

SUMMARY INDEX
PLANNING COMMISSION

February 18, 2016

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>ACTION TAKEN</u>	<u>PAGE(S)</u>
A. Roll Call	Quorum Present	1
B. Pledge of Allegiance	Recited	
C. Approval of Agenda	Approved as amended	2
D. Approval of Minutes & Findings and Conclusions	None	2
E. Old Business	None	2
F. New Business	None	2
Study Session	Presentation by Mr. O'Reilly	3-8
1. Land Development Code Policy/Procedural Issues	Presentation by Mr. Shandler	8-11
2. Railyard Policy/Procedural Issues	Presentation by Mr. Czoski	11-14
G. Staff Communications	Discussion	14
H. Matters from the Commission	Discussion	14-15
I. Adjournment	Adjourned at 8:20 p.m.	15

PLANNING COMMISSION
Thursday, February 18, 2016 - 6:00pm
City Council Chambers
City Hall 1st Floor - 200 Lincoln Avenue

CALL TO ORDER

A regular meeting of the City of Santa Fé Planning Commission was called to order by Chair Vince Kadlubek on the above date at approximately 6:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers at City Hall, 200 Lincoln Avenue, Santa Fé, New Mexico.

A. ROLL CALL

Roll Call indicated the presence of a quorum for the meeting.

Members Present

Commissioner Vince Kadlubek, Chair
Commissioner Brian Patrick Gutierrez, Vice-Chair
Commissioner John B. Hiatt, Secretary
Commissioner Roman Abeyta [arriving later]
Commissioner Justin Greene
Commissioner Stephen Hochberg
Commissioner Mark Hogan
Commissioner Piper Kapin
Commissioner Sarah Cottrell Propst

Members Absent

None

Councilors Present

Councilor Carmichael Dominguez
Councilor Signe Lindell

OTHERS PRESENT:

Mr. Greg Smith, Current Planning Division Director and Staff Liaison
Mr. Zach Shandler, Assistant City Attorney
Mr. Carl Boaz, Stenographer

NOTE: All items in the Committee packet for all agenda items are incorporated herewith by reference. The original Committee packet is on file in the Planning and Land Use Department.

B. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Commissioner Hiatt moved to approve the agenda as presented. Commissioner Hochberg seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES AND FINDINGS OF FACT

There were no minutes of Findings of Fact to consider.

E. OLD BUSINESS

There was no Old Business to consider.

F. NEW BUSINESS

There was no New Business to consider.

G. STUDY SESSION

Mr. Matt O'Reilly said he was previously the Chair of the Planning Commission and now a Staff member with the Land Use Department for the last five years. He asked for a statement from Commissioner Lindell.

Commissioner Lindell said it is fun to present before the Planning Commission. Being appointed to Planning Commission was a great honor and life changing for me on lot of diff levels. I had the pleasure to serve with numerous people and made lifelong friends. I served with Mr. O'Reilly and we went out to have dinner after the meeting. We fought like cats and dogs during some meetings knowing we would have dinner together. So I hope you develop friendship among Commissioners. It made the importance of neighborhoods make a difference. The charge that the project meets the code. That is your responsibility.

It is easy to find out your responsibility by going to Chapter 14 of the Code. It is also important to know more. This is not a design review board. Overstepping the boundaries gets the City in trouble and can get very expensive

Commissioner Abeyta joined the meeting at 6:08 p.m.

Commissioner Lindell said from personal experience, she wouldn't want to be the person who came unprepared. There were many super smart people and she wanted to come prepared. She didn't need to comment on every project but she knew and understood what was being said. Some applicants may have spent hundreds of thousands before appearing. So keep that commitment every time.

She learned from Mr. Smith that when you start seeing the same problems; the same variances over and over again to go to a councilor to see if that part of the code needs to be changed. It is not open for a lot of personal interpretation.

She suggested, in trying to be true, to talk less and say more.

She learned early on that it is very bad for someone to call you to discuss a case prior to it being heard. That is completely inappropriate. It is also not appropriate to go to ENN meetings nor to talk with anybody who calls you about a case. People have done that and it is incumbent on ourselves to govern ourselves and should let them know it is not okay to talk about it.

