



# CITY OF LAS CRUCES

## DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE (DRC)

Following are the minutes from the City of Las Cruces Development Review Committee Meeting held Wednesday, November 6, 2024, at 9:00 a.m. in Room 1158.

**DRC PRESENT:** Chris Faivre, Interim Deputy Director, Com. Dev.  
Elaine Martinez, Engineering Tech, Utilities  
Mark Dubbin, Fire Projection Engineer  
Gary Skelton, Engineer, Public Works  
Cathy Mathews, Landscape Architect, Parks & Rec.  
Mike Kinney, Plan Review Engineer, Com. Dev.  
Kyle Metzgar, MPO

**STAFF PRESENT:** Adam Ochoa, Senior Planner  
John Castillo, Planner, Community Development

**OTHER PRESENT:** John Moscato, Sierra Norte Development  
Eddie Binns, Binns Construction  
Chad Sells, Sierra Norte Development

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

Ochoa: All righty. Good morning folks. Go ahead and call this meeting of the November 6th Development Review Committee meeting to order. It is 9:01.

### 2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES -

#### 2.1 August 14, 2024

Ochoa: So first item we have is, a couple items are the approval of minutes. First one we have is the August 14, 2024, DRC minutes. Do we have any changes for that?

Martinez: Rocio said no.

Ochoa: No. I see none. Can I have a motion to approve the August 14, 2024, DRC minutes, please?

Metzgar: So moved

Ochoa: Can I have a second, please?

Dubbin: Second.

1 Ochoa: All right. All in favor please signify by saying "aye."  
2

3 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.  
4

5 Ochoa: Opposed, "nay." Those are approved.  
6

7 **2.2 August 28, 2024**  
8

9 Ochoa: Next are the August, 28, 2024, DRC minutes. Do we have any changes for  
10 those?  
11

12 Martinez: Garcia said, no.  
13

14 Ochoa: Nothing from utilities. Anybody else? I had one minor change. I believe  
15 David Weir was listed on that list of minutes. We just need to change those.  
16 But I will let the secretary know that and she can change that. Other than  
17 that, can have a motion to approve the minutes with that minor change for  
18 the August 28, 2024, DRC minutes, please?  
19

20 Dubbin: So moved with the correction stated.  
21

22 Ochoa: Thank you, Mark. Second, please.  
23

24 Metzgar: Second/  
25

26 Ochoa: Thank you. All in favor signify by saying "aye."  
27

28 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.  
29

30 Ochoa: All opposed. And those are approved.  
31

32 **3. OLD BUSINESS**  
33

34 Ochoa: So we have no old business.  
35

36 **4. NEW BUSINESS**  
37

38 **4.1 Case No. 24CS0500120: Sonoma Ranch East 2 Phase 11 Replat No. 1**

- 39 • A request for approval of a non-administrative replat known as Sonoma  
40 Ranch East 2 Phase 11 Replat No. 1.
- 41 • The subject property encompasses approximately 0.323 acres, is zoned  
42 R-1a (Single-Family Medium Density) and located at 4757 Snow Goose  
43 Road.
- 44 • The subdivision proposes to subdivide one (1) existing lot into two (2)  
45 new lots that are 0.161 acres and 0.162 acres in size.
- 46 • Submitted by Carter Surveying and Mapping, representative.  
47

