicant to make improvements. Now, if this is for the benefit of the City
was there any discussions when you guys were talking with the applicant about when and how the sidewalk, curb and gutter, lighting, was going to be built and by who?

Castillo: So there were discussions with the applicant in providing additional right-of-way to the City. As far as I think it was 15 feet. The applicant is looking to do an infill development. And I believe that would occur at the time of filing the subdivision or shortly after the filing of the subdivision, which then he would you know bring the property into compliance through development standards.

Terrazas: Okay.

Weir: So that means that the infill Mr. Fendley would be the one that would build the sidewalk.

Castillo: I'm not sure if Cobb Fendley would be the ones building the sidewalk. It would most likely be the property owner.

Weir: Okay.

Pacheco: We hired Cobb Fendley to do the subdivision.

Weir: Okay. I'm sorry.

Baum: Can I have your name for the record?

Pacheco: Steve Pacheco with the Public Works Department.

Baum: Thank you. Sorry.

Weir: Does that question your question Hector?

Terrazas: Yes.

Kinney: Mr. Chair.

Weir: Yes.

Kinney: We had, I don't remember exactly when the meeting was, but recently with Robert Messenger. And we were talking about potentially having like a multiuse path on that side of the road instead of like curb and gutter and sidewalk, or sidewalk. And that the additional 15 foot of right-of-way that was going to be dedicated to the City, my understand it was just going to be dedicated to the City and that we're fully willing to be required to build out yet. Because that, there would be this stretch of McClure Road that,
that's the only one that has sidewalk on it. And the possibility of McClure
Road on either side being built out in the near future is very slim, because
the City would have to condemn a bunch of properties on both sides, you
know a portion of the property on both sides of the road. So I don't
recollect exactly as to whether or not when the developer would develop
that parcel that's being split off that he would be required to build the
entire, only in front of his property or in front of his property and then in
front of the drainage area that.

Pacheco: The pond construction would be when we would do our side.

Kinney: Okay.

Weir: The City would take it.

Pacheco: Right. The City would be (inaudible)

Villegas: So it would be the (inaudible).

Pacheco: For our portion and then the …

Kinney: So there would be some construction of some sort of walkway or
pedestrian along that side of the road at the time of construction from the
developer.

Weir: So is this Steve's project or Cilicia's project?

Pacheco: It's Cilicia's project.

Villegas: It's mine on behalf of Public Works wanting the drainage.

Weir: Anything you'd like to add then?

Villegas: No, I think the applicant is very open and they were willing to provide that
additional right-of-way for any walkway paths. And I believe his mother
lives in the area and uses public you know transportation, stuff like that.
So he's very open to that and he's ready to start development as soon as
this gets approved. So if he's in process of getting all that squared away.

Weir: Any other comments or questions from the DRC? No. Steve or Cilicia,
any other questions you have? No. Good. Okay, John, do you have a
recommendation?

Castillo: We have a recommendation for approval.

Weir: Okay. I would entertain a motion to approve the October Sky Subdivision.
Terrazas: So moved.

Weir: Okay. Do I have a section?

Kinney: Second.

Weir: Okay. I have a motion and a second. I'll just do a roll call Public Works.

Terrazas: Aye.

Weir: Utilities.

Montoya: Aye.

Weir: Community Development.

Kinney: Aye.

Weir: Fire.

Haver: Aye.

Weir: And Parks and Rec does not have anybody. MPO, I'm going to let Mike vote for CD.

Loya: That's okay.

Weir: Okay, the October Sky has been approved by the DRC.

4.3 University Meadows Emergency Access Cross-Section (aka Broadmoor)
- Emergency access was required at Broadmoor Drive for the University Meadows Subdivision.
- R 20-048: requires the "connection to Broadmoor Drive shall be limited to emergency access only and shall be designed and constructed to meet City Traffic Engineering and Fire Department requirements."
- The City is requesting that the road be constructed to the minor local -1 cross-section.
- The 5 foot right-of-way is encumbered by yard walls.
- The applicant is requesting an alternative cross-section for this access consisting of 2 12.5-foot driving lands and 2 12-foot parkways with no curb, gutter, lighting, or sidewalk.

