



CITY OF LAS CRUCES

DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE (DRC)

Following are the minutes from the City of Las Cruces Development Review Committee Meeting held Wednesday, July 31, 2024, at 9:00 a.m. in Room 1158.

DRC PRESENT: Meei Montoya, Senior Engineer, Utilities
 Elaine Martinez, Engineering Tech, Utilities
 Mark Dubbin, Fire Projection Engineer
 Franco Granillo, Parks Administrator, Parks & Rec.
 *Gary Skelton, Engineer, Public Works
 *Cathy Mathews, Landscape Architect, Parks & Rec.
 Tony Trevino, Deputy Director, Public Works
 Hector Terrazas, Engineer, Public Works
 Javier Antunez, Senior Engineer Tech, Utilities
 *Mike Kinney, Plan Review Engineer, Com. Dev.
 *Kyle Metzgar, MPO

STAFF PRESENT: Adam Ochoa, Senior Planner
 Larry Nichols, Director Community Development

OTHER PRESENT: Anthony Gutierrez
 Marcy Dickerson
 Paul Pompeo, Souder Miller

1. CALL TO ORDER (9:00 a.m.)

Ochoa: I will go ahead and call this meeting of the July 31st DRC meeting to order.

2. OLD BUSINESS

Ochoa: We have no old business.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - January 3, 2024, January 17, 2024, May 8, 2024

Ochoa: We right into approval of minutes. The first pair of minutes was for January 3rd. That actually was already approved so we don't need to vote on that one. Next one is, can I get a motion to approve the minutes for January 17, 2024.

Metzgar: Motion to approve.

Ochoa: Second, please.

1 Skelton: Second.

2
3 Ochoa: Thank you very much. All in favor, please signify by saying "aye."
4

5 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.
6

7 Ochoa: Motion passes. Okay, the next are minutes from May 8, 2024. Do we have
8 any changes on those? All righty. If not, can I have a motion to approve
9 please.

10
11 Metzgar: Motion to approve.

12
13 Montoya: Second.

14
15 Ochoa: Thank you. All in favor, please signify by saying "aye."
16

17 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.
18

19 Ochoa: All opposed. All right those minutes pass.
20

21 **4. DISCUSSION**
22

23 Ochoa: We have no discussion items.
24

25 **5. NEW BUSINESS**
26

27 **5.1 Tierra Hermosa Subdivision - Alternative Street Cross-Sections**
28

29 Ochoa: Next we have our new business, which is the Tierra Hermosa Alternate
30 Street Cross-Sections for Tierra Hermosa subdivision itself. I will go ahead
31 and explain the four different cross sections that we will be reviewing today.
32

33 First one that we're looking at is Porter Drive which is designated as a
34 principle arterial roadway by the MPO and by Elevate Las Cruces which is
35 120-foot right-of-way. They are proposing essentially the closest cross
36 section to this I believe is Option 3 of the major arterials under our design
37 standards, but a 30-foot median and then two-foot curbs coming off the
38 median, paved section of 33 feet on each side, another two-foot curb, then
39 five foot sidewalk, and a three foot parkway.
40

41 Next one we'll be looking at is the Village Drive which is a designated
42 collector roadway per elevated Las Cruces and the MPO Thoroughfare
43 Plan. This proposes 72-foot wide right-of-way, that being because Village
44 was built prior to it being designated what it is now essentially. So the
45 subdivision to the north technically should have given their right-of-way and
46 then it would have been 85-foot right-of-way. But they're proposing

1 essentially 53 foot paved section with two-foot curbs on each side, four-foot
2 sidewalk on one side which is existing, and the five-foot sidewalk on the
3 south side which would be built with this subdivision, and three-foot parkway
4 to the south, again adjacent to the actual subdivision, and then the 300-foot
5 parkway existing to the north.
6

