DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE (DRC)

Following are the minutes from the City of Las Cruces Development Review Committee Meeting held Wednesday, April 13, 2022, at 9:00 a.m. in Room 1158.

DRC PRESENT: David Weir, Deputy Director Community Planning
Mark Dubbin, Fire Project Department
Geremy Barela, Assistant Engineer, Com. Dev. (arrive 9:07)
Dominic Loya, MVMPO
Gary Skelton, Engineer, Public Works
Hector Terrazas, Engineer, Public Works
Javier Antunez, Senior Engineer Tech, Utilities
Mike Kinney, Plan Review Engineer, Com. Dev.
John Castillo, Planner, Community Development
Daniel Balderrama, Associate Engineer, Public Works

OTHER PRESENT: Becky Baum, Recording Secretary, RC Creations, LLC
Michael Dixson
Brendan Parsa
Trey Farrell

1. CALL TO ORDER (9:01 a.m.)

Weir: I'll go ahead and call the Development Review Committee meeting of April 13th to order. It looks like we have a quorum of all the departments present.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Weir: We have no minutes to approve today.

3. OLD BUSINESS

Weir: No old business.

4. NEW BUSINESS

4.1 Escondido at Alameda Ranch Subdivision - 21SU0509417

Consideration of alternate cross-sections related to the Escondido at Alameda Ranch Subdivision.

1. Alternate cross-section for a non-standards cul-de-sac, and
2. Alternate cross-section for Calle Abuelo (change from a Collector-2 (existing roadway) to a Collector-3 cross-section).

Weir: The first order of business is Escondido at Alameda Ranch. It looks like there is a request for an alternative cross-section for a nonstandard cul-

de-sac and also an alternative cross-section for Calle Abuelo. Mike, do you want to kind of introduce the case and what we're looking at today?

Kinney: Sure. Thank you Mr. Chair. Before I get started, Trey and Brendan I had all the exhibits pulled up on my computer, in trying to log in and it wouldn't let me so Hector had to log in. So I have no exhibits. So if you can, I'd like for you to pull those up. Maybe, first one would be the exhibit of the plat. You have of a copy of that sheet one, or on the site (inaudible), the plans, this very top sheet. And then ...

Farrell: Yes, let me pull up the plat for you.

Kinney: Or the plat or the top sheet (inaudible) of the plans, whichever. Probably would be the best. Okay, so for today's meeting I'd like to clarify that there were several, if you will variances, I think there were three of them that were submitted by Kimley-Horn. One of them goes directly to the traffic management section because it's not under the purview of the DRC. And that's been forwarded on to Public Works Director for their review and approval. And that's for the minimum centerline radiuses of various locations in the subdivision.

What we're here talking about today is the proposed alternate cross-sections. One is for a nonstandard cul-de-sac, which is at the south end of the property. And the second one is an alternative cross-section for the build out of Calle Abuelo. The existing portion of Calle Abuelo that's already built out it is a Collector-2 cross-section which is shown in the Section 32-36 of the development code. And they're requesting to go to a Collector-3 cross-section, which would be without a physical divided median, but have a continuous left turn lane or what's called a TWLTL, two way left turn lane. And that's pretty much it. Just a brief summary.

Weir: Okay. Mr. Dixson or Mr. Farrell, anything you want to add to what we're talking about today?

Dixson: No, I'll defer to the experts in this case.

Farrell: That was perfect. And we can kind of dive into the reasoning on either of those. Because like would you want to start Mr. Kinney with the nonstandard cul-de-sac?

Kinney: That's the first one on the, number one on the agenda.

Farrell: Awesome. So we can jump right in. We'll pull up the exhibit again and bring it over so we can look at it. We did model this area with a fairly large fire truck. The cul-de-sac itself that we're proposing, the outside radii of
the curves and the right-of-way are in line with the standard cul-de-sac standards from Las Cruces.

Kinney: If I can interrupt? Are you showing your screen yet?

Farrell: I thought I was.

Kinney: No.

Farrell: Here we go.

Kinney: There you go. Thank you.

Farrell: Got you. Yes, so these are the two locations we’re proposing variances on. See how this first one, like you said on the southeast corner. We did model for the exhibit with fire truck turning through here, successfully can handle fire trucks up to I think around 50 feet long. We’re still waiting to hear back from the Fire Department on the exact truck they use. This is the typical one we use. It’s a little more conservative. Do we have fire representation here today?

Dubbin: We do. This is Mark Dubbin. I’m the Fire Protection Engineer of Las Cruces Fire Department. I thought we had conveyed to you the dimensions of our apparatus.

