



CITY OF LAS CRUCES

DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE (DRC)

Following are the minutes from the City of Las Cruces Development Review Committee Meeting held Wednesday, June 17, 2026, at 9:00 a.m. in Room 1158.

DRC PRESENT: David Weir, Deputy Director Community Planning
Rocio Nasir, Senior Engineer, Utilities
Jimmy Moreno, Interim Public Works Director
Michael Danner, Fire Investigator LCFD
Celeste Davenport, Fire Department
Kyle Arend, Engineering Mgr, Public Works
Eric Chavez, Public Works
Oscar Guerrero, Public Works
Cathy Mathews, Parks & Rec

STAFF PRESENT: John Castillo, Planner, Community Development
Sara Gonzales, Senior Planner

OTHER PRESENT: John Moscato
Paul Pompeo, Souder Miller Associates

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

Weir: Good morning everybody. We'll call the DRC meeting to order.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

2.1 May 6, 2026

Weir: We have one item. But before we get to that we have approval of minutes. When your agenda was distributed there were minutes from May 6th. If people will review those and are comfortable recommending approval, I'll entertain a motion.

Danner: So moved.

Weir: Okay. Do I have a second?

Nasir: Second.

Weir: Okay. I'll do a call by acclamation. All those in favor say "aye."

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

1
2 Weir: All those opposed. Okay, minutes approved.
3

4 **3. NEW BUSINESS**
5

6 **3.1 Case 25SU0501182: Sonoma Ranch North Phase 6 Alternative Cross-**
7 **Section**
8

- 9
- 10 • A request for approval of an alternate road cross-section for typical local
11 roadways associated with a subdivision known as Sonoma Ranch North
12 Phase 6.
 - 13 • The request proposes to modify the required local roadway cross-
14 section to match the existing local roadway cross-sections found in the
15 previously developed phases of the Sonoma Ranch North Master Plan
16 area.
 - 17 • Per Section 38.2.C.1.b of the City of Las Cruces Development Code the
18 DRC reserves the right to require additional or reduced improvements
19 and/or right-of-way as necessary to meet City goals and plans.
 - 20 • The subdivision zoned NH-1.S (Neighborhood-1 Suburban)
21 encompasses approximately 24.89 acres and is located generally east
22 of Sonoma Ranch Boulevard north of the Alameda Arroyo.
 - 23 • Submitted by Souder Miller and Associates, representative, on behalf of
24 Sierra Norte Development Inc., property owner.

25 Weir: We have one item of new business. We have Sonoma Ranch North Phase
26 6 Alternative Cross-Section to be reviewed and discussed by the DRC
27 today. Mr. Castillo, you want to introduce this case for us?
28

29 Castillo: Yes, good morning everyone. Today we have a request for an alternate
30 cross-section, or alternate road cross-section for a typical roadway
31 associated with the subdivision known as Sonoma Ranch North Phase 6.
32 The request proposes to modify the required local roadway cross-section to
33 match the existing local cross-sections found in previously developed
34 phases of Sonoma Ranch North Master Plan area.
35

36 So under Section 38.2.C.1.b of the Las Cruces or the City of Las Cruces
37 Development Code, DRC reserves the right to require additional reduced
38 improvements and/or right-of-way as necessary to meet goals and plans.
39 The subdivision is zoned NH-1S, which is our neighborhood 1 suburban
40 zoning district. It encompasses approximately 24.89 acres and it's
41 generally located east of Sonoma Ranch Boulevard and north of the
42 Alameda Arroyo. It was submitted by Souder Miller and Associates as a
43 representative on behalf of Sierra Norte Development.
44

45 Weir: Okay. Mr. Pompeo or Mr. Muscato, anything you want to add of the
46 request?

1
2 Pompeo: Good morning everybody. Paul Pampeo with Souder Miller and Associates.
3 As noted by John, and John could you bring up the aerial mapping? And
4 zoom out just a little bit please. So what this proposal seeks to do is for us
5 to utilize, we're at phase 6 of this master planned area and basically it's the
6 last phase of Sierra North, Sonoma Ranch North Master Plan area, phase
7 6 of the Sonoma Ranch North subdivision. All of the hundreds of lots to the
8 north of this area were developed with the cross-section that we are
9 indicating as proposed on the cross-section drawing. So what this
10 application does and the variance that we seek to get from DRC is simply
11 to allow us to continue the roadway sections that were previously designed
12 and built in the greater Sonoma Ranch North area as we fill out the rest of
13 this subdivision. And as I indicated before, this is the last phase of this
14 development so there won't be any more phases or applications or
15 variances coming in. So with that we respectfully request that DRC grant
16 this variance so we can complete the roadways in this area to the same
17 standard of which the other five phases are developed.
18