Serving on the Planning Commission is a big commitment. There is lots of material to go through. She is deeply appreciative of your commitment as a volunteer.

When any case comes to Council, we really study all the minutes of the Planning Commission to see what was said and how it was handled. Sometimes it is really, really hard when the Code doesn't support what you want to do. But the Code totally and completely guides everything you do.

Commissioner Kapin thanked Commissioner Lindell for everything she just said. It makes a lot of sense. She asked Commissioner Lindell if she could expand on what is useful for the Council to see and asked for any feedback on minutes she has gotten from the Commission.

Commissioner Lindell said it is always best when people stay on point and keep within the code. Variance criteria are well defined. No part of the criteria for a variance has to do with finances or fiscal gain and that is hard. What she found most helpful is when people ask questions that are directly related to the Code. She went through cases and cases and ignored any of the questions on design because that is not the charge of the Planning Commission except in the BCD. Listening to neighborhood people, she reads all of what the public says. That is what the Council looks for.

Commissioner Hogan appreciated the comment about friendships and going to dinner afterwards. He asked if there is a rolling quorum issue with that and if Commissioners have to worry about all of us being

there together.

Commissioner Lindell said they usually didn't have a quorum and were through talking about business when we went. Those friendships during her eight years on the Planning Commission with people she would have had no other way of knowing was great. And over the course, even with those who disagreed, we were social. This is a good Commission and she expects very good things from this Commission.

Commissioner Dominguez said he occasionally came to Planning Commission when Commissioner Lindell was on it but this Commission has not seen him much. He thanked the members for taking time out of their lives to serve on this Commission and caring about this community. Thanks to your family also for your sacrifice.

Commissioner Dominguez related what led to his serving on the Planning Commission.

"There was a time in the early 1990s that I lived in Sierra Vista in a mobile home and my wife saw the grin on my face. She asked what was wrong with the look on my face. I told her that if we wanted to buy a house, we would have to leave Santa Fe. She said, no way. So I said I would have to get involved in city politics. The reason I say that is you probably have said the same thing. So my involvement started with that. I worked on the community impact statement by Mayor Jaramillo and that evolved into the ENN. That was my first taste. I got appointed to the Traffic Calming Task Force. I served with Karen Heldmeyer, David Pfeiffer, Roman Abeyta, and Paul Campos. My favorite issue was at Sam's Club and where they were going to locate their pumps to sell gasoline.

He said it is a privilege and honor to serve on the Planning Commission and now your job is to look at Chapter 14 and not to get political. "I know it is not always clear and when that happens, don't hesitate to raise your hand. Your role is critical to Governing Body. We look at the minutes and pay close attention to them. We look to find out if the conversation speaks to the Code so we don't have to be so political. We pay attention to what you have to say. For example, there was a case at the Governing Body and we had just started dealing with Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law. And I read the minutes and the findings carefully. The findings might have said anything about compatibility but it was not clear in the Findings. So I convinced others to not approve something that was not clear in the minutes. We need for it to be clear. So thanks to all of you for your service."

Mr. O'Reilly said he would go through a handout he prepared when he became part of the Land Use Department, stepping down from the Planning Commission. The handout is to help Commissioners do the best job possible. He thanked the Commissioners too and reiterated how important your role is but would go further and stroke your egos. He explained how different the Planning Commission is from the 60 other committees and boards. Those are to give advisory opinions. But the Planning Commission is the most special entity the City has and is the only one specifically mentioned in the Constitution. The City has four quasi-judicial bodies.

"For 90% of the cases, they are heard only by the Planning Commission. Only a small portion goes on to the Governing Body. The Commission makes those decisions (especially the very big ones) in any given

year than the City Council does. You approve maps that cover hundreds of acres. That is why you are so special. So how you are often judged is your composure and consistency of your actions. That is why you are so important and viewed by people outside of Santa Fé - those who are considering investing in Santa Fé and spending up to millions of dollars. So I thank you very much for how you conducted things when I was the Land Use Department Director.

Mr. O'Reilly said he served with Commissioner Abeyta and Commissioner Hogan and Commissioner Hiatt in other ways so they probably know these things. He reviewed the bullet points in his hand out [attached to these minutes as Exhibit 1].