Kinney: I forwarded that to you Trey.

Farrell: Oh, got you. All right, we can do a little digging and see if this is in line.

Dubbin: I can save you the trouble. The truck that you’ve modeled is about seven feet shorter than our apparatus.

Farrell: Okay.

Dubbin: And that’s what I was kind of wondering where you got these dimensions?

Farrell: Got you.

Dubbin: We can send you those again.

Farrell: Good.

Dubbin: We can send you those again. But I mean, the short answer is it’s seven feet shorter.

Farrell: Got you.
Dubbin: The radius is 57 feet.

Farrell: Perfect. We can get the modeling updated and update this exhibit for the team. Pending that, if that were to still be a successful turning radius, were there any other questions from DRC on this nonstandard cul-de-sac lane? Essentially, the intent of it was to increase lot frontage for these homes, four through seven, give them enough space for front yard setbacks to maximize the yield at this portion of the site.

Terrazas: Mr. Chair. I have a question for the applicant. Hector Terrazas from Public Works Traffic. My concern from traffic's point is the traffic control there because that's a really weird intersection. I don't know if we're going to make it a two-way stop, one way stop. Sign lines would pretty much limit that lot to the north of it because you wouldn't be able to see all the way across, hidden by two of the lots. So is there any kind of mitigation measures to kind of make traffic work correctly. And the reason I'm saying this is because when we have these kind of weird wide areas people tend to start parking in the middle and of course the issue that we have is Fire's not going to be able to get in there, our refuse trucks aren't going to be able to get in there. So I don't know if you're thinking about any kind of mitigation measures. Staff and I looked at some and some of the things that we think of is if you put like a little mini traffic circle in there to kind of dictate right-of-way and let people not physically park in the middle, that would be kind of a way to kind of keep the road clear in the middle so fire trucks can get in there. I did look at your turning radius for that one. If it stays the same which it might, it probably won't, it seems like they need to be able to traverse pretty much right at the center of that weird big cul-de-sac.

Farrell: Yes. It sounds like something we can add to our marking plan of straightening out that center area. I don't think it would require any sort of raised median within there, just for what you mentioned of fire turning. I think it would be simply like a no parking striped out with like solid yellow lines. It also is I believe is to be proposed to be a private community. Mr. Dixson can confirm. The intent is to be, to have it gated. So probably most likely have a fairly strict HOA within here as well. So I'm sure if people did start illegally parking in the center there it gets a few neighbors up in arms. But I think adding some additional striping in there would be beneficial. It's something we can definitely add to our marking plans.

Terrazas: If the goal is to keep it private, then maintenance of the striping would be on the HOA, like you said. So as far as Traffic, we'd be okay with it. I don't know if Mark would be okay with that because, where we do have striping in City limits, that doesn't really keep anyone from parking there, even though it's going to be private, enforceable actions, even when we
have codes going out there to enforce it, it doesn't have the impact that we
want it to. So I defer that to either if we have a physical median up there
or something that roll over, to Fire because I don't know what Fire's take
on this is.

Dubbin: No. Thank you Hector. That's some good points I hadn't thought of. I
mean, the answer is pretty simple. If the fire truck can navigate the radius,
we'd be okay with deferring traffic on those things. I think since it is for fire
turning, I would suggest red striping in accordance with the IFC that says
no parking fire lane. And like Hector said, being maintained by the HOA.
But we could explore some options in there if we can navigate the truck
through that bulb.

Farrell: Understood.

Terrazas: And then as far as for this Traffic, well Fire, if I'm getting the direction from
Fire is we can final, we can approve with those conditions for this variance
that we finalize this at the construction plans. I know the construction
plans are in review right now, but we can finalize that if Fire is okay with
that, and of course Community Development.

Dubbin: I'm okay with that.

Weir: Dominic or Javier, do you have any questions you want to make or
comments? Mike, do you have a recommendation for the DRC on this?

Kinney: Yes. For the alternate cross-section for the nonstandard cul-de-sac my -
recommendation or motion?

Weir: Either one.

Kinney: Both recommendation to approve with conditions that were just discussed,
that need to address the concerns from Traffic about striping and traffic
movement, and also to revise the turning radius, update that. You can
send that in as a separate document or as part of the construction plans.
My motion is to approve it with those conditions.

Weir: Okay. Do I have a second?

Dubbin: I'll second.

Weir: Okay. We have a motion and second. Any other discussion?
Comments? No. Okay. I'll let you choose yourself who, we'll just go by
departments. Fire Department.

Dubbin: Yes.
Weir: Public Works.

Terrazas: Yes.

Weir: Parks and Rec is absent. Utilities.

