



Agenda

CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

DATE 5/22/14 TIME 2:20 pm.

PREPARED BY Geraldine [Signature]

RECEIVED BY [Signature]

AMENDED

PLANNING COMMISSION
Thursday, June 5, 2014 - 6:00pm
City Council Chambers
City Hall 1st Floor - 200 Lincoln Avenue

- A. ROLL CALL
- B. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
- C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
- D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES AND FINDINGS/CONCLUSIONS

MINUTES: May 15, 2014

FINDINGS/CONCLUSIONS:

Case #2014-34. 912 Hillcrest Drive Variance.

Case #2014-32. 5364 Agua Fria Preliminary Subdivision Plat.

Case #2014-33. 3542 Rufina Street Family Transfer Subdivision.

E. STAFF COMMUNICATIONS

1. Presentation and discussion of a comprehensive traffic analysis approach to access management. For information and discussion only. (John J. Romero, P.E., Traffic Engineering Division Director)

F. NEW BUSINESS

1. Case #2014-43. 3197 & 3193 Jemez Road (4989 & 4985 Airport Rd.). James W. Siebert & Associates, Inc., agent for the L-Fam Partnership requests approval of a General Plan Future Land Use map amendment to change the designation of 0.64± acres from Very Low Density Residential (4-7 DU/Acre) to Community Commercial. The property consists of two lots, located at the northeast corner of Airport Road and Jemez Road. (Donna Wynant, Case Manager).
2. Case #2014-44. 3197 & 3193 Jemez Road (4989 & 4985 Airport Rd.). James W. Siebert & Associates, Inc., agent for the L-Fam Partnership requests rezoning of 0.64± acres from R-4 (Residential, 4 dwelling units per acre) to C-2 (General Commercial). The property consists of two lots, located at the northeast corner of Airport Road and Jemez Road. (Donna Wynant, Case Manager).

3. **Case #2014-45. Paseo North Development Plan.** Architectural Alliance Inc., agent for 511 PDP LLC, requests approval of a Development Plan to construct 4 residential units totaling 11,475 square feet. The 16,449 square foot property is located at 511 Paseo de Peralta. It is zoned R-21 (Residential, 21 dwelling units per acre) and is within the Downtown and Eastside Historic Overlay District. (Zach Thomas, Case Manager)

G. ADDITIONAL STAFF COMMUNICATIONS

H. MATTERS FROM THE COMMISSION

I. ADJOURNMENT

NOTES:

- 1) Procedures in front of the Planning Commission are governed by the City of Santa Fe Rules & Procedures for City Committees, adopted by resolution of the Governing Body of the City of Santa Fe, as the same may be amended from time to time (Committee Rules), and by Roberts Rules of Order (Roberts Rules). In the event of a conflict between the Committee Rules and Roberts Rules, the Committee Rules control.
- 2) New Mexico law requires the following administrative procedures to be followed by zoning boards conducting “quasi-judicial” hearings. By law, any contact of Planning Commission members by applicants, interested parties or the general public concerning any development review application pending before the Commission, except by public testimony at Planning Commission meetings, is generally prohibited. In “quasi-judicial” hearings before zoning boards, all witnesses must be sworn in, under oath, prior to testimony and will be subject to reasonable cross examination. Witnesses have the right to have an attorney present at the hearing.
- 3) The agenda is subject to change at the discretion of the Planning Commission.
***Persons with disabilities in need of special accommodations or the hearing impaired needing an interpreter please contact the City Clerk’s Office (955-6520) 5 days prior to the hearing date.**



Agenda

DATE 5/15/14 TIME 10:35 AM.
SERVED BY Geraldine Guinto
RECEIVED BY J. Ortiz

PLANNING COMMISSION
Thursday, June 5, 2014 - 6:00pm
City Council Chambers
City Hall 1st Floor - 200 Lincoln Avenue

- A. ROLL CALL**
- B. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
- C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**
- D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES AND FINDINGS/CONCLUSIONS**

MINUTES: May 15, 2014

FINDINGS/CONCLUSIONS:

Case #2014-34. 912 Hillcrest Drive Variance.