7 Next one we'll be looking at is the interior roadways which will actually be
8 the actual connectivity within the subdivision itself. These what they
9 essentially entail is a 33-foot paved section, two-foot curbs, and then five-
10 foot sidewalks on each side, and then just on one side will have a parkway
11 which will either be the west or north side of the subdivision.
12

13 And the last one we'll be looking at here is Central Road. This was already
14 approved by DRC previously for what was a minor local, 40 foot wide right-
15 of-way for the road itself which is about 20-feet of driving lane, two-foot
16 curbs on each side, one side with a five-foot sidewalk and a 2.5-foot
17 parkway on one side, one-half foot paved parkway on the other side. This
18 will then lead into what the City is looking at putting a drainage system there
19 by the channel. So essentially that whole area right there measures about
20 74 feet in width. This was sent out for everybody to review. And I believe
21 the applicant has discussed this with staff multiple times. I will go around
22 the room and see if we have any other additional items we need to discuss
23 for either one of the right-of-ways. I'll start with Engineering.
24

25 Kinney: I just want to clarify; I have a question for Anthony. On the Village Drive
26 right-of-way it calls 72 foot wide right-of-way. And if you add all the numbers
27 up it comes up to roughly 72.5 feet. Is that due to the 3.5-foot plus or minus
28 parkway on the existing.
29

30 Gutierrez: Yes, the right-of-way is observed along the north side of Village. Has a
31 slightly different ankle than what's observed on the found monuments for
32 this piece of property. So there has to be a way to rectify that, so it widens
33 a little bit as it moves towards the west. So that's why there's the plus or
34 minus ...
35

36 Kinney: Close to three-foot.
37

38 Gutierrez: Yes. So it does get narrower.
39

40 Ochoa: Okay. So 72 feet is roughly what we're looking at for that.
41

42 Gutierrez: Yes.
43

44 Ochoa: That's just because of existing parkways to the north.
45

1 Gutierrez: To the north that we can't control. So basically we're going to fit in the 3.5
2 foot on our side.
3
4 Ochoa: Right.
5
6 Gutierrez: And the five foot walk for sure, but there's a bit of slop in there where the
7 right-of-way will not fully meet that.
8
9 Ochoa: Understood. Thank you.
10
11 Kinney: Okay. So I had during the preliminary plat process and during the review
12 of the plans and stuff I'd been calling for 72.5-foot right-of-way because the
13 dedication should have been 42.5 feet, but that apparently slipped through
14 and now it's a 72-foot right-of-way. I don't have a problem with that one-
15 half feet. And then of course Central Avenue, yes, it goes to what 74-foot
16 right-of-way. So you were correct in your e-mail that preliminary plat got
17 approved with 70, what is it, 72-foot right-of-way for Village. So that's all I
18 have.
19
20 Ochoa: All right. Thank you.
21
22 Nichols: So if I'm understanding Mike your comment about the deviation of that half
23 foot, it's brought on by the interface of what this subdivision is, what other
24 subdivisions and that's a recognizable necessity so.
25
26 Kinney: Yes.
27
28 Nichols: You're approving that.
29
30 Kinney: That's correct.
31
32 Nichols: Thank you.
33
34 Ochoa: Thank you Mike. All right. Go to Traffic. Gary you have anything else to
35 add?
36
37 Skelton: Yes. Only question we have is on the interior roadways on the east or
38 southwest right-of-way portion where you have the five-foot sidewalk with
39 no parkway. Will there be an easement that will include a roadway and
40 street furniture easement in case we need to, in case signs are going to be
41 needed on that side of the roadway?
42
43 Ochoa: Would the applicant be open to that to provide possibly like a five-foot
44 easement for.
45

1 Skelton: Well we did, yes some kind of easement so we can put our signs in because
2 there's no place for us to put them at this time with no parkway.
3

4 Ochoa: For signage and so forth like that.
5

6 Kinney: During the final plat process we would be doing an engineering traffic on
7 the easement, the utilities easement we would want that to be identified as
8 the utilities and street furniture easement.
9

