



# CITY OF LAS CRUCES

## DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE (DRC)

Following are the minutes from the City of Las Cruces Development Review Committee Meeting held Wednesday, August 14, 2024, at 9:00 a.m. in Room 1158.

**DRC PRESENT:** Rocio Nasir, Senior Engineer, Utilities  
Jimmy Moreno, Construction Management, Public Works  
Mark Dubbin, Fire Projection Engineer  
Gary Skelton, Engineer, Public Works  
Mike Kinney, Plan Review Engineer, Com. Dev.

**STAFF PRESENT:** Tim Pitts, Deputy Director Building Development  
John Castillo, Planner, Community Development

**OTHER PRESENT:** Paul Pompeo, Souder Miller

### 1. CALL TO ORDER (9:13 a.m.)

Pitts: This is Development Review Committee for August 14, 2024. Calling the meeting to order at 9:13. Can we announce our presence by department. So we'll start with the Public Works.

Moreno: Jimmy Moreno, Construction Management Administrator, Public Works.

Skelton: Gary Skelton, Traffic Management.

Pitts: Community Development.

Castillo: John Castillo with Community Development.

Kinney: Mike Kinney, Community Development.

Pitts: And Fire.

Dubbin: Mark Dubbin, Las Cruces Fire Department.

Pitts: Okay. We do have a quorum.

### 2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES -

Pitts: Entertain a motion to approve minutes from last meeting. Do we have minutes? I do not believe we have ...

1 Castillo: I don't think we have minutes.  
2  
3 Pitts: We have minutes available to review. So I will not entertain that motion.  
4

5 **3. OLD BUSINESS**  
6

7 Pitts: No old business.  
8

9 **4. NEW BUSINESS**  
10

11 Pitts: We go to new business. I'll entertain a motion to adjust the schedule.  
12 Anybody willing to move 4.2 first.  
13

14 Kinney: Motion.  
15

16 Pitts: Motion by Mike Kinney to move 4.2 to the first one.  
17

18 Dubbin: Second.  
19

20 Pitts: Second by Mark Dubbin. All in favor.  
21

22 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.  
23

24 Pitts: Okay, motion passes.  
25

26 **4.2 Case No. 24CS0500011: Sierra Norte Heights Phase 2 Preliminary Plat**

- 27 • A request for approval of a preliminary plat subdivision, known as Sierra  
28 Norte Heights Phase 2.
- 29 • The proposed subdivision currently encompasses 6.311+ acres and  
30 located at the intersection of Sonoma Ranch North Blvd., Sierra Ventana  
31 Ave. and Vista Belleza Ave. This is the second phase of the approved  
32 Sierra Norte Master Plan and Annexation that was approved in March  
33 of 2006.
- 34 • The subdivision proposes a 33-lot single family residential subdivision is  
35 zoned R-1b (Single-Family High Density).
- 36 • Submitted by the Souder Miller and Associates, Representative.  
37

38 Pitts: So first item on the new business is Item 4.2, Case No. 24CS0500011,  
39 Sierra Norte Heights Phase 2 Preliminary Plat.  
40

41 Kinney: Mr. Chair.  
42

43 Nasir: I can hear you guys now. And I hope you can hear me.  
44

45 Castillo: Yes, we can hear you.  
46

1 Pitts: Okay.  
2  
3 Nasir: Okay, perfect.  
4  
5 Pitts: So entering the meeting we have from utilities, please announce your name.  
6  
7 Nasir: Yes. Rocio Nasir with Las Cruces Utilities.  
8  
9 Pitts: Okay. Thank you. Who's presenting Sierra Norte.  
10  
11 Castillo: I'm presenting. So today we have Sierra Norte Heights Phase 2 Preliminary  
12 Plat. This is a proposed subdivision which currently encompasses 6.311  
13 acres. It's located at the northwest intersection of Sonoma Ranch  
14 Boulevard and Sierra Ventana. It also has Vista Belleza to the north of it.  
15 This is the second phase of an approved master plan. It's part of the Sierra  
16 Norte Master Plan and Annexation which was approved back in March  
17 2006. The subdivision, as I stated before, is currently proposing 33 single-  
18 family residential lots which have a zoning designation of R-1b and R-1bC.  
19 And it's been submitted by Souder Miller and Associates as the  
20 representative.  
21  
22 Pitts: All right do we have a motion.  
23  
24 Castillo: I have a motion to approve.  
25  
26 Kinney: Second.  
27  
28 Pitts: I believe we need another department. I think we need that from another  
29 department.  
30  
31 Kinney: Okay.  
32  
33 Dubbin: Second. Were there any outstanding comments on this?  
34  
35 Castillo: No. There were no outstanding comments.  
36  
37 Kinney: I can check.  
38  
39 Castillo: Traffic did have a comment regarding a second connection through Vista  
40 Belleza connecting into Sonoma Ranch. All departments approved.  
41  
42 Pitts: Any other comments, questions? Applicant wish to speak?  
43  
44 Pompeo: Yes. Good morning. Actually on this case representing Southwest  
45 Engineering nn this one. This is the second phase of the Sierra Norte  
46 Heights Subdivision. The first phase of the master plan development was

1 previously approved 18 years ago to the west. This is the last block to fill in  
2 between the existing subdivision and Sonoma Ranch Boulevard. I believe  
3 we have all of the comments addressed. Drainage has been addressed.  
4 Access. Utilities, I think the only comment we had from utilities at the time  
5 was clarification of the water provider, which we have done. There was a  
6 comment on the connection of Vista Belleza Avenue to Sonoma Ranch.  
7 When we acquired the construction drawings for the Sonoma Ranch  
8 Boulevard and had discussions with that project engineer, due to the  
9 spacing between the two roadways on the north and south of this, Public  
10 Works had not made that connection inside of the construction drawings of  
11 Sonoma Ranch Boulevard to the northern street due to the local road  
12 spacing on Sonoma Ranch Boulevard. So we would ask that in the  
13 discussion today that we'd like to continue with that as appropriate and not  
14 make that connection due to the roadway spacing on Sonoma Ranch.

15  
16 Kinney: That Vista Belleza.

