

Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC)

Notes November 29, 2023, Meeting

Committee Members in Attendance:

Robert Chavez

Ray Cvetic

Hank Kelly

George Radnovich, Trustee

Maida Rubin, Planning and Zoning Director

Other Attendees:

Sandra Gaiser, Consultant, by phone

Kay Beason

Nancy Nangeroni

Gordene McKenzie

Gwenn Baldwin

JT Michelson

Notes:

- The group discussed the public input received at the November 15 public meeting. Director Rubin went over comments from the public meeting compiled by Sandy Gaiser (attached).
- The group was not in favor of including a minimum lot threshold, and based on public input decided not to propose a different dwelling unit bonus number for the A zones and R zones.
- Next public meeting date and logistics discussed:
 - Saturday, February 3rd at 1pm
 - Public comments taken until February 16 COB
 - Record the meeting as before
 - Advertise in Village Vision Magazine
 - Need to have great visual aids
- *UPDATE post-meeting: Due to a variety of factors, the public meeting date will be Thursday February 1st with two meeting times: 2 pm and 5:30 pm. The meetings will not be recorded/live streamed.*
- Public comments:
 - Ms. Nangeroni asked a point of clarification on the 1.5 and 1.4 density bonus numbers;
 - Ms. McKenzie stated that residents are concerned about who the ordinance serves: developers or residents. She added that it is a well thought out proposal and understands the public input. She suggested a one acre minimum lot size for eligibility with smaller as a conditional use.
 - Mr. Michelson stated that eligibility will be difficult in the A-3 Zone and that it would probably be difficult for developers, who will go elsewhere.
 - Ms. Baldwin summarized the comments she had provided in written form.

Next Meeting: **Tuesday, December 12, 2023, 9:00-10:00 a.m.**

Los Ranchos Village Hall, 6718 Rio Grande Blvd., NW, Los Ranchos, NM 87107

**Proposed Revisions of Ordinance 284
Public Meeting 11.15.2023**

Compilation of Written Comments

Location

- Should be allowed in R zones and A zones
- Should R-2 and R-3 Zones be eligible for Conservation Subdivision?
- Any parcel in A and R zones capable to be subdivided should be eligible whether or not receives density bonus (2 comments)
- Should not allowed in R Zones.

Parcel Size

- One acre min. lot size (2 comments)
- Subdivisions smaller than one acre should be a Conditional Use
- Min. 1 ½ acres
- Designate min. lot size (2 comments)
- Min. acreage for R Zones (2 comments)
- Remove min lot size requirement
- Min. 10 lots to make it work, min of 3 acres for R-2 and 2 acres for R-3 (move to lot size)

Density Bonus

- Proposed density bonuses for A &R zones with the buildable area based on a net FAR, applied sitewide to encourage variety of housing types
- 1.4 bonus should be applied to all A and R Zones.
- 1.7 bonus for R zones too high
- DU bonus should not be applied to the gross parcel area but rather to the net developable area
- Proposed density bonus is excessive, particularly in R zones. Should be same for whole village, maximum of 40 percent determined by net developable area.
- Density bonus too high
- Allow variable density bonus for additional CA more than 35 percent
- Still unclear how the ratio numbers were derived, 1.7 seem arbitrary

FAR

- Common sense floor ratio

Conservation Area

- Support all proposed revisions to Conservation Area ordinance section
- CA likely owned by lot owners as tenants in common and not be severable for the lots or by a HOA
- Small subdivisions rely on recorded CC&Rs and CA maintenance plan, may not need a HOA. Maintenance would be joint obligations of the lot owners. (2 comments)
- Conservation area thoroughly defined (2 comments)
- CA remain permeable land, consistent with historical permeable land uses
- CA not public space, use of open space at meeting was confusing
- Financial guaranty by the developer and owners be required as a condition of approval
- Infrastructure not installed on CA
- Encourage using CA for agriculture
- 35 percent for CA is too little, require 45 percent
- CA should identified be a separate parcel on plan
- The term Conservation Area (“CA”) must be carefully defined—please refer to my definition: Any area(s) within a proposed conservation subdivision sought to be designated as CA must be site appropriate and promote the history and culture of the village and historic permeable land uses in the Character Area in which the parcel is located, including small scale agriculture, habitat, animal husbandry, maintenance of culturally significant historic sites or structures, preservation and use of acequias, preservation of scenic aspects of the parcel and views, small scale horse activities, or similar uses of land in furtherance of the village Master Plan, the culture of the village and historic permeable land uses in the applicable Character Area. (This means park use may be a permitted CA use in the R-zones, not in the A-zones.)

Process

- Follow major subdivision process
- Eliminate pilot program

HOA

- Both HOA and COA (condo owner assoc.) should be clearly allowed to facilitate needed housing
- Do HOA requirements for NM fit in with what Los Ranchos is thinking about?

Misc.

- Ord 284 should be repealed and replaced
- Residents do not want higher density for its own sake. Preserve semi-rural lifestyle.
- Allowing clustering as a tool and preserve more permeable land as CA
- Make ordinance mandatory
- Consider impact of increased traffic and population
- Need to show maximum house size or average house size allowed
- Can more representatives from East Los Ranchos be added to the CAC?
- Any considerations for current and future properties that are uninhabitable or are viewed as a blight?
- Please acknowledge property rights in presentations

Spreadsheet

- Eliminate fractional Dus
- Use acreage, not sq. ft.
- Add column for smaller parcels