10 Gutierrez: So just dual use, right.
11

12 Skelton: Yes.
13

14 Kinney: That way they can put in the signs.
15

16 Ochoa: So the applicant's amenable to that, that will just be something at the final
17 plat that we could make sure that that gets taken care of at that time.
18

19 Gutierrez: Right. We will add that language so that the utility easement encompasses
20 traffic also.
21

22 Kinney: Okay.
23

24 Ochoa: Thank you very much. Okay. Thank you Gary. Go to Utilities. Meei.
25

26 Montoya: We don't have comments on the makeup of the streets. Just like to know a
27 little bit more about what is the improvement timeframe of each light for the
28 Village Drive and for Porter and for Central. What would happen for the
29 Village Drive that would it be improved all the way to the eastern end of this
30 subdivision during Phase 2 or is going to spill onto Phase 3? And this is
31 mentioned for we need to have utility extension, then one when will happen
32 at what? If we had definite information.
33

34 Ochoa: Anthony, can you clarify?
35

36 Gutierrez: So the improvement follows the phasing plan. So the Phase 1 and 2 will
37 improve Village all the way to the connection point. The only portion that's
38 being left out is this very western edge that will be improved during Phase
39 3.
40

41 Montoya: But your Phase 2 boundary does not go all the way to the eastern end of
42 your subdivision.
43

44 Gutierrez: The Phase 2, if you look at the phasing map, not this map, we did bring the
45 Phase 2 all the way up.
46

1 Montoya: Okay.
2
3 Gutierrez: Just in the right-of-way so that we can make the connection.
4
5 Montoya: So a Village Drive would be improved in Phase 1 and Phase 2 construction
6 plan.
7
8 Gutierrez: Yes. Yes, all the way.
9
10 Montoya: All the way.
11
12 Gutierrez: Yes.
13
14 Montoya: Okay.
15
16 Gutierrez: The only portion that won't is the connection point to Porter and Village,
17 that's because we've got to do a roundabout and more traffic control for that.
18 So we're putting that off till Phase 3.
19
20 Montoya: Okay. What about Porter Road?
21
22 Gutierrez: Porter is in Phase 3, right, Phase 5. Porter is in Phase 5, yes. The last.
23
24 Montoya: And Central is in Phase 3.
25
26 Gutierrez: Yes. That's right.
27
28 Montoya: Okay. That's all. Thank you.
29
30 Ochoa: Thank you Meei. All righty. Park and Rec.
31
32 Mathews: So I note that in an e-mail on July 10th Michael kindly noted some
33 comments from Parks and Rec regarding the parkway locations. Our
34 preference is for the parkways to be located on the inside of the sidewalk,
35 between the back of curb and the sidewalk rather than on the outside. It's
36 not possible for us to maintain parkways that are located outside of the
37 sidewalk because they're indistinguishable between private property and
38 public property in that way. And the parkways then also serve as a buffer
39 between pedestrians and the traffic on the road. So that comment stands,
40 although it appears it hasn't been addressed, or it hasn't been accepted that
41 that's how we want the parkways to be.
42
43 Gutierrez: There are excessive grading elements on this so we need the parkway on
44 that side so that we can make a grade change between the back of walk
45 and the lots. Because this being a flood zone property, especially in these
46 first two phases we need that parkway to do grade transition on those lots

