



CITY OF LAS CRUCES

DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE (DRC)

Following are the minutes from the City of Las Cruces Development Review Committee Meeting held Wednesday, May 6, 2026, at 9:00 a.m. in Room 1158.

DRC PRESENT: David Weir, Deputy Director Community Planning
Rocio Nasir, Senior Engineer, Utilities
Michael Danner, Fire Investigator LCFD
Oscar Guerrero, Public Works
Chris Faivre, Director Community Development
Natashia Billy, Public Works
Christina Abeyta-Corella, Parks & Recreation

STAFF PRESENT: Sara Gonzales, Deputy Director Building Safety

OTHER PRESENT: Adrian Renteria, A&E Engineering
Pedro Achaval, Libbin Underwood Engineering
Kent Thurston, Ken Thurston Development

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

Weir: It's 9 o'clock, I'll go ahead and call the DRC May 6th to order. Are we good, Sara? Okay.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

2.1 April 15, 2026

Weir: The first item on the agenda was approval of minutes, but I don't believe those were distributed, so...

Gonzales: They were sent out through the e-mail as well, yes.

Weir: Were they?

Gonzales: Yes.

Weir: Okay. Okay, well then I would entertain a motion to approve minutes from April 15, 2026. And if no one has read them, we can postpone until the next meeting.

Nasir: So move.

1 Weir: Second?

2
3 Danner: Second.

4
5 Weir: Okay. All those in favor?

6
7 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

8
9 Weir: All those opposed. Okay, minutes approved.

10
11 **3. NEW BUSINESS**

12
13 **3.1 Case 25CS0500099: Summer Estates Subdivision Preliminary Plat**

- 14
15
 - A request for approval of a Preliminary Plat known as Summer Estates Subdivision.
 - The proposed subdivision is zoned NH-1S / NH-3S (Neighborhood-1 Suburban / Neighborhood-3 Suburban), encompasses approximately 33.023 acres in size, and is located south of Engler Road/ Thurmond Road and along the east side of Settlers Pass/ Longview Lane. The subdivision proposes to subdivide two (2) existing tracts into twenty-nine (29) new residential lots that range in size from approximately 0.880 to 1.018 acres
 - The subdivision proposes modifying the required local roadway cross-section from fifty (50) feet to forty (40) feet to align with right-of-way located in the development on the west side Settlers Pass/Longview Lane. Section 38-2.C.1.a & b allows cross-section deviations if approved by DRC.
 - Dedication of Settlers Pass/ Longview Lane and Engler Road/ Thurmond Road are proposed with the development.
 - In lieu of providing the required road improvements to the roadways immediately adjacent to the subdivision, the developer will be providing road improvement to Settlers Pass/ Longview Lane.
 - Submitted by Libbin Underwood Engineering and Surveying, on behalf of Thurston Kenneth R Trustees, & G Buce Brown Jr. & Nelita U, property owners.

37
38 Weir: The next item on the agenda is new business. Summer Estate Subdivision Preliminary Plat. Ms. Gonzales, do you have a presentation?

39
40
41 Gonzales: Sure. So for this preliminary plat, it is Summer Estate Subdivision. The property encompasses about 33 acres in size. It is zoned NH-1 Suburban as well as NH-3 Suburban along the north side of the tract by Engler. The property is to be subdivided into 29 new lots. The reason it's 29 new lots is because in one tract, there will be block A, which has 28 lots. There is a second block B, which is going to have essentially one lot designated for it.

1 That's going to give us dedication for Longview Lane. So that's why it's
2 being included into the actual map.

3
4 The dedication is going to be provided as required for the subdivision along
5 Engler or Thurmond, whichever road you would consider it, as required for
6 the 60 feet. We're also going to see dedication adjacent to the subdivision
7 along Settlers Pass and Longview Lane, which is going to be 42.1/2 feet.
8 However, the applicant is requesting to take the improvements from this
9 area and relocate them and finish out Longview Lane to where we have a
10 full 42 1/2 foot cross section. And so that's going to essentially run from
11 Carson Ranch subdivision, which was filed about four years ago on the
12 north side. That will give us connection from there, and then take us
13 essentially to Arroyos at Settlers Pass Phase 2. And so the 42 1/2 foot
14 cross section would align to where there's a full paved cross section that
15 will now take us all the way from Engler essentially to Del Rey Boulevard as
16 an improved section.