1. Be prepared. As an applicant, I knew who had read the packet and who hadn't.
2. Arrive on time - it is not cool if a quorum cannot be achieved.
3. It might be necessary for the Chair to explain how they will conduct the meeting.
4. Procedural questions arise - those should be put to staff or attorney by the Chair. It makes the meeting go quicker to do it that way.
5. Be recognized by the Chair before talking.
6. Keep questions to staff to a minimum. The Applicant and other people came to say something and there is time afterward to ask questions of staff. Maybe write down your questions beforehand. And you can always call staff to alert them of problems or a question the staff can answer for you so you won't embarrass yourself in the meeting.
7. Chair should always announce the public hearing portion and verbally close it
8. Treat all of the public with respect. Most are not used to speaking in public; be fair to everybody.
9. Don't ever separate the public into those in favor and those not in favor. The goal is to hear from everyone. It is a matter of fairness.
10. Never get into an argument with a member of the public. Don't engage any of them unless they are at the podium. When that happens, the Chair loses control.
11. Less is more. Be courteous to the Chair and other Commissioners. Keep comments brief - don't relate your personal experiences.
12. After the public hearing is closed and you want to ask a question of a public member, go through the Chair to ask permission to ask the question.
13. Avoid editorializing when discussing a project.

14. In imposing other conditions, it is good practice for the Chair to ask the Applicant if they understand the condition that was added and if they accept the condition. Staff will inform you of those that are not lawful.
15. Make clear and concise motions.
16. If there is no discussion, take a vote right away. If there is lots of discussion, the Chair should restate the motion before voting.
17. Calling the roll should be used sparingly. If the Chair thinks the Commission is very divided, call the roll
18. There might be a need to call a recess after a long case. Don't use a recess to discuss how to vote on a case.
19. You don't need a motion to adjourn. The Chair can announce adjournment.

Mr. O'Reilly add that there is one exception to prohibitions on considering design. That is for projects in the BCD. The BCD-DRC Committee reviewed projects in the Railyard and certain downtown areas. When that Committee was disbanded, those duties passed to the Planning Commission and in those cases, you can make design decisions about how a building looks or stucco colors. Rarely do you hear those. The Drury was one and there were some in the Railyard.

Chair Kadlubek asked about the other (BCD) sub zones for the Commission to consider design issues.

Mr. O'Reilly said they are redevelopment districts. Mr. Smith can elaborate on that. It doesn't come up that often. Mr. Smith could get you that information.

Chair Kadlubek was also interested in how those got to be redevelopment zones.

Mr. Smith said he would be happy to provide that information later. Mr. Czoski will also provide that for Railyard projects.

Commissioner Gutierrez asked if the Chair votes only with a tie or always.

Mr. Shandler said there has been a dispute about that for years. The citizens changed the charter to allow the Mayor to vote. In most judicatory boards, the Chair votes only with ties.

Commissioner Greene said along the lines of what would be called design, there is a section in the packet for things that might be called design. There is a fine line there.

Mr. O'Reilly said he had not seen the packet so he didn't know what that refers to. There are things in the Land Use Code but most are at the building permit level. Usually, the architectural standards are not

the Commission's purview.

Commissioner Greene referred to Chapter 14-3 on approval criteria for things like yard walls, etc.

Mr. O'Reilly said a different way to say design would be aesthetics which are limited to redevelopment subdistricts. Some others may really be performance standards.

Mr. Shandler added that in development plans there is a list of 21 possible conditions.

Mr. O'Reilly gave an example: In a development plan, there is a big parking lot and nearby is residential and those neighbors are afraid the car lights will shine in their bedrooms. The Commission could ask the applicant if he would construct a wall to block those lights, even though not a requirement of the code. It is a site development issue the Commission could consider.

Commissioner Hochberg thanked him for coming. He asked if he could take issue on number 17. We are small and it would not take much time for a roll call vote.

Mr. O'Reilly said he discouraged it because the Commission is blest by meeting once a month. There were times in the past where the Commission always met every two weeks with 6-8 cases on the agenda each time and they were trying to get through an agenda before midnight. Sometimes roll call brings comments to justify their vote and that results in a lengthy discussion and makes the meeting longer.