Antunez: Yes.

Weir: CD engineering.

Kinney: Yes.

Weir: CD MPO.

Loya: Yes.

Weir: Okay. So that waiver or variance has been approved.

The next one if you want to discuss the alternative cross-section for Calle Abuelo.

Farrell: Awesome. So I just switched over to CAD view here to show kind of the striking configuration we will be proposing or we're currently proposing for the Collector-3 section with no median through here. A big reason for that is going to be to maintain Pegasus and our entrance as full movement intersections. Putting a median in between these two roadways would limit the left turn pockets onto each road. So keeping it as a two way left turn bay would allow for southbound to eastbound left turn movement, as well as northbound to westbound left turn.

Weir: Okay.

Farrell: South of the site, we're also showing this same configuration to carry it through. There is more of a, this is more of an area of where we could possibly add a median, but since we don't really know with full confidence what's going in on the southwest portion of the site, we left it as a two way striped currently. There’s also, prior to the arroyo, City of Las Cruces sewer line. Keeping no medium through this area will allow for maintenance access vehicles, to make full turning motions off of that access way going north. And then future Calle Abuelo develops going south to make movements going south as well. This is, north of it is kind of the biggest area of concern with Traffic and Fire. We're looking to get back into the Collector-2 cross-section. A median within this area can also be proposed if you would prefer.
Weir: Mike or Hector do you have anything?

Terrazas: Mr. Chairman. Trey can you show us the length of that between your street and Pegasus how long that is? Because our minimum standards for a median opening is 100 foot of taper and 60 foot of stack. So if we can fit that then a median, back to back median would be sufficient. And the reason that we want medians in there is like you mentioned north of this, it does have a median, even because Calle Abuelo is a major collector, we want to continue to have median access. So for sure for the part to the south we want that to be median controlled, even though we don't know what's going to go on the west side. Whenever that development comes in, they can apply for a median opening just like everyone else does whenever there is a fully built out street.

But can you show me the, yes pretty much the length of your, yes so you have 280 feet so we can fit a back to back curb, accommodate that. It is residential streets so I don't expect both, they're both going to be private so I don't expect a lot of through traffic through there. So if we can accommodate the minimum medians in there we can work that out. So as far as that being the reasoning for it, that Traffic doesn't see that as a good enough kind of technical reasoning for it.

And the other issue that we don't want to do Collector-3. Collector-3 does not have any bicycle facilities. So with our ATP and moving forward, the City wants to accommodate all modes of transportation, so that's another issue that we have. And of course we don't have Parks representing right now, but landscaping of streets, it's a major deal. So of course with medians not being in place that's going to be a different kind of concern as far as Parks. But I'm not going to talk for Parks. But as far as Public Works, we don't want to have asphalt that's really not going to get used, that's why we need to have a median there, because it's never going to get use. If that development to the south doesn't request another access points and they go off of Pegasus then yes that's just dead asphalt that's never going to get used because there's really no need for it

Farrell: Understood. That measurement for 280 was from centerline to centerline.

Terrazas: Right.

Farrell: For actual paint, that's about 174 feet. So that would be your true kind of turning cue and storage area.

Skelton: Yes, looking at the exhibits you provided, you're right, you've got about 176 from approximately point of tangent to point of tangent, but if you throw in the radii of Pegasus and on the other street, you've got
approximately 236 feet. So you can still accommodate the 220 feet for the
two left hand turns.

Farrell: Understood. So you guys would accept a turning opening of 110 fee. Is
that essentially what you guys would like to see?

Skelton: It'd be a 60 foot radius from the north left and the south left, and the 100
foot taper in between, so you know approximately 220 feet of total length
and median.

Terrazas: Yes, in short as long as we can accommodate the minimum, which is like I
said, 60 and 60, I'm not really worried about the stack beside the Fire
Department being able to make a movement there. We can work with
those minimums and we can do a variance. And that one would not go
through DRC, it would go through Traffic, because there is more benefit to
have that controlled media than to not have that controlled median.
Because like you said, if you go with this and whenever Calle Abuelo
develops to the south, and you have people trying to go both into Pegasus
and into this development, they're going to jump in there as soon as they
can. So that's a safety issue. So that's why. But if you can provide us
something, just like Mr. Kinney said with Committee Development, you
can provide something separate of this and we can review it and do a
(inaudible) review, that way you're not having to send it through Excella
you can send it to …

Kinney: Or come back here for DRC.

Terrazas: Yes.

Skelton: Right.

Terrazas: And it won't go through DRC because at that point, like I said, the brains
for the length of the stack and the taper would go through Public Works,
Traffic. Go ahead.