17  
18 Pompeo: Yes. So when that set of construction drawings was approved for that, that  
19 road was not tied in on that construction project. And according to the  
20 project engineer for that section of road, it was decided to leave, at that time  
21 the Public Works didn't want that connection made due to the spacing of  
22 the local roads to keep more of a free flow on Sonoma Ranch. So that was  
23 our understanding. And so that's what we're proposing at this time.

24  
25 Pitts: So you're proposing that the right-of-way will remain, but just not built

26  
27 Pompeo: Yes, the right-of-way ...

28  
29 Pitts: You're not putting that into a lot.

30  
31 Pompeo: No, no. With the right-of-way will be maintained. The roadway actually  
32 comes to an end there, and there's a header curb Hector across the end of  
33 the street, if I remember correctly. It was this one here, Jimmy. Yes, sir.  
34 So we would just ask that ...

35  
36 Kinney: It's a dead end right now, it's not, it's just blocked off. So how many  
37 entrances do you have to the subdivision?

38  
39 Pompeo: Well, we have two entrances to the north and south onto local streets.

40  
41 Moreno: I believe in discussions with the Public Works Director it was the  
42 understanding that that was going to be tied in at the time of that lot  
43 development. So that may be a further point of discussion.

44  
45 Pompeo: Okay.

46

1 Moreno: But what was, for the record what was your reasons for not tying it in?  
2  
3 Pompeo: Well, we were, in our discussions with the Chad Sells who was the engineer  
4 that did this said, that did the Sonoma Ranch drawings, that going through  
5 the review process on that section of Sonoma Ranch when it was widened,  
6 I guess that project's just recently been completed in the last year, that they  
7 had removed that design connection to Sonoma Ranch in that set of  
8 construction drawings due to, they were told in that approval with the City  
9 about trying to minimize the number of local streets that were coming into  
10 Sonoma Ranch, so that it stayed as a free flowing arterial. I mean I don't  
11 think, I'll ask the developer rep. is here, Mr. Ray Carlson, but if we had to  
12 make that connection I don't think we would have an issue with that.  
13  
14 Moreno: Okay.  
15  
16 Pitts: Just I would prefer not to because I think keeping that road free flowing  
17 would be preferable. But I just make sure that there's no planning or fire  
18 reason to want that.  
19  
20 Skelton: Traffic position is we would prefer not to have the connection as well. But  
21 if there was a connection to be made that wouldn't carry through the median  
22 and make an additional median opening. So it would be just a right in, right  
23 out access only.  
24  
25 Pompeo: Okay.  
26  
27 Moreno: That will be a departmental decision. We'll get this information back to the  
28 director and he can make the ultimate decision on that motion, along with  
29 other departments.  
30  
31 Pompeo: And on behalf of the developer I think we're okay either way. I guess we'll,  
32 just, as we move forward to final plat and construction drawings we'll just  
33 address it in the construction drawings at that time. That's fine.  
34  
35 Moreno: Okay.  
36  
37 Pitts: Okay, with no objections on that. Any other comments from anybody on the  
38 DRC? Seeing none. I'll ask for a vote by department. CD.  
39  
40 Kinney: Aye.  
41  
42 Pitts: PW.  
43  
44 Skelton: Aye.  
45  
46 Pitts: Fire.

1  
2 Dubbin: Yes.  
3  
4 Pitts: And utilities.  
5  
6 Nasir: Yes.  
7  
8 Pitts: Okay, so it passes unanimously 4-0. Thank you. I think it'll be nice to see  
9 that built out. It's a nice neighborhood. I think it'd be nice to have some  
10 more houses out there to finish it out to the road.  
11  
12 Moreno: How far down the road, Mark, is the fire station on Central planned.  
13  
14 Dubbin: It's going to be on the corner of Central and Sonoma Ranch.  
15  
16 Moreno: Is it in the next couple of years, you think, or is it just?  
17  
18 Dubbin: It's within the year.  
19  
20 Moreno: Good. Awesome.  
21  
22 Dubbin: It' gone out to bid.  
23  
24 Pitts: I think it's subdivided now. I think we're finished with that.  
25  
26 Dubbin: Plans are done.  
27  
28 Kinney: Going to start building Central Avenue here soon.  
29  
30 Moreno: Wow, very nice.  
31  
32 **4.1 Case No. 24CS0500023: Royal Crossings Subdivision Phase 1A Final**  
33 **Plat and Right-of-Way Vacation**  
34 • A request for approval of a vacation of a 45-foot-wide right-of-way known  
35 as Camino Del Rex,  
36 • associated with a final plat known as Royal Crossings Subdivision  
37 Phase 1A.  
38 • The proposed subdivision currently encompasses 17.71 + acres and is  
39 located at the corner of  
40 • Solano Drive and Main Street also known as the former Country Club.  
41 • Submitted by the Souder Miller and Associates, Representative.  
42  
43 Pitts: Okay, moving on to case 4.1, number 24CS0500023, Royal Crossing  
44 Subdivision, Phase 1A Final Plat and Right-of Way Vacation.  
45

1 Castillo: Today we have a request for approval of a vacation of a 45 foot right-of-way  
2 known as Camino del Rex. It's associated with the final plat known as Royal  
3 Crossings Subdivision Phase 1A. The proposed subdivision currently  
4 encompasses 17.71 acres and is located at the corner of Solano and Main  
5 Street. It's also known as the former Country Club. This was also submitted  
6 by Souder Miller and Associates as the representative. So this today we've  
7 all seen the final plat come in previously. We just have to take out a small  
8 portion of Camino del Rex that was dedicated to the City of Las Cruces, but  
9 they want to incorporate it into their properties.

10  
11 Kinney: Just trying to find that on the map here.

12  
13 Pompeo: It's on page two.

14  
15 Castillo: Right there.

16  
17 Pompeo: There you go.

18  
19 Kinney: For the right-of-way.

20  
21 Pompeo: It's up on the intersection of Samaritan and North Main Street. There you  
22 go.

23  
24 Kinney: There's Samaritan.

25  
26 Pompeo: Right there. What to says "see insert A."

27  
28 Kinney: This insert A.

29  
30 Pitts: It's the old entrance to the Country Club building.