Weir: The third item is the University Meadows Emergency Access Cross-Section. John you want to introduce that.
Castillo: So today we're going to be talking about the University Meadows Emergency Access Cross-Section. This emergency access was required at Broadmoor Drive for the University Meadows Subdivision. According to Resolution 20-048 it "requires a connection to Broadmoor Drive shall be limited to emergency access only and shall be designed and constructed to meet City Traffic Engineering and Fire Department requirements." So the City is requesting that the road be constructed to the minor local one cross-section, which would be a 50 foot right-of-way. This, however, is encumbered by yard walls just north of the subject property. So the applicant is requesting an alternate cross-section for this access consisting of two 12.5-foot driving lanes and two 12-foot parkways with no curb, gutter, lighting, or sidewalk.

Weir: And Ted or Steve, do you want to add anything to this? I'm assuming this is your case.

Scanlon: Yes. I'm Ted Scanlon for the record. And I don't think it's appropriate to build a complete 37 foot wide street for emergency access. For one thing too attractive for regular traffic. It needs to be, and there are already yard walls out in the right-of-way on Broadmoor in University Estates, which limit the width there. We're willing to pave the 25 foot all the way from Karen Drive down to our street, and then put a siren activated gate on it to limit it to just to emergency access.

Weir: I was going to go to staff, but Mike you want to go first?

Kinney: Yes. Thank you. I checked with Mark Dubbin with the Fire Department on his requirements, Fire Department requirements. And from what Mark told me that really what was important to the Fire Department was an electrically activated, operated gate which is siren activated. I provided a photograph of a gate that's similar to that that's off of …

Pacheco: Indian Hollow.

Kinney: Indian Hollow. Yes Indian Hollow. Thank you. Forgot the name of that. See currently Broadmoor north of the property line there was no improved road, it's just unimproved dirt area. And like John mentioned, there's rock walls, yard walls, for the residences on the east and west side that are encroaching into the 50 foot right-of-way, which if we build out a 50 foot right-of-way with curb and gutter and sidewalks through that area on Broadmoor those walls would have to come down. And one of the questions would be, are they going to be relocated? And who's going to tear them down and who's going to build them back? That question still hasn't been answered sufficiently in my mind.
I do have a question for the applicant. Will the proposed cross-section, will it be accessible to pedestrians to walk north and south across into the two, passed the subdivisions?

Scanlon: We can leave a gap next to the fence or to the gate where people can walk through there.

Kinney: Okay, so by a gap, what does that mean?

Scanlon: A four foot gap,

Kinney: A four foot gap.

Scanlon: Accessible to ADA and …

Kinney: It would be unimproved or will there be sidewalk. That's what I'm saying would there be a hard, compacted surface or gravel, what? I just don't know. That's the first question.

Scanlon: If it's going to be ADA it needs to be concrete or asphalt.

Kinney: Asphalt. Yes.

Scanlon: We can make that detail.

Kinney: Okay. And the northern section of the Broadmoor outside the property, those lots are over a half an acre or half acre or above, and from City code are not required to have sidewalks, and curb and gutter. Second question, I'm sorry.

Scanlon: Go ahead.

Kinney: Skipping back and forth. The second question I have for the applicant was at Broadmoor and Silverado Loop will there be sidewalk and ADA ramp installed?

Scanlon: Well, there'd have to be ADA.

Kinney: So you do the curve curb.

Scanlon: Yes.

Kinney: Curb and gutter. Okay.

Scanlon: Yes, you have to continue ADA accessibility.
Kinney: All right. Okay. And then in part of my research, I speak with Hector and traffic section requested *(inaudible)* have the standard minor local 50 foot right-of-way with curb, gutter, and sidewalk. I contacted the applicant and of course they’re requesting the modified cross-section.