Case #2014-32. 5364 Agua Fria Preliminary Subdivision Plat.

Case #2014-33. 3542 Rufina Street Family Transfer Subdivision.

- E. OLD BUSINESS**
- F. NEW BUSINESS**

1. **Case #2014-43. 3197 & 3193 Jemez Road (4989 & 4985 Airport Rd.).** The L-Fam Partnership requests approval of a General Plan Future Land Use map amendment to change the designation of 0.64± acres from Very Low Density Residential (4-7 DU/Acre) to Community Commercial. The property consists of two lots, located at the northeast corner of Airport Road and Jemez Road. (Donna Wynant, Case Manager).
2. **Case #2014-44. 3197 & 3193 Jemez Road (4989 & 4985 Airport Rd.).** The L-Fam Partnership requests rezoning of 0.64± acres from R-4 (Residential, 4 dwelling units per acre) to C-2 (General Commercial). The property consists of two lots, located at the northeast corner of Airport Road and Jemez Road. (Donna Wynant, Case Manager).
3. **Case #2014-45. Paseo North Development Plan.** Architectural Alliance Inc., agent for 511 PDP LLC, requests approval of a Development Plan to construct 4 residential units totaling 11,475 square feet. The 16,449 square foot property is located at 511 Paseo de Peralta. It is zoned R-21 (Residential, 21 dwelling units per acre) and is within the Downtown and Eastside Historic Overlay District. (Zach Thomas, Case Manager)

G. STAFF COMMUNICATIONS
H. MATTERS FROM THE COMMISSION
I. ADJOURNMENT

NOTES:

- 1) Procedures in front of the Planning Commission are governed by the City of Santa Fe Rules & Procedures for City Committees, adopted by resolution of the Governing Body of the City of Santa Fe, as the same may be amended from time to time (Committee Rules), and by Roberts Rules of Order (Roberts Rules). In the event of a conflict between the Committee Rules and Roberts Rules, the Committee Rules control.
- 2) New Mexico law requires the following administrative procedures to be followed by zoning boards conducting “quasi-judicial” hearings. By law, any contact of Planning Commission members by applicants, interested parties or the general public concerning any development review application pending before the Commission, except by public testimony at Planning Commission meetings, is generally prohibited. In “quasi-judicial” hearings before zoning boards, all witnesses must be sworn in, under oath, prior to testimony and will be subject to reasonable cross examination. Witnesses have the right to have an attorney present at the hearing.
- 3) The agenda is subject to change at the discretion of the Planning Commission.
***Persons with disabilities in need of special accommodations or the hearing impaired needing an interpreter please contact the City Clerk’s Office (955-6520) 5 days prior to the hearing date.**

SUMMARY INDEX
PLANNING COMMISSION

June 5, 2014

ITEM	ACTION TAKEN	PAGE(S)
A. Roll Call	Quorum Present	1
B. Pledge of Allegiance	Recited	1
C. Approval of Agenda	Approved as presented	2
D. Approval of Minutes & Findings and Conclusions		
1. Minutes of May 15, 2014	Approved as amended	2
2. Findings of Fact & Conclusions of Law		
• <u>Case #2014-34</u> . 912 Hillcrest Drive.	Approved as presented	2
• <u>Case #2014-32</u> . 5364 Agua Fria.	Approved as presented	2
• <u>Case #2014-33</u> . 3542 Rufina Street.	Approved as presented	3
G. Staff Communications	Presentation by Mr. Romero	3-6
E. Old Business	None	6
F. New Business		
1. <u>Case #2014-43</u> Rezoning to C-2 3197 & 3193 Jemez Road	Recommended Approval	6-9
2. <u>Case #2014-44</u> Future Land Use Map 3197 & 3193 Jemez Road	Recommended Approval	9
3. <u>Case #2014-45</u> Subdivision Paseo North Development Plan	Approved	9-13
H. Matters from the Commission	Discussion	13-14
I. Adjournment	Adjourned at 8:05 p.m.	14

PLANNING COMMISSION
Thursday, June 5, 2014 - 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 Tom Spray 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

