Realize Las Cruces Ad Hoc Committee Agenda
August 2, 2023, at 3:00 P.M.
City Hall Clerk's Office, First Floor, Room 1202

I. Call To Order

II. Approval Of Minutes

   Documents:

   07-12-23 REALIZE TAC MINUTES.PDF
   07-19-23 REALIZE TAC MINUTES WS.PDF

III. Discussion Items

   III.I. Chapter 5. Development Standards
         Sec. 5-2. Roads, Rights-of-Way, and Parking

   III.II. Chapter 3. Zoning Regulations
          Sec. 3.1. General Provisions

IV. Next Meeting

V. Reference Material

V.I. Elevate Las Cruces Community Profile Scenario

   Documents:

   ELC COMM PROFILE SCENARIO 8.2.23(F).PDF

VI. Public Comments

VII. Adjournment

Posted 7/27/2023
Following are the minutes from the City of Las Cruces Realize Las Cruces Ad Hoc Committee Meeting held Wednesday, July 12, 2023, at 3:00 p.m.

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**
- Christopher Brown
- Arturo Duran
- Sara Gonzales
- Scott Kaiser
- John Moscato
- Paul Pompeo
- Luis Rios
- Sharon Thomas

**MEMBERS ABSENT:**
- Daniel G. Buck
- Dan Carter
- Paul Dulin
- David G. Lynch
- Ken Odenheim
- George Pearson
- Dawn Sanchez

**STAFF PRESENT:**
- Sara Gonzales, Senior Planner, Community Development
- David Sedillo, Director of Public Works
- Tony Trevino, Deputy Directory Public Works
- David Weir, Deputy Director Community Planning
- Mark Miller, Planner, Community Development
- Larry Nichols, Director of Community Development
- Rocio Nasir, Senior Engineer, Utilities Department
- Cathy Mathews, Landscape Architect, Parks & Rec

**I. CALL TO ORDER:**

Meeting was called to order.

**II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - June 21, 2023:**

Scott Kaiser motioned; second by Christopher Brown. Motion passed.

**III. DISCUSSION ITEMS:**
1. Chapter 5 Development Standards

   o Sec. 5-2. Roads, Rights-of-Way, and Parking:

Section D, private streets. Question of why under 1.b.4, sprinkler systems are required within all homes that are located on private streets. Staff stated sprinkler systems being within a private development, in reading other information it stated someone who is on property all the time or have sirens to get into the gates. So covers private streets but any connection with condo areas, apartments which are gated, not really streets more easements, driveways; is there differentiation between those or streets are streets and driveways and parking lots that are private? Staff stated difference is apartments are all one lot. These public streets will be individual homeowners would buy properties so they would not be part of the streets, so possible homeowners association.

Question about the HOA provision, the intent written by the consultant to provide a mechanism for street maintenance, but some of the difficulties of HOA’s posed in a general sense. There are certainly HOA and private streets. Question on how those are being maintained. Staff stated there is a part they no longer want to be HOA and when they try to subdivide or disseminate the HOA, they then become public streets which makes it a private situation going into a public street that no longer meet the standards. The retrofitting after the City then accepts it. New construction states private streets will meet the standards of public streets. This is how the standards currently read, and the intent is that when they want to be turned over. The city requests before accept a street for maintenance, we test the condition of that and if subpar ask to bring it up to standards (resurfacing, treatment, fixing damage). If they are private streets, the City is under no obligation to repair or accept into the system, in such a state of disrepair. City does not monitor, maintain, check status of privately maintained roads. When if the streets are requested to be turned over, then City will evaluate them.