31  
32 Castillo: Yes, it's the old entrance into the Country Club building.

33  
34 Kinney: This is the insert here.

35  
36 Pitts: Okay. Entertain a motion to consider this.

37  
38 Kinney: So moved.

39  
40 Moreno: Second. Mike, can you share?

41  
42 Kinney: Yes, if I can figure out how to do that.

43  
44 Pitts: Okay, any, well go the applicant first. I did that wrong first.

45  
46 Kinney: Hold on Rocio.

1  
2 Pompeo: But you got to click her down, you got to minimize the two screens. There  
3 you go.  
4  
5 Castillo: Can you see it Rocio?  
6  
7 Nasir: Yes, I can see it. Thank you.  
8  
9 Pompeo: There you go.  
10  
11 Kinney: Okay.  
12  
13 Pompeo: Sorry, I used to take two screens all the time. Okay. This is the final plat  
14 request for the first phase of Royal Crossing which basically encompasses  
15 the right-of-way dedication for Heart Avenue contiguous out to Samaritan,  
16 a portion of Samaritan and out to Solano. And then the 12 commercial lots  
17 between Heart Avenue, Samaritan, generally along North Solano Drive and  
18 Main Street.  
19  
20 Kinney: We on 1B.  
21  
22 Moreno: We're on 1A.  
23  
24 Kinney: We're still on 1A.  
25  
26 Moreno: Yes, this is the first.  
27  
28 Pompeo: Yes, we're on 1A.  
29  
30 Kinney: I'm sorry.  
31  
32 Pompeo: There we go.  
33  
34 Kinney: I thought we ...  
35  
36 Pompeo: So I guess the caveat to this approval is the project is still under construction  
37 right now. There are ongoing discussions with Public Works or yet to be  
38 started discussions with Public Works, on a letter of credit and guarantee of  
39 performance for the valuation for that. I had a brief conversation with the  
40 Public Works director yesterday about going through that process. So  
41 what's going to have to happen now if this gets approved, the next step is  
42 going to be to figure out with the contractor, the developer, and the Public  
43 Works staff, where the project sits right now in terms of completion, And  
44 then to get that assessment figured out for what the valuation is. That has  
45 not occurred yet. So that's the next step before we go anywhere down the  
46 road about (*inaudible*). And as part of this plat there is that old remnant



1 piece of right-of-way for Camino del Rex between the subject property and  
2 North Main Street, and so by this plat we are asking for the City to vacate  
3 that piece of land, and it'll be absorbed into the two lots on the northeast  
4 corner of this subdivision.  
5  
6 Pitts: Can I just ask? And it's really I guess a legal question. We don't have a  
7 legal representative here. But when you vacate a street like that, the normal  
8 course of events is for, you can, each property owner on each side can  
9 fence up to the midpoint of that. In this case there is, the owner on the other  
10 side is DOT. Can the City in the vacation process do a, yes I guess a quick  
11 claim deed on the entire property to this developer, or what happens to that?  
12  
13 Pompeo: It's my understanding that if the vacation is approved then there has to be,  
14 the next documents would be the actual transfer of the property, which  
15 would be by deed from the City to the.  
16  
17 Pitts: So that becomes just a land management problem not one that we're  
18 worried about here. Okay. Fair enough.  
19  
20 Pompeo: And then there needs to be another deed that transfers it into the property  
21 to Lot 1 and then Lot 2. So there'd be another set of filings after that.  
22  
23 Pitts: Okay. Any other comments, questions?  
24  
25 Moreno: This is a question. The approval that's on this item today, is that for this  
26 vacation only or for the entire plat?  
27  
28 Pompeo: It's for the, my understanding is it's for the vacation and for the final plat.  
29  
30 Moreno: Final plat.  
31  
32 Pompeo: Yes, sir.  
33  
34 Moreno: Okay. I did have some questions. I'd be leery to approve this in its entirety  
35 just because of the outstanding questions that we had with drainage and  
36 whether or not there was going to be a pond or any changes to this plat.  
37 Those are my only concerns. If those are worked out with the Public Works  
38 director, then I'd say we can move forward. But I would hate to approve this  
39 as a final plat and then there'd still be some necessary changes. I don't  
40 know how that would work.  
41  
42 Pompeo: Can I ask? Can we get, because actually after this meeting I have a meeting  
43 with the Public Works director, so to go over the drainage report and the  
44 requirements. Because, to your point Jimmy, the drainage report was  
45 approved for Phases 1, 2 and 4, which encompasses the other property that  
46 was cleared to the inside of Heart and Samaritan. You can tell by the

1 subdivision that there's pond icons all over that thing. And I think the issue  
2 is on the drainage is that we needed to, each one of those lots needs a pond  
3 to balance the storm water out, and that has to be done. So I'm going to  
4 meet with the Public Works director after this meeting to go over that. Would  
5 it be possible for this committee to do a conditional approval of this pending  
6 the positive outcome of that interaction with the Public Works director.  
7

8 Moreno: So another concern was not only the on-site ponding, which is actually  
9 separate, but the additional drainage from the roadways. Looks like it's all  
10 going to exit on Samaritan, and based on your plat, there's no room there,  
11 room for changes in terms of adding an additional pond on that far west  
12 end. Now there is some, the leaving the flat alone or leaving it as is, there  
13 is some mitigations that you can do if that is necessary to add a pond but  
14 there would be some additional infrastructure, drainage infrastructure,  
15 whether it be drop in, things like that to catch all the water that's coming on  
16 those roadways. However, I don't, unless the committee feels otherwise, I  
17 think a conditional approval, as long as those items are addressed or that  
18 the plat, if there's any necessary changes with the plat, that they'd be  
19 changed conditionally as well, that those would be changed as part of that  
20 conditional approval.  
21

22 Castillo: So Mr. Chair. So this discussion right now is just purely for the vacation of  
23 right-of-way, because as our process goes we have to vacate the right-of-  
24 way, and it has to go to City Council for their approval. Yes, the plat still  
25 needs to go through its normal subdivision process of either reaching  
26 substantial completion or the developer needs to apply for or request a letter  
27 of credit with a guarantee of performance. So the plat we can still adjust, if  
28 it would make it easier for everybody, we could do a separate vacation plat  
29 that everybody would look at. It would just be very generalized that shows  
30 Heart Avenue, not the 12 additional lots, and just show the small insert that  
31 we're looking at as part of what we're vacating. If that would make it easier  
32 for everybody.  
33

34 Pitts: So John ...

35  
36 Moreno: Makes it less confusing.