Members Present

Commissioner Tom Spray, Chair
Commissioner Lisa Bemis
Commissioner Michael Harris
Commissioner Dan Pava
Commissioner Angela Schackel-Bordegaray
Commissioner Renee Villarreal

Members Absent

Commissioner Lawrence Ortíz [excused]
Commissioner John Padilla [excused]
[One Vacancy]

OTHERS PRESENT:

Tamara Baer, Planner Manager, Current Planning Division – Staff liaison
Zachary Shandler, Assistant City Attorney
Zach Thomas, Current Planning Division Staff
John Romero, Traffic Division Director
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 Historic Planning Department.

B. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES AND FINDINGS/CONCLUSIONS

May 15 2014

Ms. Baer said there were no changes from staff.

Commissioner Harris requested the following change to the minutes:

On page 10, last paragraph, 4th line, "worth" should be "worse."

On page 15 in the closing paragraph, third line it should say "farther" rather than "father."

Ms. Baer requested in the same paragraph, in the 7th line, it should say "formerly" rather than "formally."

On page 10, 2nd paragraph from the bottom, it should read, "I know it sounds counterintuitive and it did to us as well, but it is actually a safer movement, [delete next 4 words] just in certain circumstances."

Commissioner Schackel-Bordegaray moved to approve the minutes of May 15, 2014 as amended. Commissioner Villarreal seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

FINDINGS/CONCLUSIONS:

1. Case #2014-34. 912 Hillcrest Drive Variance.

Commissioner Villarreal moved to approve the findings of fact and conclusions of law as presented for Case #2014-34. Commissioner Pava seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

2. Case #2014-32. 5364 Agua Fria Preliminary Subdivision Plat.

Commissioner Villarreal moved to approve the findings of fact and conclusions of law as presented for Case #2014-32. Commissioner Bemis seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

3. Case #2014-33. 3542 Rufina Street Family Transfer Subdivision

Commissioner Harris moved to approve the findings of fact and conclusions of law as presented for Case #2014-33. Commissioner Bemis seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

G. STAFF COMMUNICATIONS [out of order]

Mr. John Romero presented a short power point presentation to the Commission to explain Access Management. He noted the Family Transfer at the last meeting had lots of discussion on access management and connectivity along Agua Fria. Access Management had an inverse relationship linked to the hierarchy of street types with higher category having more limited access.

The hierarchy from the top included major arterials, secondary arterials, collectors, sub-collectors and lanes. Usually major arterials were for getting into and out of town and discouraged access. Secondary arterials were designed to get people around town with high mobility but also a need for access. Collectors had medium to small length - circulation within neighborhoods; Sub-collectors had low mobility and high access.

Access management balanced the need to provide safe and efficient traffic movement with the need to provide reasonable access to adjoining properties. Elements to consider in the classification included signal spacing, full access spacing and driveway spacing. Each classification had its own characteristics in design to reduce conflicts and crashes, reduce congestion, reduce cut-through traffic and provide economic benefit.

Access control provided a safety benefit since 62% of crashes were access related. Urban divided highways have 27% less crashes than undivided highways; divided highways with partial access control have 41% fewer crashes than those without.

He noted a major concern on Rufina were J-turn intersections. U-turns were unsafe so a J-turn design had motorists go beyond the intersection and do a U turn and then a right turn at the intersection.

J turns prohibited left turns. A national study found a 20% reduction in crashes with J turns. A regular intersection had 32 conflict points and a design with J turns had significantly fewer points. He showed an example with Rodeo at Yucca and several others that had less optimum access control. Then he showed what was in store for Rufina.

Chair Spray asked about the ADT (average daily trips).

Mr. Romero said typically they focused on places with more than 15,000 cars using that road in a day.

Commissioner Pava thanked Mr. Romero for this presentation. He thought it might have been in response to his comments in May. They discussed the function of the traffic circle further down on Rufina.

Chair Spray said that was a half mile south and west.

Ms. Baer agreed that it was a question that came up and it was 2,000 feet away.

Commissioner Pava noted a traffic circle was in place there and he asked if it was helpful in this situation with a compromised arterial.