Section E: street layout. There has been some conversation and it bleeds into the connectivity index. At the end of 1, near 1, Local streets will connect to collectors and local streets. Local streets connect to arterials all the time. Question of is it a new requirement that you cannot have a local street intersecting an arterial and that local streets can only connect to connectors and other local streets? Staff stated the intent is to not designing subdivisions with high-speed conflicts with low speed traffic. There will always be instances where local streets hitting arterials. The intent is to make arterials truly corridors to get across town to get to activity centers. Intent is to get local streets onto collectors and then collectors on. The consultants will be requested for further information on that. This would be one intersection every half mile with an arterial. Concern about unintentionally restrict connectivity with the strict
hierarchal approach, i.e. if collector is very half mile, then long way for pedestrian. This would severely undercut connectivity. Issue was local streets crossing an arterial, no signalization, just stop signs, which is a safety in traffic. New cross sections of 120 or 160 foot of right-of-way for an arterial. General safety and connectivity index to have additional local streets into the collector, and then also limits on block size of suburban and urban areas, to make sure accommodate multiple modes safely. City has no residential access to collectors, arterials now, so there has to be some type of local street frontage for people to get onto their lots. Basically if encouraging smaller lot sizes and getting the traffic on to the collector before it to the arterial. It probably will change some of the layout of subdivisions, but the intent is to eliminate long street stretches and also use of cul-de-sacs. Also address how to treat each mode of transportation equally. It was suggested it is contradicting connectivity, i.e. local has to connect to a connector and it cannot connect to arterial, and connectors are only half mile apart, that is a significant problem from non-automotive. Need more access for non-automotive. Also don't want particular infrastructure on a principle arterial, fine and well, but the reality is if everything funnels to a principle arterial, that is where you end up. The strict hierarchal approach is contradictory.

There was a question about trails and other access points into developments, does not always have to be associated with a roadway. Some times these are safer than incorporating them in the roadway system. The change that is being proposed is that all collectors and arterials in the urban and suburban areas have that bike infrastructure separated from the traffic. Only time substitute in-street bike facilities is when there is a trail that far larger.

When writing these codes it is important to look for voids, look for overlap and redundancies. Cross reference sections. Be sure there is extension on trails. Also in the next section another place can identify, places to label - trails though here, what are connecting points. One question was, can some of these connecting points be the trail system or be something else? Trails, walking paths are not identified, but maybe put in there to align it to show for the other users.

Roundabouts are the only rural mention of intersections. There has been discussion on sight-lines. There has been some intersection design standards, see that added somewhere, in addition to roundabouts. "Roundabout shall be the standard form of traffic control between collectors and other collectors." Also see that as a preference for local to local, do away with four-way stops and only traffic circles that can address some of the management components. Great opportunities to neighborhood traffic calming. "All new development shall comply with arterials and nonresidential collectors." Request for more robust discussion on roundabouts as it is rarely mentioned. If have cross sections for the travel lanes, maybe also cross sections for intersections and place types, how they relate. It says the roundabout design shall be reviewed
by the City traffic engineer, but if we have design standards and cross section
designs, why not have a one-lane roundabout design, a two-lane roundabout
design so not having to reinvent the wheel. They would be included in the
actual cross section design standard. Fire trucks cannot do roundabouts.
Intersections have elements laid out and cross sections need the same thing.
There will be flexibility but the idea is there are certain aspects of intersections.
Curb extensions should be 100% at every intersection. Mentioned people
running through four-way stops versus a roundabout forces people to slow.
There is flexibility but objective in safety. Traffic calming a menu of things and
there is a certain amount you have to address.

**Connectivity index.** Discussed previously. Nothing more.

**Cul-de-sac and streets, page 276.** Question if encouraging cul-de-sac. The
answer was "no." Cul-de-sac are discouraged unless necessary. Danger due
to push traffic into one place. Question of putting something in the code that if
the tract shape is such that nothing else can be done, a cul-de-sac would be
okay without a variance. Most plats go through preliminary plat.

Question on table 5.2.7, block length, and are those reasonable lengths in the
table. In general subdivision codes blocks are called out between 300-600 feet.
A walk shed is a quarter of a mile, is 1,300 feet, which is two blocks. Current
code is quarter mile to a park is the goal.

Traffic calming, page 278, points to the technical manual. Mentioned that this
section is very thin in detail about what is meant, and does the technical manual
have detail about the various things they can do, and is that adequate. The
answer is "yes" the technical manual does have enough detail. There are a lot
of sections that call out traffic calming. A reason to go to technical manual is
that if there is a new technique that come in, it is easier and faster to implement
and utilize this way.