37  
38 Pitts: This is the final plan for 1A, 2 though.

39  
40 Castillo: Correct. This is the final plat for 1A.

41  
42 Pitts: And that has not been previously approved.

43  
44 Castillo: No.  
45

1 Pitts: What is the difficulty for the applicant to come back should construction  
2 drawings need to be modified? What's the difficulty if we approve here of  
3 coming back to modify that final plat? Is it just another meeting or is it a ...  
4

5 Castillo: So as the construction of Phase 1A and the final plat are linked together, as  
6 we would with any subdivision, whether it's a commercial subdivision or a  
7 residential subdivision. We are still held bound by either obtaining  
8 substantial completion or full completion or a letter of credit to file the plat  
9 before we can release lots for addressing or for sale to build on. So in this  
10 case since we haven't had all signatures, but we've had an approval from a  
11 review standpoint to get to the mylar phase, which we're at right now, it  
12 would just be altering mylars and making sure that we have the appropriate  
13 addendums for whatever requirements Public Works is seeking from the  
14 drainage standpoint; either show up on the final plat or some type of  
15 agreement to let this plat continue forward.  
16

17 Pompeo: Mr. Chairman. I have a point of clarification. I think that it probably would  
18 be appropriate this time. For the drainage report on this subdivision, and I  
19 don't know if you all can see this, the roadways are, they're separate basin.  
20 Okay. So on this particular one, the roadways free release out to Solano.  
21 That is hardened. And a portion of Samaritan, go down Samaritan out to  
22 Solano. So but in order to balance between the pre- and post-development,  
23 which is what we're trying to do, there's additional ponding requirements on  
24 all the lots so they have to hold back more water than they normally would  
25 because that's offsetting the water that's going out on Samaritan. So if you  
26 look at the analysis point for this drainage network as we exit out to Solano  
27 in the developed state, we're discharging less storm water off the site than  
28 what we were in the pre-development condition. But that is predicated on  
29 the fact that the ponding areas have to be developed. And I think the issue  
30 that we saw a couple weeks ago with free release of storm water out onto  
31 Solano and the issues that came along with that is, there were no ponding  
32 areas that were developed within that site at that time. So those ponds have  
33 to be developed now. And if you'll notice there's a pond icon at every one  
34 of those lots. So the issue to address Public Works concern about  
35 additional runoff, those have to be developed at this time. And that's one of  
36 the issues that I need to discuss with the director today is implementing  
37 those ponds, getting those ponds built so that that site will not release  
38 additional stormwater.  
39

40 Kinney: I want to go back to. Hold on.

41

42 Pompeo: Right. And then so there are the pond volumes that go with each lot.  
43

44 Pitts: These are post development pond volumes. So that is accounting for  
45 impervious surface in those lots.  
46

1 Pompeo: It's the impervious area inside the lot, and basically half the street in front of  
2 your lot.  
3  
4 Pitts: Okay.  
5  
6 Pompeo: So each lot is grabbing their piece of the street. What's not on that table  
7 and is not, and has to be determined is there's a pond icon in Phase 1B, of  
8 course, that plat is coming up next, but that pond needs to be developed,  
9 because that's the lion's share of some of the issues that's causing  
10 problems out there, actually two ponds I should say.  
11  
12 Pitts: So, if I could I think I'd recommend we approve as is with the understanding  
13 that the issues of the construction drawings are not resolved yet.  
14  
15 Pompeo: They're not resolved.  
16  
17 Pitts: And it's the developer that has to make sure that that works.  
18  
19 Pompeo: It's the developer ...  
20  
21 Pitts: Before a signature will be upon it.  
22  
23 Pompeo: Right. It's the developer and their consultants responsibility at this point in  
24 time to satisfy to the Public Works director that the drainage issues are  
25 resolved on the site. So that's what I, that has to be done.  
26  
27 Moreno: And I would also, to include any changes to the approved plat, as  
28 necessary.  
29  
30 Pompeo: Yes. Okay.  
31  
32 Moreno: Whether additional off site ponding, anything else that's necessary in terms  
33 of modifications to a plat.  
34  
35 Pompeo: As required.  
36  
37 Moreno: As a condition as required.  
38  
39 Pompeo: Okay, as required. I'm with that.  
40  
41 Pitts: So we're adding a condition that approved subject to whatever.  
42  
43 Moreno: Subject to approval from Public Works to include plat modifications and  
44 changes as necessary due to the drainage.  
45  
46 Pompeo: I'm okay. I'm good with that.

1  
2 Pitts: The general statement that Public Works just can literally decide whatever  
3 they want.  
4  
5 Moreno: Yes.  
6  
7 Pitts: But based on the drainage issues identified.  
8  
9 Pompeo: Right. We have to come up. We have to do that. And my goal, Mr.  
10 Chairman, is we have this resolved obviously prior to the meeting on the  
11 27th because I do not want to go to Planning and Zoning with a condition.  
12 I mean I'm sorry one, B's coming up. I don't want any conditions.  
13  
14 Castillo: So the next step for this one, at least for the right-of-way vacation, the next  
15 step would just be City Council.  
16  
17 Pompeo: Okay.  
18  
19 Pitts: Okay. Any other discussion on this item?  
20  
21 Kinney: I have a question.  
22  
23 Pitts: Mike.  
24  
25 Kinney: I was noticing that on the crosshatched area here, I'm not sure what sheet  
26 we're on, next to lot 8, 7, 6, etc, that's an existing easement will be vacated.  
27 And then there's a note in lot 8 that says "a blanket access easement" for  
28 accessing Three Crosses Monument to be created in lot 8. I guess my  
29 question would be to Mr. Castillo, is I remember seeing e-mail strings about,  
30 I don't know if it was Facilities or Public Works or Parks and Recreation,  
31 said that they didn't have enough room to access or maintenance Three  
32 Crosses Monument. Does this blanket easement take care of that?  
33  
34 Castillo: Blanket easement should unless we narrow it down to something different,  
35 and then it would have to be identified with the size of the easement and  
36 more specifically. But the blanket easement should handle it. We would  
37 just have to, at the time of development of the lot is when it would be tricky,  
38 because that easement would then have to be identified, so that way staff  
39 can ensure that.  
40  
41 Kinney: Because right now it just say a blank easement. So what does it mean, the  
42 entire lot 8 as an easement?  
43  
44 Pompeo: The intent of the note, I think Sara Gonzales with the City and I had talked  
45 about this before which was at this point in time we don't know what the  
46 development footprints on that lot look like so we can't really give a route

