



Agenda

Long Range Planning Sub-Committee (LRPC)

**Wednesday, June 1, 2016
11:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.
Round House Meeting Room
City of Santa Fe Rail District Offices**

- 1. CALL TO ORDER**
- 2. MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE**
- 3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**
- 4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: April 27, 2016 meeting**
- 5. DISCUSSION ITEMS:**
 - 1. City of Santa Fe General Plan 1999: overview & analysis**
- 6. MATTERS FROM THE STAFF**
- 7. MATTERS FROM THE COMMITTEE**
- 8. MATTERS FROM THE PUBLIC**
- 9. NEXT MEETING DATE: Wednesday, July 6, 2016**
- 10. ADJOURN**

An interpreter for the hearing impaired is available through the City Clerk's Office (955-6521) upon 5 days notice. For questions regarding this agenda, please contact the Long Range Planning Division at 955-6609.

Long Range Planning Sub-committee meeting notes from April 27, 2016

Members in attendance: Kim Shanahan (Chair), Justin Greene, Vince Kadlubek, Piper Kapin, Michael Maremont

Members Absent: None

Staff in Attendance: Reed Liming, Richard Macpherson

Visitors in Attendance: (All are members of the River Corridor Plan Working Group) Gayla Bechtol, Jim Gray, Jeff Harbour, Rick Martinez, Hilario Romero, Pancho Sobien, Carol Thomas. (Planning Commissioner Greene was also a member of the Working Group).

The meeting was called to order by the Chair at approximately 11:05 a.m. and all LRPC members were present.

The Chair recognized the Working Group Members and allowed each member to provide a self-introduction.

Richard Macpherson began his presentation by providing background on the process including the fact that the Working Group had met weekly for nearly six months and started by setting goals for the plan and then discussing, meeting by meeting, the existing conditions in the Planning Area.

Richard Macpherson then presented an overview of the draft plan in front of three presentation boards showing:

- The Goals of the Plan (p. 18 in the Plan)
- Future Land Use & Recommended Zoning Map (p. 31 in the Plan)
- Summary of the Proposed Overlay Zoning District (p. 37 in the Plan)

Minimum frontage of 250 feet mentioned for new subdivisions on West Alameda St. in plan draft.

Street improvements for West Alameda St. discussed, and when or if they might happen.

Transit issues in the plan area discussed and the need for better bus, bike and pedestrian routes. Piper said north side of West Alameda could be better for sidewalks. Kim talked about the right-of-way along West Alameda St.

Rick Martinez spoke about neighborhood connections to the river.

Jim Gray said working group was not trying to design West Alameda St.

Justin said no budget in CIP funds at present for West Alameda.

Michael asked about historic homes and if there was a survey, etc. Reed said plan does not address to that detail, but that historic survey would be appropriate, especially along Agua Fria.

Reed stated that west half of Plan area was part of the Phase 2 annexation.

Piper asked what the zoning of the Commons is. Reed said it is R-5.

Piper asked if there is a map showing developed and undeveloped parcels map available. Piper asked about parcels that could be developed potentially. (Reed said that the map on page 11 in the plan shows vacant/developable properties.)

Vince asked about assumptions made in the plan draft.

Vince asked about the need for rental units, the need for urban infill, infill close to transportation, and how infill is key to Santa Fe's future.

Kim asked about zone changes recommended in the plan draft.

Jeff Harbour spoke about traffic issues and the traffic congestion on Agua Fria Street.

Kim asked about the down zoning recommendation in the plan.

Gayla Bechtol said the working group honored what was in the plan area. Gayla spoke about how many extra housing units could go in this area. (370 added dwellings were projected based on the plan).

Piper spoke about having private property rights taken away with proposed down-zonings proposed..

Questions regarding the Mixed Use zoning district and what it allows and that changes are needed.

Vince would like to see some information about how the plan address future needs of the city.

Piper asked how zoning recommendations came about, regarding the mixed-area. (Reed reviewed what staff recommended for each of the four sub-areas and that staff recommended up to 12 units per acre in Mixed Area, but that the working group wanted 7 units per acre (in the Plan).

Jeff Harbour said he thought 21 units per acre was too high for the former Blue Buffalo site. He said present owners probably want more density than the plan recommendations.

Kim spoke about individual property rights of land owners.

Justin spoke about R-1 zoning and how it didn't make sense for the plan area. He also spoke about how zoning recommendations came about.

Rick Martinez spoke about the Homewise project using mixed use zoning.

Justin said residential density of 12 units per acre is probably ideal for some parts of the plan area.

Kim asked about how down zoning recommendations came about. Reed said that there were many discussions with the working group regarding zoning in the various areas.

Rick Martinez said Juanita St. has been down zoned.

Reed mentioned that the Historic District overlay may be another example of down zoning in the city. While Don Gaspar historic area is zoned R21 (high density), it may not be possible to get that density with overlay rules.

Piper thanked the working group for all their hard work.

Piper asked for a city view on this – a city perspective and what was intent of resolution.