Question of table 5-2-4, there are still cul-de-sac right-of-way widths are at 36,
54, and 62 and are those going to be modified. It will match on local streets.
Other question maximum cul-de-sac length for nonresidential and any
commercial districts, in the industrial park some tracts are 10 acres in size, so
maximum cul-de-sac length is not past the first lot, the 300 foot is overly
restricted. Block length, can have 600 foot block length, so only nine homes
per block in a standard R-1 residential subdivision, remember additional
secondary setback on each end. Seems restrictive compared to some recent
subdivisions done. In the future development map, the urban area is built out
part of the City already, most of street network is already established. If it were
to be redeveloped then have to be all that land assembly and relaid out.
Mesquite and Alameda Depot were mentioned with relatively short blocks.
Suggested that these are standard recommendations but if doing a master plan
or PUD where dive into those layouts, that maybe there would be latitude there
to modify the distances based on actual layout. Discussion further on connectivity index and number of homes per block being limited to about nine, but that would be urban, and in suburban block lengths are longer. Shorter block forces to build on a grid. The standards that are currently called flex, will be administrative modifications to address what looks like needing numerous variances. Question if this limits denser neighborhoods and different housing types. It was brought up that there seemed to be limitations of the connectivity index or the table. The current zoning does not have a zone that only allows single family homes. On internal roads, really trying to keep down the number of lots that have dual or triple frontage, which leads into the overall cost of development that is then passed to the end user. Don't add additional roadways for the sake of adding roadways to meet these criteria. More intersections is more conflicts. Not make things overly restrictive, have administrative approvals. Elevate wanted to provide much more direction than that. Questioned if there could be a graphic of connectivity index that loosely resembles the table of block length. Keep in mind buildable area, add in ADU, space is reduced due to so many frontage. Block length would increase connectivity index, then the minimum requirement for connectivity index as written would be too low. With the block lengths would not be able to get to 1.4, and so maybe the number needs to be higher.

**Alleys.** 7.c is the opposite of what development is today. Fronts of homes along arterials, alley access from the back, obviously no driveway access. Arterials shall provide for on-street parking; this is an urban context. So if homes do want to be on an arterial, not accessing on the arterial, but alleyways to access. Question of who wants the front of their home along an arterial street (no one would), so why the requirement. Emphasis more on form than land uses, frame the street with the house. Mentioned that this was impractical for typical builder and typical builder's customer. Urban context is different, working in infill. Allowing would be fine, but requiring would be unworkable. Mentioned that if this had been in place the area of Sonoma Ranch at Northrise south a few blocks would look different. Doña Ana County, 18% privately held land, mass consumption of land for the return of few units when requiring these things. Make roadways and the interaction between right-of-way's and homes access. So increasing pedestrian, biking, neighborhood look, applies to all end uses. Spruce to Kilmer unpleasant street overall, no walkability, no bike. North Alameda was mentioned with the homes there, and the alleys behind them. Go back to cross section and if housing front certain roadway classification, build a roadway that is appropriate for that type of development. Possibly reconsider what an arterial road looks like. Why have: e) where the average lot width along a block face averages 40 feet or less, the lot shall be rear loaded with alley access? Might discourage higher density. A driveway every 40 feet discourages people to walk along those areas. Going back to cost, now building a street and an alleyway, more concrete, more asphalt. If saying an alley is preference for vehicle access, should go back to cross sections and don't need the standard of 40 foot of asphalt. If an alley then developer would
give less right-of-way as not needed. There is a cross section and an alley cross section, but nothing that if you do an alley then here's a new alterative cross section. Utilities in alleyways, current standards there is not enough separation between the utilities in an alleyway, so those will have to come off of the adjacent roadway. Reducing roadway may put other aspects or features within that in conflict with utilities.

Quite a bit of discussion has been on cross sections lately, staff has looked at El Paso, the county. Would the TAC be interested in looking at county UDC and seeing how that works? Their land use concepts are similar to Elevate, right-of-way widths match what the City currently uses, Viva Doña Ana was a consortium of every entity in the county. Potential to take their right-of-ways and plug that into this ordinance and address some of the land uses. Washington, DC, El Paso, Alexandra, VA were mentioned they build streets from a menu based on the land use context and accommodated for existing right-of-ways. We don't have is the urban, more of parking lot on arterials and collectors, frontage, etc.

Access Management. 3. Generally, access point design. Language to "reduce the conflict points between peds, cyclists, and vehicles of all access points." Is that language adequate to promote multimodal safety concern? Yes, it is. Suggestion to insert "if applicable" into 3.a at the end of the last sentence.