Mr. Romero thought it was very helpful. It was a form of intersection control and could be used in place of an all-way stop or a traffic signal. It helped with capacity to move cars through quicker. It was also a good area for U turns. They would look for more opportunity for roundabouts, medians and enough room for U turns.

Commissioner Pava also thanked him for previous support and comments when we reviewed those long subdivisions set by acequias out onto Agua Fria. He asked if the State DOT did context-sensitive street design so they could adapt certain standards for pedestrians and bicycles.

Mr. Romero agreed. The current requirements in Chapter 14 now used 11' widths for lanes and sub-collectors and on more major arterials they now had 10' lanes had bike lanes and sidewalks.

Commissioner Pava said as a resident off Camino Alire and the large populated school meant he would encourage, if any opportunity existed, that they were good candidates for redesign that was more pedestrian and bike friendly.

Commissioner Bemis said she was very pleased with Cerrillos Road which had been a nightmare. She asked who set the traffic lights to coordinate traffic.

Mr. Romero said it was the Traffic Division. With the reconstruction since 2003, access control and auxiliary lanes helped move traffic. They re-timed it a couple of years ago by lagging them at certain hours of the day. They measured the efficiency and had a blue tooth on some of those. The modeling worked and improved travel time.

Commissioner Bemis said there were a couple of roundabouts there that worked pretty well. She asked if the Traffic Division had good success with those.

Mr. Romero said overall they had but haven't had local formal studies yet. For the most part, some people gripe about them but they were easier to negotiate. The one on Siler Road has good flow.

Commissioner Schackel-Bordegaray wondered that too. It was rough at SFCC and Richards and asked if that one was considered successful.

Mr. Romero said he wasn't directly involved in it but at SFCC they had a 4-way stop right there which caused a backup. He believed they fixed that problem. There were still some capacity issues.

Roundabouts worked best when the streets going both directions were relatively equal in volume. The City tried to do them on convergences of two major collectors.

Commissioner Schackel-Bordegaray said it appeared that U turns were not opposed by traffic engineers and that was new to her. At the Chávez Center they had a right out and then a U turn. But there was a no U turn allowed there for a while.

Mr. Romero said since those were done in the 80's they had changed.

Commissioner Harris said the Commission had a couple of discussions over the years about U turns. He agreed with Commissioner Bemis that Cerrillos Road worked much better today but he saw a lot of close calls with U turns. Most people think they were illegal.

He asked if Rufina was a collector now, as opposed to an arterial.

Mr. Romero said Rufina was a minor arterial or secondary. The MPO classifications were up for changes.

Commissioner Harris personally thought roundabouts were great. There were actually three on Richards and things moved well.

Back to the family transfer, that parcel was right at the end of the median and could have been shortened. There were other neighbors like Ms. Sanchez who recorded comments at the ENN meeting. He asked if staff had ever looked at a roundabout at the Atocha intersection. He thought it would speed things up a little.

Mr. Romero said it was potentially a roundabout but it could just be a median opening with a left turn bay. The staff didn't want roundabouts at every intersection.

Commissioner Harris had a photo of a "No U Turn" sign that was not a city sign. That was what Ms. Sanchez was talking about on Rufina. People took short cuts.

Using the Rufina example, rather than going down for a left turn, people would turn off to the side. He drove down Rufina and it had a dirt frontage road right now that wasn't constructed by the City. So there were situations that developed. He thought they really needed to consider how people behaved and give them decent options. That picture of the sign happens around town. Other than that, Traffic staff did a good job.

Chair Spray asked regarding St. Michael's Drive about the proposed road diet that was put forth on it/ what was current status. They were going from six lanes to four.

Mr. Romero said the Long Range Planning Division met with him to scope out a traffic study on it. He thought without doing traffic counts what it would do to improve travel time. On any road that has a capacity that gets reduced too much, they either would go through much slower and frustrated or they would use another route or alternative transportation. It gets to a critical point with a significant delay in traffic. If the majority were going from Tierra Contenta to the hospital, they still would drive and might cut through Siringo.

Chair Spray asked if the study would be a six figure project operation.