17
18 The applicant is also requesting to deviate from the internal roadway, which
19 is known as Summer, I think it's Summer Street, yes Summer Street.
20 Instead of doing a 50 foot cross section for a local roadway, the applicant is
21 requesting to do a 40 foot cross section, which would be an alternate cross
22 section from our normal standards. We used to have in our code a large lot
23 subdivision. If you did a large lot subdivision you could do a 40 foot cross
24 section. When Carson Ranch came in, it was located on the west side of
25 this property. This is now the east side of the property to be developed.
26 And so they're just matching and aligning with what was existing, so that
27 way the roads are basically aligned with each other and they don't offset,
28 instead of doing the additional 10 feet. And so the cross section would
29 essentially be the same that was proposed from the other subdivision
30 located on the west side. So just a continuation.

31
32 Staff did send everything out for review. There were no additional
33 comments from anyone except for the requirement that DRC is to approve
34 the cross section or deny those cross sections since the alternatives from
35 the original code. Nothing else.

36
37 Weir: Sara, because of the large lots are not required to provide sidewalks, is that
38 the comment?

39
40 Gonzales: So what the applicant is proposing is the cross section you see before you.
41 So you would essentially have a four foot sidewalk.

42
43 Weir: Okay.

44
45 Gonzales: We have them called out as parkways. I think at this point staff would like
46 to see them as being sidewalks instead of parkways, knowing that parkways

1 do not actually provide any pedestrian activity. They are part of the right-
2 of-way. And four feet does not actually supply where you can see trees or
3 plants or anything growing within them. And so at that point staff would be
4 looking for the parkways to be sidewalks or improved.
5

6 Weir: Okay. Mr. Thurston, anything you'd like to add or your representative?
7

8 Thurston: Just the main one I'm concerned on, not concerned on, but wanted to point
9 out is just the connectivity that we're trying to do, more just for the record of
10 showing why we're trying to do that. There's a need for connectivity out
11 there, and the reason we were seeing it is instead of us going on the right-
12 hand side and doing our improvements there, which you'll go from like a
13 four-lane right back down to a two-lane, so it would be a piece of
14 improvement that really would not be used. And you've seen that there on
15 Mesa Grande Estates where it goes from four lanes to two lanes back to
16 four lanes, and it's just kind of mixed all the way around. So we are really
17 wanting to just take our existing improvements that we are supposed to do
18 and then improve Longview Lane. Because you see that the houses on the
19 left side or on the west probably won't get developed for quite a while, and
20 so we believe that for a longer-term solution for the city is to have better
21 connectivity out there. I just think it's a better use of funds, and I think it's
22 better for the city as well for maintenance. It should be better for the Public
23 Works to maintain as well. So we're crossing our fingers that you guys like
24 that design. I think it's, I personally think it's great for the whole area. You're
25 going to get some relief from adjacent subdivisions that will also use that
26 new road. And I've chatted with some neighbors, and they have asked
27 what's going on. And we've talked to them and told them that we were
28 wanting to connect that, and every single person that we've talked to is
29 excited and wanting that to go through. So that's just from our standpoint
30 what we wanted to do.
31

32 Now the other part is, the other kind of waiver or deviation is the 40-foot
33 right-of-way. We're just basically copying to the subdivision to the west that
34 was done. And so we're not, we don't think we're really asking for very
35 much other than just doing what used to be allowed that was just to the
36 west, being that they're big lots. And we do not have, on Google Earth, if
37 you look on it, there are no sidewalks on the other one. And so we were
38 going to build it as such.
39

40 Renteria: Yes, that cross section in the past had an alternative for either a Type J curb
41 or a sidewalk. And what they went with is a Type J, and that's what we're
42 proposing on this one as well.
43

44 Weir: Okay. I know the 2001 codes, if you were greater than a half acre,
45 sidewalks weren't even required, so I don't know if that's changed in the
46 new code.