I guess I also have a question for MPO. Is or any other members of DRC? Is Broadmoor ever going to be in the future?

Loya: Ever reclassified.

Kinney: Reclassified.

Loya: That would be a discussion between the MPO and the City, especially the traffic engineering section. They’re the ones that usually bring forward some of the stuff if as things change, if it would need to be classified or not.

Scanlon: Just for the record, when we went to Planning and Zoning Commission with this case, Planning and Zoning Commission insisted that this be a full blown City street to connect the two subdivisions together. And then when we went to City Council, Kyle Moberly brought in an appeal from some of the neighbors out there in University Estates and the City Council upheld Kyle’s appeal to make that strictly emergency access. So that was done by City Council action. And I don’t think they talked about how to construct the street at City Council. But we did talk subsequently to Adam Ochoa who brought the case to the Council, and he said that he thought that a 30 foot wide easement with a 25 foot wide paved roadway would be sufficient. Now that brings up the issue is, will that ever become a City street? So we need, I think if there’s a chance of that happening, then it’s appropriate to have the 50 feet of right-of-way in our subdivision, because there’s 50 feet here. I mean somebody have to knock down those walls and build a real street in there. So that’s what we’re planning on providing is 50 feet of right-of-way and but with 25 feet of street, 25 feet of paved road.

Weir: So my Mike, in regards to the classification of Broadmoor as a collector is what I’m thinking of now.

Kinney: Local.

Kinney: Also Mr. Chair. The preliminary plat was resolution 20-048 and was another one, 20-049. That was like for the master plan. One was the preliminary plat and the other was the master plan. Both of those, Ryan showed that section of Broadmoor within the University Meadows to have a 50 foot right-of-way, which matches up with the 50 foot right-of-way on, outside of north of the subdivision.
Scanlon: We had originally shown it to be like I said a full blown City street connecting Karen Drive to our street. And that's why it's reflected that way on the preliminary plat. Because when the preliminary plat was approved that way, but then the City Council on appeal restricted this roadway to just emergency access only.

Weir: Mr. Terrazas.

Terrazas: So I have a question for the Fire Department. Is the Fire Department okay with the 25 foot, is that the minimum width that you guys?

Haver: Yes. So the 25 feet of paved road with a minimum 20 foot width electronically activated siren gate would be sufficient for us, just for emergency access.

Terrazas: Okay.

Haver: But I think part of that conversation as well as what the needs are for traffic for that cross section as well.

Scanlon: Chances are there'll never be any traffic on it.

Terrazas: So Mr. Chair. I bring this up because we have had concerns like Mr. Kinney said, we do have a gate up there on Indian Hollow. It does have everything which includes sidewalk on both sides, that Fire Department uses very regularly, and it does have a full blown cross section there. We have had recent requests or not requests but I guess encounters, but questions about when if that gate would be moved, and that have not come up anymore. It was kind of out there when they were doing some rezoning. I'd be okay if the applicant meets Fire Department's code for the north side of Broadmoor, which is the existing portion, and accommodate some kind of ADA pad. And on the site that they are supposed to, John correct me if I'm wrong, by code they only need to develop this, point to the exhibit, this portion, right.

Castillo: Yes.

Terrazas: And then on the north portion which would be just meet the Fire Department code. So I would recommend that we just have the portion that's adjacent to lot 15 that are being developed now, by code just build a typical 50 foot section, and then somehow transition in there to meet Fire Department code.

Scanlon: So go with 25 feet north of our property line and 37 feet south of our property line.
Terrazas: Yes, so typically the same cross section as on Silverado Loop, I'm guessing it's the same one.

Scanlon: That's a waste of pavement and concrete.

