



Agenda

CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

DATE 6/11/15 TIME 11:47am

SERVED BY Waldemar Quinto

RECEIVED BY Alicia Hartup

PLANNING COMMISSION
Thursday, July 2, 2015 - 6:00pm
City Council Chambers
City Hall 1st Floor - 200 Lincoln Avenue

- A. ROLL CALL
- B. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
- C. ELECTION OF OFFICERS
- D. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
- E. APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA
- F. APPROVAL OF MINUTES AND FINDINGS/CONCLUSIONS

MINUTES: May 21, 2015
June 4, 2015

FINDINGS/CONCLUSIONS:

Case #2015-39. 1964 Cerros Colorados Terrain Management Variance.

Case #2015-42. Wagon Road Self Storage Development Plan.

Case #2015-46. River Trail Lofts, 2180 and 2184 West Alameda Rezoning.

G. CONSENT

- 1. Case #2015-48. Plaza Pinones Final Development Plan Time Extension. Report of the Land Use Director's approval of a second one-year administrative time extension for 40 townhomes on 7.44± acres east of Fifth Street and south of St. Michael's Drive. The May 8, 2015 approval expiration would be extended to May 8, 2016. JenkinsGavin Design & Development, Inc., agents for Soñar LLC, Ken Raymond. (Zach Thomas, Case Manager)

H. OLD BUSINESS

I. NEW BUSINESS

- 1. Case #2015-54. 4250 Cerrillos Road Sign Variance, JenkinsGavin Design & Development, agent for Santa Fe Mall Property Owner LLC, request a Variance to the maximum size of sign per Subsection 14-8.10(E)(6) "Wall Signs" and 14-8.10(G) "General Requirements for Signs According to District" to allow 169 square foot wall sign where 80 square feet is the maximum. (Dan Esquibel, Case Manager)
- 2. Case #2015-55. 4250 Cerrillos Road Sign Variance, JenkinsGavin Design & Development, agent for Santa Fe Mall Property Owner LLC, request a Variance to the maximum size of sign per Subsection 14-8.10(E)(6) "Wall Signs" and 14-8.10(G) "General Requirements for Signs According to District" to allow 136 square foot wall sign where 80 square feet is the maximum. (Dan Esquibel, Case Manager)

3. **Case #2015-47, 455 St. Michaels Drive Christus St. Vincent Regional Medical Center.** WHR Architects, Inc., agent for Christus St. Vincent Regional Medical Center, request review and approval for:
- Master Plan Amendment,
 - Four variances to include:
 - Variance to the “Maximum Height of Structures” per Table 14-7.3-1: "Table of Dimensional Standards for Nonresidential Districts" to allow 49’ where 36’ is the maximum, and
 - Variance to the “Maximum Height of Structures” per Subsection 14-5.5(A)(4) "Standards" to allow 49’ where 25’ is the maximum, and
 - Variance to the maximum size of sign per Subsection 14-8.10(G)(2) for C-1 Districts to allow 80 square foot signs where 32 square feet is the maximum, and
 - Variance to the maximum height of sign per Subsection 14-8.10(G)(4) for C-1 Districts to allow a sign height of 37 and 46 feet where 15 feet is the maximum.
 - Development Plan to construct a 65,500 square foot addition on Tract A-1-3 containing 20.65± acres and Tract A-2 containing 9.29± acres,
 - Special Use Permit to permit a Hospital in a C-1 District to include the construction of a 65,500 square foot addition new inpatient bed wing, main entrance and lobby for the hospital. (Dan Esquibel, Case Manager)

J. STAFF COMMUNICATIONS

K. MATTERS FROM THE COMMISSION

L. 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

July 2, 2015

ITEM	ACTION TAKEN	PAGE(S)
A. Roll Call	Quorum Present	1
B. Pledge of Allegiance	Recited	2
C. Election of Officers	Elections held	2
D. Approval of Agenda	Approved as amended	2
E. Approval of Consent Agenda		
F. Approval of Minutes & Findings and Conclusions		
1. Minutes of May 21, 2015	Approved as amended	2-3
2. Minutes of June 4, 2015	Approved as amended	3-4
3. Findings of Fact & Conclusions of Law		
• <u>Case #2015-39</u> 1964 Cerros Colorados	Approved as submitted	4
• <u>Case #2015-42</u> Wagon Rd Self Storage	Approved as amended	4
• <u>Case #2015-46</u> River Trail Lofts	Approved as amended	4-5
G. Consent		
1. Case #2015-48. Plaza Piñones Final Development Plan Time Extension	Approved	5
H. Old Business	None	5
I. New Business		
1. <u>Case #2015-54</u> - 4250 Cerrillos Road Sign Variance - Santa Fe Mall Property	Approved	5-10
2. <u>Case #2015-55</u> - 4250 Cerrillos Road Sign Variance - Santa Fe Mall Property	Approved	5-10
3. <u>Case #2015-47</u> - 455 St. Michaels Drive Christus St. Vincent Regional Medical Center	Postponed with directions	10-45
• Master Plan Amendment		
• Variances		
• Development Plan		
• Special Use Permit		
J. Staff Communications	Discussion	45-46
K. Matters from the Commission	Discussion	46-47
L. Adjournment	Adjourned at 12:15 a.m.	47

Exhibits: 1-6

PLANNING COMMISSION
Thursday, July 2, 2015 - 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 Michael Harris on the above date at approximately 6:12 p.m. in the Council Chambers at City Hall, 200 Lincoln Avenue, Santa Fé, New Mexico.

A. ROLL CALL

Members Present

Commissioner Michael Harris, Chair
Commissioner Brian Patrick Gutierrez, Secretary
Commissioner Katharine Anne Chávez
Commissioner Justin Greene
Commissioner Vince Kadlubek
Commissioner Piper Kapin

Members Absent

Commissioner Sarah Cottrell Probst [excused]

OTHERS PRESENT:

Ms. Lisa Martínez, Planning and Land Use Department Director
Mr. Greg Smith, Current Planning Division Director and Staff Liaison
Mr. Daniel A. Esquibel, Senior Planner, Current Planning Division
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.