6.c (page 280), the platting of partial width rights-of-way is prohibited except already. When you have an arterial along a section line where the neighboring property is BLM or State Trust Land, you have to have a partial right-of-way, therefore the statement of 6.c of the platting of partial width rights-of way is inaccurate. 7.a.1, new development shall be served by a system of sidewalks, paths, greenways, roadways, accessways, and other facilities. A small development may not be able to provide all of those, not sure of the "shall be served" that includes all of these, maybe pick some of the above. Obviously, certified roadways, sidewalks, but paths on local roads, not necessarily, greenways, not necessarily, and other facilities, what does that mean. Put a period after the parentheses pedestrian, and then say, "specific facilities to be built will be based on the development size and character." Staff suggested that they will get clarification or more clear. 7.b, pedestrian cross-access, 7.c bicycle cross-access. Can those two be combined? Is there a need for separate pedestrian and bicycle cross-assesses? More like to have pedestrian cross access in most developments than bicycle. Under 7.b and 7.c ii, and iii are similar but i is separate. Maybe label it as cross access and then define bicycle and pedestrians for one, and then combine ii and the iii in the comments, read those and minimize the space/language. It was mentioned that if the bike and ped sidewalk is much more constrained would it be necessary to have both sections. If the bikeway is within the roadway and then
also a sidewalk, then they would be different. Some can also be addressed in the parking lot design standards as well.

Page 281. Where the widths come from under d.i, the last sentence, "the cross access shall consist of a driveway or drive aisle that is at least 27 feet or two one-way driveways or aisles that are at least 15 feet wide." Both cases those are wider than the actual road travel lane that are being proposed. Current cross section 12 and 12 for two lane, one way would be 12 feet, why would parking lot need to be bigger? That's based on parking lot design. Vehicles pulling in at an angle or at 90 degrees, so they need additional room to back up and out and then drive out. 27 feet end of striping on each side, that aisle in between in the parking lot is giving room for two vehicles to move and park. Could be lesser if just a driving aisle between two. Discussing access in from the right-of-way onto a property, that access has to line up with that parking in that development. Important to have graphics with this. Somewhere this needs to specify this is for two-way traffic. This is off of the public right-of-way and going from parking lot of one development to parking lot in the next development. Have the bare minimum, and if parking on both sides of access then 27 feet necessary. Why need more than actual road travel lane to go between parking lots? It says within the development, and any parking lot adjoining the parcel, two different pieces.

Suggestion to move to zoning and start on page 281 next week.

2. Chapter 3 Zone Regulations - Introduction

PowerPoint shown. Future development map is more robust than other comprehensive plans. Two elements on this map, place classification which is urban, rural, and suburban, also other which is regional, commercial, and civic institutional uses. Next map is overlays. Does places, start smart planning or transect planning, and characteristics of the area and then place type. Same map but with overlays, town centers, neighborhood centers, and mixed use corridors. City is stating they want additional development and additional standards to take place in those areas. Town center, outside Organ Mountain High School, former Las Cruces County Club property, mall, and University Hospital, Aggie Uptown section, intended to allow more urban type development, more attention to the aesthetics and architectural standards. Mixed use corridors areas to encourage intensification, making more active streets. Neighborhood centers, little different they are shown but not static, where development takes place and maybe appropriate to have more intensification of uses, and that will be treated differently.

To show where we are headed, in Elevate Las Cruces talks about place classifications, rural, suburban, urban, and other. In Realize proposing to use those again, specific standards to match those characters. This roughly follows the smart code or transect planning, T2, T3, T4, T5, and this is what the
county’s Unified Development Code (UDC) also allows this type of development. Character areas provide standards for roadways, cross sections, streetlight interact in the areas, Elevate calls through-ways, sidewalks and trail system and how that will be treated, type of not only street trees but street furnishing in those areas, dictate connectivity and some site features in those areas. Proposed districts, suburban residential, suburban neighborhood. And mixed use. This concept of character is not new; Lohman Avenue Overlay and Avenida de Mesilla Gateway have certain standards from the design perspective that when development comes in they meet those. This will apply to everywhere within the City.