Kinney: Trey, I guess what I'm understanding from the Hector is what we're asking
for is kind of a back to back curb type median, so it's not going to be like a,
I don't know if you have a full 19 foot, whatever, 15 foot wide median,
whatever that is, collector, for the Collector-2, yes it's a 12 foot median.
So it will be kind of like back to back curb for median separation.

And then for the southern half south of Loretto Drive, I know that Traffic
and Public Works would like to have the full Collector-2 cross-section.

Farrell: Okay.
Kinney: Additionally, on Calle Abuelo on the north side of Pegasus, if you could scroll down to that. Right now there's a left turn lane median, and I believe, I understand, correct me if I'm wrong Hector, is that Public Works would like to have that median closed off and have a 12 foot radius curb. Now there's no left turn lane there. Is that correct?

Terrazas: Yes. The comment from Public Works is, and we've done this before, because we try and plan for the future, right, like you guys were trying to say, well if we put a median on the south side of here, we don't know what's going to go on Pegasus. Well, we try to plan out wherever it was on Calle Abuelo that Pegasus would continue to the east of Calle Abuelo. Well, this development didn't continue that, right. So I know you guys propose to go right out, but what we want to do is build out that median, make it the full width, continuous width of whatever is out there, instead of just scoring it out because it doesn't serve a purpose to just score it out and its perpetual maintenance for the City to keep that strike out.

Farrell: Understood. Is there any cost sharing or payback associated with those improvements?

Terrazas: No, because like I said, that was, the MPO Thoroughfare Plan called out for Pegasus to continue. That did not happen here in this location. If you're street connected here at Pegasus then you would be benefiting from that previous development having a left turn pocket. So because this layout doesn't connect there, it doesn't have a benefit to it. But yes, we've been asking all developers either be it then that they were saying, yes we're going to opening here and then (inaudible) says no, we're going to close it off and just have houses abutting. They've been closing it off. So there is no cost sharing for that.

Farrell: Understood.

Weir: Any additional comments?

Farrell: Yes, Michael, did you have any comments on that? Essentially, I think what they're asking for is to close out this median instead of striking it out. So it'd be, we come at this point of reverse curvature.

Dixson: Yes.

Farrell: And then saw cut it two feet along with the future travel lane. You'd likely be ripping up probably most of this nose and then saw cutting another two feet on the northeast side, and then coming in button it at a full median.

Terrazas: Trey, for that one we could probably save the east side of that median and just get rid of the west side, like the gore side of that curb and gutter. So
you would just tear up pretty much once the, yes from there and then just
tie it in, like at the PT on the right side of the median and then just kind of
tie it in as best as we can. So we don't like tearing up stuff like that, but
like I said, because this street didn't continue like it was supposed to on
the MPO Future Thoroughfare Plan, we need to close it off because it's
not a service or use to anyone.

Farrell: Okay.

Terrazas: Yes, something like that Trey. Yes, that's pretty much it, new curb.

Dixson: Hey Trey.

Farrell: Yes.

Dixson: Just spitballing here. Is there a way to shift, and since I have everybody
on the phone right now, this may solve actually like, kill a couple of birds
with one stone since we're going through it right now? And we're also kind
of looking at making some other changes right now, right with the plat and
stuff. Is there a possibility to relocate this cul-de-sac street to the south so
it aligns with Pegasus Drive and lose the cul-de-sac and have that be an
entrance and just basically swap the existing entrance for the cul-de-sac,
kind of flip flop those and clean up this whole thing? Is there a way to do
that?

Farrell: You possibly could but you'd be losing lots within here. Because
essentially, what you'd be doing is you'd be getting rid of this entrance.
You could lot here lot here then right, and then this slides down for that
connection. You're going to have some fairly large lots in here, but you're
going to be losing these three here. But just thinking out loud.

Dixson: Yes. I think you've got a good point. Okay I was just spitballing. Yes, I'm
just trying to figure out simplicity here.

Terrazas: And as far as that, Public Works would prefer to not have offset streets.
We'd rather be squared up, but right now we are okay with it because it is,
well either side, Pegasus or this development, they're are private
neighborhoods.

Dixson: Could we do that then? Could we take it, could we lose this cul-de-sac
right here and turn that in and not move any of the streets, just keep the
cul-de-sac and turn that into Pegasus which is straight through and kind of
change the medians there to kind of offset the entrance? Could we do
that?
Farrell: It's getting pretty tight. I think what they're saying is, they already don't like this. That's almost 300 feet. If you were to come in here it's even worse. I think this configuration is probably the most extreme they're willing to accept. I think any smaller probably wouldn't be ideal for traffic operations and safety.