1
2 Gonzales: It's no longer within the new code.
3
4 Weir: Okay.
5
6 Gonzales: That's why. So at this point, that's why we're saying you know sidewalks
7 would be the preferred method, even with the alternative cross section.
8 Being the lots, that's why I say the area right now doesn't have sewer, which
9 is why they're required to put in septic tanks, which is why the lots are
10 required to be the size that they are. And so minimum standards from any
11 media is 0.75 acres or larger. And so that's the reason why the lots have to
12 be at a large acre.
13
14 Weir: Anybody, DRC members, any questions for staff or the applicant?
15
16 Billy: I just want to, I just want to reiterate what Sara mentioned, because that's
17 what Public Works supports as well, in terms of making those sidewalks and
18 potentially instead of the left side being six feet, making that side five feet
19 and then the other side five feet. And then you know just wherever we have
20 streetlights, it'll just dig down to you know like four feet and then go back
21 out to five feet, meander basically for that particular cross section.
22
23 Gonzales: So on the 40 feet, you would say this part, the four-foot parkway being
24 proposed in the outline would end up becoming a five-foot sidewalk.
25
26 Billy: Right. And you just take that foot from the other side towards the six feet.
27
28 Gonzales: So I'm turning to the applicant based on the light pole and then the sidewalk
29 and the four-foot clearance that we do have to still maintain for PROAG. If
30 we go down to five feet with the light pole base we wouldn't have enough
31 room.
32
33 Billy: Is that why?
34
35 Gonzales: Yes.
36
37 Billy: You're doing that on that side?
38
39 Gonzales: Yes, But I would say we could take the travel lanes and reduce the travel
40 lane.
41
42 Billy: Reducing the travel lane for the, maybe if you go down to 11 1/2 feet?
43
44 Gonzales: Because it is a local road, is why I'm thinking.
45

1 Billy: Maybe if you go down to 11 1/2 feet, is that something that Fire would be
2 okay with?
3
4 Danner: It's going to be tight, just because I know here it's only shown on one side
5 as parking for street, but we all know that everybody parks on both sides.
6 So it's going to be tight. But because it's just a straightaway, we can make
7 it happen. If it was like within the entire neighborhood, that might be another
8 one.
9
10 Gonzales: And I would show there's a lot more when the larger lots, we're not seeing
11 as much on-street parking that is taking place within those areas because
12 there is so much more room within their property. So that would be some
13 of the consideration, which is why that with some of the rural areas were
14 given those exceptions for larger lots, no parking generally on the street.
15 Previous cross-section didn't have parking at all, and it wasn't a
16 requirement. And so by providing at least one opportunity, it does have it.
17 But you can see that most of the properties right now, they're not as utilized
18 as some of our more dense areas that are on local streets. So if the
19 consideration would be to reduce the travel lane, even if it's only 11 1/2 feet,
20 so we maintain the six feet to have clearance on the one side and only
21 reduce the parkway to, or the sidewalk, increase it to five. Would everybody
22 be okay with that? And we'd also look to the applicant if that is what you'd
23 be amenable to.
24
25 Thurston: Reduce it by a foot, the driving lane?
26
27 Gonzales: So we'd reduce the driving lane here by a foot to add a foot here to increase
28 it to a five-foot sidewalk.
29
30 Renteria: Fine.
31
32 Thurston: Five-foot sidewalk on both sides is what you're?
33
34 Billy: Yeah.
35
36 Gonzales: This is going to be sidewalk on this side and sidewalk here.
37
38 Billy: Well, we'd still leave it six. I know it's very, I know it's very preliminary, but
39 do you foresee streetlights on either side?
40
41 Renteria: It's typically just on one side.
42
43 Billy: Okay.
44
45 Renteria: Streetlights is where we run them through.
46