Terrazas: So, and the reason that I'm going this way is because our new ATP, or not new anymore but ATP and everything that the City is moving forward is to give pedestrian accessibility traveling. Now Mr. Mike Kinney brought up the fact that people might be going back and forth and people like walking so we shouldn't restrict that. As far as the north side, there are projects where the City is going in there and tearing down rock walls that they built into City right-of-way at that point. So because the code doesn't require you to go in there and tear down rock walls because our department is okay with the minimum width of 25, then that's when more than not Public Works would be okay with, on the north side just making the pavement width and then putting the gate on the south side, and then the 50 foot typical road section.

Scanlon: 37 foot street that nobody will ever drive on.

Weir: Mr. Peale.

Peale: So …

Scanlon: Let me condition that a little bit further. I would be willing to go with a 25 foot wide road section and a sidewalk on one side and a gap in there where the gate is. Would make sense to me, but it looks too attractive as it's a street to drive on if you make it 36 or 37 feet wide and, it just doesn't make sense to me to build it 37 feet.

Peale: Plus the City's been asking for a minor local one section and that is a seven foot parking lane on both sides. But we have also been requested by the Fire Department to put up no parking signs. So that section just doesn't really call for what the road is, you know I mean so you know it's, yes I think the four foot.

Scanlon: It's an emergencies, for use by the emergency responders. If the emergency responders are okay with 25 foot wide section all the way, it's their street.

Weir: Thank you. Mr. Kinney you had a comment you wanted to make?

Kinney: Yes sir. I may have misunderstood what Mr. Terrazas was speaking about. The Broadmoor section from Karen Drive all the way down to Silverado. Loop, from my understanding of the resolution was that all of
that has to be improved. Because right now from Karen Drive to the
property line it's just direct. So did I misunderstand it.

Weir: I think what we had before is, one is to get clarification on what we accept
for that unimproved area. I think we'd all agree the resolution was it had to
be improved. And then I think there's also a question should that portion
that's within the University Meadows Subdivision be built out to the
required standard or is the DRC willing to allow a waiver to match what
they're proposing for the north side of it. And what I heard Hector said that
he feels that we need to start out with the 37 feet of pavement like a local
street, and then taper it down, and then the 25 is appropriate on the south
side. I guess my question would be, even if it were a 25 street, don't we
have a local street standard that goes down to 24 feet? And this is just for
discussion. And do we really want to encourage use of this street? I think
the neighborhood to the north kind of protested that to begin with. And
really I would say from a maintenance standpoint do we want to get away
with a minimum or do we want a full build out? I guess kind of the
question before us.

Scanlon: More to maintain. And for the record, I would like to clarify that Indian
Hollow Road is not a 50 foot wide right-of-way. It's a 50 foot wide
easement, because I used to own the building where Keller Williams is, is
in and I owned half that street. So it's an easement.

Weir: I guess by asking Code, if the portion within University Meadows were 25
feet, would that still meet your needs for?

Haver: So if it's clear width, yes. And I know what, I mean I know, so Mark
Dubbin our Fire Protection Engineer. The reason why I'm sure he was
requiring the no parking signs is because in practice, in reality, what will
happen is people will park on either side of that street. It will happen. It's
not a question. It's when. It will happen. That's what's happening in all of
our newer subdivisions right now, even subdivisions that have restrictions
on owning campers, parking campers, trailers, those types of things. It's
happening in Sonoma Ranch right now. So that would be our concern.

So the only concern that we have is when you put no parking signs up, if
we restrict that or if we narrow that down to 25 feet, assuming there's still
no parking signs, we really have very little way of enforcing that. So
people could park in front of that all day long and there's really not much
we can do about it. So within the subdivision I would recommend to still
have the wider width of street. Now outside of the gate we would be okay
with the 25 feet. But unless there's some different kind of assurances that
we can restrict parking even further between those two lots on that part of
the street within the subdivision, that would be our concern. I don't know,
Hector do you have any other thoughts on that from when you and Mark talked together?