1 through there. But as the lot develops and as driveways are created and  
2 such, then that easement would turn more into a permanent description. I  
3 would suggest Mr. Chair that there probably needs to be some additional  
4 wording added onto the note about the blanket easement, that at the time  
5 of lot development a permanent easement will be, that the blanket  
6 easement will be vacated and a permanent described easement be created.  
7 So that that way it's around whatever it is they're going to put on that lot.  
8

9 Moreno: Can you look at the notes Mike? I believe, I thought there was a mention  
10 something on the main notes page, the front page or something I thought  
11 that mentioned that. Because that was my initial concern with those e-mails  
12 as well. And I thought I'd addressed it.  
13

14 Kinney: Any particular to note?  
15

16 Moreno: It was one of the key notes. I can't remember what it was, which one it was.  
17 But I'm in agreement with Pau..  
18

19 Kinney: You want me to go back up to the page where.  
20

21 Moreno: I can't remember. I remember just seeing it. It might be down here, scroll  
22 down right here on the general notes.  
23

24 Pompeo: I think it may have started in there and then it moved back over to lot 8  
25 specific.  
26

27 Moreno: Okay.  
28

29 Pitts: Any objection noted just adding that comment?  
30

31 Pompeo: No. What I'll do is I'll, let me type up the text of it and let me e-mail that to  
32 John, and then he can distribute it out. And then if everyone's okay with  
33 that, then I'll change this note on the plat. But basically, it's to remove, at  
34 the time of lot development that a described easement be created and the  
35 blanket easement be vacated.  
36

37 Pitts: And in the meantime ...  
38

39 Pompeo: In the meantime ...  
40

41 Pitts: Maybe we'll be able to go over that property in any way they want to get to  
42 the ...  
43

44 Pompeo: Exactly. It's not limited. If you go to the blanket you can drive all over it if  
45 you want. But when it comes time to develop it then we'll put the describe  
46 easement on there.

1  
2 Pitts: So when you, you're going to, as I understand it, you can put a trench and  
3 a berm after the curb to stop any water flow.  
4  
5 Pompeo: On the back. The ponds on the ...  
6  
7 Pitts: On the backside of the berm. I'm just, I'm thinking of the actual physical  
8 activity of getting to the Three Crosses, if they put a ...  
9  
10 Pompeo: No, on that lot ...  
11  
12 Pitts: Three foot high berm I'm not seeing anybody driving over that.  
13  
14 Pompeo: Lot 8 drains generally to the southern boundary line. So for instance that  
15 particular lot, if we look at the, that's lot 8, so that requires, if I remember  
16 right, it requires I think 19,000 cubic feet. Yes, 19,400 cubic feet. So all  
17 that's going to be along that southern edge of that. So it won't inhabit  
18 access.  
19  
20 Pitts: Okay. So whatever you're going to do for drainage is not going to inhibit.  
21  
22 Pompeo: Yes.  
23  
24 Pitts: Parks getting in there and picking up garbage, painting something, fixing a  
25 light bulb.  
26  
27 Pompeo: Turning the (*inaudible*) so the lights come on.  
28  
29 Pitts: Yes. Okay.  
30  
31 Pompeo: Be nice is somebody would just take it. We would like to state to take it.  
32 They said no. Even though it's half on their property. But no, it's important  
33 that it stay and be maintained. So make sure.  
34  
35 Pitts: Okay. Any other comments? Yes, sir, from the public.  
36  
37 Shervanick: I was wondering if the lot development will be sequential by the numbers  
38 that I see on the lots from south to north, or will all the lots be in development  
39 concurrently?  
40  
41 Pompeo: At this time they're not intertwined with each other. So they could be  
42 developed in any, there's no sequence to it. It can be developed; any lot  
43 can be developed at any time. And they would be independent of each  
44 other.  
45  
46 Shervanick: Thank you.

1  
2 Pitts: And just point of information. The road needs to be completed before any  
3 of them are developed. That's a fire requirement that there be fire access  
4 from two directions, whatever gets developed out there. So that is a  
5 requirement that we already have on there. Okay. All right. So I'll entertain  
6 a vote. CD.  
7  
8 Kinney: Was there a motion?  
9  
10 Pitts: Motion, you made the motion.  
11  
12 Kinney: I did. Okay.  
13  
14 Pitts: With two conditions that hopefully will be satisfied before we go any further.  
15 One is subject to Public Works approval of the drainage plan with any  
16 required changes to the plat that that entails. And two, that the change to  
17 the terminology on the easement that it's available now, but there will be a  
18 final easement depending on the development of lot 8.  
19  
20 Pompeo: Yes, okay, and I'll get that, John I'll get that to you today and then let me  
21 know and I'll make the changes.  
22  
23 Pitts: So with those two conditions. CD.  
24  
25 Kinney: Aye.  
26  
27 Pitts: Aye.  
28  
29 Kinney: Was there a second on the motion?  
30  
31 Pitts: Yes. Jimmy.  
32  
33 Kinney: Okay. All right.  
34  
35 Pitts: Okay. PW.  
36  
37 Moreno: Aye.  
38  
39 Pitts: Fire.  
40  
41 Dubbin: Yes.  
42  
43 Pitts: And Utilities.  
44  
45 Nasir: Yes.  
46



1 Pitts: Thank you. All right. Passes four/zero.

2  
3 **4.2 Case 24CS0500064: Royal Crossing Subdivision, Phase 1B**

- 4 • A request for approval of a preliminary plat known as Royal Crossing  
5 Subdivision, Phase 1B.  
6 • The subdivision encompasses 57.33 + acres, is zoned C-3C  
7 (Commercial High Intensity-Conditional) and C-2C/R-4C (Commercial  
8 Medium Intensity-Conditional/Multi-Dwelling High Density & Limited  
9 Retail and Office), and generally located south of Samaritan Drive, east  
10 of Solano Drive and southeast of Main Street.  
11 • The subdivision proposes ten (10) commercial lots and three (3)  
12 commercial/multi-family lots.  
13 • Submitted by Souder Miller and Associates, representative.