Mr. Romero said it was expensive. He had suggested they used the counts and factor them with growth projections to see what it would like with reduced lanes. Another thing they were suggesting was closing all medians between signals. That would affect the amount of time allowed for left turns. They would do the study and then work on what to look for to find.

Chair Spray said when St Francis was put in, cars and movement was the driving force with that. Arterials were wonderful but for those who were walking across St. Francis. They were still dealing with the lots that got cut off when it was built. It seemed to be a bypass and now we have 599 as a new bypass. But he was glad to see the City moving forward with that.

Commissioner Schackel-Bordegaray said this was an important discussion for the Commission. A lot of people cut through on Camino Carlos Rey and Campanas and that's the way she went. It was obvious that people cut through there because Richards was never connected. Some day it needed to go through. That was one of our city's traffic problems.

She asked why there were stop signs on Campanas.

Mr. Romero said that was actually not a roundabout there but a traffic circle. Those were there before he was born. He explained that roundabouts were primarily intersection control and traffic circles were just an impedance to slow traffic down.

E. OLD BUSINESS

There was no old business.

F. NEW BUSINESS

- 1. Case #2014-43, 3197 & 3193 Jemez Road (4989 & 4985 Airport Rd.)** The L-Fam Partnership requests approval of a general Plan future Land Use map amendment to change the designation of 0.64± acres from Very Low Density Residential (4-7 DU/Acre) to Community Commercial. The property consists of two lots, located at the northeast corner of Airport Road and Jemez Road. (Donna Wynant, Case Manager).

Ms. Baer reported for Ms. Wynant using the overhead projector on these cases. She said the two cases should be considered as one by the Commission but they needed a separate vote on each one to make recommendations to Council on the final decision.

They were for rezoning from R-5 to C-2. There were two lots jointly totaling 0.64 acres at the northwest corner of Jemez Road and Airport Road. Both have long been developed as commercial use on residential properties and the cases were to bring zoning into compliance with use. They got permission from the EZA before under jurisdiction of the City.

She pointed them out on aerial drawings including the new Walgreens and showed on the east was Catholic Social Services and on the west part a driving school now and other commercial establishments over the years. The owners recently purchased the left lot.

When the zoning was done in 2009 they did so on this west area. It was annexed January 1, 2014 but came into city jurisdiction in 2009.

At that time, when the City was creating the new zoning for this property and assigning future land use designations, they took a broad view except for those where before there had been a master plan approval. Unless someone came forward, the City didn't always know that. In this case, (in Exhibit B-2) it showed the future land use designations and she pointed out the red line around these lots which was part of a large swath at very low density residential.

Even though designated very low, Exhibit B-3 showed the zoning was actually R-4 which didn't fit the very low density. Some were R-3 size but some were actually developed at R-4 which was more of an average density. That was how it might have been done.

The purpose of these applications was to correct the future land use map and zoning for the actual historic uses. There was not any planned changes for these properties.

Access to both was from Jemez Road and there was no direct access from Airport Road. The Fire Department requires the access to designate the physical address. They were on city water but not city wastewater and at time of their development of the property, it would require a sewage connection.

Ms. Baer said Land Use supported these applications.

Chair Spray thanked her for the presentation. He invited the applicant to speak.

Present and sworn was Mr. James Siebert who said he didn't know what he could add but to reinforce that some of these things went back 20-30 years. It was once a book store and then boat repair so it had been commercial. There was prior zoning given and maybe an oversight that the zoning was not carried forward when adopted by the City.

Commissioner Bemis asked about the difference between community commercial and general commercial.

Mr. Siebert said the zoning they were requesting was C-2. Community Commercial was for the future use map.

Chair Spray announced this was a public hearing.

Present and sworn was Mr. Daniel Roybal who said he and his wife owned the property to the right with the two mobile homes on them and the property extended a little further than shown. He asked if there was a planned development for this corner lot.

Chair Spray said during the meeting the Commission would try to find the answer for him.

Mr. Roybal said they would like to have their property rezoned also.

There were no other speakers from the public and the public portion was closed.