Commissioner Abeyta thanked Mr. O'Reilly. This is well thought out and well put together. He suggested this be given to each new Commissioner at the point of appointment.

Commissioner Abeyta said he was confused whether the Commission should postpone or table a case.

Mr. O'Reilly said that a motion to table under Robert's Rule of Order is for tabling is to a point later in the same meeting. Postponing it is to a date certain. The City Attorney and Staff usually know which your intent is. So you should usually postpone to a date certain.

Commissioner Abeyta reasoned that the appropriate motion if the Commission can't arrive at a decision would be to postpone.

Mr. O'Reilly agreed. Sometimes the Commission needs more information, or the Commission might believe they should just go to the site and the Commission could go together.

Commissioner Abeyta asked if there is no debate on table or postpone motions.

Mr. O'Reilly agreed.

Commissioner Kapin said going to a site at a meeting is usually too dark.

Mr. O'Reilly thought perhaps they could do that in the summer months. Or Staff could schedule it during the day. It can be cumbersome because members of the public could go as well. The Attorney can explain how to keep a quorum and not lose control.

Commissioner Kapin asked what happens when the Commission adds a condition but the Applicant doesn't accept it.

Mr. O'Reilly said the reason for asking is that if an applicant accepts the condition, it makes it difficult later to say they didn't accept it. If it isn't asked, it makes it possible that it would be overturned. Often, the applicant spends thousands of dollars to prepare the application. The applicant, if they disagree, could say they withdraw their application.

Chair Kadlubek asked if the Chair can make a motion.

Mr. Shandler said he hasn't seen that.

Mr. O'Reilly said one of the hardest things for him as Chair was that he didn't get to vote. A good Chair lets the Commission discuss and work things out. So that's why he asked Commissioners to support the Chair in running the meeting; especially if it is very contentious. For that reason alone, it is hard to be Chair. It is the Chair's role to be fair with discussion among the Commissioners and the Commissioner's job to help the Chair do that.

1. Policy and Procedural Issues Related to the Land Development Code (Chapter 14). (City Attorney Office and Land Use Department Staff)

Mr. Shandler went through the scenario which was his packet [a copy of the scenario is attached to these minutes as Exhibit 2].

He showed a table of what cases go where - either just to the Planning Commission or to the Council.

Mr. Shandler walked the Commission through the scenarios. The first was to explain under the General Plan, what points have to be addressed in the presentation as approval criteria.

He went next to a rezoning of a district and what must be proved up there. He provided the acronyms for zoning in a chart and the descriptions of what the different districts are.

Mr. Shandler went next to a scenario for Special Use Permits. He pointed out the list of permissible conditions there (a through p). On the next page is a chart in Chapter 14 when a special use permit is needed. In it, P = permitted; S= permit needed.

He went next to Subdivisions and pointed out the approval criteria shown there. He also clarified preliminary vs. final. A subdivision has to do a preliminary plat and a final plat.

He went next to Development Plans. Regarding size, he said 30,000 square feet floor area triggers a development plan requirement although it is 10,000 in some districts. The criteria for a development plan was listed. He added that the conditions list is very similar. The final development plan has to be consistent with the preliminary plan and the Planning Commission must make a specific finding about consistency.

He went next to Master Plans which are required in certain rezoning applications. Some people come forward voluntarily with Master Plan and that lets the Commission know that it will be large project. In it, the infrastructure must accommodate the plan.

Mr. Shandler went next to variances and gave the elements of a variance.

In his scenarios, he printed out a Finding of Fact from the last meeting. Those are the elements. Whoever presented this case made sure all the elements were there. For a variance, the elements must also be there. Staff usually has all of those criteria in the packet. If not, the Commission needs to ask questions. Direct questioning is the beginning and you would work backward like a prosecutor.

Chair Kadlubek excused himself from the meeting at 7:19. Commissioner Gutierrez chaired the remainder of the meeting.

Commissioner Propst said this is helpful and she liked how Mr. Shandler laid it out. Sometimes in the written materials from the applicant, the Commission sees that the response is met but she asked if it would be helpful for Staff to help out the Commission by not leave it as a grey area in the staff reports.