Chair Harris acknowledged two new Commissions have been appointed and only one was present at this meeting, Commissioner Justin Greene. The Commission welcomed him.

C. ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Commissioner Gutierrez nominated Commissioner Harris to remain as Chair. Commissioner Greene seconded the nomination and he was elected by unanimous voice vote.

Commissioner Kapin nominated Commissioner Kadlubek to be Vice-Chair. Commissioner Chávez seconded the nomination and he was elected by unanimous voice vote.

Commissioner Greene nominated Commissioner Gutierrez to be Secretary. Commissioner Kadlubek seconded the nomination and he was elected by unanimous voice vote.

Commissioner Kadlubek nominated Commissioner Greene to serve on the Long Range Planning Committee. Commissioner Gutierrez seconded the nomination and he was appointed by unanimous voice vote.

The Long Range Planning Committee is composed of Commissioner Kadlubek, Commissioner Kapin and Commissioner Greene.

Commissioner Kadlubek nominated Commissioner Gutierrez to be Chairman of the Summary Committee. Commissioner Kapin seconded the nomination and he was elected by unanimous voice vote.

Chair Harris said he had a discussion with Commissioner Cottrell Probst on Monday and she agreed to serve on the Summary Committee.

Commissioner Chávez nominated Commissioner Probst to serve on the Summary Committee. Commissioner Gutierrez seconded the nomination and she was appointed by unanimous voice vote.

Commissioner Chávez nominated Commissioner Kadlubek to serve on the Summary Committee. Commissioner Gutierrez seconded the nomination and he was appointed by unanimous voice vote.

Chair Harris said those committees will elect their own officers.

D. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Smith had no changes to the agenda.

Commissioner Kadlubek moved to approve the agenda as published. Commissioner Chávez seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

E. APPROVAL OF MINUTES AND FINDINGS/CONCLUSIONS

1. MINUTES:

a. May 21, 2015

Commissioner Kadlubek requested the following changes to the minutes:

On page 38, last paragraph, first sentence where it should say, "Commissioner Kadlubek said as a new person on the Commission, 'I am already seeing a trend of master plans or ~~master plans~~ or general plans that might be outdated...'"

On page 43, last paragraph - half way down (fifth sentence) should say, "I don't know of other parks." Two sentences later, "...where it does exist" should read, "where does it exist..."

Chair Harris requested the following changes to the minutes:

On page 11, the second paragraph says, "Mr. Goodwin said he will strike it." It should say "he will stripe it."

On page 12, 3rd paragraph, third line, should say "Chair Harris said that it will not work very well." That refers to the location of the mail boxes.

On page 15, he commented that the Commission wasn't looking at Findings for the Lost Peak case,

Mr. Shandler, countered that in the motion it says, "With all the conditions of approval set out in the staff report and with the agreement for the twelve parking spaces, and that the road be modified for continuous parking along tract 13." But the Commission also came up with an additional condition that had to do with CC&R's. Rather than staff review and approval, we said we would modify the first specific language regarding staff review of CC&R's and provided the code reference, 14-9.5 A 2 for the record.

There were no other corrections requested to the May 21, 2015 minutes.

Commissioner Greene moved to approve the minutes of May 21, 2015 as amended. Commissioner Kapin seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

b. June 4, 2015

Mr. Smith said there were no changes from staff.

Chair Harris requested the following corrections to these minutes:

On page 9 he commented that names are important. Mr. Jeff Seres is the applicant's agent for Case

#2015-42. His name is misspelled as "Sears" twelve times on pages 9-12.

On page 10, in response to testimony by Stephanie Beninato, the Chair did acknowledge her statement and agreed with her comments about the AV equipment not working. His response was not included in those minutes.

There were no other corrections requested for these minutes.

Commissioner Chávez moved to approve the minutes of the June 4, 2015 meeting as amended. Commissioner Kadlubek seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

2. FINDINGS/CONCLUSIONS:

a. Case #2015-39. 1964 Cerros Colorados Terrain Management Variance

A copy of the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law in Case #2015-39, 1964 Cerros Colorados Terrain Management Variance, is incorporated herewith to these minutes as Exhibit 1.

Commissioner Kadlubek moved to approve the Findings and Conclusions for Case #2015-39 as submitted. Commissioner Kapin seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

b. Case #2015-42. Wagon Road Self Storage Development Plan

A copy of the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law in Case #2015-42, Wagon Road Self Storage Development Plan is incorporated herewith to these minutes as Exhibit 2.

Mr. Shandler noted a correction to the draft Findings that was sent out to the Commission. It is in the conditions and as corrected, it says, the amendments of the development plan is approved as submitted, subject to the conditions in the staff report, except the following additional conditions that supersede the condition in Exhibit A from the City Water Division Engineer. Separate water metering will be required to the extent required by the water chapter in the Municipal Code. That is on page 10 of the minutes.

Commissioner Kapin moved to approve the Findings and Conclusions for Case #2015-42 as amended. Commissioner Kadlubek seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

c. Case #2015-46. River Trail Lofts, 2180 and 2184 West Alameda Rezoning to R-7 and River Trail Lofts, 2180 and 2184 West Alameda Development Plan Development Plan

A copy of the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law in Case #2015-46, River Trail Lofts, 2180 and 2184 West Alameda Rezoning to R-7 Rezoning and River Trails Lofts, 2180 and 2184 West Alameda Development Plan, is attached herewith to these minutes as Exhibit 3.

Mr. Shandler pointed out that in two places it refers to "properties along the south side of West Alameda have developed over the years as multi-family type housing rather than single family subdivisions." Upon review of the full record, the findings should be corrected by striking "rather than" and inserting "as well as."