Kinney: Correct.

Terrazas: And we do have a minimum offset for 125. So again, that would put you right at that area.

Farrell: For the back to back left turn pockets here again, can you describe the configuration your team would like to see? Was it 60 feet of storage on each side?

Terrazas: Yes. So if you want to do a minimum of 60 feet and 60 feet, and I don't know what the taper would entail being right there. Our standard calls out for 60 of storage, a 100 foot of taper. But like I said we're willing to work with you on those just because we'd really want to have that median access control.

Farrell: Okay, we'll do.

Terrazas: And that one …

Farrell: So essentially … sorry, go ahead.

Terrazas: I was just going to tell you that one, like I said, you can send Mike Kinney a proposal and then you can forward it to Traffic and we'll give them back comments. And the reason I want to go through Mike Kinney is because he is reviewing the whole site as a whole, so we want to make sure that it goes through him. But yes, we'll assist him and assist you guys, so we can move this forward and get you guys going.

Farrell: Thank you.

Weir: Any other comments? Go ahead.

Farrell: Yes, so essentially we're no longer applying for a variance for Calle Abuelo. But we will need to coordinate with Mike Kinney and Public Works on the taper reduction at this location.

Terrazas: Correct.

Farrell: Okay. Awesome.
Weir: Okay. Any other comments from DRC members? Go ahead.

Kinney: Mr. Chair. I just have a question. Since we're doing a back to back median curb, back to back curb median in between Loretto and Pegasus, is that also an alternative cross-section, correct?

Terrazas: No.

Kinney: No.

Terrazas: No, because the alternative cross-sections usually just entail, they don't entail everything. So as far as what we see, we don't see it as an alternative cross-section because the majority it's still going to be the same, the same width.

Kinney: Okay. So then I guess Trey is correct in that what we discussed here the last few minutes it negates the request or need for an alternative cross-section for the Collector-3?

Terrazas: Correct.

Kinney: You concur with that Trey?

Farrell: Yes.

Kinney: Okay.

Terrazas: So, Mr. Chair, I don't know, if we can have the applicant kind of pull back their request.

Weir: Say in essence are you withdrawing that request, or do you want us to vote it down as a Board?

Farrell: We will withdraw the request.

Weir: Okay. All right.

Farrell: Thank you.

Weir: Thank you.

Kinney: Okay, so with that said Trey we'll work with you on looking at that and try to get all that tied up in a nice little bow for your next submittal. If you want to send that information, I don't know, would that be appropriate to send it just directly to me and we can …
Terrazas: Yes.
Kinney: We can do like a courtesy review and then whenever we get everything cleaned up and ready to go, then you can do it as part of the official submittal into Excella. Does that work?
Farrell: Yes. We'll likely try to get this configuration locked down by the end of the week.
Kinney: Okay.
Farrell: And send our off site paving sheets to you and then possibly we can distribute those ahead of our submittal.
Kinney: Right.
Farrell: Just to make sure we're on the right track. Does that work with the team?
Kinney: Yes.
Farrell: Okay.
Weir: Okay.
Dubbin: I have a question.
Weir: Go ahead.
Dubbin: I have a quick question. Why were the on sheet like phase one DRC requests, sheet one, why were the 50 foot radiuses highlighted as variance request locations? I understand the nonstandard cul-de-sac but items one through five.
Kinney: I could answer that.
Dubbin: Okay.
Kinney: City code requires on centerline radiuses for 90 degree or near 90 degree turns, the minimum allowable radius is 50 feet with the express written consent of the Public Works Director. That's Section 32-36.E Table 1, footnote number seven.
Dubbin: So what is the minimum radius that does not require the express permission of the Public Works Director?
Kinney: 50 foot one inch.
Dubbin: Okay. Thank you that answers my question.

Weir: Does DRC need anything else of the applicants today? Okay. Thank you gentlemen for attending the meeting. And you're welcome to hang around or you can sign off, whatever you'd like.

Farrell: Sounds great. Thank you everyone.

Weir: That concludes our action item today.

5. DISCUSSION

Weir: That leads it, the only thing we have is there anything the committee wants to discuss as a group? Okay, I do have a question for you stay up after a little bit.

6. ADJOURNMENT (9:30 a.m.)

Weir: I'll entertain a motion to adjourn.

Dubbin: I'll make a motion to adjourn.

Weir: I have a second.

Kinney: Second.

Weir: Okay. I have a motion and a second. I'll just take a verbal vote. All those in favor.

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

Weir: All those opposed? Okay. We're adjourned.

Chairperson