In some of the examples Mr. Shandler gave, there are a lot of things that need to happen. She asked if that would mean the project should not go forward.

Mr. Shandler said if a case is appealed, it goes to City Council and that Body includes four former Planning Commission members. So it needs to be very detail oriented.

Mr. Shandler observed that Mr. O'Reilly covered ex parte very well. Don't talk with anyone but Staff and don't talk about the case before or after with anyone. He said sometimes his wife breaks Planning Commission news to him after reading Face Book statements about the planning. So he would like every Commissioner to stay off of Facebook. And if you do not stay off, you will be excused from that case.

Regarding a new General Plan (Scenario #5), he posed where the Commission should start. He wanted to copy the whole General Plan but it is gigantic.

He gave his two cents - it does impact you when citizen's don't support it because the General Plan has not been updated in this century. Three or four companies were brought in to re-write it and there were lots of details about what is most traveled so updating the document would take a lot of time. Now the city is facing a shortfall. The MPO is a reactive agency. General Plan has diagrams on layouts and setbacks, etc. Perhaps they just need to supplement the General Plan. If so, how can we use the best method?

Maybe we need to add sector plans as an appendix. Maybe there should be new policy statements for Affordable Housing, etc. They might need to look at the annexation area for future use designations. They all came in as R-1 and those maps need to be updated.

Mr. Shandler made several other suggestions like a hot spot map for development. He explained that he was being deliberately provocative here. The Commission needs to help people get unstuck about the General Plan.

Commissioner Kapin said in the approval criteria for development plans, they ran into this one time in condition Q. The Commission was instructed that we don't have a lot of sustainability code. So she asked what the Commission could ask for in criterion Q.

Mr. Shandler said he didn't know the history of that condition.

Mr. Smith explained that this is a compiled version from previous lists of conditions. It is of conditional jurisdiction and there is not much policy direction here.

Mr. Shandler reasoned that a condition to require greater recycling has nothing in Chapter 14 to use for what that really means.

Commissioner Kapin recalled that the former case got into things like lighting. One case could talk about recycling of water and harvesting techniques and another case might not address that at all.

Mr. Shandler agreed to research that to find out more about criterion Q.

Mr. Smith agreed 100% that the Planning Commission is not doing a design review. There are factors in site planning and site design is in the Commission's purview. So, in terms of how they operate their business, architectural design is only considered in just a handful of places. 14-8.6 is the code. It is never seen in big box standards.

Commissioner Propst asked if Commissioners can talk outside of meetings.

Mr. Shandler said there is a case in Albuquerque where the government got in trouble. It is both legislative as well as judicatory. He said he would get back to her about that.

Commissioner Hiatt asked him to hand out the Albuquerque Commons case. They really screwed it up and it cost them millions of dollars. And the Planning Commission should learn from that.

Commissioner Hogan was intrigued with Motto 3 and how that relates to issues of the General Plan that was conceived over 15 years ago and was taking advantage of the density. A lot of that didn't happen. So he asked how the Commission should take into consideration having others do the work for the Commission. He wondered if the Commission could ask applicants about their review of the General Plan.

Mr. Shandler said with some of these criteria, the Commission has to establish consistency with the General Plan. He heard from Kate Noble that there might be money for the River Sector but it was done for free so maybe that money is available for some work on the General Plan. He didn't think the Commission could put too much on the applicant.

Commissioner Greene appreciated Mr. Shandler's humor in this training. He noted, regarding Motto 3, that there is some private money so he asked if there could be a public-private partnership to do it. \$10,00 is not much. Could the Commission point people in the right direction?

Mr. Shandler said he spoke at the Neighborhood Law Center about that in December. He said it would be better to discuss that off-line.

2. Policy and Procedural Issues Related to the Railyard Master Plan (BCD Redevelopment District). (Richard Czoski)

Mr. Czoski thanked the Commission for giving him this opportunity. He provided a hand out of his PPT [EXHIBIT 2], and wanted to provide some context. There is a lot of misunderstanding about how the Railyard is set up. The Railyard consists of 50 acres at Guadalupe and Peralta and also ten acres at Baca and Cerrillos. A trail is constructed between the two and with the underpass completed, will provide a seamless connection. The acreage is covered by a conservation easement. When build out is completed there will be 500,000 square feet of development. They are 86% leased now. It also has an underground parking lot.