1 Ochoa: So moving on to new business. First item we have here is case  
2 24CS0500120. It's the Sonoma Ranch East 2 Phase 11 Replat No. 1 This  
3 is a nonadministrative replat for a property that encompasses roughly 0.323  
4 acres in size. Yes, that's it right there. Is that it? My apologies. Yes, that's  
5 it right there. 0.323 acres in size. Subject property is R-1a, single-family  
6 medium density, and is located at 4757 Snow Goose Road. Subdivision  
7 proposes to subdivide one existing residential property into two new lots.  
8 One encompassing roughly 0.161 acres in size, and the other 0.162 acres  
9 in size. This has been submitted by Carter Surveying and Mapping  
10 representative. This seems like a fairly simple subdivision. There are no  
11 really outstanding comments on this from what we've seen in the database,  
12 but I go around the table if anybody had any additional comments for this  
13 replat here.  
14  
15 Kinney: Question.  
16  
17 Ochoa: Yes. Engineering. Mike.  
18  
19 Kinney: So the reduced size of the lots, how do they compare to the ones in the  
20 vicinity? The general vicinity. Are those bigger? Are those quarter acre  
21 lots?  
22  
23 Moscato: No. Well, there's a few lots that are large, but most are 52 by 110.  
24  
25 Kinney: Okay.  
26  
27 Ochoa: And for the record that was John Moscato. Yes, so these lots roughly, Mike,  
28 are your typical R-1a size lots between 5,000 to 7,000 square feet in size.  
29 This one right here is kind of a ...  
30  
31 Kinney: Yes it was like ...  
32  
33 Ochoa: Wonky lot.  
34  
35 Kinney: Quarter of an acre.  
36  
37 Ochoa: Correct.  
38  
39 Kinney: Or more. Yes.  
40  
41 Ochoa: Rather large lots and now we're just trying to subdivide it into two lots for  
42 development.  
43  
44 Kinney: I just had, and then a question I had primarily is with the side setbacks and  
45 rear setbacks for code, and of course front setback. How is that going to  
46 affect the footprint of the size of the structure?  
47

1 Ochoa: So the zoning code does have exceptions for these types of lots where,  
2 essentially the rear lot if you will is the actual back corner here.  
3  
4 Kinney: Right.  
5  
6 Ochoa: And then you measure your 20 feet, because it is R-1a, 20 feet along the  
7 side property lines, and that's essentially your rear setback.  
8  
9 Kinney: Okay. Leaving a five foot setback on the side lot.  
10  
11 Ochoa: And a five foot setbacks on the sides, 15 in the front, and then 25 for garage.  
12 So the lots, the way they are they're still pretty much developable.  
13  
14 Kinney: Okay, that's primarily what I was getting at. Okay. Thank you.  
15  
16 Ochoa: Thank you. Thank you for the comments, Mike. Any other comments? All  
17 righty, seeing none. I'll go ahead and entertain a motion to recommend  
18 approval for case 24CS0500120.  
19  
20 Dubbin: So moved.  
21  
22 Ochoa: Can I have a second, please?  
23  
24 Mathews: Second.  
25  
26 Ochoa: Thank you very much. All in favor please signify by saying, "aye."  
27  
28 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.  
29  
30 Ochoa: All opposed? Seeing none. Motion passes. This will be moving forward to  
31 the December, pardon me, if I could get a date specific for this, this is the  
32 December 17th Planning and Zoning Commission for this one.  
33  
34 **4.2 Case No. 24CS0500112: Amador Investment Properties Replat No. 1**  
35 • A request for approval of a non-administrative replat known as Amador  
36 Investment Properties Replat No. 1.  
37 • The subject property encompasses approximately 7.290 acres, is zoned  
38 M-1/M-2 (Industrial Standard) and located at 1655 W. Amador Avenue.  
39 • The subdivision proposes to subdivide one (1) existing lot into two (2)  
40 new lots that are 2.548 acres and 4.742 acres in size.  
41 • Submitted by Libbin Underwood Engineering & Surveying,  
42 representative.  
43  
44 Ochoa: All righty. Next case we have is case 24CS0500112. This is a proposed  
45 replat known as the Amador Investment Properties Replat No. 1. Subject  
46 property encompasses 7.290 acres in size. Is currently zone M-1/M-2,  
47 which is industrial standard. And located at 1655 West Amador Avenue.