Commissioner Harris noted on the cover memo it said not accessible, new construction for septic permit but he assumed that whatever the trigger for development, there would be discussion on connecting to public sewer instead of a septic permit.

Ms. Baer clarified that on page 10 of the staff report, the applicant stated that water and sewer lines were available. Mr. Hand's memo says that would be the trigger for connection. Wastewater indicated the properties were not connected.

Commissioner Harris read the septic permit statement.

Ms. Baer said that statement was not correct and needed to be corrected.

Commissioner Harris commented that this was a valuable piece of property and reflected historic use commercially. It should be commercially zoned but also should be connected to the City sewer.

Chair Spray asked Ms. Baer about the adjacent lot to the east that was still zoned R-4 and whether with approval of this case, Mr. Roybal's property could be considered for rezoning to C-2.

Ms. Baer agreed.

Chair Spray supposed that any owner could come ask for change.

Ms. Baer said if Mr. Roybal had come in first they might have had trouble getting it because the Code says it must be at least 2 acres or be adjacent to C-2. If and when this goes through, then his property would be adjacent and he could make the request and follow the same process.

Chair Spray understood and assuming it was approved by Council, it could improve Mr. Roybal's chances.

Commissioner Pava moved to approve Case # 2014-43 to recommend to the Governing Body the approval of a General Plan future Land Use map amendment to change the designation of 0.64± acres from Very Low Density Residential (4-7 DU/Acre) to Community Commercial. Commissioner Villarreal seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

- 2. Case #2014-44, 3197 & 3193 Jemez Road (4989 & 4985 Airport Rd.).** The L-Fam Partnership requests rezoning of 0.64± acres from R-4 (residential, 4 dwelling units per acre) to C-2 (General Commercial). The property consists of two lots, located at the northeast corner of Airport Road and Jemez Road. (Donna Wynant, Case Manager).

Commissioner Schackel-Bordegaray moved to recommend to the Governing Body to approve Case #2014-44 at 3197 and 3193 Jemez Road for rezoning of 0.64± acres at from R-4 to C-2. Commissioner Villarreal seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

- 3. Case #2014-45. Paseo North Development Plan.** Architectural Alliance Inc. Agent for 511 PDP LLC, requests approval of a Development Plan to construct 4 residential units totaling 11,475 square feet. The 16,449 square foot property is located at 511 Paseo de Peralta. It is zoned R-21 (Residential, 21 dwelling units per acre) and is within the Downtown and Eastside Historic Overlay District. (Zach Thomas, Case Manager).

Commissioner Harris disclosed that his wife had worked next door to the subject property. The Commission accepted his disclosure as not a conflict of interest.

Mr. Zach Thomas presented the request from Architectural Alliance for approval of a Development Plan to construct 4 residential units for a total of 11,475 square feet at 511 Paseo de Peralta in property zoned R021 and within the Downtown and Eastside Historic District. It was new construction exceeding 10,000 in a residential zone so it needed approval by the Planning Commission.

Mr. Tomás displayed a site view photo showing what the current lot looked like at 511 Paseo de Peralta and indicated the architect was here to describe more details. The lot coverage at 40% included above grade structures but not the below grade garage or driveways. The development included common open space in the courtyards. In the exhibits the garage roof was described as a "living roof" because it was at ground level but was the top of the parking garage. The plan also provided 350 square feet of private open space per unit.

The single point of access/egress provided vehicle access to the garage and pedestrian access to the units. The project was reviewed by Mr. Romero and found to be compliant with the condition that the rock

wall would be lowered to three feet for a traffic view shed.

The project complies with height requirements and the owner had a zero lot line agreement with the property owner on the east side which allowed for a reduced setback on the east side for the bottom story or ground floor level. The second story was set back from the property line ten feet.

An ENN meeting was held on April 17 and the outcome was no major objections at the meeting and those notes were in the packet as Exhibit C-1.

The project was within the Downtown and Eastside Historic District and the HDRB has oversight of the architectural review. It was heard by the Board on May 27 and still being considered so the exhibits were subject to change and could have minor changes with the footprint.

Staff recommended approval without any additional conditions of approval.