The City owns all 50 acres and the Community Corporation manages it. The Santa Fe Conservation Trust holds the conservation easement. The other major players are those who lease the buildings.

So the City is our landlord; we are the tenant and have a lot of performance requirements. We are responsible for leasing the ground parcels, manage all events and public use. The lease expires in 2030.

So we pay rent to City. It will amount to a little over \$20 million and have paid a little over \$5 million so far.

Our use fees are same as park use fees for the City.

The terms of ground leases are up to 90 years. Lease rates increase by CPI each year and are reevaluated every 10 years. We have a lot more authority over tenants than most landlords. Every tenant has to be approved by us even though tenants own the buildings. Everything is subordinate to City ownership. In 90 years, the City will own all improvements. And if the agreement expires, the City becomes landlord for all tenants. Among the tenants, 65% are local businesses and nonprofits. 12% are national businesses. The Master Plan encourages local business and gives preference to local businesses.

Commissioner Abeyta pointed out that there is a big difference between preference and allowing.

Mr. Czoski said REI, Verizon, and Violet Crown are the national businesses. We are obligated to comply with the Master Plan.

Commissioner Abeyta asked why 23% is uncommitted.

Mr. Czoski said it is mainly because we are trying to have that occupied by local businesses. We could fill it quickly with national firms.

Commissioner Abeyta asked why they would not go ahead and lease to national businesses.

Mr. Czoski explained there was lots of public input that said the community did not want this as a shopping mall of national tenants. Our board makes the decisions and consistently said they would rather wait and not fill with national chain stores. They would rather wait and follow the Master Plan rather than fill it up sooner.

Commissioner Hochberg asked if they have a 28-year agreement now.

Mr. Czoski said, theoretically, in 2030, we could do another 90-year lease. He added that some buildings were existing when we started.

Commissioner Greene asked about historic designations.

Mr. Czoski explained that the Railyard is not a historic district but a few buildings are landmark buildings. Pueblo Revival architecture is not allowed in the Railyard. The Master Plan has been amended 10 times.

The Railyard complies with all of the ordinances for Affordable Housing, Water Rights, Parking, Impact fees, etc. And, if the project is less than 10,000 square feet and it complies with the architectural standards, then the Architecture Review Committee gives the approval on it. When the consultant is satisfied, they send a letter to the State CID. If the project is larger than 10,000 square feet, like Violet Crown, they vet it to be in compliance before coming to the Planning Commission. Our job is to get it as close as possible to the Master Plan requirements. It then has an ENN meeting; then goes to the Planning Commission, and then to CID for approvals. If it requires a Master Plan amendment, it is pretty much the same process.

Their status to date is 15 buildings completed and 8 yet to be built. The 15 completed have 255,000 square feet total floor area. Mr. Czoski showed pictures of the Railyard architecture. He also showed what is likely to come before the Planning Commission.

He announced that in April, a 58-unit apartment structure will be constructed south of Paseo de Peralta. The ENN meeting was last week. The Texas developer will be seeking a Master Plan amendment for height and is still working with the Land Use Department on a second possible project.

There are four other parcels with one in the north area and three in the Baca portion. The Railyard will also bring a request to demolish some sheds at Baca for another project in the future.

Regarding the bankruptcy comments for Market Station, it was developed by a local group. They built the garage and the building on top. It was a \$30 million project. It has struggled for various reasons not connected with the Railyard. That building is also subject to foreclosure by the lender. The building could go back to owners or the lender. It is a great building. Nothing is wrong with it.

There is a lot of confusion because the owner's name is very similar to ours. The ground lease has been paid on time. The bankruptcy will just have to work through the courts.

There was a very long community-based planning process at the beginning for the Railyard. They have two web sites. One is .org. and the other is .com.

Mr. Czoski hoped that his presentation has given the Commission more context for addressing the project when it comes to the Commission.

Commissioner Hogan thanked him for a great presentation. He asked if Mr. Czoski would characterize the ten amendments to the Master Plan.

Mr. Czoski said one of the big amendments was to reconfigure the layout of the potentials.