1 So this is a subdivision of the existing industrial lot. The one existing  
2 industrial lot into two new lots. One encompassing roughly 2.549 acres in  
3 size, and the other one 4.742 acres in size. This submitted by Libbin  
4 Underwood Engineering and Surveying. I guess this one was a little more  
5 controversial, so let's go around the table and see if we had any other  
6 outstanding comments. Start with MPO. Any comments?  
7  
8 Metzgar: No comments.  
9  
10 Ochoa: All right. Fire.  
11  
12 Dubbin: No issues.  
13  
14 Ochoa: All right. thank you. Utilities.  
15  
16 Martinez: Utilities, no issues.  
17  
18 Ochoa: Thank you very much. Parks and Rec.  
19  
20 Mathews: I don't have issues, but I do have a question. On Burn Lake Road, will there  
21 be any improvements along that road? I mean when these properties are  
22 developed do you anticipate? Do you think?  
23  
24 Castillo: Mr. Chair. To answer Cathy's question. There will not any improvements  
25 made to Burn Lake Road as it's a leased property that the City has with  
26 EBID.  
27  
28 Mathews: Burn Lake Road is leased property.  
29  
30 Castillo: Yes.  
31  
32 Mathews: Okay. Okay. Thank you.  
33  
34 Ochoa: All right. Thank you, Cathy. Engineering, Traffic.  
35  
36 Skelton: Along the same lines, along Burn Lake Road. Will there be any access  
37 granted? As we don't believe a jurisdiction there to grant access.  
38  
39 Castillo: At this time there won't be any access through Burn Lake Road.  
40  
41 Skelton: All right. Okay.  
42  
43 Ochoa: Thank you, Gary. Mike, Engineering, any additional comments?  
44  
45 Kinney: No, none from a standpoint of engineering. But I believe this property is  
46 part of, within the flood zone. Mr. Binns.  
47  
48 Binns: I didn't understand your question.

1  
2 Kinney: I believe this property is part of the, your properties are on West Amadora  
3 that are currently in a flood zone.  
4  
5 Binns: Correct.  
6  
7 Kinney: And so right now there's a study being initiated by the City through Wilson  
8 and Company to, it's phase one of a flood study, and hopefully it'll go into  
9 phase two. And it's not known whether or not this property would be actually  
10 in the flood zone. I noticed here on the replat it's not shown, so I'm not,  
11 without checking my map I don't know if it's actually within, the portions of it  
12 are in an actual designated flood zone. So I would guess what I would ask  
13 if it is then the flood zone needs to be shown, outline.  
14  
15 Ochoa: Okay. Other than that, any other comments on that?  
16  
17 Kinney: No.  
18  
19 Ochoa: All right. Thank you, Mike. So that being said, that's a comment that I think  
20 could be resolved for DRC and not necessarily a condition that's required  
21 for the Planning and Zoning Commission. So that being said, can I have a  
22 motion to recommend approval for the proposed replat, which is case  
23 24CS0500112.  
24  
25 Mathews: So moved.  
26  
27 Ochoa: Can I have a second, please?  
28  
29 Kinney: The motion with the contingency.  
30  
31 Ochoa: So I don't think we need a contingency just because contingencies move  
32 forward to the Planning and Zoning Commission, and this has been kind of  
33 an issue with the Planning and Zoning Commission, because this is more  
34 of an engineering issue that needs to be resolved with us, if you will. And  
35 the Planning and Zoning Commission, all they're really looking at is the  
36 actual replay itself. So we just need to make sure before we send out mylars  
37 for signatures that that issue gets resolved.  
38  
39 Kinney: Okay.  
40  
41 Ochoa: Is the way I want to kind of start dealing with these. That way it's left on  
42 administrative standpoint since it is kind of an administrative.  
43  
44 Kinney: So you'll handle that internally.  
45  
46 Ochoa: Yes, sir.  
47  
48 Kinney: Okay. Is that okay with Mr. Binns and Mister.

1  
2 Binns: Can I ask for clarification on you're talking about?  
3  
4 Ochoa: Mr. Binns is looking for clarification on that, Mike. What is it that you would  
5 like o on the plat, please?  
6  
7 Kinney: For these two lots, lot 1B and 1A.  
8  
9 Binns: Okay.  
10  
11 Kinney: If any part of those lots are currently in a designated FEMA flood zone, then  
12 the flood zone needs to be shown on ...  
13  
14 Ochoa: On the plat.  
15  
16 Binns: Okay.  
17  
18 Ochoa: Yes, sire. If those could be shown on the plat when mylars are created Mr.  
19 Binns.  
20  
21 Binns: There's no question about that.  
22  
23 Ochoa: Okay.  
24  
25 Kinney: I just, as I sit here I can't tell you if they are or they are not.  
26  
27 Ochoa: So if they are, if you could get those on the actual plat itself when they come  
28 in for mylars, that way we can take care of that within house if you will.  
29 Kinney: Okay.  
30  
31 Ochoa: All right.  
32  
33 Kinney: Works for me.  
34  
35 Ochoa: So we did have a motion. Can I have a second, please?  
36  
37 Dubbin: I'll second the motion.  
38  
39 Ochoa: All right. Thank you very much. All in favor, please signify by saying, "aye."  
40  
41 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.  
42  
43 Ochoa: All opposed. Motion passes. This will move forward to the December  
44 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting as well.  
45  
46 **4.2 Case 24CS0500092: Peachtree Hills Road Right-of-Way Vacation Plat**  
47 • A request for approval of vacation plat known as Peachtree Hills Road  
48 Right-Of-Way Vacation Plat.