Zoning districts, residential will allows mix of uses, missing middle, apartment, multifamily, ADU, some light commercial. Neighborhood allows residential, also more commercial and mixed use could be almost predominantly commercial or employment center type use. Regional commercial is mall, car sales, etc. Industrial are areas that are industrial. Also open space, arroyos, parks. Suburban, similar to current code, residential, neighborhood, mixed use, regional, commercial. Has the most variety with the overlays, town centers and neighborhood centers in this area, mixed use corridors, and existing planning and developments. Urban district, same districts but have different standards, the town centers are on the edge.

Showing standards for different zoning districts come from. Block on top is place type description in Elevate, and block on the bottom is draft where have density, lot sizes, build-to setback lines, etc. This is being informed by Elevate and the sections. Zoning districts are lot size, setbacks, actual building forms, building arrangements. Proposes more direction as to how buildings will be arranged on the lot, that is not new to the City. On the left is the future development map, on the right is the current zoning ordinance, once the districts are defined can start converting the future development map into the zoning map to match the zoning categories.

The Albuquerque approach looked at all the neighborhood activity centers and drew all the connections and then along the connections is where they had transit and corridor on either side of the connections allowed higher density to support that. Seems some of this type of information is missing here. When the City actually goes to create the map, they will have to look at what the existing zoning and existing uses are then place the appropriate new zoning districts. Some has gone into the future development map, different place types to match uses already in place.

IV. NEXT MEETING:

Next week, July 19, 2023, and room change from now on to 2007C.
V. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

VI. ADJOURNMENT (5:00)

Motion to adjourn; seconded.

____________________________________
Chairperson
Following are the minutes from the City of Las Cruces Realize Las Cruces Ad Hoc Committee Work Session Meeting held Wednesday, July 19, 2023, at 3:00 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:
- Scott Kaiser
- John Moscato
- George Pearson
- Paul Pompeo

MEMBERS ABSENT:
- Christopher Brown
- Daniel G. Buck
- Dan Carter
- Paul Dulin
- Arturo Duran
- David G. Lynch
- Ken Odenheim
- Luis Rios
- Dawn Sanchez
- Sharon Thomas

STAFF PRESENT:
- Sara Gonzales, Senior Planner, Community Development
- David Sedillo, Director of Public Works
- Tony Trevino, Deputy Director Public Works
- David Weir, Deputy Director Community Planning
- Larry Nichols, Director of Community Development
- Srijana Basnyat, Performance Manager
- Rocio Nasir, Senior Engineer, Utilities

I. CALL TO ORDER:

II. CONFLICT OF INTEREST:

III. DISCUSSION ITEMS:

1. Chapter 5 Development Standards
   - Sec. 5-2. Roads, Rights-of-Way, and Parking:
Board Members were asked to review the County’s cross-sections provided by Sara Gonzales and decide whether they would like to take that direction with the consultants between the last meeting and today. Members that did read the material feel that the County standards are a good starting point for this Board, while it still needs to have clarifications added.

Discussion of page 281 continued with Section 8: Driveways. The prohibition against double or circle driveways may become problematic for developers in future. Some developments may be better without on-street parking. Board Members suggested making this rule conditional, tied to lot size or place type. This prohibition is also inconsistent with numbers 3 and 4 which permit double or circle driveways, so it should be modified or removed. On the next page, about commercial driveways: B4 required 45-foot widths, which seems inconsistent with Table 5.29. Upon closer examination, 45 feet is the width between two driveways while the table refers to the width of each driveway. The language needs to be clarified in this section.

At the top of page 283, second line says, "The City Traffic Engineer may require a shared mutual access easement." This is too ambiguous and leaves too much room for arguments or may force property owners to do something with their property they do not wish to do. The intent was to reduce curb cuts and street access points. The word "require" may need to be removed. Board Members are curious as to how other places have dealt with this problem and worried that this language may make it more difficult for developers in redevelopment areas. A suggestion was made to add in language referring to safety requirements. The designations of the figures are unclear.