19 Weir: And so John may have already hit this but so substantially the difference is
20 that instead of six foot sidewalks there are five foot sidewalks, and instead
21 of the on-street parking areas being eight foot in width they are just seven
22 foot. And so instead of the sidewalk going to property lines there will
23 actually be a foot or two foot parkway on each side of the street. Is that the
24 substantive change?
25

26 Pompeo: That is correct. There's the two foot parkway basically takes one foot out of
27 the sidewalk area, takes one foot out of the parking area. And then we have
28 submitted just for the DRC's information, in the subdivision application we
29 have submitted the calculations on the light pole foundation design to allow
30 us to use the two foot foundations for this application.
31

32 Weir: So if I can, can I ask Parks and Recreation. Are you the ones that are
33 responsible for maintaining parkways ...
34

35 Mathews: That's my question.
36

37 Weir: In the street?
38

39 Mathews: Well yes and no. So that's my question about where, so where the
40 streetlight is shown is that becoming a parkway or is it just sort of a cutout
41 for just the streetlight?
42

43 Pompeo: No, that that would actually, for the remainder of the area it would be a
44 parkway behind the sidewalk.
45

1 Mathews: Okay. So I mean I don't, I haven't the slightest idea who maintains. And I
2 don't know if anybody does. It's either Public Works or Parks and Rec. And
3 typically if it's about landscape improvements it's Parks and Rec. So, and I
4 would request if we're going to have parkways they have, they need to be
5 maintainable as much as possible. And that would be with a ground cover,
6 a three inch layer of ground cover, ground mulch. I mean that's the best we
7 can do to kind of make them maintainable in that way. Is that possible to
8 include?
9

10 Moscato: Well I think the concept here is that this parkway is adjacent to the front
11 yards of the home. So that they would, it would seamlessly blend to the
12 front yard landscaping.
13

14 Mathews: Okay.
15

16 Moscato: And be the responsibility of the homeowner.
17

18 Mathews: Okay so it's adjacent to and contiguous but there's nothing between the
19 parkway and the private property.
20

21 Moscato: Correct.
22

23 Mathews: Okay I think that's fine. I think that should be fine, because people will read
24 it as their yard.
25

26 Weir: If they were to put a ...
27

28 Moscato: That's the concept.
29

30 Arend: If it's residential code requires that they maintain that area in front of their
31 property. So that was going to be my question is this all residential?
32

33 Moscato: Oh yes.
34

35 Pompeo: There is, there is one crossing. John could you bring that up? I'm sorry the
36 aerial. There is, on the, on the, you can see commercial businesses Kyle
37 along Sonoma Ranch.
38

39 Arend: Right.
40

41 Pompeo: But along that edge we have built an additional walking path that goes up
42 to the back of the properties there on the, where the commercial properties
43 are there along Sage Springs.
44

45 Arend: So there's no, there'll be no ...
46

1 Pompeo: There's extra. Because we have a 10 or 11 foot sidewalk in there.
2
3 Arend: Okay.
4
5 Pompeo: But the remainder of the property is all residential.
6
7 Moreno: Is there any collectors? Because we see problems on a residential, I agree
8 with Kyle, on a residential site it's no big deal because it's adjacent to like
9 front yards. But on the collectors where it's the sides of residence homes
10 it's outside of their wall. In other words that's where we see the issues.
11
12 Pompeo: Okay.
13
14 Moreno: And so I don't, is there any roads like that where it's adjacent where you're
15 going to have a parkway - in other words you're going to have a rock wall
16 or a yard wall parkway and then sidewalk. That's where we see the bigger
17 issues on the collectors.
18
19 Pomp Okay. No all of the roads in this subdivision being developed are all local
20 roads. So there's no collectors or anything higher than a local street.
21
22 Weir: But there will be some corner lots where do you have potential.
23
24 Pompeo: There will be some corner lots. I guess maybe what we could do in those
25 areas, there may be some areas where we have, Dave to your point, we
26 may have some retaining walls that are adjacent to the, between the
27 retaining wall face which is on private property in the back of sidewalk on
28 those corner lots. I'm guessing we can just landscape or rock those areas
29 whenever they build. So to that point what I can do on the, before we
30 resubmit the construction drawing set, if this were to be approved, I would
31 just indicate those areas where we would install rock between the sidewalk
32 and the, because I believe in those cases where we could we can install
33 that, show that during the subdivision construction. In other words put it on
34 the, the walls are going to be there when we finish the subdivision
35 construction. So we, if they're retaining walls, so we would we could put
36 that in at that time.
37
38 Moreno: Does it alternate on those corner lots? So for example does it alternate
39 between like people's front yards and then there's a corner lot where it's a
40 side? Because most of the ones I've seen is you got, you have the
41 residential road and then on both sides you have that front two-foot parkway
42 that's in front people's front yards.
43
44 Pompeo: Right.
45