Commissioner Greene moved to adopt the Findings and Conclusions for Case #2015-46 as amended. Commissioner Chávez seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

G. CONSENT AGENDA

1. **Case #2015-48. Plaza Piñones Final Development Plan Time Extension.** Report of the Land Use Director's approval of a second one-year administrative time extension for 40 townhomes on 7.44± acres east of Fifth Street and south of St. Michael's Drive. The May 8, 2015 approval expiration would be extended to May 8, 2016. JenkinsGavin Design & Development, Inc., agents for Soñar LLC, Ken Raymond. (Zach Thomas, Case Manager)

Commissioner Chávez moved to approve the Consent Agenda as presented. Commissioner Kadlubek seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

H. OLD BUSINESS

There was no Old Business.

I. NEW BUSINESS

1. **Case #2015-54. 4250 Cerrillos Road Sign Variance,** JenkinsGavin Design & Development, agent for Santa Fe Mall Property Owner LLC, request a Variance to the maximum size of sign per Subsection 14-8.10(E)(6) "Wall Signs" and 14-8.10(G) "General Requirements for Signs According to District" to allow 169 square foot wall sign where 80 square feet is the maximum. (Dan Esquibel, Case Manager)

A Memorandum dated June 24, 2015 for the July 2, 2015 Meeting, to the Planning Commission from Dan Esquibel, Planner Senior, Current Planning Division, in this matter and in Case #2015-55, is incorporated herewith to these minutes as Exhibit 4. Mr. Esquibel explained that there are actually two applications but one owner so his report deals with both Case #2015-54 and Case #2015-55. Issue - if the applicant addressed the variance standards.

2. **Case #2015-55. 4250 Cerrillos Road Sign Variance,** JenkinsGavin Design & Development, agent for Santa Fe Mall Property Owner LLC, request a Variance to the maximum size of sign per Subsection 14-8.10(E)(6) "Wall Signs" and 14-8.10(G) "General Requirements for Signs According

to District" to allow 136 square foot wall sign where 80 square feet is the maximum. (Dan Esquibel, Case Manager)

Mr. Esquibel presented the staff report for these cases. He explained that each case needs its own motion. Please see Exhibit 4 for specifics of this presentation.

Chair Harris thought the attachment was stapled out of order and the fifth image is what is allowed and second it what is proposed.

Mr. Esquibel briefly described the photographs and explained why he took each one. They were chosen so the Commission would have a visual reference commensurate with the rules.

Chair Harris thanked him for the helpful explanation.

Presentation by the Applicant.

Present and sworn was **Ms. Jennifer Jenkins, JenkinsGavin Design & Development, 130 Grant Avenue, Suite 101, Santa Fe**, on behalf of Santa Fé Place Mall.

Ms. Jenkins displayed slides in her presentation. She said the proposed new addition is happening on the north side of the mall where the theater space was located. She pointed out where World Market and Bed, Bath & Beyond want to locate. To the right side of Dillard's is the proposed addition for the two new retailers with a new entrance. That is the location for the two signs proposed. She then showed the elevations as they relate to the façades and zoomed in on the proposed location of the signs. This is SC-3 zoning (Planned Shopping Center) and it is a unique zone because it is the only zone for a regional mall. Santa Fé Place is the only regional mall in Santa Fe. It had movies and restaurants, was built in 1985 and has suffered from lack of redevelopment and re-investment; lack of merchandising; and lack of new tenant mix. But malls are evolving and coming back with a consolidation of retailers. She shared some examples. They usually happen through bankruptcy and acquisition. There is too much in-line space. This mall is almost 700,000 square feet and the largest building in Santa Fe. A regional mall has an important role economically not only for goods and services but it also has been the largest generator of GRT in past years. Right now it is not doing that job in that regard for several years.

The mall has new owners as of last September who believe in this mall, this market and this community and they are investing millions of dollars in redeveloping and rebranding to serve Santa Fé with more dining, entertainment and retail options.

She said this mall has been on life support and the City is fortunate that this group wants to invest here. These exterior retailers eat up some of that interior space. It is about evolution and this mall is evolving. The Sports Authority wanted to take most of Mervyn's space on the west side in 2012 and asked for a similar variance from the Planning Commission for their sign there. One of our positions regarding the variance is that the Sports Authority sign is 445 feet from the street so for wayfinding from the street, a larger sign is needed.

The location for this sign variance is for a sign on the north side of the mall is 1.7 football fields away from Rodeo Road, not to mention 20 feet below Rodeo Road. It is obvious from the imagery that an 80' sign would look ridiculous. The provisions in the code don't take a 700,000 square foot building into account. Signs should be proportionate to the building size and should be 20% of the façade instead of 1.5%.

The Sports Authority sign was granted in 2012 and by no means does it seem enormous. It is proportionate to the façade. She was present at this meeting to request two similar proportionate signs.

In the 1985 development plan that was done, there was not a signage plan. Staff recommended a signage plan, rather than asking for variances repeatedly. So they are now working on a signage plan for the mall to bring to the Planning Commission.

Right now, the retailers want to be open for Christmas so they are working quickly on building permit applications right now. So they are not in a position right now with these two tenants to wait for that signage plan. A lot of work has already been done on the interior.

Public Hearing

Chair Harris announced this is a public hearing and asked for public comment for this particular case.

There were no speakers from the public regarding these two cases. Chair Harris closed the public portion of the meeting for these two cases.

Questions by the Commission

Commissioner Kadlubek asked Mr. Esquibel how the other gigantic signs were approved for anchor stores (Dillard's, J. C. Penney, Mervyns) – also by variance or some other way.

