Development Review Committee  
Regular Meeting Minutes  
Thursday, May 04, 2017  
10:00 a.m.

THESE MINUTES ARE NOT VERBATIM, THEY ARE SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEMBERS PRESENT</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Absent</th>
<th>OTHERS PRESENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Luis Marmolejo, Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Ken Thurston, Thurston Homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janine Divyak, Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Kent Thurston, Thurston Homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela Roberson, Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>David B. Church, KD Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert Casillas, Planning</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas Sotomayor, KD Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jannette Kresser, Secretary</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Dugie, Flood</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Gwynn, Flood</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Armijo, Engineering</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rene Molina, Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Duran, Engineering</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Sambrano, Engineering</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Crespin, Fire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arturo Herrera, Fire</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nora Oliver, Utilities</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mireya Carnero, Utilities</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CALL TO ORDER: Albert Casillas, Planner – 10:24 am.

2. **APPROVAL OR CHANGES TO AGENDA:**
None

3. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM MARCH 30, 2017**
   Move: Robert Armijo
   Second: Nora Roberts
   Motion carries. Approved by a response of Ayes by all present.

4. **OLD BUSINESS**
None

5. **NEW BUSINESS**
   Albert Casillas: Case # V17-002: Submitted by Kent Thurston, Discussion on variances to a proposed Development known as Vista Rancho Subdivision. The review will cover multiple variances to the road access standards on different proposed roadways. The parcel is identified by Parcel # R0305802.

   Kent Thurston: We are proposing to do a three-lane road through the property vs the four land road that is the current requirement within the code. We would also improve the intersection of Elks & Taylor Road. We would also like to extend the three land road all the way down to El Camino Real. During phase 1 of the project, the improvements to Lopez Road would be completed as well. This will allow for better connectivity within the community and the school. We are also asking for a waiver on the interior road sections of Phase 1 to remove the requirement for sidewalks and curb and gutter except for where it is necessitated by drainage concerns. This will match the existing neighborhood and keeping in mind that these are larger ¾ acre lots.
Robert Armijo: In the existing neighborhood, there are sidewalks over the drainage areas allowing for pedestrian traffic, though they are not up to ADA standards. Considering the schools in the area, I feel sidewalks are a concern to allow for safe walking to school.

Rene Molina: The connectivity would be beneficial to tying the school to this area of the community.

Kent Thurston: We are proposing to have community walkways to be constructed on the next phases of construction. We plan on staying with the same Master Plan with the same densities proposed therein (358 lots). If the variances are approved, both Taylor and Lopez roads would be constructed during Phase 1 of the project.

Ken Thurston: The reason we are proposing to do the complete infrastructure is because when we met to the School Board, they were very receptive to the idea of bringing a better traffic scenario to their schools. In regards to the sidewalks, if you look at the property to the north, there are very few sidewalks currently.

Robert Armijo: While it is true that there are very few sidewalks in the existing neighborhood, when new facilities are built they do need to be brought up to current standards. Given that, I am willing to work with you providing there is a walkway for the kids.

Rene Molina: We are not opposed to deviate from the standard, I do agree that there is a benefit to what you are proposing. I’m just not sure that this is the time to vote on the deviation for the entire development.

Kent Thurston: Dan Lilley prepared the TIA for the current Master Plan and he determined that the 3 lane road will suffice for this area.

Ken Thurston: We do not plan to deviate from the approved Master Plan as far as densities; however, we do not have the exact location and curvatures (of the roads) nailed down at this time.

Thomas Sotomayor: There are other issues regarding the placement of a four lane road at this location. If the four lane would be extended through the existing neighborhood it would take up almost the entirety of the front lawns. Also, because of the existing erosive soil materials on the property, the current code of the UDC would require us to transition within 1,000 feet of the property from the four lane road to a rural road.

Robert Armijo: From a road maintenance perspective, it makes sense to look at a three lane at this point in time. The sidewalk really is a concern that I have.

Kent Thurston: I think with the existing pathways that we are planning within the subdivision as well as the addition of some crosswalks, will provide a safe and viable path for the children to take to school.

Thomas Sotomayor: Again a reminder, we are only suggesting the subtraction of sidewalks for north of Taylor Rd. The only children walking would be the older children to the Middle School and at a mile-and-a-half away, they would not be required to walk. They would be within the distance for the bus service for Vista Middle School. All of the elementary school age children in that area go to Dona Ana Elementary, not Columbia Elementary so they walk north, not south.

Robert Duran: Would you mind putting a buffer between the driving lane and the paved walkway on Taylor and Lopez roads?