1 Moreno: And then you have a collector that collects all of those residential and for
2 the entire length of that collector you have those two-foot parkways that are
3 all in between. My point is if it's consistent instead of it just being rocked it's
4 better if we actually adopt that wider sidewalk if it's going to be the entire
5 length.
6

7 Pompeo: Could I - let me point to the screen. I'll give you an example I think Jimmy
8 where I was looking at. If you were to look at this street here, right here.
9

10 Moreno: Yes.
11

12 Pompeo: There's about 12 foot of elevation grade difference between here and here.
13

14 Moreno: Okay.
15

16 Pompeo: So, sorry, did I touch it. Okay, so in this area here we have a retaining wall
17 here so there's a section of retaining wall that starts here and runs to about
18 here. So I think that's the area you're talking about is what do we do in an
19 area like this.
20

21 Moreno: Yes.
22

23 Pompeo: Where we have a retaining wall up against there. So I don't know, you'll
24 have to ask Mr. Moscato. I mean if we just make those six feet in those
25 locations. And I don't know.
26

27 Mathews: There also may be instances where it's not, it's similar condition where it's
28 not a retaining wall per se built with the subdivision but it's a, just a rock
29 wall. People want a rock wall on their side yard oftentimes. And it still
30 leaves that kind of no-man's land, that parkway that the home, the property
31 owner doesn't you know automatically feel that it's their responsibility
32 though it is but they don't recognize, it's outside my wall why should I
33 maintain that kind of thing. So even not in a retaining wall if there's a wall
34 there it makes it unclear to the property owner that they're supposed to
35 maintain.
36

37 Moreno: And it also creates a kind of a waste of space, with the front of that on the
38 yards where you do have the room for the streetlight it makes perfect sense.
39 But when you have that long strip, there's no reason to have that, I mean
40 no reason not to have that wider sidewalk as long as it's continuous. I mean
41 if you're going piecemeal back and forth it doesn't make sense to do that.
42 But I just want to make sure that we don't have those two foot parkways that
43 are maintenance issues throughout the subdivision.
44

45 Pompeo: Jimmy that, we're talking, your condition is the same area like I described,
46 it's the secondary frontage on the lots. Not the front yard but the side yard.

1
2 Moreno: Yes. That's correct.
3
4 Pompeo: Okay. So back up just.
5
6 Weir: See it there.
7
8 Pompeo: That's the condition you're speaking of. Okay.
9
10 Moreno: So I think the request will be formulated around everywhere where it's a
11 side yard that we have a method that alleviates this concern. Whether it be
12 the wider sidewalks. My recommendation is wider sidewalks where we can
13 just because it makes it, you have more room for that.
14
15 Weir: John, are there any additional comments that you have from the Community
16 Development planning side?
17
18 Castillo: Yes. So one of the comments that I have as far as this is kind of as to why
19 we're bringing this forward now. I know during, as I was researching this a
20 little bit more during the preliminary plot stages and everything, as far as
21 following what our new land development code was stating it was told to our
22 Planning and Zoning Commission that we would follow the cross-sections
23 given.
24
25 Weir: With the adoption of the new ...
26
27 Castillo: With the adoption of the new.
28
29 Weir: Development codes.
30
31 Castillo: Yes, with following the adopted, the newly adopted land development code.
32 So if you could illustrate a little bit more on that.
33
34 Pompeo: Well I mean I think that at the time the new code had come into effect and
35 we hadn't, didn't think it out that there was going to be you know issues like
36 this. So I just I was assuming that we would just carry the same. It didn't
37 make sense in the sixth phase of a multi-phase development that we would
38 just change the street sections at the kind of end of the game. So that's
39 why we're respectfully coming in today and asking if we can you know
40 simply match what's there and alleviate some of the other concerns that the
41 staff might have.
42
43 Weir: Mr. Danner, anything from fire?
44
45 Danner: No, sir. We're good with it.
46