Reed mentioned that the Working Group allowed staff to make Future Land Use Map and zoning recommendations for each sub-area and then working group accepted those or came up with their own recommendations (in the Plan).

Piper asked if John Romero can address traffic issues in the plan area.

Question regarding how new housing units would affect traffic issues. (Reed mentioned that growth/traffic impacts were shown on pages 34 & 35 in the Plan.)

Request to have Alexandra Ladd give a presentation on housing units and her view.

Hilario Romero spoke about traffic congestion and problems with bottle-neck on Agua Fria Street. This plan was much needed planning for this area. Urban sprawl mentioned as problem with too much development.

Pancho Sobien talked about water availability in the plan area.

Kim asked about the 5000 sq. ft. recommendation (in proposed Overlay Zoning District) for building and if "total square feet" was the true intention, or whether it was meant to refer to maximum size of building "foot print" of any non-residential building.

Questions regarding the Organic area, road access & future possible roads, etc.

Piper wanted to know whether, in fact, Paseo de la Conquistadora was insufficient to be the only access for future development on vacant properties in the Organic Area.

Questions and discussion about development, in the Organic area. Staff spoke about limited access and no access to certain lots.

Planning Commissioners requested that staff members John Romero, Alexandra Ladd and Stan Holland make presentations at either a commission study session or public hearing.

Vince requested clarification of the 5000 square foot building footprint.

Vince would like staff to address how plan reflects all the General Plan goals –specifically affordable housing, economic diversity, jobs and urban form.

Piper would like a comparison how current zoning and what is recommended. Piper would like a housing comparison.

Reed said other city staff members have been part of plan process, through presentations at various Working Group meetings and that those staff members have been provided the draft plan.

Piper made a formal request to have an official city stenographer at these LRPC meetings.

Vince complimented the working group and said he likes about 80% of the plan and it was a great effort.

There was discussion that the Planning Commission would now hear the Plan, either in study session or public hearing. When a date for either is determined by P.C. Chair and Land Use Department staff, all attendees would be notified.

Staff was asked to:

1. Compare amount of additional housing allowed by current zoning vs. the Plan.
2. Compare current zoning regulations (i.e. height, setback, etc.) with those proposed in Zoning Overlay District.
3. How did the Working Group address three of the General Plan themes (i.e. *Urban Form, Economic Diversity & Affordable Housing*).

Next LRPC meeting will be Wednesday, June 1, 2016.

Notes by: Richard Macpherson _____ Date: _____

Approved by: Kim Shanahan, Chair _____ Date: _____

Overview of the City's General Plan

The City of Santa Fe first adopted a city plan over 100 years ago... "Report of the Santa Fe City Planning Board" December 3, 1912... and then adopted city-wide land use plans in 1947, 1962, 1973, 1983 and 1999). Most cities adopt plans that provide guidance for the future planning and physical development of the city.

New Mexico State law allows for "Master Plans" (NMSA 3-19-9) that address the physical layout of the community; state law provides flexibility in what is covered in the plan. The city's current General Plan was adopted, and is amended, by resolution. Amendments tend to be almost exclusively to the Future Land Use Map.

Long Range Planning staff provides the following critique of the "pros" and "cons" of the city's current plan adopted in 1999:

Pros

- Provides great detail on many different topics;
- Provides a detailed (parcel level) Future Land Use Map to help guide new development;
- Provides detailed policies used by Land Use staff in reviewing new developments and subdivisions.

Cons

- Too Much Time & Money (City spent \$500,000 and 5 years);
- Plan was too long & detailed (over 300 pages & 600 policies);
- Future Land Use Map competes with the zoning map in detail, creating confusion.
- Plan tried to cover too many topics (keep it to **land use, urban design, transportation**);
- Plan is confusing by seeming to compete with Chapter XIV in its detail;
- Plan format is outdated (too much text, no color, minimal graphics).
- Plan is not "public-friendly" in length and layout of document.

Update

- Focus update on Land Use, Urban Design & Transportation
- Time & Money – City staff and technology can update the plan for much less time and money...or, pay for consultant services to create plan.
- Length of Plan – An updated Plan could be much leaner & more effective with greater use of graphics;
- More Focused - plan should focus on city's physical development;
- Better graphics and color! (Current Plan is not in color)
- Does not need to describe each city department and it's goals or plans.

General Plan Themes – There are 14 “themes” or overarching goals of the current General Plan: (themes were not prioritized in the Plan)

- 1. Affordable Housing** – Actively participate in the creation of affordable housing.
- 2. Quality of Life** – Enhance the quality of life of the community and ensure the availability of community services for residents.
- 3. Transportation Alternatives** – Reduce automobile dependence and dominance.
- 4. Economic Diversity** – Develop and implement a comprehensive strategy to increase job opportunities, diversify the economy, and promote arts and small businesses.
- 5. Sustainable Growth** – Ensure that development is sustainable and that growth, conservation, redevelopment, and natural resource protection are balanced.
- 6. Regional Perspective** – maintain a regional growth perspective and work with other private and governmental entities towards that goal.
- 7. Water** – Undertake comprehensive efforts to conserve water and ensure adequate supplies with growth.
- 8. Character** – Maintain and respect Santa Fe’s unique personality, sense of place, and character.
- 9. Urban Form** – Promote a compact urban form and encourage sensitive/compatible infill development.
- 10. Community-Oriented Downtown** – Put community activities back into downtown.
- 11. Community-Oriented Development** – Orient new development to the community; foster public life, vitality and community spirit.
- 12. Mixed Use** – Provide a mix of land uses in all areas of the city.
- 13. Review Process** – Streamline the planning and development review process.
- 14. Implementation** – Ensure consistency between the General Plan, implementing ordinances(including zoning and impact fees) and the Capital Improvements Program (CIP).