1 Billy: I'm just, because I know you have that curve in there, and sometimes your
2 lighting analysis may need something around there. I'm just, I'm just you
3 know talking about stuff in the future.
4
5 Gonzales: Right here.
6
7 Billy: Yes, just thinking about the potential for those streetlights. And you know
8 for some reason if it has to be on the other side. But I'm sure you guys can
9 make that work, just to make sure that it's ADA compliant as well.
10
11 Thurston: Due to the larger lot sizes, do we need sidewalks? Because I know it's a
12 desire, but it's, to be honest out there I don't see many people that will use
13 the sidewalks when you have such large areas. Most people will still, even
14 though you have a sidewalk, they'll still walk on the road.
15
16 Gonzales: I would say the sidewalks are preferred because parkways right now are
17 harder to maintain. And then property owners don't know necessarily that
18 they're to maintain those parkways in front of their properties. A lot of our
19 discussion when we went through the cross sections for the new
20 development code was to eliminate having parkways, just because they're
21 either, one, not wide enough for planting material or landscaping to go into.
22 And then they just basically create you know it's code enforcement
23 problems. And so at this point, the sidewalk actually provides more for a
24 separation from the roadway to the pedestrians, so it's easier for them to
25 walk on the sidewalk and have that ability as opposed to say it's not
26 necessary.
27
28 Thurston: Are you guys okay with us just putting a sidewalk on one side and not both
29 sides?
30
31 Billy: I think for ADA accessibility, it would be required on both sides. I don't know.
32 You know you start talking about locations for like mailboxes and stuff like
33 that for people to get to those. I don't know where that's going to be in the
34 subdivision. But there's a, you know moving forward with the code you
35 know we do want to increase those sidewalks for people you know to have
36 the opportunity to have that type of mobility.
37
38 Faivre: I think the expectation from Council now is that we are looking at more
39 pedestrian-friendly street design. And so I don't think there's going to be
40 support for doing no sidewalk or only sidewalks on one side.
41
42 Billy: I think the cross-section overall and with the addition of the sidewalk and
43 just if we can somehow increase the other side, Public Works is in support
44 of that.
45

1 Weir: Sara, can you go back to the plat? I just want to make sure I know. So the
2 alternative cross-section will be all the interior streets. And then the Settlers
3 Pass, Longview will be paved, and the alternative section to here?
4
5 Gonzales: We have a different one, and that's already paved, based on the previous
6 subdivision on the west side, so it's actually going further south. They're
7 being relocated.
8
9 Weir: So from basically here ...
10
11 Gonzales: Here going, actually this subdivision is built out from Cerro Court, so this is
12 Carson Ranch. It will actually start from the end of Cerro Courte and go
13 down. So the improvements that are going from here are now going to start
14 from Cerro Court further down.
15
16 Weir: Okay.
17
18 Gonzales: And that way we can actually get the connection. So there's about 1,322
19 feet or so is what the applicants require to install. They're installing about
20 1,500 feet to make the linear path to actually make the connection. To
21 relieve a lot of the traffic that we're seeing in Metro Verde off of Sonoma
22 Ranch. So that's one of the big wins with getting the connection of that
23 road. Yes, so none of the improvements will be adjacent to the subdivision,
24 just the internal roadway.
25
26 Weir: And so the top of Thurman also is not ...
27
28 Gonzales: Right.
29
30 Weir: *(inaudible)*.
31
32 Gonzales: Right. You have to take basically the top of Thurman. This is about 850
33 feet or so, and then the other, that's going to be adjacent to Longview.
34 That's what's going to supplement the other side.
35
36 Weir: And my understanding is all staff is in support of that?
37
38 Gonzales: Of the connection, yes.
39
40 Weir: Okay.
41
42 Gonzales: Now we're just going through essentially the role where DRC has to be final
43 option saying these cross-sections can meet. So is everybody in agreement
44 that the sidewalks would be installed five feet for at least the one parkway
45 to be increased to five feet? Driving lanes can go down to 11 1/2 feet