- 1 • The subject area encompasses approximately 1.938 acres, is zoned
- 2 PUD (Planned Unit Development, and is located within the Metro Verde
- 3 PUD area east of the City of Las Cruces City Limits and west of the
- 4 currently built out Peachtree Hills Road.
- 5 • The subdivision proposes to vacate portions of this section of Peachtree
- 6 Hills Road since Peachtree Hills is being realigned and this portion will
- 7 be the future extension of Electra Avenue. The vacation will algin the
- 8 width of this portion of the future extension of Electra Avenue with the
- 9 existing width of Electra Avenue and the approved cross-section and
- 10 width called out in the Metro Verde PUD.
- 11 • Submitted by Sierra Norte Development, Inc., representative.

13 Ochoa: Last item we have here is case 24CS0500092. This is the proposed,  
 14 vacation plat or vacating plat of Peachtree Hills Road right-of-way. This is  
 15 essentially a vacation plat for property that accompanies roughly 1.93 acres  
 16 in size. Property's currents zoned PUD, planned unit development, and is  
 17 part of what is the Metro Verde PUD area. It is located generally east of the  
 18 City of Las Cruces city limits, and west of what is currently the built out  
 19 Peachtree Hills Road. So the subdivision proposes to vacate portions of  
 20 this section of Peachtree Hills, since Peachtree Hills has been realigned,  
 21 coming up from the southwest going east. There we go. And this is  
 22 basically the future extension of what is known as Electra Avenue. The  
 23 vacation will align the width of this portion of the future extension of Electra  
 24 Avenue, with existing width of Electra Avenue with the approved cross  
 25 section and width called out by Metro Verde PUD.

27 This went through a couple of reviews, just minor issues when it came to  
 28 the actual calling out what tract is what, what subdivision is part of what.  
 29 But I believe all comments were resolved for this. But that being said, I'll go  
 30 around the table and see if there are any additional comments on this here.  
 31 MPO.

33 Metzgar: Comments for MPO. No comments.

35 Ochoa: Thank you. Fire.

37 Dubbin: We have no issues.

39 Ochoa: Thank you. Utilities.

41 Martinez: No issues.

43 Ochoa: Thank you. Parks and Rec.

45 Mathews: No issues.

47 Ochoa: Thank you very much. Traffic Engineering.

48



1 Skelton: Yes the tract looks like it's, so the, it looks like the proposed Electra Avenue  
2 extension along this, you know along this part. The approach angle to  
3 Peachtree Hills is coming in, it looks like 30 degree plus or minus with the  
4 last second turn to make it a 90 degree approach. We're not in support of  
5 that approach. It's too close to Peachtree Hills. We believe it needs to be  
6 pushed back so that the turn is more of a 90 degree approach instead of  
7 being just a turn right on to Peachtree Hills. So we're not really in favor of  
8 this layout for the proposed road or extension of Electra Avenue.  
9

10 Ochoa: Okay. Can we hear from the applicant, please?

11

12 Sells: That was approved with Metro West Phase 1.

13

14 Skelton: It was.

15

16 Sells: It's under construction.

17

18 Skelton: Okay.

19

20 Kinney: That's not part of this vacation. It's just, that's just showing for reference  
21 location. Okay.  
22

23 Ochoa: Yes. So this is just essentially eliminating the width of was 50 feet of  
24 Peachtree Hills, eliminating and making it a narrow right-of-way is what it is.  
25 The actual alignments of the roads out there are already kind of existing as  
26 is.  
27

28 Kinney: Okay.

29

30 Ochoa: Engineering, any additional comments?

31

32 Kinney: Just a question. Where do you have the curve, C3? That area is going to,  
33 I take it the tract A will become a road at some point in time. Is that correct?  
34