How Is the General Plan Amended?

General Plan Amendments go through the Land Use Department as resolutions, often in tandem with a re-zoning request; first to the Planning Commission, then to the City Council.

Nearly all General Plan Amendments are from landowners wanting to change the Future Land Use Map, regardless of the size of the area. Some General Plan Amendments have been for individual lots of less than an acre and the largest amendment, initiated by city staff, was inclusion of the Southwest Santa Fe Community Area Master Plan (2009).

Successes Achieving General Plan Themes

1. Affordable Housing:

- Tierra Contenta, city-initiated master plan, begun in 1995, has required “affordable housing” component...As of 2016 1,348 affordable housing units have been built in Tierra Contenta (427 rental and 928 for-sale units), more than 50% of the 2,555 total housing units built in Tierra Contenta.
- City-Wide, during the past 10 years (2006-2015), the city has permitted a total 3,294 housing units of which 848 units, 26% have qualified as “affordable” units. (Santa Fe Trends 2016)

2. Water:

- Annual water demand has dropped 35% over the past 20 years (**1995, 12,700 af; 2015, 8,200 af**), while population grew an estimated **18%** (Santa Fe Trends 2016).
- The city’s Water Off-Set program requiring water rights to be purchased by the developer and transferred to the city for larger developments and water conservation off-sets in smaller developments has been important.
- The construction of the Buckman Direct Diversion has created a more secure water supply for the city’s future. This additional source allows the city more flexibility in its water supply management efforts.

Struggles Achieving General Plan Themes

1. Economic Diversity:

- Santa Fe has long been a “Government & Tourism” town. It continues to struggle diversifying its economy by attracting private firms and industries to locate here, or grow local or incubated firms. Santa Fe reflects some ambivalence about attracting more jobs and growth. (Government and Tourism-related sectors account for 60% of all jobs in Santa Fe.)
- Some of the issues holding back economic diversity and general job growth include: Higher land and housing costs (median housing price near \$300,000); lack of a sizable young, well-educated labor force (median age nearing 50 makes Santa Fe older than most other U.S. cities); competition from the much larger Albuquerque Metro market just 60 miles away that includes a major university and considerable transportation and distribution facilities.

2. Mixed Use:

- New development and new subdivisions on the edges of Santa Fe still lack a more fully-integrated urban design with mixes of uses. The city has been slow to absorb more neo-traditional, “new urbanist” design and development in its newer residential and commercial developments. Conventional, low-density, suburban single-family development patterns tend to remain in place as new projects come forward

1999 General Plan – Topics

Chapter 1. Introduction / General Plan Themes (& public survey results) Scope, purpose, regional maps, plan organization, planning process	14 pages
Chapter 2. Heritage Resources Historic/Cultural Resources, Archaeological Resources, Heritage Resource Management	22 pages (30 policies)
Chapter 3. Land Use (w/ Future Land Use Map) Evolution of the Land Use Pattern, Current Land Use Pattern, General Plan Land Use Framework, Land Use Classifications	16 pages (12 policies)
Chapter 4. Growth Management Growth Management Methods, Population Growth & Projections, Growth Management - Regional, Growth Management - Urban Area, Urban Area Staging Plan	32 pages (50 policies)
Chapter 5. City Character & Urban Development Neighborhood & Residential Development, Downtown & Commercial Development, Office & Industrial Development	50 pages (61 policies)
Chapter 6. Transportation Streets, Transit, Bicycle & Pedestrian Circulation, Parking, Aviation	34 pages (90 policies)
Chapter 7. Infrastructure & Public Services Water Supply, Water Conservation, Wastewater Management, Solid Waste Management, Storm Water Management, Private Utilities, Impact Fees.	40 pages (122 policies)
Chapter 8. Natural Resource Management & Conservation Biological & Natural Resources and Habitat Conservation, Hillsides & Visual Resource Conservation, Natural Landscapes and Landmarks, Environmental Protection, Noise	34 pages (58 policies)
Chapter 9. Community Services & Development Affordable Housing, Economic development, The Arts, Children & Youth, Human Services, Libraries, Senior Services, Schools, Parks/Recreation/Open Space, Fire & Police Protection, Neighborhood & Community Planning	62 pages (179 policies)
Chapter 10. Institutional Framework Glossary of Terms	6 pages (14 policies) 8 pages
<hr/>	
TOTAL	318 pages (616 policies)