1 if at all possible. On the east side of the road it doesn't matter, that's why
2 we pushed it to one side.
3
4 Mathews: So I understand that. So will there be a private wall then at the property
5 line? Are those locations going to have a rockwall at that location?
6
7 Gutierrez: There are no rockwalls in the interior lots. There will only be rockwalls along
8 the exterior locations, and the interior. There will be a lot of concrete
9 delineating the property lines based on the site plans that we have seen
10 between the walk and the driveways. But, no.
11
12 Dickerson: Ms. Cathy, let me see if I understand your question. Are you asking that on
13 the houses, on the like house yard is there going to be a wall that delineates
14 the house yard from the parkway.
15
16 Mathews: Yes.
17
18 Dickerson: From what I understand from the French Brothers development plan, is that
19 there will be walls. They will not be rock. We cannot afford rock to get to
20 our price point. But there will be walls delineating what, if you will the yard.
21 When you get to your house you will walk into your backyard and there is a
22 fence that gets you a yard. Does that answer your question?
23
24 Mathews: Well sort of. What I'm trying to get at is first of all how steep is that slop
25 going to be then from the property line, or end of right-of-way to the
26 sidewalk?
27
28 Gutierrez: It's not that excessive. And there's two points. Because of those modified
29 section we only have parkway on one side anyway. So this would only be
30 an ask on one side of the street. And so if we bump the sidewalk away from
31 the curb only on one side of the road because of this modified section, it's
32 going to look a little weird, number one. And then it's not going to be
33 consistent throughout the subdivision. Because we have zero parkway on
34 one side.
35
36 Pompeo: Cathy, can I ask you a clarification question?
37
38 Mathews: Yes.
39
40 Pompeo: Can we separate the conversation between the interior roads and exterior
41 roads?
42
43 Mathews: Yes.
44
45 Pompeo: Okay, so on Village Drive, on Central, and on Porter those sidewalks could
46 be jumped to the outside.

1
2 Gutierrez: Yes, that's correct.
3
4 Pompeo: So Central, Village, Porter I believe, unless the developer has objection, we
5 can move those sidewalks to the property lines.
6
7 Mathews: Okay.
8
9 Pompeo: I believe the parkway is there. So that means the only road that we have a
10 question about is the interior roads, and only because we have parkway on
11 one side. But since they're low volume interior roads, does that alleviate
12 your concern as far as the separation of pedestrians and the traffic?
13
14 Mathews: It does. It does. Absolutely. And on interior roads parks is not responsible
15 for maintaining the parkways.
16
17 Gutierrez: Cool.
18
19 Mathews: As long as Porter Drive, Village Drive, and Central Road can all have their
20 cross sections changed so that the parkways are interior to the sidewalks.
21
22 Pompeo: Sidewalk up against the right-of-way line.
23
24 Mathews: Yes.
25
26 Gutierrez: Yes, so we have, yes, easy.
27
28 Pompeo: Fair enough.
29
30 Gutierrez: Sorry, I was not focusing on interior because we were on interior. I was like,
31 no.
32
33 Mathews: Thank you.
34
35 Ochoa: Thank you for clarifying that Paul. I think that takes care of that issue. MPO
36 did you have anything else to add?
37
38 Metzgar: Nothing to add in addition.
39
40 Ochoa: All right.
41
42 Metzgar: Regular comments.
43
44 Ochoa: All right. Any other discussion items? I'll entertain a motion with the
45 condition that Porter Road, Central Road, and Village Drive, well that the
46 cross sections get approved with the condition that those three roads, that

1 the parkway and sidewalk get essentially flipped to put the parkway
2 adjacent to the curb.

3
4 Gutierrez: Basically I'm writing down put parkway behind curb between walk on all
5 exterior sections.

6
7 Ochoa: Correct. So I'll look for a motion with that condition please.

8
9 Kinney: So moved.

10
11 Ochoa: Mike Kinney so moved. Can I have a second please?

12
13 Mathews: Second.

14
15 Ochoa: Thank you very much. All in favor please signify by saying "aye."

16
17 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

18
19 Ochoa: All opposed. Motion passes. Cross sections are approved. We have no
20 other items for this DRC.

21
22 **6. ADJOURNMENT (9:18 a.m.)**

23
24 Ochoa: Can I have a motion to adjourn please?

25
26 Kinney: So moved.

27
28 Ochoa: Mike Kinney motions.

29
30 Montoya: Second.

31
32 Ochoa: Thank you very much. All in favor.

33
34 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

35
36 Ochoa: We are done at 9:18.

37
38
39
40
41
42 _____
Chairperson