Mr. Esquibel wasn't sure at what point they got that size sign and couldn't find out in his research. Some were part of the mall development back when it was originally adopted as a regional mall. They are there and with exception of Sports Authority, he couldn't tell the Commission. He explained that their records get destroyed after ten years. He assumed the signs that are below 80 square feet were by regular approval. Out of 16 signs on the mall, five meet the requirements and the rest exceed the 80 square feet requirement.

Commissioner Kadlubek asked if the Planning Commission had to listen to Target or Wal-Mart for them to get approved for their sign that exceeded 80 square feet, or if they fell under different criteria.

Mr. Esquibel explained that everyone who wanted to sign exceeding 80 square feet had to come to the Planning Commission or Board of Adjustment in order to obtain a variance. In the past, the variance criteria was much easier to attain. After 2012, the variance criteria change and they are more difficult to meet.

Commissioner Kapin noted in #2, the City Land Development Code allows for a wall sign to encompass 20% of a façade. She asked where the 80 square feet come in to that 20% of façade.

Mr. Esquibel all of the sign requirements in Chapter 14 have to be met. There are requirements for no more than two sizes of fonts, no more than three colors. And for wall mounted signs, it is based on the linear feet of that façade not to exceed 80 square feet. That is the way the standard is written. It applies to different types. This one is in the Cerrillos Road Highway Corridor and that has different standards where there's businesses that are not on the Cerrillos Road Highway Corridor do not. There are also different zones on that corridor. This location is in Zone 4 and others might have different standards. Each one is different, depending on location. Most of the sign regulations do limit the business to 80 square feet. In some cases, with a ground mounted sign, it could go up to 150 square feet.

Chair Harris recalled that he was probably the only Commissioner who dealt with the sign variance for Sports Authority and the issue at that time was less about the size of the lettering and more about color. The Sports Authority corporate brand is the red color. The Planning Commission at that time got beyond it. He asked if color is an issue now.

Mr. Esquibel explained that at this time, he didn't know the proposed colors for certain. Chapter 14 says if the sign's structure is an integral part of the sign, the entire area gets counted as part of sign area. And color in that case, it is part of the integral part.

Chair Harris thought the 151 square feet for the Sports Authority was just the lettering.

Chair Harris asked Ms. Jenkins for more detail including about the lettering as distinct from the background and said she knew all 24 pages of the sign ordinance.

Ms. Jenkins said for what is reflected here, the Bed, Bath and Beyond lettering is proposed to be white and the lettering for World Market is proposed to be maroon and the signs will be mounted on the stucco side of the building. Everything is proposed. The side has to be covered with either stucco or sign or metal. But everything has not been resolved yet from an architectural standpoint. .

Mr. Shandler noted that for the Sports Authority application said that the applicant anticipated a development plan to the Commission at a future date and asked if that plan had been done.

Ms. Jenkins said it has been done and they did an administrative development plan amendment but just reallocated some square footage. They had an out parcel that was entitled to so much square footage and they wanted to reallocate that around the site so they processed it administratively with staff.

Mr. Shandler asked for the Findings regarding the sign size. He asked if they are 169 square feet and 136 square feet or 169 and 151.8 square feet respectively.

Ms. Jenkins responded their calculations show that the sign is 169 square feet on Bed Bath and Beyond and 151.8 square feet on Cost Plus World Market. Then she apologized and said Mr. Esquibel indicated they may have miscalculated. So it is 136 square feet on Cost Plus World Market.

Commissioner Kapin asked about how many more anchor businesses there would be anticipated.

Ms. Jenkins said that Sears, Dillard's, Penney's and these two new ones are junior anchors. They already have a restaurant pad site going up. It is a brew pub and they are talking to other restaurants as well. There is possibility of wholesale wine business and she apologized that she is limited in what she can share. On the south there is potentially a large fitness institution and they don't need as much visibility.

Commissioner Kapin asked what the difference is between an anchor and a junior anchor and if the request for a sign would be different.

Ms. Jenkins agreed. She explained that they are not expecting any other anchors at this time. If Sears closed down and another big department store came, they would address a sign of that same magnitude.

She added that the code says if a building has more than one store, each one is allowed one 80 square feet. She asked if the Commission could imagine this mall with 80 square feet signs outside on each one of the stores. The signage plan will address what each level is entitled to and lay it out with dimensional standards, etc. Those with no exterior entrance would not have an outdoor sign.

Mr. Esquibel commented regarding the difference from 151.8 to 136 square feet, that they were calculating more space than they would actually have on that façade. So that is how the 136 was decided.

Commissioner Greene asked Ms. Jenkins if there would be an effort for outdoor patios and the restaurants in the plan.

Ms. Jenkins agreed. There will be landscaping improvements and outdoor seating and an opportunity on the south side as well.

Commissioner Greene asked if that plan will come before the Commission.

Ms. Jenkins explained that it is not building permit stuff but just moving things around but if they wanted to do something outside of that, it will come forward here. She said they could also provide progress reports to the Planning Commission as an informational update.

Mr. Esquibel apologized and corrected his earlier statement that 151.8 is the correct size for World Market. It was not 136 after they recalculated the space.

Commissioner Gutierrez asked Ms. Jenkins if with the redevelopment, there is an intent to put signs at the entrances.

Ms. Jenkins said they are there now and will just be redesigned a little. They will also have one low to the ground and some interior directional sign. They will all be freshened up.

Commissioner Gutierrez asked if those signs would list the tenants.

Ms. Jenkins said they will just list the anchors and junior anchors.

Commissioner Kadlubek asked about the process of the sign plan approval.

Mr. Esquibel said currently, as Chapter 14 identified signs in the SC-3 District, the sign plan would have to be brought here for approval, especially for signs that exceed the ordinance and it might include an ordinance change request if it requires variances to achieve those goals.

Commissioner Kadlubek asked how items get on the consent agenda.

Mr. Smith said the only type that is placed on consent are time extensions. There is not a provision for any other type.