Kent Thurston: I’m not opposed to that. We would need to have our Engineer go back and make sure that adding a buffer would not affect drainage. Basically, it would be swapping the location of the parkways with the bike/walking path.
Thomas Sotomayor: The problem with that is that you could not have any objects within the parkway such as plants, trees, and/or rocks because that would not allow room for a vehicle to pull off on the side of the road due to breaking down or for traffic stops.

Rene Molina: Also, looking at what you have drawn here, roadside swales are harder to maintain with curb and gutter.

Thomas Sotomayor: We would not be able to use curb in those areas, we would need underground pipes because the flows that we have would overflow those curbs.

Kent Thurston: We also have an HOA for the current Phase 1. This HOA is there for parks and for drainage only.

Rene Molina: I just want to mention that maintenance is high on roadside swales. Knowing that the velocities are high, this will require the stabilization of those soils. I realize that you have to manage the spread of the water, by utilizing curb cuts at regular intervals, you can manage the spread.

Thomas Sotomayor: Again because of the slope on the west side of the property, we would be required to begin placing curb cuts so far up that hill that it would requires a roadside swale to carry the water down to the ponding area at the bottom of the hill, either that or underground pipe.

Thomas Sotomayor: It is not labeled, however the rock that is being shown would be grouted rock. We have had a drainage plan for the past three years and that drainage plan has not changed. The plan shows these drainage swales.

Ken Thurston: Our drainage plan shows that curb and gutter does not work in this area and would actually require it to change the historical flow of water. This will cause many other concerns and problems in the long run.

Kent Thurston: This application for variance is more complicated than it maybe needs to be, because it had already gone through the ETZ. This had originally been submitted through the ETZ and had gone through all of the proper reviews and approvals needed through that board. Then the UDC was passed and we were told that our final meeting with the ETZ had been cancelled because that board no longer existed. Since then, it has been 5 months waiting to get to this point. There has been a lot of confusion with the switch to the UDC.

David Cristiani: It makes sense to me why there is a mortared rock swale. What ways could low impact development techniques that you have employed in other sections of the development be employed here with a possible adjustment to the section that would help to minimize the runoff and maximize the cost savings?

Thomas Sotomayor: The parkway being landscaped would work but it would have to be something drivable like a base course or packed rock. That would absorb some moisture but not much, the sheet flow would just sheet right across it. This would create more maintenance on the pedestrian walkway as it would now be covered in sand. Also, in our first submittal of our drainage plan, we had individual ponds on each property that would have been the responsibility of the property owner to maintain. We were told that this was too big of a liability to the property owner and to change the design which is when we came up with the drainage swales to convey the water to a larger drainage pond.

Rene Molina: This was a recommendation of the Flood Commission. It is my recollection that Paul Dugie was concerned with the maintenance that each property owner would have to perform to insure proper drainage of the entire area and the problems that could occur if that maintenance was not completed.
Thomas Sotomayor: We do now have rear ponds at the back of each property. We have a raised residential roadway that will flow to the back of the property and be conveyed from property to property until it reaches the point where it is conveyed to the larger retention pond, with elevated building pads. It is still a concern about who is going to maintain those ponds, whether it is in the front or in the back of the property.

Janine Divyak: Generally speaking, the whole thrust of the UDC is to create walkable communities. We are supportive of sidewalks at least on one side of the street or a walking trail that the kids do feel safe to walk to school. New real estate sales are now giving you a walkability index.

Ken Thurston: The UDC is based upon smaller lots vs the ones that we are proposing for this phase. When we get to the other phases, you will see curb and sidewalks because the lot sizes are much smaller.

Thomas Sotomayor: The UDC does say that the lot size had to be greater than 1 acre to be designated as rural, but it also says that any lot size over 10,000 square feet can have a rural cross section so there is an inconsistency in the UDC.

Robert Armijo: I move that the cross section remain the same with the exception of a 7 foot shift of the grade separation interior to the roadway for Phase 1.

Motion: Robert Armijo
Second: Albert Casillas
Motion carries by a vote of “Yes” by those present.

Robert Armijo: I move that for Exhibit B-C-D that the waiver be granted for the cross section with the exception of, one of the bike/pedestrian lanes be shifted adjacent to the right of way based on the 358 lots for Vista Rancho.

Motion: Robert Armijo
Second: Arturo Herrera
Motion carries by a vote of “Yes” by those present.

Robert Armijo: I move for Exhibit E-F-G that the waiver be granted for the cross section with the exception of, one of the bike/pedestrian lanes be shifted adjacent to the right of way based on the 358 lots for Vista Rancho.

Motion: Robert Armijo
Second: Albert Casillas
Motion carries by a vote of “Yes” by those present.

6. Not on Agenda

7. COMMITTEE REPORTS
None

8. STAFF INPUT
Robert Armijo: I think this was a productive meeting and I thank everyone for working together.

9. ADJOURNMENT
12:10 a.m.