1 essentially with each one making them still an area where you have 23 feet
2 to navigate.
3

4 Weir: So could I have a motion to approve the alternative cross-section, as we
5 discussed, internally to the subdivision?
6

7 Billy: Natasha Billy, Public Works.
8

9 Weir: Do I have a second?
10

11 Nasir: Second.
12

13 Weir: All those in favor?
14

15 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.
16

17 Weir: Anybody opposed. Okay. And then I'd also like to get a motion to approve
18 taking the Thurman improvements and putting those to the off-site to make
19 a connection on Settlers Pass/Longview Drive as proposed. Do I have a
20 motion?
21

22 Billy: I have a question about this. Is there any way we can talk about that cross-
23 section separately?
24

25 Gonzales: Yes.
26

27 Weir: Okay. We can have the discussion now.
28

29 Gonzales: That's what I was going to ask you. You want a discussion first and then
30 we can just do the discussion with the alternative and the approval to move
31 it to the other side. Because I know this is what, so what was originally
32 proposed, we have two different ideas. So we have the cross-section for
33 the 42 1/2 feet. The applicant essentially proposed the three-foot parkway,
34 four-foot sidewalk, curb and gutter would be two feet, a four-foot bike lane.
35 You have the two driving lanes that are 12 feet wide, and then you would
36 have a 1 1/2 curb and gutter, and then a four-foot area that's essentially for
37 your turn lanes whenever it does actually come in. That will essentially be
38 the space where medians are going to go, if not a turn lane.
39

40 In reviewing that Public Works did come back with some of those comments
41 and provided some alternatives for the area. One, we wanted the wider
42 sidewalk, just knowing that you can have the two-foot parkway and then put
43 the sidewalk in, so that way it actually would create that six-foot area, so it's
44 a little bit wider. And then have an increased bike lane at five feet. Reduce
45 the traffic lanes to 11, just because there would be no on-street parking, so
46 there would be no impact to emergency services. This would just be the

1 two driving lanes. And then, essentially, a five-foot turn lane instead of just
2 having the four feet. So it's just kind of readdressing some of these numbers
3 to make some more room to make sure the walkability and the bike provides
4 a little bit more and not just the travel lanes. Natasha, anything to add?
5
6 Billy: Yes. Basically, we just wanted to reallocate some of the dimensions for
7 different uses.
8
9 Thurston: Yes, the cross-section we proposed kind of matches up with what's already
10 there on the north side, and on the south side so that's why we proposed
11 that cross-section is kind of what's already out there.
12
13 Billy: Yes, and Public Works supports the addition or the connection, but we didn't
14 feel like just moving forward with the code, and we know that's out there,
15 but these are the recommendations that we're making.
16
17 Weir: Okay.
18
19 Billy: The only other question that we had, just for clarification, on the plat, on the
20 first sheet we saw that there's 40 feet of right-of-way dedication, and then
21 on the third sheet we saw some areas that it said 50 feet of right-of-way
22 dedication. And I'm so sorry because this is for that local roadway. We just
23 wanted clarification if it was 40 or 50 feet.
24
25 Thurston: It's 40 feet.
26
27 Billy: Okay. Just because on the third sheet it says 50 feet on there. Actually it
28 was on the drainage plan or something.
29
30 Weir: You can work with staff to clarify, correct the third sheet of the plan.
31
32 Gonzales: Oh, it's just right here. See that 40 right here is where it says 50. It's just
33 right underneath the street name, so we just have to clarify the sheet three.
34
35 Billy: Okay.
36
37 Thurston: Okay.
38
39 Gonzales: It shows 40, 40, and then it goes 50, 50, and that's all it is.
40
41 Renteria: I guess at some point we're going back and forth.
42
43 Weir: Okay.
44
45 Gonzales: Yes.
46

1 Weir: Can you go back to the alternative cross-section, Sara? And so this does
2 have sidewalk just on one side of the street, so that's.