Action of the Commission

Commissioner Kadlubek moved in Case #2015-54 at 4250 Cerrillos Road, to approve a Sign Variance to allow a 169 square foot wall sign for Bed, Bath, and Beyond where 80 square feet is the maximum. Commissioner Kapin seconded the motion.

Commissioner Gutierrez asked if that motion would be subject to getting building permit.

Mr. Smith clarified that the permit is a code requirement whether stated or not in a motion.

The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

Commissioner Kadlubek moved in Case #2015-55 at 4250 Cerrillos Road, to approve a Sign Variance to allow a 151.8 square foot wall sign for Cost Plus World Market where 80 square feet is the maximum. Commissioner Greene seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

3. **Case #2015-47. 455 St. Michaels Drive Christus St. Vincent Regional Medical Center.** WHR architects, Inc., agent for Christus St. Vincent Regional Medical Center, request review and approval for:
 - a. Master Plan Amendment,
 - b. Four variances to include:
 - Variance to the "Maximum Height of Structures" per Table 14-7.3-1: "Table of Dimensional Standards for Nonresidential districts" to allow 49' where 36' is the maximum, and
 - Variance to the "maximum Height of Structures" per Subsection 14-5.5(A)(4) Standards" to allow 49' where 25' is the maximum, and
 - Variance to the maximum size of sign per Subsection 14-8.10(G)(2) for C-1 Districts to allow 80 square feet signs where 32 square feet is the maximum.
 - Variance to the maximum height of sign per Subsection 14-8.1-0(G)(4) for C-1 Districts to allow a sign height of 37 and 46 feet where 15 feet is the maximum.
 - c. Development Plan to construct a 65,500 square foot addition on Tract A-1-3 containing 20.65± acres and Tract A-2 containing 9.29± acres,

- d. Special Use Permit to permit a Hospital in a C-1 District to include the construction of a 65,500 square foot addition new inpatient bed wing, main entrance and lobby for the hospital. (Dan Esquibel, Case Manager)

A Memorandum dated June 25, 2015 for the July 2, 2015 Planning Commission meeting from Daniel Esquibel, Planner Senior, Current Planning Division, in this matter, is incorporated herewith to these minutes as Exhibit 5.

Chair Harris asked why these matters were all bundled into one case. He recalled that last time with Las Soleras case, there was General Plan amendment, a Master Plan amendment, and a subdivision plat and the Commission considered them as separate cases.

Mr. Smith agreed and said the caption identified four distinct cases and they are identified as separate action items: the Master Plan, the four variances, the Development Plan and the Special Use Permit. The variances are distributed in an unusual way between the Master Plan and the Development Plan, so staff is trying how best to characterize it. They could have chosen to put more than four action items, each with its own action numbers but it didn't seem to be a reasonable way to consider it.

Chair Harris heard that and read it but he was confused about why they are doing that this way. It hasn't been done this way in his four years as a Commissioner.

Mr. Shandler stated that there is not a legal impediment to how it is captioned.

Chair Harris asked if the Commission needed to make four separate motions.

Mr. Shandler said he didn't know how staff intends to proceed on it.

Commissioner Kadlubek asked if a motion would say the case number and then a bullet point number or letter.

Mr. Esquibel thought that would work to identify the different modules in the case and that would adequately distinguish it in the minutes.

Mr. Smith said Mr. Esquibel will get into more detail but the Land Use Department staff has a change in the recommendation per the Legal Department and on page 2 and 3 in the Staff Report. There is a matrix under the application summary with four categories there. The first is Master Plan Amendment and it states under the type of decision a recommendation to the Governing Body. Staff believes that would be the appropriate motion by the Commission.

The second category is Variances. The Attorney Staff has advised the Land Use Department Staff that there was a different interpretation of appropriate action on variances. Their advice was that it is more appropriate to say the Planning Commission action is final on variances for that motion.

The Third category is the Development Plan and he was not certain of the Attorney's recommendation

but he believed the Planning Commission action is final.

The fourth category is Special Use Permit and the motion is for final action by the Planning Commission.

Chair Harris proposed to use (1) for the Master Plan amendment, (2) for the Variances, (3) for the Development Plan and (4) for the Special Use Permit sections.

Mr. Shandler agreed that would be acceptable.

Mr. Smith said there has been some evolution in the review but the Land Use Department Staff does concur with that advice from the Attorney.

Mr. Esquibel suggested since there are actually two types of variances, one for signs and the other for building heights, there would need to be 2-a and 2-b within those parentheses to consider for each type.

Secondly, for the Development Plan, Special Use Permit and Variances, all of these are contingent upon the Master Plan approval by the Governing Body so the final decisions will all be subject to that approval.

Chair Harris thanked him and said there is a, b, c, d for the four separate variances.

Staff Presentation.

Mr. Esquibel read from his staff report, reading the caption first. This is a special exception as required from 2012 ordinance. Page 2 has the recommendations which he read. The recommendations are subject to the conditions in Staff Exhibit A. He recognized the other members of the Development Review Team: Ms. RB Zaxus is here for drainage and lighting issues, Mr. John Romero is here on traffic analysis, the Fire Marshal on fire protection issues and Mr. Noah Berke on landscaping issues.

Applicant's Presentation

Ms. Jennifer Jenkins (previously sworn) set up the presentation and turned to the Christus St. Vincent (CSV) COO.

Present and sworn was **Mr. Jason Adams, 1248 Crus Blanca** who introduced himself as the Chief Operations Officer of Christus St. Vincent Regional Medical Center. He introduced his project team, Mr. Marty Hughes, Chief Architect from WHR, Dave Aube and Doug Magouski, from Design Group in Albuquerque, and Ms. Penny Bush, Project Manager from Dallas as well as Ms. Jenkins.