1 Weir: Okay. Oscar, the active transportation perspective.
2
3 Guerrero: So from that perspective, the push is to have those wider sidewalks but at
4 the same time you know it's like this is the last phase of that whole
5 subdivision so it makes sense to match it. But at the same time in those
6 areas where we can accommodate the six foot side, six foot wide sidewalk
7 it would make more sense instead of the two foot parkway between rock
8 walls and sidewalk.
9
10 Weir: Anything else Paul?
11
12 Pompeo: Ask Mr. Moscato.
13
14 Moscato: There will be an active HOA that would require maintenance of those two
15 foot strips if that were approved that way. But if there's a lot of heartburn
16 over that, because I'm aware of the situation. We see a lot it does result in
17 being a no-man's land when there is no HOA. When there's an active HOA
18 that requires maintenance they do send notices of non-compliance
19 regularly.
20
21 Pompeo: Could we provide to the city if that was the case that we wanted to go as to
22 a responsible party that is responsible for that and not the city? Could that
23 be an acceptable solution?
24
25 Guerrero: The parkways on the outside when they're before the lot is developed end
26 up being maintained by the city right, before the lots developed?
27
28 Pompeo: Well that would be alleviated by, that same situation would be alleviated by
29 you know when there's people there right?
30
31 Guerro: Yes, but if lots get stranded in construction we still can face complaints in
32 time before it's completed. so I think if you guys can propose to at least
33 landscape these areas in the meantime and lots do get stranded for some
34 period of time because they do sometimes for years, then at least there's a
35 bridge between now and then. Does that make sense?
36
37 Pompeo: Well I think that we could, back to the same group, same homeowners
38 association which I guess is originally run, originally by the developer and
39 then turned over to the lot. so that would set the entity that would also
40 alleviate that concern. so the city would have somebody to hang their hat
41 on as to the responsible party.
42
43 Guerrero: Okay.
44
45 Moreno: Paul do you see, how many corridors or blocks do you see where we're
46 going to have this situation continuous?

1
2 Pompeo: Do you have that set of, you had that set of construction drawings up?
3
4 Castillo: So that was (*inaudible*).
5
6 Moreno: I'm trying to get a number of where it makes sense where we can widen
7 those sidewalks. Because really we can transition. I mean I understand
8 you're trying to keep the same kind of pattern but all it takes is one stone to
9 transition into that wider sidewalk it's not a huge impact in terms of you
10 know.
11
12 Pompeo: Okay.
13
14 Guerrero: So in other words once this is once this is built out it's always harder to go
15 wider but if we're wider from the beginning we have that alignment already
16 set. So on the corridors where we can get those wider sidewalks I would
17 like to.
18
19 Pompeo: Typically that's the side yard situation Jimmy?
20
21 Moreno: Yes.
22
23 Guerrero: Where it can be continuous where you're not having that.
24
25 Weir: While John's pulling it up. Utilities do you have anything you want to add to
26 the discussion?
27
28 Nasir: No, not at all. Because for us the utilities will be the same, nothing is
29 changing for us. Everything will be underneath the asphalt so it does not
30 impact utilities at all.
31
32 Pompeo: Let's pull up the plat and we can, I can show you Jimmy on those where we
33 have those side yard situations.
34
35 Moscato: The other advantage of this is the way the required cross-section reads you
36 would have a six-foot sidewalk but then you would have a narrowing to four
37 feet when you have a streetlight, other signage, conceivably that could be
38 a safety issue. Cyclists, pedestrians, visually impaired people thinking it's
39 six foot all the way, all of a sudden bang right into a light pole.
40
41 Guerrero: They're break-away. We'll see if they can break away.
42
43 Mathews: Do the rest of the phases have an HOA currently?
44
45 Moscato: Yes.
46