On page 284, median openings, on 10b.3: Analysis of Potential Conflicting Vehicular Movements should also include conflicts with pedestrians and bicyclists. Shared access should be required if there is only one median opening to the parcels. Board Members find the language in this section confusing and desire clarification in order to reduce the need for variances later on. There is concern for cyclist/pedestrian safety at these points, as drivers do not necessarily look for anything other than cars. The Traffic Impact Analysis should be used to help determine the measures to be taken before the development and median are built. The word "justify" may need to be removed from this section. Especially in redevelopment areas, it was suggested that a TIA is not needed as long as the plans meet all the requirements in Code. Code requires a minimum of 300 feet between median openings and in some places in the city, that is too close. The suggestion was made that longer distances between openings will reduce conflict between vehicular traffic and pedestrians/cyclists and improve safety. The continuous turn lane on University was mentioned as a big problem for pedestrian/cyclist safety. The City currently has no plans to
install medians. The pedestrian/cyclist facilities along there are on State property.

The discussion of abandoned driveways and medians indicates 30 days' notice. Board Members feel that is not enough. It is indicated that if the median is no longer needed, the property owner will be charged for removal. Board Members do not agree.

Section H: Clear Sight Triangle has a problem in the redevelopment areas when removing a vertical curb. It will force developers to rebuild the road and may become cost-prohibitive in the infill areas. It was suggested to add exceptions for infill development.

Section 3A: Minimum Height for Landscaping: Canopy heights and landscaping have to be planned carefully to maintain clear line of sight for drivers. The line about objects eight inches wide should be clarified. On page 289 objects between two feet and ten feet are prohibited, landscaping between three feet and eight feet are prohibited.

The charts and diagrams on the next page are not consistent with the AASHTO standards and should be removed. The graphic on the next page looks like it was done in Microsoft Paint. It indicates that the sight triangle needs to be kept clear when designing driveways and the distances involved. It may not be possible to do this in dense urban areas. Item 4C says "driveways in general" in reference to this.

Discussion of street lighting: Current requirements of 250 to 400 feet with the old LED lights do not provide sufficient light. The new standards to meet are IES and the requirement is one candlepower per square foot, per square foot of right-of-way. This will increase the number of streetlights drastically. Board Members wonder how other Southwestern cities deal with streetlights. The Board was surprised that many people do not notice the lack or presence of streetlights around their homes. Light pollution and keeping the night sky dark were all mentioned. There was also discussion about separately lighting bike lanes and driving lanes so that pedestrian lights would be shorter than streetlights. The State has a Dark Skies ordinance which requires the light to be directed down and not allowed to radiate upward. Many lights in the City are Bluetooth compatible and can be adjusted. The suggestion was made to do more research and get public input before going into detail on the lighting section. Inside subdivisions streetlights are required at driveways and intersections. A suggestion was made to create something that is Dark Sky compatible, migratory bird compatible, and safe. The last sentence of 5A says "All streetlights shall be installed, powered, and operational prior to the issuance of any building permits." There are concerns over this because El Paso Electric is slow, and this will hold up construction. Streetlights are no longer powered
directly from the transformer pads and now have meters and have to be
serviced. It was suggested that it would be easier to pay a flat monthly fee
per fixture rather than the current metered situation. The answer to that is
that the metered system has saved the City money. The power discussion
will be deferred until the Board gets to the "substantial completion" section
of the document. Traffic signals and traffic control devices are included in
the streetlight section, on the bottom of page 295, number 12.

Section E, page 296 says "A traffic control plan shall be submitted to the
Public Works Department prior to placement on any street under City
jurisdiction." A suggestion was made to include specific language about
appropriate, ADA compliant safety signage and detours for
pedestrians/cyclists.

Page 294, section 9A discusses preliminary review including "location
botanical and common name" analysis. El Paso Electric will not begin
installing until they have an "approved plan." This means the plan has to
have the City's stamp as an approved construction set.

Page 295 discusses traffic signals and new development. A suggestion
was made that it should be called out how the improvements will be paid for
and treated. Right now the City will say that the costs of reconstruction and
signalization of roadways should be paid for by the developer and goes on
a case-by-case basis. However, at least 70% of the traffic through those
intersections is the general public. A suggestion was made that the City
should decide on where to place signals according to a uniform plan,
perhaps with something like the impact fee system. It was suggested to
treat the signal system like a utility and have every citizen pay into the
maintenance and installation, as almost every citizen uses the system. This
will allow the City to install signals where needed and less haphazardly.
Public Works may have an RFP out for this planning. Currently developers
are only required to build the half of the roadway that is abutting their
property. Developers currently wait until another developer pays for the
signal before starting their own development, which slows everything down.
Having the City take over and turn the signals into a utility would allow the
developers to have a standardized contribution and ease that problem.
Roundabouts were suggested. The system in Chandler was mentioned as
a possible model for Las Cruces to use. It was also suggested to add a
half-percent tax to sales tax, gas tax, or GRT to pay for roads and signals.