3
4 Gonzales: Yes, because right now being the cross-section is only half of what a
5 collector would have required. So the cross-section would be 85 feet in total
6 for collectors. In the new development code, it is increased. However, this
7 is just basically finalizing an area that has the gap, right. So we're
8 continuing the gap. With the 42 1/2 feet, we were able to get dedication for
9 a smaller portion that's right above Arroyos at Sellers Pass through the
10 purchase on Monday from City Council. They approved that purchase.

11
12 Weir: Okay.

13
14 Gonzales: That gives us the 42 1/2 feet. Other 42 1/2 feet has either been dedicated
15 throughout the process before it was annexed into the City of Las Cruces
16 when it was still part of the county. And then there was one portion which
17 is why it becomes that second tract. They have to dedicate their 42 1/2 feet,
18 which is why they are part of Block B right here. It's this lot there off, right
19 here. Because this lot has not dedicated yet. And so we're getting all of
20 the dedication necessary in order to build it and keep it aligned in a straight
21 line. If not, the dedication would have had to gone to the east side, which
22 means you would be dealing with a curve from the north side and then
23 another curve going back to the south side from where the improvements
24 currently are, which is why everything is being located onto the east side.
25 Everything will be 42 1/2 feet. And the cross section, I know the north side
26 and the south side, they had matched, and so you were trying to be
27 comparable to what those match. I know moving forward we're trying to get
28 as close as we can, knowing that, one, we're not going to see this cross
29 section ever be 115 feet as to what a collector is called now, but we do want
30 to follow as much more of making sure that the different types of
31 transportation needed on a road are going to be impacted and implemented
32 into whatever cross section we can find. So providing wider sidewalks,
33 providing wider bike lanes, and then not always having just a higher driving
34 or vehicle lane, knowing that the 11 feet can still be amenable when you
35 don't have parking necessarily on both sides of the road is what we're going
36 to try moving forward with. And so that's why the recommendations were
37 made is to get closer to what our development code has, knowing that we're
38 still constrained by the limited right-of-way we do have.

39
40 Weir: Okay. Thank you.

41
42 Renteria: I got one question on this cross section.

43
44 Gonzales: Okay.

1 Renteria: Are we going to have, I'm assuming on where we're tying into, is it Luke or
2 is that Carson on the. Tying into the north road and then on the south road
3 to connect those two, are we going to have any alignment issues from what
4 is existing to what is proposed?
5

6 Thurston: Yes, there has to be because there's, I mean it's not matching up. The back
7 of curbs aren't matching up, so there's going to have to be some transition,
8 right.
9

10 Gonzales: They'll be off by about a foot.
11

12 Billy: Yes, you'll have to have a transition between the two.
13

14 Thurston: Okay. Is, I don't know if somebody from traffic is here. I don't know if they've
15 looked at that. Because I know they might have some heartburn involved.
16

17 Renteria: Yes. Are they going to have any issue with that curb coming back in
18 another? Is that coming in too? Is that going to bring the curb to the?
19

20 Billy: What's the speed limit on this?
21

22 Gonzales: Thirty-five is what Sellers Pass is.
23

24 Billy: Yes, you would just need to put in a transition you know based on, you know
25 AASHTO MUTCD to meet those.
26

27 Weir: Okay. Any other questions on that portion of roadway?
28

29 Abeyta-Corella: No, but for our Parks and Rec, I know that we will support it, but we do
30 want the gravel mulch to be installed, and we want it to be at least three
31 inches in depth to finish grade, and then half below the top of the concrete,
32 so this way it's not a tripping hazard. Just for the little bit of parkway that's
33 left, which is two or three feet.
34