14  
15 Pitts: And we move to Item 4.3, case number 24CS0500064, this is Royal  
16 Crossing Subdivision Phase 1B. So we will fill out this circle here or oval.

17  
18 Castillo: So today we have a request for approval of a preliminary plat known as  
19 Royal Crossing Subdivision Phase 1B. This subdivision encompasses  
20 57.33 acres. It's currently zoned C-3C which is our commercial high  
21 intensity conditional, as well as CRC/R-4C which is our commercial medium  
22 intensity conditional, and multi dwelling high density and limited retail and  
23 office conditional. It's generally located south of Samaritan Drive, east of  
24 Solano Drive, and southeast of Main Street. Once again, this is also still  
25 known as the former Country Club. This subdivision proposes 10  
26 commercial lots and three commercial/multifamily lots. This was also  
27 submitted by Souder Miller and Associates as the representative.

28  
29 Pitts: Do I have a motion?

30  
31 Castillo: I make a motion to approve.

32  
33 Pitts: Second.

34  
35 Dubbin: Second.

36  
37 Pitts: The applicant,

38  
39 Pompeo: Mr. Chairman. Continuing our discussion on Royal Crossing. This Phase  
40 1B which is generally the area between Heart and Samaritan. Which is by  
41 this plat is further subdivided. Was shown on a tract in the Phase 1A. Now  
42 it's being subdivided into multiple commercial lots in 1B. It also fills out the  
43 lots generally on the south side of Samaritan. With this, as we've talked  
44 about drainage, these ponds are not, this portion of the property does not  
45 drain generally into what's going to be the regional ponding area, so there  
46 are ponding requirements on each one of the lots as discussed previous.

1 Let's see if there's anything else. This development, except for a proposed  
2 internal roadway between Heart and Samaritan, all the other appropriate  
3 infrastructure for utilities and right-of-way will be completed. This will  
4 complete Samaritan Drive from its terminus by the hospital out to an existing  
5 section of Samaritan out by Solano. And I believe all mainline utilities are  
6 already going to be in the ground in the Phase 1A construction. So I'd be  
7 happy to answer any specific questions that staff has at this time.  
8

9 Pitts: I have two questions. One is are you stubbing everything out so we don't  
10 cut into the curb, into the pavement for about 20 years?  
11

12 Pompeo: Yes.  
13

14 Pitts: Thank you. And two, the driveway that is attaching to whatever that road is  
15 south of the hospital, it doesn't line up exactly. I'm wondering if there's a  
16 reason why it doesn't, I think we would want and I defer to traffic on it, but I  
17 think we would want that intersection to be a squared.  
18

19 Pompeo: I will send that over to, let me send an aerial with the construction drawings  
20 for that road to staff. But it is the intent that it be lined up.  
21

22 Pitts: Okay.  
23

24 Pompeo: There will be no offset from the City street crossing Samaritan.  
25

26 Pitts: And the actual construction.  
27

28 Pompeo: In the actual construction it will be centered. And I'll verify that for staff.  
29

30 Pitts: Any other?  
31

32 Moreno: As part of this plat I don't see any regional ponding. So it's similar to Phase  
33 1A in that all the drainage from these roads, intent is to push that out of  
34 Samaritan onto Solano.  
35

36 Pompeo: Well there is going to be a regional ponding area that is going to be within  
37 tract C3A, and that pond is ...  
38

39 Kinney: A1 or C3.  
40

41 Pompeo: I'm sorry, where you got your cursor now Mike.  
42

43 Moreno: C3A1.  
44

1 Pompeo: Thank you. Okay, because that regional ponding area is to take all of the  
2 runoff that's coming down the existing section of Samaritan plus the  
3 discharge from the hospital.  
4  
5 Moreno: Okay.  
6  
7 Pompeo: So that ponding area, and the only reason why it's not shown on this  
8 preliminary plat, it's part of this but there's beginning discussions with your  
9 department, Jimmy, and the Parks department about working together on  
10 the ponding area that's inside of Apodaca Park so we can clean all that up.  
11 So that's ongoing and will be part of this project, will be that the  
12 determination of that and configuration and location of how those ponds are  
13 going to be interconnected.  
14  
15 Moreno: So everything south and west of that tract C3A1 will all drain to Solano.  
16  
17 Pompeo: Yes.  
18  
19 Moreno: Out of Samaritan or Heart.  
20  
21 Pompeo: Well the this one, we want ponding on there, but from, yes this inner area  
22 here will still discharge out here. All of, and this will still drain out on the  
23 Solano side. The hospital, all this, there's going to be drop inlets  
24 constructed, or there's already a pipe under the road right here.  
25  
26 Moreno: Yes.  
27  
28 Pompeo: And that needs to be graded and then this ponding area figured.  
29  
30 Moreno: Okay.  
31  
32 Pompeo: So that is to be determined by this application, that interconnection of that  
33 pond. So, I guess to the answer, back to answer your question, Jimmy,  
34 some ponding is on site ponding, some is regional ponding.  
35  
36 Moreno: Okay.  
37  
38 Pitts: And the current situation with drainage there is that that, the water that's  
39 coming out of where the hospital is now, that includes some runoff out of  
40 the country club neighborhood, is now going south into that City pond.  
41  
42 Pompeo: Yes.  
43  
44 Pitts: So until the construction drawings here, that's going to remain so that that  
45 won't be discharging onto Solano.  
46