Mr. Adams said that health care has evolved over the last 30 years. This facility built in 1977 with a combination of private and semi-private rooms. With different levels of care, ranging from intensive care

beds, intermediate care beds, labor and delivery and medical surgical beds. They are all different levels of care and, historically in 1977, most hospitals were built with semi-private med-surg beds. What that means is that you have a combination of some people having private rooms and other people sharing a room. This addition of 65,000 sq. ft. near the current main entrance of the hospital, will add 36 beds (rooms) to the hospital on the second story. It is important to add that on the second story because they will create a two-story connector between the old hospital and the new addition that will connect on the first floor a new lobby for better wayfinding. For the last 30 years, the hospital has had an identity crisis with the lobby being on the lower floor and an upper lobby. This project gives us the opportunity to meet the requirements and connecting the two buildings to finally satisfy that issue and create one identifiable primary lobby. And on the second floor it will allow them to have the new med-surg beds connect with the current med surg beds and renovate the floors. Once completed with the new wing, they were renovate all the current rooms (four units) to become all private rooms. This has been the current trend in health care for the past 25 to 30 years. Also the studies including this one from Dr. Roger Ulrich at Texas A&M University, that demonstrate that private rooms will reduce infection rates in hospitals and also lower stress for patients. It will provide higher quality of care. Roommates are a source of stress 85 to 90% of the time. In addition it provides increased staff and patient safety when they do transfers. Every time a patient is moved there is potential risk for a fall. So having private rooms will reduce injuries.

Mr. Adams displayed the drawing showing a typical room of modern design in the hospital. In the corner is a staff sink for hand washing at the entrance. That reduces infections or cross contaminations. Couches allow a family member to stay around the clock with family member patient. Rooms will be 260 square feet or about 20 square feet bigger than current semi-private rooms. They will comply with national standards. It will significantly increase patient satisfaction.

Ms. Jenkins addressed the various applications in this case.

1. Master Plan Amendment

Ms. Jenkins said they were first requesting an amendment to the Master Plan. The C-1 zoning requires a hospital to seek a special use permit, a development plan, and variance on signage and height.

As background, the Hospital was constructed in 1977 on this property. In 1985, the property was rezoned to C-1. C-1 is traditionally usually office zoning. A lot of the area along St. Michael's Drive and St. Francis Drive have high concentrations of office and it is C-1 zoning. That is the zoning of the 48 acre campus. The Master Plan commensurate with that zoning approval in 1985 laid out various development standards and future improvements. The Master Plan was amended by the City Council in 2006. They made adjustments to future improvements and additional buildings they envisioned for the future. There were also some conditions of approval that would be triggered by future developments. This is the proverbial future improvement.

She showed the site plan that shows the new addition and a critical element of the application is that it has to connect with existing the med/surg unit for staff proximity on the second floor. They can't have ramps or stairways for patient and staff safety. In the area being connected is radiology, laboratory and surgery are proximate. The hospital spent time analyzing the best location for the new addition. This one is

the best and accomplishes several things. It minimizes distance. The connection to existing building gave great opportunity for a new main entry lobby that will greatly improve wayfinding. It will benefit more vehicles on St. Michael's as opposed to the entry on Hospital Drive. This was not contemplated in the 2006 Master Plan so this is an amendment. Also on that 2006 Master Plan there was a circular drive around the campus and that is not needed so it will be removed.

The traffic analysis called for changed access and removing the parking area on the east where the residential neighborhood area is located.

Several other buildings were proposed in 2006 that are no longer in long term plans. With this addition and removal of those buildings, it is actually a net reduction of 3000 square feet for the campus.

. The storage building on tract D (east side) was proposed first at 5,000k square feet for maintenance vehicles and the maximum now is potentially 10,000 in the plan but probably will be less.

Also they are adjusting area boundaries created in the 1985 Master Plan to incorporate the new addition in the proper area.

Ms. Jenkins displayed a perspective of the brand new entry and below that, a view from St. Michael's of the new wing and new entry on west side. She also showed a view of new entrance and waiting area and a new meditation space that looks out on a garden. At very east end is another waiting area on the second floor for families to be closer to the patients.

She explained the various areas of the Master Plan that have different standards. With the addition attached to the existing building, they had to include it in Area 1 and swapped the 3,200 square feet space between Area 1 and Area 2. The areas are the same size but adjusted for the new addition.

2. Height Variance

Regarding height, she explained that 65' is the maximum height in the original Master Plan for Area 1 but they are not proposing that height now. Part of the property is also in the South Central Highway Corridor. It is an overlay that has different standards for the lower portion of St. Michael's Drive and Old Pecos Trail with a lower height limit of 25'. The entire campus is zoned C-1 which is usually a 36' height limit but is further limited by the highway corridor. So they are asking for height variances from the C1 height limit and also from the highway corridor height limit only for new addition that is outside of area 1. The portion that is in Area 1 is not subject to the variance requests. They are asking for a height of 41' to allow for various appurtenances. To the top of roof deck is only 28'. That is a variance of 5' over the 36' of C-1 and 16' over the highway corridor limit.

She reiterated that they are proposing a 2-story building to accomplish connectivity for patient and staffing that has to connect with the existing patient area. They considered putting it on the north but that is much closer to residential neighbors so for that and longer traveling distance for staff and visitors to that location. So for that and other reasons, this is the absolute best option.

3. Signage Variance

Ms. Jenkins said they are also asking for signage variances. The 1985 Master Plan contemplated a 500,000 square foot regional hospital has unique signage needs that might not be contemplated in the Code and probably would need a study at some point to understand what signage needs to make sure there is adequate wayfinding for the public.

In the C-1 zones, the signs are limited to 32 square feet maximum and CSV is asking for one sign of 90 square feet and one sign of 16 square feet.

Two existing 40 square feet signs would be removed and replaced with one 80 square feet sign and one more of 16 square feet. The 80 square foot sign would be placed on the stone wall of the new wing to be visible from St. Michael's to draw visitors into the hospital from St. Michael's Drive so they can avoid going down Hospital Drive where the Emergency entrance is located. The sign on the stone wall is really not that big compared with the building.