Terrazas: I agree. And just looking at the aerials for the existing houses on the north side of Broadmoor, they use that alley as their personal parking. And of course they built it into. So that's one of the issues that you're going to have to deal with no matter what. But on the south side, yes, I agree with you, if we narrow down the road, people are going to park even if we put no parking, and then codes can't ever be out there. So we make it wide enough so it can accommodate cars on both sides, it's less, I don't see it a lot, but I don't see any double parking. So more likely that would accommodate the fire truck to go through if we do the 50 foot typical local road on the south side.

Weir: Okay. Ted or Steve any other responses.

Scanlon: Okay, that's fine. We'll build a 37 foot street down here so people can park and 25 feet to the north, right.

Haver: Yes sir.

Scanlon: That's what we'll do.

Kinney: One other point Mr. Chair. On Broadmoor section within the property line per code sidewalk build out along Silverado Loop and which would be Broadmoor for lots 49 and 50 would be the responsibility of the home builder. Only requirement for the sidewalk would be at the ADA ramps at the corner.

Scanlon: Okay. That's fine.

Weir: Any other discussion? So if I get the consensus of staff the recommendation is the 25 feet of Broadmoor from Karen to the subdivision property line, and then from the property line of the subdivision down to Silverado that it'd be a local street. Is that correct?

Terrazas: Mr. Chair. Yes.

Weir: And then the signalized gate. If that's the case, could I have a motion to approve that.

Terrazas: So moved.

Weir: Okay. Do I have a second?

Haver: Second.
Weir: Then I'll go ahead and do a roll call. Public Works.

Terrazas: Aye.

Weir: Utilities.

Montoya: Aye.

Weir: Community Development.

Kinney: No.

Weir: No, okay. Fire.

Haver: Yes.

Weir: And Parks and Rec is not present. The cross section was approved by three to one vote. Okay, so everybody on the same page?

Peale: Thank you very much for your time.

4.4 Case #21SU0504899 - Central Subdivision Right-of-Way Requirements

- Central Subdivision Preliminary Plat was approved November 27, 2018.
- The plat intended to dedicated 17.5-feet of additional right-of-way along Central Road, but did not intend to provide additional build-out. This was initially approved by the P&Z in November 2018 for the approval of the Preliminary Plat.
- Per Sec 37-80.F, the approved preliminary plat expired in November 2020 and a new preliminary plat submittal is required.
- Prior to formal submittal of a new plat, it is requested DRC determine whether or not improvements are required on Central Road and Mesa Grande Drive adjacent to the proposed Central Subdivision, per Sec 32-36.b.

Weir: The next case is Central Subdivision, the right-of-way requirements. John or Mike who's best talking about this one?

Kinney: Central Subdivision, the right-of-way requirements.

Weir: Yes.

Kinney: Central Subdivision the, which is case 21SU0504899 is in for review. And one of the things that was on the plans and they were dedicating 17.5 feet
of additional right-of-way to the City with no build out. And research from
the preliminary plat, master plan, which was approved in 2018, that was
part of the approval where they just would dedicate 17.5 feet of additional
right-of-way with no build out. The problem is, is the two year window has
passed, in other words that preliminary plat expired on November 27,
2020. So part of this case here is to, the DRC would have to consider this
anyway. And Central Subdivision has to go through the Planning and
Zoning process all over again. And so bringing it up to the DRC for a
consideration and approval for reapproval of dedicating the 17.5 feet of
additional right-of-way without build out.

Weir: Okay. Question for you Mike. So they've made a request to have the
preliminary plat reapproved or?

Kinney: They have not.

Weir: Okay, so today is really just discussion, provide guidance on what we're
going to do.

Kinney: Yes, they filed up a final plat, which went in through review, and the last
status of that particular review is revisions required. And I can't speak for
what happened on the developers end, but I have informed them that the
preliminary plat has expired and they have to go through that process
again.

Weir: Is there anybody here representing Central Subdivision?

Salcido: Kevin Salcedo with Pillar Engineering.

Weir: Okay.

Salcido: Yes, we'll be going back to get this process started up again since it has
expired.

Weir: Okay.

Salcido: There were no changes on anything from what was previously approved.
We're just going to get (inaudible) into.