It was suggested to continue the discussion regarding roadways and signals
at the next meeting, along with parking lots, zoning, and sidewalks.
Comments and suggestions were requested between meetings.

2. Chapter 3 Zone Regulations - Introduction
Sec. 3-1. General Provisions:

Sec. 3-2. Zoning Districts:

Sec. 3-3. Uses, Additional Dimensional Standards, Building Design Standards:

Sec. 3-4. Zoning Procedures:

IV. NEXT MEETING:
August 2, 2023

V. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION
There was none.

VI. ADJOURNMENT (4:58)

Chairperson
REALIZE LAS CRUCES
TAC Meeting
August 2, 2023
ELC Community Profile – Population Profile

- 37% growth 2018 to 2045
- Population younger than NM & US
- 72% identify as a minority
- Median income less than NM & US (higher than DAC)
- 24% below poverty line
Community Profile – Land Use & Development

- +40% detention, open space, or agricultural use
- 16% of land is vacant
- Residential growth predominately east & north of US 70
- Infill redevelopment limited
- Overlay zoning districts has encouraged disparate land development regulations
Community Profile – Natural Resources

- Arroyos are utilized for storm drainage and open space
- Significant land area owned by NM & US likely to not be developed
- Arroyos & open space provide green infrastructure opportunities
Community Profile - Infrastructure

• Ample water supply for immediate & near future
• Wastewater treatment sufficient for additional 100k residents
• Stormwater management improving
• Conservation & resiliency activities expanding
• Sanitary landfill adequate for growth
Community Profile – Economic Development

- Jobs-Housing Balance is below APA recommendations
- Significant commuting workforce may reflect limited housing choice
- TIDD & Opportunities Zones for targeted redevelopment
- Infill Overlay limited impact on commercial development
- Major employers primarily public entities
- Economic recruitment has been inconsistent
Community Profile – Housing & Neighborhoods

• 60% of housing is SFR detached units
• Total housing units have increased faster than population growth
• Housing values & rent have outpaced household income growth
• Public & subsidized housing currently concentrated
• Neighborhood organizing has been limited
• Majority of residential growth outside infill area
Community Profile – Community Resources

- Nearly ¾ of LCPS students receive free or reduced-price lunches
- LCPS enrollment has remained steady
- Several vulnerable population service providers exist
- Average household size:
  - Owner-occupied decreasing
  - Renter-occupied increasing
Community Profile - Mobility

- Existing land use densities have not supported high transit ridership
- First & last mile connections to fixed-route transit is lacking
- Multi-use trails north of US 70 lacking
- Increased emphasis on pedestrian & bike infrastructure
- Traffic congestion concentrated on segments of US 70 & Lohman Ave
Community Profile –
Public Services

• Increasing parkland acreage through Parks & Recreation Master Plan
• Additional parkland & recreation accessible programming needed
• Additional police and fire staff and facilities anticipated with continued city growth
Community Profile – Cultural Resources

- Numerous historic districts and structures
- Main Street & Arts & Cultural District designations
- Historic Preservation Ordinance
- Historic Preservation Guidelines drafted
ELC Scenario Planning – Background

• Scenario Planning (& community profile) informed Future Development Map

• Scenario Planning Inputs
  • Population projections
  • Land use trends
  • Land use place types
  • Existing conditions
  • Fiscal impacts
Scenario Planning - Scenarios

• Scenario Analysis
  • Trend
  • Compact Centers
  • Strategic Centers & Corridors

• Common Themes
  • Intensification of downtown
  • Continued growth east of I-10 & south of US 70
  • Continued growth in Sierra Norte/Red Hawk area
  • Commercial growth in downtown, airport, Solano, Red Hawk
Scenario Planning - Consensus
Consensus Scenario – Future Development Map
DISCUSSION