Present and sworn was Mr. Eric Enfield, 612 Old Santa Fe Trail who thanked the staff for their review and support. He explained that this site had been neglected for 4-5 years. His client, Mr. Cody North purchased it recently. He agreed with the staff recommendations and said the project did meet the codes.

He said there were a lot of existing retaining walls on the site. They were trying to use some of them as part of the building. Rather than seven units covering the whole site and parking, he decided to put all parking underground. The project presented an opening onto a landscaped courtyard and plaza. It was also a unique location. He listed most of the buildings that were part of the streetscape.

There were three separate building on the site. There were some concerns by the HDRB. Lot coverage was discussed by city staff on how to consider the underground garage. They were pushing any two-story façade back ten feet on the second story and the buildings were set back 15 feet from retaining walls. The 3 buildings were distinct structures and no city code addressed this situation. The IBC Section 509.9 talked about multiple buildings above parking structures. He read the IBC code which required a fire separation of 2-3 hours. The solid concrete and lid separated the garage from the other buildings. There was a six foot separation unroofed.

The HDRB said they didn't care about the IBC code but did care about the looks. There were relevant definitions in the City Code including one for definition of façade which had to be at least 8' wide and offset by at least 4' to be a separate face. The definition of building included that they were not connected by a roof. The garage roof was actually a dirt surface with the roof below the grade.

There was a long retaining wall along Paseo de Peralta and the garage would be below that wall. The precedent was set not to measure from the bottom of the garage. He broke the three buildings down into each façade. He distributed copies of the elevations showing the façades of each of the buildings and how they were measured. The 18 façades were measured from existing finished grade since there was no existing grade. The overruns (elevator) were allowed an extra four feet. His height limit was 23' and he met it with the additional four feet for slope.

Chair Spray understood the finished grade was the top of the garage.

Mr. Enfield agreed and by code it was not a three story building.

He added that although it was tabled at HDRB, he was confident they would approve the project. They requested a reduction of overhangs and the elevator tower. A lot was metal and they wanted more wood. So there were going to be some changes. They stated that they liked the massing and were comfortable with reduction of overhangs and elevator. They felt it needed to show more as one-story on Paseo.

The Board also agreed with the reduction of the rock wall. The former solution was bells and mirror but the Board agreed with him to reduce the wall and he would keep the historic material in the wall and relocate it to other places on the site. He would probably return to the Board in July or August to get final approval. They had some concern about lot coverage. 70% was allowed with private open space and he were well within the 40%. Neither the IBC nor the City had a definition of lot coverage.

Mr. Enfield held up a foam board of the elevation showing how it appeared to be a single story elevation with a 4' 6" rock wall and landscaping along the Paseo Side. One could see it was basically one story on the east side and mostly one- story on Paseo as shown in his handout on page six.

Mr. Enfield stood for questions.

Chair Spray said it was a public hearing and asked for anyone from the public who wanted to speak.

Present and sworn was Ms. Carmen Pert, 228 Otero Street since 1947 who said she was so pleased that Mr. North decided to purchase this property. Many situations were frightening in the neighborhood. She and neighbors were so pleased with this project and she couldn't imagine anybody else doing anything there. For him and the architect to invest in it was really appreciated.

There were no other speakers from the public regarding this case and the public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Pava said he had just one question. On the façade illustrations where the parking was shown, there really was only one ingress and he asked what the second grille was. It was on sheet one of handout in the upper left hand corner.

Mr. Enfield said it was a 20' open grate that provided access to the units and small stairs down to garage. They didn't have to mechanically vent the parking but used the grates for that vent and built in a gate to enter the garage.

Commissioner Harris estimated it had been about 7 years with that hole in the ground and there seemed to be lots of neighborhood support. He asked how they would treat the back wall.

Mr. Enfield said it was a retaining wall and meant to be left exposed. It was a finished retaining wall system. It was shown on his sheet A-5 - north exterior elevation. The dark line was that retaining wall. A lot of the buildings were below that dashed line. That wall was an integral part of the site and taking it down would be prohibitive.

Commissioner Harris said he was worried about the aesthetics.