1 Pompeo: Right.  
2  
3 Pitts: That will be discharging on ...  
4 Pompeo: All of that goes ...  
5  
6 Pitts: Into our pond.  
7  
8 Pompeo: Right.  
9  
10 Pitts: For now and then as we develop whatever is going to happen out there, it's  
11 just going to be basically, your two roads that you're building right now that  
12 are draining, that water is what's draining into Solano.  
13  
14 Pompeo: Right. But all the pond, but there's oversized ponding on all the lots that are  
15 supposed to, that balances the flow, if we're to build.  
16  
17 Pitts: I get that.  
18  
19 Pompeo: But to really minimize the flow going out to basically West Madrid, which I  
20 think is the bigger issue, we're cutting off the flow that's coming out of the  
21 subdivision to the east, coupled with all the development of the 33 acres on  
22 the primary hospital site, all that's going to go to that regional ponding area  
23 and then be discharged at a lower rate. So it's just right now I don't have it  
24 shown on these because we're entering into those discussions with the  
25 Parks and Public Works, but that's the intent.  
26  
27 Pitts: Yes, because you've got that other discharge point for water coming out of  
28 the country club neighborhood that ...  
29  
30 Pompeo: Right, out of Desert Way.  
31  
32 Pitts: Basically currently goes ...  
33  
34 Kinney: Right, it goes ...  
35  
36 Pompeo: It goes ...  
37  
38 Pitts: It goes down towards Apodaca Park.  
39  
40 Pompeo: It runs right into the ponding area at Apodaca. And then the problem is ...  
41  
42 Kinney: This is the pond, City's pond that ...  
43  
44 Pompeo: Right.  
45  
46 Kinney: Mr. Pompeo is talking about.

1  
2 Pompeo: Right. And we just need that, that whole area, both on ours and in in  
3 Apodaca Park needs to be cleaned up. And, you know more of a  
4 permanent.  
5  
6 Pitts: One other. And this is just a question more than anything. This area was  
7 not properly studied in the last flood study we did for the City. I am, I mean  
8 I know it shows the zone x, but who knows. I mean, the study was not, the  
9 study didn't actually ...  
10  
11 Kinney: The study actually ended at Solano and Main Street.  
12  
13 Pitts: So I guess that would be my question is, how are we going to, you know the  
14 City comes in and does a FIS on this area. Yes, what's our?  
15  
16 Pompeo: Well, I think that the ponding area is going to ...  
17  
18 Kinney: Is Rocio still there?  
19  
20 Pompeo: Going to pick that up.  
21  
22 Castillo: Yes, she's still there.  
23  
24 Pompeo: I mean, and I would point, Tim, to the final drainage report for the hospital,  
25 which picked up that 33 acres of development. And also the very beginning  
26 of the master plan and what that ponding area is. It's a pretty good sized  
27 ponding area for what was originally approved in that.  
28  
29 Pitts: Okay. Well, I just, as I say it's just a question more than anything, because  
30 I'm not quite sure. I mean our code doesn't really speak to what we do in  
31 those situations where it's unstudied, but it is something we need to be  
32 aware of, especially as we're going east into areas that are also outside of  
33 the floods. We do have as you go up Alameda Arroyo, and so there was  
34 study, but it was never put into a final FIS. There was modeling. I'll just  
35 leave it at that.  
36  
37 Pompeo: Well, yes, and that modeling was limited to just the flow rates, and it wasn't,  
38 there wasn't any mapping that was done  
39  
40 Pitts: Right. Okay.  
41  
42 Moreno: My concern for this one is similar to Phase 1A in that there's no regional  
43 ponding, and it sounds like you want to oversize on lot ponds to take into  
44 account the additional drainage from the roadways. But the same concern  
45 has it that, well if we're dumping City water or you know City right-of-way  
46 water from the roadways into private property ponds, what our recourse is

1 in maintaining those ponds or that those ponds will mean be maintained in  
2 perpetuity. So my concern for Phase 1B is similar to Phase 1A in terms of  
3 a regional pond to capture all this excess drainage. And I haven't looked at  
4 the number specific, I had just looked at the drainage report overall. So  
5 that's my concern. I have no reservations about moving the preliminary plat  
6 forward with those caveats that there may be some modifications based off  
7 of additional studies or additional drainage or looking at the additional,  
8 because the construction plans that we have so far for Phase 1A doesn't  
9 show, and of course this one's not in construction yet, but doesn't show any  
10 drainage infrastructure that gets any of that excess water onto private lots.  
11 But my concern is even putting them on private lots, putting that excess  
12 water, is that we're putting City right-of-way water onto private ponds. So  
13 just that's my concern for the record. And we can move forward and have  
14 those discussions throughout the plat process.

15  
16 Pompeo: And I don't have any issue with the conditional approval with Public Works,  
17 with those items being addressed as we get finalized construction and get  
18 the final plat.

19  
20 Pitts: Just on this issue of the, it was my understanding, and I guess maybe  
21 correct me if I'm wrong, that we weren't actually putting water directly from  
22 City right-of-way into private ponds.

23  
24 Pompeo: Right.

25  
26 Pitts: But the ponds were, that really what the private property is doing, what the  
27 private ponds are doing is over, they're releasing less water than the historic  
28 in order to offset the amount that the roads are going to release. So that  
29 the water that's actually coming from the roads is not entering private  
30 property anywhere. Is that? Am I wrong or right on that?

31  
32 Pompeo: No, no. In this particular development is whatever rainfall falls on the public  
33 street, it stays in the public right-of-way and it runs out of the subdivision.  
34 So it never enters into private property. How we control that runoff is by  
35 requiring the adjacent lots to that road to store additional runoff, and that's  
36 how the drainage balances so that the post development discharge at the  
37 time of full development is less than the predevelopment discharge going  
38 up to Solano. But as we've talked about before, and Jimmy is correct, on  
39 the current set of construction drawings for Phase 1A those ponding areas  
40 are not contained within those drawings.

41  
42 Kinney: Right.