She pointed out how people take Hospital Drive and it leads to ER. St. Michael's is the main entry point. They are constructing a new drive from Hospital Drive to go to the front entry. In multiple meetings with neighbors, they discussed the new entry way which will greatly reduce confusion.

The traffic impact analysis was reviewed by John Romero. The recommendations out of it and working with Mr. Romero, are to provide a financial contribution to the roundabout /light intersection at San Mateo and Galisteo. 17.5% of traffic is attributed to the hospital. So whichever costs more (signal or roundabout), CSV will write a check for about \$85,000 to be held in escrow with the City for that traffic improvement.

She referred to the Traffic memo with the proposed "clarifications" to the Recommended Action which they have discussed with Mr. Romero are as follows:

1. The money given to the City are ear-marked specifically for improvements at that intersection.
2. If the City doesn't spend that money, SCV would get it back after 5 years. She said that is standard practice in the City. There are many others like it in Santa Fe for fair share. The City cannot sit on the money indefinitely and not spend it. For a non-profit regional hospital, \$85,000 is a lot of money.
3. The Master Plan shows a potential future addition to the medical/dental building on the campus and CSV might be required to give an added donation for that intersection. Mr. Romero is comfortable with that change.

The Hospital Drive entrance, based on the analysis, shows that traffic has decreased since 2006 and was at one time to be an entrance only but now will be changed to only right in/right out and no left turn there so a median will prevent that.

Ms. Jenkins stated that with this application, all of the 2006 Master Plan conditions are being satisfied.

Ms. Jenkins said they had many meeting with neighbors to north and those to the east. In the dozen meetings, also met with individual neighbors to resolve their concerns. They had the formal ENN followed by another last week to address all concerns.

As a result, some additional concerns are also being addressed. There is a 15' landscape buffer on the northeast side that has been neglected and they are reviving that existing landscaping. They are making lighting modifications - pole heights will be lowered and some bulbs will have less brightness. Generator noise is being addressed. The backup generator is a federal mandate. It is on east side and it has to be tested weekly and a power surge can also kick it on. They have been exceeding code's maximum noise so CSV will either enclose it in the building or relocate it to the central plant to bring it into compliance.

Open areas on east side had been used by staff for smoke breaks and now the whole campus is non-smoking. So they have beefed up security and neighbors have been given a direct line to security to report violations.

Lastly, CSV is providing an email tree for neighbors to report hospital and construction issues back and forth with the hospital.

CSV will have an annual neighborhood meeting with Hospital administration to deal with issues.

She showed the parking islands and water retention areas on the north parking lot and explained the existing nature trail improvements on the south side, wrapping around to east side up to the landscape buffer.

There will be accessible routes to and from the neighborhood at several locations and to the bus stops on Hospital Drive. It will all be ADA accessible. And all lighting will comply with the ordinance so there will be no light pollution.

Ms. Jenkins concluded her presentation and requested right of rebuttal after the public hearing.

Public Hearing

Chair Harris asked members of the public to line up to be sworn en masse. They were sworn.

Mr. Lawrence Barty, 202 West Lupita Road said he was representing the San Mateo Neighborhood Association and the Task Force of that Association who were are immediately affected by and are immediately adjacent to the Hospital, specifically, West Lupita Road residences, Camino Amado and the south end of Don Gaspar.

He said, "We support the hospital's efforts to modernize and upgrade its facilities. That's not why we are here because we know that's important to the entire community. But some of our neighbors have issues with the design and height of the proposed St. Mike addition - not all, but many do. We address this in the formal reply that is in your packet. [The reply is attached to these minutes as Exhibit 6.]

"I am going to focus on four issues that are particularly important to us. In Master Plans dating back to 1985, the hospital, which was then Sisters of Charity and then another entity, agreed to put in the buffer zone. The buffer zone is important to us, to those of us who live along the edge because it provides visual screening and, to some degree, quieting of hospital activity. That buffer zone was never put in. I gave you a handout and a ring binder. If you look at page 9, you will see a picture of what it looks like today. It is kind of a vacant road there. Nothing has happened over the years.

"We met, as Jennifer said, with the Hospital ten days ago and it was a very positive meeting. I think a lot of things are moving in the right direction toward resolution and improvement. Mr. Adams said that the buffer is part of the budget for this new addition and I take him at his word. But because of the 30 year history of this, we are looking for further assurance if a new CEO comes in or if a new entity buys the Hospital before this is done for if there are budget changes, that this buffer zone be there. We would like Planning Commission to make it a requirement that it be a condition of granting the Special Use Permit. It's not because we don't trust the word. It's just because we have this history.

"The second issue that we've got concerns traffic flow between the visitor and patient parking lot. People come in. (He pointed out the location.)

"In that lot as it presently stands, people come in either from two ways. One, from St. Michael's Drive at the store entrance and also from Hospital Drive. If you stand at that intersection for any length of time, you see that most people come in from the City from the west, come up to the intersection at Hospital Drive and St. Mike's and they see the hospital and they see a sign that says hospital. In smaller letters it does say emergency room. And the bulk of them turn on Hospital Drive and then turned into that parking lot. It's just a natural thing. And then that's where they leave. There is an exit onto St. Michaels' Drive but it's hard to see, it's hard to find. But I think its common nature when coming in an entrance, to turn around when you get ready to leave and go out the same way. What the hospital and the traffic engineer are now proposing, contrary to the 2006 Master Plan which said that this entrance would be an entrance only and never became an entrance only but has remained an open exit, is to make that a right out only. Now I understand what the purpose of that is to keep people from turning left right there at that intersection because it is dangerous and all. The consequence of making that a right only is that most of the traffic that is leaving that parking lot is going to go out and go right up Hospital Drive thrust right into what is already a very congested neighborhood. They are going to go to the top and they are going to turn right onto Lupita, which is a dirt road or they are going to cut across and be up on Galisteo at that intersection with San Mateo that Jennifer was talking about, which is where Martinez Elementary School is where people are walking dogs, people walking children,. I understand there is a traffic study and that are details that say, yes, this ought to be done. But what they are doing is dumping a bunch more traffic into our neighborhood which is not a through neighborhood by any means.