Weir: Mike or Hector's, is there something that you want to change or you just
want to discuss dedication and right-of-way at this time?

Terrazas: Mr. Chair. I just had; well I had a couple of questions for Mike Kinney.
The data approval in 2018, did it talk about anything about was that Mesa
or ...
Montoya: Mesa Grande

Terrazas: Mesa Grande.

Kinney: Yes. Both Mesa Grande and Central Subdivision, that the preliminary plat said that both of those roads have been built out to City standards and no improvements are necessary.

Terrazas: Okay. Because if I recall correctly, Mesa Grande, it's kind of a weird setup there. And so I don't think it's fully built out to our arterial standards. I think we might have a 90 foot section there.

Kinney: Yes the section of Mesa Grande that's located there is, if you look at roughly 120 foot right-of-way on Mesa Grande it's built out more towards the west. It doesn't sit centerline down the right-of-way.

Terrazas: And if I remember correctly there is a …

Kinney: There are curb, there is curb and gutter, and sidewalks and streetlights along Central and Mesa Grande.

Terrazas: So for that portion I think what's missing for Mesa Grande there to have a typical City standard arterial roadway is the wider median. If I recall correctly it's back to back there. So I think that's what it is. So I think, and I don't know if this is going to be for approval or discussion Mr. Chair.

Weir: I think it'd be best to have this just discussion, provide direction when they formally submit that preliminary plan. And then we can do that and then just provide direction. That's what I'd like to do today. I don't know we can pass that or it's any modifications or requirements be a part of that preliminary plat just keep it together in one place.

Terrazas: Okay. No, and that's what I was going to say. On the Mesa Grande side I would want to see what's out there now and what they're requesting the variance for. If it's, we already had it built out, we streetlighting, curb and gutter, and everything, we're just missing a 10 foot median or whatever it is to make it the typical arterial. That's on Mesa Grande.

On the south side on Central. I had another question which are more for I'm guessing it's the same thing, but is there any kind of improvement the City is looking for in exchange for on the original one. Now, with the ATP being improved.

Kinney: No.
Terrazas: And I wish Parks was here to see if there was any kind of, okay you don't have to build because Central is a collector, so they need to build 85 feet of right-of-way. I know there's another subdivision maybe three residential lots to the east, the Tierra Del Sol, that's I think, supposed to come through DRC sooner or later. And they're asking for a 50 foot or they're asking to not improve Central as well. So I think that's going to have to jive, make sure we're not asking one applicant to give up the right-of-way and the other one doesn't. And then west of here along Central, west of Mesa Grande the applicant at that time did dedicate and improve the 85 feet of cross-section there. So just at the Dollar General, so at the same time if we're going to be changing cross sections from one side to the other, I think the City should be consistent on what is going to be proposed there. So I know for now this one and the Tierra Del Sol subdivision are going to go through DRC at some point and request that.

Weir: So basically they need to coordinate their request.

Terrazas: Correct.

Weir: And we treat them equally.

Terrazas: Exactly. And then like I said there's that previous subdivision to the west that did improve 85 feet of right-of-way.

Castillo: Mr. Chair. Hector, the Skylark Subdivision or the Tierra Del Sol subdivision has already gone, at least for the preliminary plat, it's gone through DRC. And has been approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Terrazas: Okay.

Castillo: They are ready to submit the final plat, which they should be doing I believe hopefully soon, if they haven't done so already. When we did take it to DRC. I know that Natalie had spoken prior to many of the directors in the different departments regarding that. And I do believe that Central was a roadway that was not going to be further developed or provide any extra right-of-way. So it would stay as it is right now. The only one they were taking a bit of extra right-of-way was from Mesa Drive.

Terrazas: Okay.

Weir: So in regards to the discussion today, Mike you wanted clear direction on whether we would be requesting those improvements or not on Central right?
Kinney: Well, it would be nice to have you know clear direction, but if we need to table the matter and further consideration, because I still have to go through P&Z, correct, the preliminary plat, they have to redo that.