Commissioner Hochberg left the meeting at 8:04.

Mr. Czoski said some parcels got pushed back away from the neighborhood. Some parcel uses have been changed like water detention, etc. There was also some clarification on vending on the parcels.

He offered to send a copy of the amendments but didn't have them memorized.

He commented that there was going to be a post-production development where the apartments are now going in.

Commissioner Hogan asked if the Railyard does the initial review and approval of the amendments and come to the Planning Commission after that.

Mr. Czoski said when the amendments are project-related they come to the Planning Commission; otherwise, they go directly to the Council.

Commissioner Greene noted the budget shortfall was discussed at the Chamber, including possibly selling of City assets. He asked if Mr. Czoski could comment on that or maybe they would use Baca assets for liquidation. He asked if those scenarios have come through.

Mr. Czoski didn't understand the question about Baca and Commissioner Greene clarified that it was

just talk about sale of city assets.

Mr. Czoski felt the easiest way to answer it is the lease to 2030 obligates us to rent the property. The City could not sell the ground because it is leased to us. They could always approach us but our obligation is to lease the parcels and pay rent to the City. So we are not in default with the City. The City could bring a proposal to our board.

Commissioner Abeyta asked if there is something the Commission could do to make it easier for the Railyard Board to lease these buildings. The Commission should make it easier for the Railyard Board to lease it - to stimulate GRT revenue. This would be a perfect place to do that.

Mr. Czoski said our tenants own the buildings and it is their responsibility to lease them. We have an 8% vacancy rate which is less than the City overall. The ones in Market Station are obvious. Our job is to help developers build in the Railyard. The fact that they go to CID if over and if under 10k doesn't come here and can be much more contemporary designs helps that process.

Mr. Czoski said he has worked for 28 months with the Texas developer. It is 30% more expensive to build here than in Texas. Out-of-state developers are intimidated about coming here. We do a lot of the work that a development consultant would do and do it for free with these folks. We also have good relations with the City. It is a code issue that we have to come here for larger developments. Most of the rest of the development projects will probably come to the Planning Commission.

The Commission could help us best by doing what Mr. O'Reilly and Mr. Shandler have talked about doing. We went to BCD-DRC many times and came here once.

So we have agreed to comply with the Code and it is our job to deliver buildings and meet the Master Plan requirements and provide places for people to work and to live.

Commissioner Abeyta said the Commission needs to be more forward thinking, especially when we have good projects like this. He questioned why we make them come here.

Commissioner Hiatt said he has been here in Santa Fe for 28 years and really remembers a proactive leadership in the 1990's. He was very grateful for two particular projects - Marty Sanchez and the Railyard.

Vice-Chair Gutierrez thanked Mr. Czoski for his presentation and answering Commission questions.

G. STAFF COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Smith said the Pulte developers offered to host the Planning Commission and Staff at a site visit in Albuquerque at their development site and Ms. Martínez is working on a date. Commissioners could contact him or Ms. Martínez to figure out the transportation and determine the quorum. In their presentation, they believe they have the best 21st century model and wanted to share it with the

Commission.

The next meeting is in the first week of March and they haven't scheduled a second meeting in March.

H. MATTERS FROM THE COMMISSION

Commissioner Kapin said the Long Range Planning group met today and had a very productive meeting. They have our other member at large and talked about a work pattern that matches up with the Planning Commission, the Neighborhood Association process. They heard a good update on the West River Corridor. We hope to either meet more often or have longer meetings.

Commissioner Greene agreed that it was productive. There was a little frustration at not having meetings. There were good comments on the General Plan and the lack of time on Long Range Planning. Reed Liming and Richard Macpherson were there and have spent a lot of time on it. More resources are needed. They are making their way around the River Corridor task group. They have met 15 times. Not all of the neighbors know about it but some have shown up.

He said they divided the corridor into four subdistricts and the goal is to have an open house soon. No date has been set yet. There is a potential to wrap it up in 8-12 weeks.

I. ADJOURNMENT

Vice-Chair Gutierrez adjourned the meeting at 8:20 p.m.

Approved by:

Vince Kadlubek, Chair

Submitted by:



Carl Boaz for Carl G. Boaz, Inc.