43  
44 Pompeo: Those ponds, including the big lot in this that we're talking about subdividing  
45 now, those need to be, those drawings need to be turned into the City to  
46 show the location and the sizing those ponds. And those ponds need to be

1 put in now so that the storm water balances and there's no additional  
2 discharge off the site.  
3

4 Pitts: Okay. And I think maybe the where we're going to have the problem of City  
5 water going into private ponds is in this new regional pond that you're  
6 building, and whatever you do with what comes off of Desert, because there  
7 will be private ponds and there'll be the City pond. And to me that, I think  
8 that, in that location, yes, we will have City water flowing through.  
9

10 Pompeo: We're going to have commingling of private and public water in that pond,  
11 but that was as approved by the City back in 2016 with the hospital's  
12 drainage analysis. So we're going to have to figure the nuts and bolts of  
13 that final out that wasn't spelled out in the drainage report. It was just the  
14 size of the pond, and it would be taking in private water and public water.  
15 So we still need to work that out. And we need to work it out with Public  
16 Works and Parks because we've got to figure out what to do in that corner  
17 over there.  
18

19 Pitts: You good with all that?  
20

21 Moreno: Yes. Based on my original concern that's a concern I have. The other pond  
22 up to the south is a separate issue, and that can be easily worked out. Yes,  
23 my concern is that. And then you know the concentrated flow resulting from  
24 gathering all the street flow and emptying it on one point on Solano. So  
25 based on those discussions and the calculations, that's where modifications  
26 to the plat may come into place, may or may not, at this point we're not there  
27 yet.  
28

29 Pompeo: We'll work it out, and if whatever the changes need to be required after we  
30 come to consensus.  
31

32 Pitts: Yes, I still say we should do something along Solano before it gets released.  
33 You know something that small pond there to manage some of the release  
34 so that it doesn't just come flying out like it did. I don't know, it rained pretty  
35 heavy last night. I don't know how things go. Have you been by there?  
36

37 Pompeo: There's a four foot berm out there now. I couldn't, nothing came out of the  
38 site..  
39

40 Moreno: Yes, that was a separate issue because those are temporary issues related  
41 to the SWIPT. The one we're talking about with the plat is a permanent you  
42 know post development. Yes, those many issues with the construction  
43 phase in terms of SWIPT. Yes, temporary measures will keep that separate  
44 issue there.  
45

46 Pitts: Are there any other comments, concerns, questions? Mark.

1  
2 Dubbin: Can we look at the sheet where it borders Apodaca Park?  
3  
4 Pompeo: This one here? Apodaca's right here.  
5  
6 Dubbin: So one of my questions was, how are we, do we have access through the  
7 park to the subdivision? I know that was something that was talked about  
8 conceptual stages.  
9  
10 Pompeo: There's an access requirement, but it's just trail. It's just walking.  
11  
12 Castillo: Yes, it's only going to be a pedestrian access because of how we've  
13 obtained the Apodaca Park, we can't make modifications to it.  
14  
15 Dubbin: Well, I know that it's a congressional set aside, I know literally an act of  
16 Congress to change that. But we do have a parking lot that runs through  
17 there..  
18  
19 Kinney: What's he even looking at?  
20  
21 Dubbin: I don't think we need to mark ...  
22  
23 Pitts: Is this the right sheet? Or we got one more?  
24  
25 Pompeo: Well I probably need to look at the aerial. If you have an aerial of that.  
26  
27 Moreno: Apodaca Park, Mike.  
28  
29 Pompeo: Zoom into Apodaca Park.  
30  
31 Pitts: So currently we have a gate here, right.  
32  
33 Pompeo: Yes. Like right here.  
34  
35 Dubbin: Right. Will that gate remain to allow like at least an emergency access into  
36 that area?  
37  
38 Pompeo: Well this is going to be multi-family; I mean high intensity family here. I  
39 mean, I don't know why you would have a, just because of the layout we're  
40 probably going to have a perimeter road on it. And I don't think there would  
41 be any issue with leaving the gate there. But I mean that would be up to  
42 Parks and bunch of other people.  
43  
44 Castillo: There was some discussions previously with the Parks and Recreation  
45 director about modifying Apodaca Park, but I don't know what the plans are  
46 and how long that would take.



1  
2 Pompeo: I believe we would be willing to discuss that with the City after an internal  
3 City discussion about that.  
4  
5 Dubbin: I would agree. I think I'd like to leave that on the table as something that  
6 might be a requirement before the final plat, if that's something that we can  
7 address with that access through Madrid.  
8  
9 Pompeo: Okay.  
10  
11 Pitts: Is there anything in the plat, John, that would forbid that?  
12  
13 Castillo: So right now this is still a preliminary plat. So we haven't gotten to the final  
14 plat construction stages yet. This is purely just to give a more detailed  
15 outline of what the master plan has said for this portion.  
16  
17 Pitts: Okay.  
18  
19 Castillo: As we get to construction drawings and final plat process, there will need to  
20 be more discussions between the City and developer as to how we make  
21 those connections to Apodaca Park and what Parks and Recreation has  
22 planned for redevelopment of Apodaca Park.  
23  
24 Pitts: I believe that Apodaca Blueprint called for some type of open space or  
25 internal park space in that area too.  
26  
27 Castillo: Correct. The Apodaca Blueprint does call out, as well as the master plan  
28 for Royal Crossings, but that would be done towards a later phase, and as  
29 we get closer to the end of Phase 1B.  
30  
31 Pitts: Okay. But it'd be wise to include that in any planning at the construction  
32 drawing phase it would seem to me, so that you don't for foreclose an option  
33 that would be really nice to have.  
34  
35 Pompeo: Correct. Now we're open to those discussions. I mean as we work through  
36 the other documents.  
37  
38 Pitts: Okay. Any other questions, comments? Okay, I'll entertain a vote. CD.  
39  
40 Castillo: Yes.  
41  
42 Pitts: PW.  
43  
44 Moreno: Yes.  
45  
46 Pitts: Fire.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

Dubbin: Yes.

Pitts: And Utilities.

Nasir: Yes.

Pitts: Okay. Thank you. And that is all our items on the agenda.

**5. ADJOURNMENT (10:12 a.m.)**

Pitts: So by the Open Meetings Act I must adjourn. I think we need a motion to adjourn I think it's how that we do it.

Dubbin: We do not.

Pitts: Robert rules does not require one. Okay. We adjourn.

---

Chairperson