Castillo: Yes the preliminary plat will have to start over. I would say that since our Active Transportation Coordinator isn't here and the Tierra Del Sol Subdivision going to provide a two acre park, you would most likely want to see some kind of maybe either side, since there is sidewalk there may be either extra sidewalk connecting to the park to afford for walkability and maybe multimodal transportation or if possible a type of multiuse trail or possibly moving the park to create a parkway of some kind to provide pedestrian coverage.

Terrazas: I have a question for the applicant or maybe Mike Kinney. Was there any proposed improvements along Central there, or just the dedication? Was it just going to be dirt filled?

Salcido: Just the dedication.

Terrazas: Just dedication, so no improvements whatsoever. No abatement for dust or anything?

Salcido: No.

Kinney: My understand is the dedication of the 17.5 feet was the same as what it was in the approved preliminary plat in 2018. So there was no change. Not on that.

Weir: So my question is from a traffic standpoint and from a fire protection, you're comfortable the road improvements that are on Central today.

Haver: For that area, I believe so.

Weir: And then for the applicant, the intentions are still to provide the 17.5 feet.

Salcido: That's correct.

Weir: Moving forward. And that does that cause a jog in our right-of-way dedications or?

Terrazas: It does. My only concern now, and if we want to go that way that'd be fine. Just like I said west of this or west of Mesa Grande on Central. Yes, it's going to be a weird jog lining it up. So I will profess that we at least go back something and have improvements, partially on Central and I think there's a street maybe, is it a lot for two lots, local street that you guys are proposing.
Salcido: I'm not too sure where you're…

Terrazas: Just east of Mesa Grande along Central your street, your local street that runs north to south, probably maybe 200 feet away.

Salcido: So we're Central here and Mesa Grande.

Terrazas: This is the street I'm talking about, so my concern is existing already we have this (inaudible) out area and not lining it up in the future. So maybe make some improvements here for cars to actually line up in the future. Like John said, I think the City is okay for now going with the 50 foot section and just to make it match up on this side, I will request that something be done to kind of line it up for the future whenever this one's built out.

Weir: So Hector, would you think that maybe additional dedications not necessary, and then they would do improvements here?

Terrazas: Yes, at least here, just depending on how much of a distance this is. Do improvements there, just describe the intersection. And then I mean that's why I wanted to have Parks in here. I don't know if Parks or like John said the ATP coordinator would want some kind of improvement in lieu of building out 80 foot section just put either a trail or something else or additional landscaping or something.

Haver: Actually have here if it makes any help. That's the intersection there. So that would be along the division we're talking about there. And this is the opposite side. That's basically the entire intersection.

Terrazas: Yes, that's pretty much it. So it just creates some weird geometry offset. So if we can have the applicant update that somehow just to make it clear.

Weir: So for the applicants information, it appears that we're comfortable not requiring additional improvements to Central, other than that intersection.

Terrazas: Yes. And then I mean other than maybe Parks wanting additional pedestrian amenities. But as far as build out of the whole road, like Mr. Weir said, probably we do some kind of geometry change there to kind of line up, Public Works would be okay.

Kinney: So it would require relocating that fire hydrant on Central.

Haver: I believe so.

Kinney: Talk about widening the throat, Hector.
Terrazas: Yes, pretty much so it lines up with the west side of Central there.

Kinney: I'm not sure how, just throwing it out there, I was told that that stretch of Central was built under a CDBG grant.

Terrazas: That probably was. And that's what really restricted, that's why it was built out before it was developed. And I'm pretty sure they went with that section because if you go further east, there are residential homes that …

Salcido: Down here.

Terrazas: Yes, that probably already gave their dedicated or at that time they just dedicated (inaudible), so that's what the City had to work with as far as right-of-way.