Mr. Enfield said the buildings would screen all but a small area. The neighbors above now looked at the wall.

Commissioner Harris said their prospective owners would see it. Mr. Enfield agreed.

Commissioner Harris said structurally it had been there for 7 years and he didn't know about the drainage there since a retaining wall nearby had failed.

Mr. Enfield said there was a letter from Jim Hands who inspected the retaining system within the last six months. With the work on the site with construction, if it failed, they would have to reconstruct it. He also provided a copy of the letter to the association there.

Mr. Thomas said the letter was included in the packet as Exhibit D and it was dated April 15th.

Commissioner Villarreal liked this. It was a different architectural style. It was cool. She was curious if he could elaborate more on the living roof.

Mr. Enfield said they used that area to catch the water off of the roof area. Some ponds cascading down with water from north side would harvest it. It would hopefully be something they would see more of in Santa Fé. In Istanbul, they used the flat roofs all over the city.

The owner was willing to separate it and harvesting all the water at that roof would be beautiful. There were limitations on what could grow on the living roof but they were also lining the street with trees and working with the City engineers on that.

The HDRB said it might be future Santa Fé Style but maybe not recent Santa Fé Style.

There were big structures around it and fortunately everyone he had shared the proposal with agreed it was good.

Commissioner Villarreal wondered what the price would look like. Underground parking and elevators meant a high end unit.

Mr. Enfield agreed but added that the Affordable Housing payment would be \$16,000.

Commissioner Schackel-Bordegaray thanked Mr. Enfield for doing something special. She asked if the previous failures happened from the economy problems.

Mr. Enfield said they built all the retaining walls and then ran out of money and then the economy collapsed and they didn't have enough to refill the hole. All the neighbors were interested in just getting it filled.

Commissioner Schackel-Bordegaray said that had been the Sunwest Bank parking long ago. She wished him good luck with the HDRB.

Commissioner Pava said he read the staff report and it was clear and concise.

Mr. Thomas thanked him.

Commissioner Harris moved to approve Case #2014-45 as recommended by Land Use Department staff. Commissioner Bemis seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

G. STAFF COMMUNICATIONS

The Staff Communications were considered earlier in the meeting. There were no further communications from staff.

H. MATTERS FROM THE COMMISSION

Commissioner Pava said he and Commissioner Bemis attended the Long Range Planning Committee meeting. One subject was what he would call the Aging and Livability Task Force and they made specific suggestions for things they might consider and at some time they would get a full report. There were things like walkability for the aging, improving sidewalks, removing obstacles like poles and signs. They were looking at building codes on kitchens and on demographics.

They heard a report on the impact fee study and a prolonged discussion on the traffic capacity on St. Michael's Drive. They asked LRP staff to talk with the Commission further about that traffic study. It was a very good meeting.

Chair Spray asked what happened with impact fees.

Commissioner Pava said it was merely a status report.

Ms. Baer said that report would come to the Planning Commission at the next meeting.

Commissioner Villarreal noted that was this Chair Spray's last meeting.

Chair Spray agreed. His term would end at June 30 so he presumed it was his last meeting barring something else. He was not a candidate for renomination. It has been a great run but he strongly believed in rotation and term limits. He felt it was important to move on. He added this was a great Commission and he never tired of talking about how great the Commission was.

Commissioner Villarreal thanked him for his service. He was a good mentor and she wanted to make sure that everyone knew that she appreciated Commissioner Spray.

Commissioner Bemis agreed. He had been a wonderful leader and a gentleman in all of these meetings.


Chair Spray thanked them and said he had been kept well fed. He tipped off Mr. O'Reilly and promised him he would keep his commitment to the end of his term and he did that.

Commissioner Schackel-Bordegaray also thanked him for his service, his professionalism and his style. She was sad that he was leaving but respected the rotational aspect.

I. ADJOURNMENT

This the agenda completed and no further business to come before the Commission the meeting was adjourned at 8:05 p.m.

Approved by:


Tom Spray, Chair
Michael Harris

Submitted by:


Carl G. Boaz for Carl G. Boaz, Inc.