35 Sells: I'm not, which is tract A?

36

37 Kinney: Tract A is right there, the one on the south. And then as you move towards  
38 the east, towards there right C5 there's an opening, so that looks to me like  
39 that's going to be like a roadway where, like an intersection.  
40

41 Sells: The applicant. Electra will take place at Peachtree. We're just narrowing it  
42 to the 46.  
43

44 Kinney: Okay. So that would be the northern intersection of Electra.

45

46 Sells: Right.

47

48 Kinney: Okay. All right. So, all right.

1  
2 Ochoa: We good, Mike.  
3  
4 Kinney: Yes, I just don't know what the distance is between point C6 and C4 if that's  
5 going to, that open space which is not part of the, you know what that  
6 distance is. I don't know if it's wide enough for a roadway. So what's the  
7 width of our tract A?  
8  
9 Skelton: You're proposing a 46 foot right-of-way along Electra Avenue, correct.  
10 Okay. And I assume you'll maintain that all the way up to Peachtree Hills.  
11  
12 Sells: Right.  
13  
14 Skelton: Okay.  
15  
16 Kinney: So that'd be a local road in Metro Verde. All right.  
17  
18 Ochoa: Correct. The designed local road for what is for Metro Verde PUD.  
19  
20 Kinney: Okay. All right. Just ...  
21  
22 Ochoa: I got a bigger here, Mike, if you need to see it.  
23  
24 Kinney: Yes, just the only question I have is there enough open space between the  
25 end of where C6 is marked and C4 is marked to allow for the construction  
26 of an intersection, therefore, which would be an extension of Electra  
27 Avenue. Is that correct, Chad, on that side?  
28  
29 Sells: Electra ties into Peachtree Hills Road.  
30  
31 Kinney: On both sides.  
32  
33 Sells: I'm not understanding what you're asking.  
34  
35 Skelton: Yes, it's existing at ...  
36  
37 Kinney: Right there. On the north of, right there where Adam has his arrow. There's  
38 an opening there.  
39  
40 Sells: That's part of Metro West Phase 1 plat. This is a vacation plat for Peachtree.  
41  
42 Ochoa: So essentially that's already there is essentially I believe, what the applicant  
43 is stating.  
44  
45 Kinney: Okay. All right. So what portion of Peachtree is being vacated?  
46  
47 Ochoa: So the portion of Peachtree that's being vacated is a 1.361 acre tract of  
48 land, which runs along the northern side over here. It's about two feet wide

1 on the north side of Peachtree Hills. Widens out a little bit here to take in  
2 this piece as well. And then it's also, and then a 0.4  
3  
4 Kinney: Tract B.  
5  
6 Ochoa: Acre of tract B, which is about 12 feet wide, which runs along the southern  
7 portion of it right here, as well as there's an additional 0.169 acres which is  
8 tract C on the east side, which is continuation of Peachtree Hills.  
9  
10 Kinney: Okay. That wasn't clear for me. Okay.  
11  
12 Ochoa: All righty.  
13  
14 Kinney: All right. In that case, as well as Roseanne Roseannadanna would say  
15 "never mind."  
16  
17 Ochoa: All right. Thank you, Mike. All right. Any additional comments on that? All  
18 righty folks. That being said, can I have a motion to approve case  
19 24CS0500092?  
20  
21 Dubbin: Motion to approve.  
22  
23 Ochoa: Can I have a second please?  
24  
25 Kinney: Second.  
26  
27 Ochoa: All righty. Thank you very much. That being said, all those in favor, please  
28 signify by saying "aye."  
29  
30 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.  
31  
32 Ochoa: All opposed. All righty this will move forward to City Council say in about a  
33 month, just to make sure we get that case packet in on time for you all. All  
34 righty.  
35  
36 **5. ADJOURNMENT (09:21 a.m.)**  
37  
38 Ochoa: All righty, folks. Any other items for discussion? All right, seeing none.  
39 Can I have a motion to adjourn, please?  
40  
41 Kinney: So moved.  
42  
43 Ochoa: Mike Kenney, so moved.  
44  
45 Ochoa: Can I have a second, please?  
46  
47 Mathews: Second.  
48

1 Ochoa: All in favor signify by saying "aye."

2

3 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

4

5 Ochoa: All opposed. We are adjourned at 9:21/

6

7

8

9

10

11 \_\_\_\_\_  
Chairperson