Kinney: One of the things I would have liked to do is go back and see in November of 2018, or right before there, before the P&Z approved the preliminary plat was to see what, from an aerial standpoint what was there. I can't get into the minds of the P&Z members, but they made it, clearly it states in the resolution, City resolution, on City Commission's resolution of the approval of the preliminary plat. It clearly states that, no, excuse me, it was just the Planning and Zoning Commission, it didn't go to the City Commission. I'm sorry. It clearly states that further improvements along Mesa or Central were not required because both of those roads were built up to City standards. And the reason why I brought this before the DRC today was kind of is to get ahead of the curve, so to speak, the Central Subdivision is now in it's what third review, will be going down, at least the second review.

Salcido: I believe so.

Kinney: Second, third review. And I was hoping to talk, you know without any further delays on that.

Weir: Well my question would be is if City staff, you know, Public Works, Fire is still comfortable that those roads being sufficient or would meet the need to 2018. What has changed that we'd want to require additional changes to the approval at that time. Is there anything. I guess the Skylark Subdivision.

Terrazas: Right and then that's like, and like John said, since it's been approved, I mean as far as traffic, I don't see a lot of traffic there growing. The only issue I have is just lining up the geometry. And that's pretty much it.
Haver: I mean I would agree with Hector. It meets the needs for emergency access today. I mean really no changes needed. But I mean I see his point and could agree with that, that this is probably the only chance to try to square up that intersection. And if we didn't do it now probably wouldn't be another chance in the future without a lot of headache. So if there is a way to try to make that happen now, that would probably be the best interest.

Weir: And so they had agreed to provide that extra 17.5 feet, is there a need for the City to have that or is that something that they can return some of that lot to incentivize them to improve that intersection?

Terrazas: I think the 17 feet can accommodate that improvement. I don't think it would affect their lots.

Weir: Okay.

Terrazas: I don't know what (inaudible) we produce from here today. But it seems like those 17 feet will just accommodate. So they don't need to dedicate more.

Weir: Okay.

Haver: You're talking about the width right here.

Terrazas: Yes. right there.

Haver: I have a tool for that.

Kinney: Mr. Chair. I don't have, I can't actually quote chapter and verse in the code, but my understanding from the requirements from code when it comes development and build out or improvements, I think it says when improvements are needed, then the developer is required to either provide those improvements or provide the funding for. I think, and that's just, I'm paraphrasing, and I could be wrong in some areas. But I think the key word in the development code is that when improvements are needed. And so I don't know what has changed significantly between November of 2018 and the end of February of 2020 in a four year time that would require additional improvements. That's why I brought this before the DRC to try to get ahead of the curve. If improvements are needed, which I understand my question for what Mr. Terrazas and Mr. Haver are saying that I would recommend that we table this this matter for further discussion and review with the developer, their engineer, Traffic and Fire.

Weir: Okay.
Kinney: The question is, are they needed? That's the question. I don't know. Who is the arbiter of the need? That's another question.

Weir: I think it's the departments that provide services the streets sufficient for that. I think that's why until you have discussion, and I think we can, when they actually submit the preliminary plat, we can make those decisions at that time. So that gives us some lead time to discuss that. Because I think ultimately the type of improvements will be approved at the time of construction drawings for the internal streets, and then you'd also look at that access point since it's a (inaudible) section adjacent to the subdivision. That's what I see today anyway.

So we didn't actually discuss this as a decision but I guess just to close out the meeting, is there anything else anybody wants to discuss on this matter? Any outstanding questions? If not, I'll entertain a motion to table this until the preliminary plat is submitted.

Kinney: Motion to table.

Weir: Can I get a second?

Montoya: Second.

Weir: We'll do just a verbal. All those in favor?

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

Weir: Item is tabled. That was our last discussion/action item today.

5. **ADJOURNMENT (9:44 a.m.)**

Weir: So if there's nothing else to discuss on the previous cases, I'll entertain a motion to adjourn.

Terrazas: So moved.

Weir: Can I have a second?

Haver: Second.

Weir: All those in favor?

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

Weir: Thank you