35 Gonzales: That two-foot area.
36

37 Renteria: What are we talking about?
38

39 Abeyta-Corella: The parkway.
40

41 Weir: The parkway.
42

43 Gonzales: Right here.
44

45 Renteria: Just the parkway.
46

1 Abeyta-Corella: Just the parkway.
2
3 Renteria: Ended up one-foot or two-foot of parkway.
4
5 Abeyta-Corella: Yes.
6
7 Gonzales: Yes, because the numbers.
8
9 Renteria: Just the gravel mulch. Do you just want the crusher fine?
10
11 Abeyta-Corella: Yes, grey crusher fine is fine.
12
13 Thurston: Okay.
14
15 Billy: I'd like to, from Public Works standpoint, I would just make sure that the
16 gravel mulch isn't so small that it washes out and creates an ADA issue on
17 the sidewalk.
18
19 Abeyta-Corella: So compaction or something that's been taken in place.
20
21 Weir: So is that something that needs to be part of this approval?
22
23 Abeyta-Corella: Yes, please.
24
25 Thurston: I think that's just an added expense for not, you're not going to achieve very
26 much for that in practicality. My only issue with that is you're to the west of
27 it, it's just all desert land. I don't really see the benefit of just having the
28 native dirt there and getting the native dirt to the sidewalk height versus
29 bringing in crusher fine for the sidewalk height. I just don't see the, I don't
30 see the actual benefit of it personally.
31
32 Gonzales: So you'd rather concrete it?
33
34 Thurston: I don't know, just dirt.
35
36 Billy: At this point, can we switch the location of the parkway and the sidewalk?
37 Can we flip those two? To put a buffer between the sidewalk and traffic?
38
39 Abeyta-Corella: The bike lane.
40
41 Billy: The bike lane.
42
43 Guerrero: So it would be preferable for that sidewalk to be in the edge over there by
44 the right-of-way and have that two-foot buffer between the sidewalk and the
45 curb. We'll have more separation from the traffic in the travel lanes. And
46 that is preferred from active transportation point of view to have a better

1 separation from the sidewalk and the curb and the travel lanes. So if we
2 are going to have that parkway, we should at least have it between the
3 sidewalk and the curb.
4

5 Gonzales: My only concern with that is we already have two cross sections where
6 they're developed and built out where the bike lane is on the opposite side.
7 So we're going to have a gap in between so the bike lane is actually in the
8 right-of-way. If we swap where the sidewalk is, we don't have a way for the
9 bikes to get back in between two. The sidewalk's already built and then the
10 bike lane is in the actual right-of-way.
11

12 Abeyta-Corella: The bike lane will stay in the right-of-way.
13

14 Gonzales: Oh, you're just talking about the parkway and the sidewalk.
15

16 Abeyta-Corella: And the sidewalk. Yes.
17

18 Gonzales: Oh, okay.
19

20 Renteria: Then are we going to have any issue with light poles? So now that trail's
21 going to meander.
22

23 Weir: It's a six-foot sidewalk they're requesting so there'll be plenty of clearance.
24

25 Gonzales: So just swapping these two.
26

27 Renteria: A sidewalk and then there'll be.
28

29 Abeyta-Corella: It'll be five feet at the, so we want a six-foot sidewalk, but it'll be,
30

31 Billy: Five feet at the post.
32

33 Abeyta-Corella: Yes, depending on however you make your foundations. With the
34 foundations, we typically see like a two-foot foundation, but if you make
35 them flush, then that could be part of the clearance.
36

37 Weir: So the recommendation is that the sidewalk be pushed to the back of the
38 right-of-way. The two-foot parkway that will exist will have the mulch and
39 crusher fine.
40