1 Mathews: They are under an HOA.
2
3 Moscato: Yes.
4
5 Mathews: Do my colleagues in Public Works, do you know of complaints in the
6 neighborhood? Do you have a sense of?
7
8 Arend: Just only on the run downs going into the Alameda.
9
10 Mathews: Okay.
11
12 Pompeo: So we have the situation here and here. So there's two sides of the street
13 here Jimmy and one here. These are front yards. These are larger lots.
14 This is all purple sage up here on the top. That's all along the arroyo.
15
16 Moreno: Okay.
17
18 Pompeo: Can you go to the next? So over here we have, this is where it comes
19 around and there's, so there would be, this is a commercial lot so it has
20 different requirements, so then just this one lot here.
21
22 Guerrero: So there's just a couple lots on each corner.
23
24 Pompeo: Just a couple of lots on each corner. So there's basically one street with
25 two sides and then two streets with one side.
26
27 Moreno: Okay. Thank you.
28
29 Weir: So is there further discussion about the proposal options out there?
30
31 Pompeo: Can I offer a suggestion? So what I would be requesting is, is that the DRC
32 approve the proposed cross-section pending final design approval with the
33 construction drawings that are currently under review with Public Works.
34 So that we would have a chance to present options on it and then it would
35 be in the review process.
36
37 Weir: Is it the potential for you to highlight on the construction drawing those
38 areas?
39
40 Pompeo: Yes.
41
42 Weir: Where they're double frontage or one will be a side yard. That was the
43 proposal.
44

1 Pompeo: Right. I'll highlight it on the (*inaudible*) plan and we'll just have those areas
2 noted. And then we need to know what the treatment will be in those areas,
3 and then we can submit it for approval to Public Works.
4

5 Nasir: I do have a question. Jimmy, where are the water meters currently being
6 placed? Are they being placed on the two foot parkway or are they being
7 placed inside of the property yard? The private property.
8

9 Moreno: When we have have the parkway, so when the subdivision is built, just the
10 stub out comes out. So Public Works typically is involved when the meter
11 is actually placed but it's usually right there. If there is a parkway, they'll put
12 it in the parkway. If there's not, they'll put it right behind.
13

14 Nasir: The sidewalk.
15

16 Moreno: Right behind sidewalk. So whatever that last obstruction is, they'll put it
17 right behind that.
18

19 Nasir: Okay. Thank you.
20

21 Weir: So we're at a point where we can either entertain a motion or any conditions
22 to be placed on a recommendation. Community Development is not going
23 to support the request. We've adopted a new development ordinance. The
24 platting has been done to the new development codes and so just we feel
25 that there's never a good time to make that break. And so our stance is to
26 meet the standard code for the development. But that's just CD. That's not
27 the DRC as a whole.
28

29 So from a procedural standpoint, recommend that we make a motion in the
30 positive and that way if there's a mix of votes, if it comes out of tie, that it's
31 a failed motion. So with that I'll either entertain any other discussion on
32 those two items or if someone wants to make a motion to act on this request
33 for an alternative cross-section.
34

35 Arend: I'll make a motion that we approve the amended proposed cross-section
36 with the condition that the parkways will be maintained either by the
37 homeowners association or through additional landscaping installed until
38 such time as residential HOA or residential construction is complete. Does
39 that tie it up?
40

41 Weir: Would you be comfortable saying that, in the areas in question would be
42 identified on the construction drawings?
43

44 Arend: That's correct.
45

46 Weir: Okay. Do I have a second?

1
2 Guerrero: Second.
3
4 Weir: I'll go ahead and take a roll call on this. Public Works.
5
6 Moreno: Aye.
7
8 Weir: Utilities.
9
10 Nasir: Aye.
11
12 Weir: Fire.
13
14 Danner: Aye.
15
16 Weir: Parks and Recreation.
17
18 Mathews: Aye.
19
20 Weir: Active Transportation.
21
22 Guerrero: Aye.
23
24 Weir: And Community Development will vote no. But the amended cross-section
25 is approved.
26
27 **4. DISCUSSION**
28
29 Weir: Next item on the agenda is discussion. Is there any further discussion we'd
30 like to have as a DRC? Not seeing any.
31
32 **5. ADJOURNMENT (09:25 a.m.)**
33
34 Weir: I'll move for adjournment. Do I have a second?
35
36 Nasir: I'll second.
37
38 Weir: All those in favor?
39
40 MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.
41
42 Weir: We're adjourned at 9:26.
43
44
45
46 _____
Chairperson