"It seems to me and the rest of us, that if instead, we fulfill the 2006 Master Plan and turn that into an entrance only, people will come in and can be directed by hospital signage so whenever they get ready to leave, they will come out on St. Michael's and go wherever they need to go without becoming embroiled in the neighborhood where someone will get lost. They are always asking for directions because they are on a dirt road and cannot figure out where they are. It makes no sense to me and my group that it become a

right only exit onto Hospital Drive.

The third issue that I want to address is that of the construction activity. If you grant the hospital's request it will be done on the south end. They have a lot of vacant space to the north. And they have already stored some materials for various projects and things. We are concerned that there will be construction activity on the north side of the campus. And it generally starts at the crack of dawn and there will be trucks and deliveries conceivably. We would like to see the hospital limit the activities on the north side to reasonable hours, 8-5, Monday through Friday so that we have a chance to enjoy our yards, to enjoy our family. I don't think it is unreasonable restriction on what I think will be a relatively low level of activity on the north end. You can help us protect our property that way.

Finally, I need to address the staff report. The staff report suggests on page 9 that the hospital could build this addition in a different part of area 1 and not need the height variances that they were asking for. The only space in area 1 that is available is at that north end. This would be a building that, at most, would be several dozen yards from some of the residences. Apart from the construction mayhem of two years and building that high and that close with the additional activity that goes on around it, the values of the homes along that edge will plummet. And if the difference here is on a commercial corridor - St. Mike's - the building is somewhat higher than the code technically allows versus an essential disruption of several dozen homes along that edge. If it comes down to that choice, we would like to see the Hospital redesign it lower. I don't know if that is possible. If it comes to that choice, we would not stand in the way of a height variance.

"I also gave you a letter separately from a neighbor, Barbara Chatterly, who raised issues on design and could not be here tonight. She had several questions about design and the purpose. I hope you will read that and take that into account. Those are her views and solely her views."

Ms. Mary Schruben, 2119 Rancho Siringo Road who had a couple of questions. "Could you explore with applicant, what would be the condition of the highway height regulation of 25' for the highway corridor if St. Michael's Drive loses its highway designation under the 'ReMike' program where they are looking to make it a two-lane street. I know the two-lane street would not extend that far east but I wondered whether you have given consideration to the removal of that restriction because of the highway corridor.

"Secondly, I didn't understand about the raised median to be constructed at the south entrance, which I believe is on St. Michael's Drive and whether or not that means it would be closed to vehicles driving east and they would not be able to turn left there. If you could explain that, I would like to understand it a little better.

Thirdly - about the smokers. This is endemic all over Santa Fe. What does your security plan say about dealing with visitors and patients who are smoking outside? I'm also unclear about where the entrance to the cancer center has moved or if it has moved exactly. Could you show that again please?

Regarding the signage, will you be removing the street signs existing at the corner of Hospital at St. Mike's and the south entrance at St. Mike's completely or just the building mounted signs and whether or not there will be a street sign indicating where the emergency entrance is, because that is not clear now.

Pardon me for saying this but I believe that the overhang is ugly and doesn't fit here in Santa Fé. I would like to see that we designed. It doesn't fit with the character of Santa Fe at all.

Lastly, I'm all in favor of the buffer for the neighborhood that was supposed to have been done years ago, hasn't been done, and has been maintained. However, I would caution you that the Municipal Tree Board has come out with a new list of trees that are approved for our drought conditions and new watering standards and I'd like for you to consider those carefully because it is quite a large buffer and it's going to be a significant one for the neighborhood and for the hospital. And we want to see it thrive so be sure that you put that in your planning.

Also the change the applicant has made to include all of the Master Plan, development plan, variances and special use permit under one case is confusing to people who have monitored cases for a long time and will make this case difficult to follow the tracking of all that stuff. I encourage staff and Commission to adhere to the previously acceptable numbering system.

Ms. Gail Rappaport, 216 W Lupita Road said she is the house right behind Physicians' Plaza, facing the dumpster and the generator.

She said, "I realize the issue this evening is the proposed addition to the actual hospital for increased patient bed space. However, as a 36 year homeowner on Lupita Road, directly adjacent to the hospital campus, I was to provide a bit of history and a few comments.

"I spoke at a City Council meeting on February 11, 2004. Actually, I spoke in favor of the proposal to build Physicians' Plaza. I was asked to do so at the request of the developers and Rick Crabtree, the now discredited former CEO of the hospital. And at that time, my comments related to my support for the need of a state of the art hospital campus to meet the growing needs of this community. I was thanked profusely in the newspaper and by Alex Valdez, then CEO, and others. And they even sent me some flowers which was somewhat insulting because they wouldn't do that for a man. But they were trying. Unfortunately, I now consider my support a mistake from a number of reasons. It should be noted that it was St. Vincent's hospital that was the force behind building Physician's Plaza. They were the folks who spoke of it in February. Although the building is on their campus and should be part of their Master Plan, it seems Christus St. Vincent's now wants to distance themselves from any responsibility for that building and their ongoing problems.

The hospital should obviously be responsible for all setbacks. There are setback issues and the parking so close to the fence is the hospital's problem. And, of course, the landscaping issue that has been addressed. The problems with Physicians' Plaza continue to be the placement of the dumpster and the garbage pickup and obviously the generator.

I have had intermittent success in working with the property manager. An example is lighting that building all night. They have stopped that.

Currently there has been some discussion with the manager of that property. Recently they put in a