41 Abeyta-Corella: The gray crusher fine.
42

43 Weir: And that the driving aisles be reduced to 11 feet. Okay. And the parkway
44 or the,
45

46 Gonzales: The turn lane.

1
2 Weir: What'll, future turn lane will be five feet right-of-way. So was there anything
3 I left out on the alternative? And Sara, you've got it all, so we can request
4 a ...
5
6 Gonzales: An update to it.
7
8 Weir: An update before we take this to Planning and Zoning Commission.
9
10 Gonzales: So DRC would be the recommending, or final action for cross-sections.
11
12 Weir: Okay.
13
14 Gonzales: We can still include those as part of it to understand what was discussed
15 and what we've all been able to see and view from here, so that way they
16 do have that.
17
18 Weir: Okay.
19
20 Gonzales: Yes.
21
22 Weir: Okay. Any other discussion on this?
23
24 Thurston: So every light pole that's there, then we're going to have to make that
25 sidewalk meander around it.
26
27 Weir: No, it'll be part of the sidewalk. It'll be built into the sidewalk.
28
29 Billy: It'll just be this, and the pole will be in.
30
31 Weir: Within the sidewalk.
32
33 Billy: Within the sidewalk.
34
35 Thurston: So I'm going to, you put the parkway from the back of the curb two feet out,
36 and then the edge of the right-of-way, you'll have that six, you'll have a six-
37 foot walking trail, and then I'm going to put a straight road, or not a road, a
38 straight sidewalk, and then wherever that light pole is, it'll just reduce to four
39 feet.
40
41 Billy: Yes.
42
43 Thurston: Okay. And keep that parkway uniform.
44
45 Renteria: Okay, I get it now. And then crusher fine in between.
46

1 Gonzales: And your two-foot parkway that's going from three to two.
2
3 Thurston: Now if the parkway is on the right side, now I would see why you would want
4 crusher fine there. But if it was on the west side, just where the desert is, I
5 don't see the use of that. But if you're on the right side of it, I can see why
6 you'd want crusher fine.
7
8 Gonzales: So then we're all good?
9
10 Thurston: Fine.
11
12 Gonzales: Okay.
13
14 Weir: So do I have a motion to approve the modified alternative cross-section as
15 discussed?
16
17 Billy: Natasha, Billy, Public Works.
18
19 Weir: Okay. Do I have a second?
20
21 Nasir: Rocio Nasir, Utilities.
22
23 Weir: Okay, I'll go ahead and do a voice vote again. All those in favor, say "aye."
24
25 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.
26
27 Weir: All those opposed Okay. And so the two alternative cross-sections have
28 been approved by DRC. And we'll just, Community Development will need
29 those updated for our records, and then before you submit for the
30 construction drawings.
31
32 Was there any comment on the plat itself, the layout, the connection to the
33 road, lot sizes, drainage, utilities?
34
35 Billy: The only comment that we have for the roadway drainage is that during
36 construction time the roadway, we need to just know how it's going to be
37 mitigated, just because we know that there are on lot ponds here. But with
38 roadway runoff you know there's potential to increase velocities, volumes,
39 flows, and if that's going to be the roadways are dedicated to the city, then
40 we need to know how the roadway runoff is going to be mitigated. So that
41 can be just part of the construction review process with Community
42 Development.
43
44 Weir: So it's kind of heads up. You need to be sure and address that when you
45 submit your construction drawings. Okay. If that's the case, I will entertain

1 a motion to approve the preliminary plat for Summer Estate Subdivision. Do
2 I have a motion?
3
4 Abeyta-Corella: Motion.
5
6 Weir: Do I have a second?
7
8 Billy: Natasha.
9
10 Danner: Second.
11
12 Weir: Okay.
13
14 Billy: You can have it.
15
16 Weir: Okay. We'll just do a voice vote again. All those in favor say "aye."
17
18 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.
19
20 Weir: All those opposed. Okay. So we've got a positive recommendation to the
21 Planning and Zoning Commission for the preliminary plat with the
22 alternative cross section.
23
24 **4. DISCUSSION**
25
26 Weir: Next item on the agenda is discussion. Is there anything that the group
27 wants to discuss in relation to development or updates? Okay. That's great.
28
29 **5. ADJOURNMENT (09:33a.m.)**
30
31 Weir: Last but not least is adjournment. Do I have a motion to adjourn?
32
33 Nasir: So moved.
34
35 Weir: I have a second.
36
37 Guerrero: Second.
38
39 Weir: All those in favor say "aye."
40
41 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.
42
43 Weir: Okay. We're adjourned.
44
45
46

1 _____
2 Chairperson