

**Santa Fe Board of County Commissioners
Special Meeting**

County Commission Chambers
County Administration Building

June 25, 2014

5:00 PM

Please turn off Cellular Phones during the meeting

Special Meeting Agenda

- I. Call To Order.**
- II. Roll Call.**
- III. Pledge Of Allegiance.**
- IV. State Pledge.**
- V. Approval of Agenda (Action Item).**
- VI. Timeline for Adoption of the Sustainable Land Development Code Amendments and the Zoning Map.**
- VII. Public Meeting on An Ordinance Amending Ordinance 2013-6, The Sustainable Land Development Code (SLDC).**
- VIII. Public Meeting on the Zoning Map of All Land in the Unincorporated Area of Santa Fe County to which the Santa Fe County Sustainable Land Development Code Applies.**
- IX. Adjourn.**

The County of Santa Fe makes every practical effort to assure that its meetings and programs are accessible to people with disabilities. Individuals with disabilities should contact Santa Fe County at 986-6200 in advance to discuss any special needs (e.g., interpreters for the hearing impaired or readers for the sight impaired).

Item VI

Daniel "Danny" Mayfield
Commissioner, District 1

Miguel M. Chavez
Commissioner, District 2

Robert A. Anaya
Commissioner, District 3



Kathy Holian
Commissioner, District 4

Liz Stefanics
Commissioner, District 5

Katherine Miller
County Manager

DATE: June 18, 2014

TO: Board of County Commissioners

FROM: Penny Ellis-Green, Growth Management Director

VIA: Katherine Miller, County Manager

RE: Timeline for Adoption of the Sustainable Land Development Code Amendments and the Zoning Map.

The June 24, 2014 Special BCC meeting will be the second public meeting to take comments on the SLDC changes and the Zoning map.

At the May 28, 2014 BCC meeting staff was instructed to schedule four additional special BCC meetings as public meetings on the SLDC changes and the zoning map.

The proposed dates are as follows:

July 22
August 20
September 16
September 23

Staff is working on locations for these meetings.

After these 4 Growth Management Area meetings, staff will request to Publish Title and General Summary of a version of the Zoning Map that the BCC directs us to release.

At that point we will do all the required legal noticing for the required Public Hearing (s) for the adoption of the zoning map.

Item VII

Daniel “Danny” Mayfield
Commissioner, District 1

Miguel M. Chavez
Commissioner, District 2

Robert A. Anaya
Commissioner, District 3



Kathy Holian
Commissioner, District 4

Liz Stefanics
Commissioner, District 5

Katherine Miller
County Manager

DATE: June 19, 2014

TO: Board of County Commissioners

FROM: Penny Ellis-Green, Growth Management Director

VIA: Katherine Miller, County Manager

RE: Public Meeting on An Ordinance Amending Ordinance No. 2013-6, The Sustainable Land Development Code (SLDC).

Attached is the proposed Ordinance amending the Sustainable Land Development Code.

This is a public meeting, no action is required at this time.

**THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
OF SANTA FE COUNTY**

ORDINANCE NO. 2014-Ordinance 2014-_____

**AN ORDINANCE AMENDING ORDINANCE NO. 2013-6, THE SUSTAINABLE LAND
DEVELOPMENT CODE (SLDC)**

:

WHEREAS, on December 10, 2013, the Board of County Commissioners voted to adopt Ordinance 2013-6, the Sustainable Land Development Code (“SLDC”);

WHEREAS, at the time of its December 10, 2013 vote to adopt the SLDC, the Board of County Commissioners directed County staff to review the SLDC and come back to Board with recommended changes and Section 1.13 of the SLDC provides that “The Board shall review the SLDC at the time of adoption of the Zoning Map...”;

WHEREAS, staff did review the SLDC since the adoption vote;

WHEREAS, Ordinance 2013-6 stated that “The Board shall review the Sustainable Land Development Code at the time of adoption of the Zoning Map and six (6) months thereafter”; and

WHEREAS, Ordinance 2013-6 although adopted, by its own terms does not become effective until 30 days after the adoption and recording of a Zoning Map.

NOW THEREFORE, be it enacted by the Board of County Commissioners of Santa Fe County to adopt the following changes in amending Ordinance 2013-6, the County’s Sustainable Land Development Code:

1. A new section with the following language shall be added as §1.11.8:

1.11.8. Development Approval for Applications in Process. Any application for a development approval, which has been deemed complete by the Administrator prior to the effective date of this SLDC may be approved in conformance with the 1996 Santa Fe County Land Development Code so long as the application is able to move through the process within a reasonable period of time not to exceed 12 months. Development of any subsequent phase or further application related to the same development shall be in compliance with this SLDC.

2. The following change shall be made to § 1.15.6.2:

1.15.6.2. Criteria.

3. Suitability as Presently Zoned. The Board shall consider the suitability or unsuitability of the tract, parcel or lot for its use as presently zoned. This factor shall however, be weighed in relation to proof of a clerical mistake in the text or map dimensions and uses of the zoning district, substantially changed conditions in the area surrounding the

property, or to effectuate the important findings of § 1.15.7.2 § 1.15.6.2, and is supported by the goals, policies, and strategies of the SLDC, the SGMP, Area, District or Community Plan.

3. The following changes shall be made to § 4.4.5:

4.4.5. Application.

*** * ***

4.4.5.3. Fees. Before an application will be deemed complete for consideration, all required application fees as set forth in the Board-approved Permit and Review Ordinance, shall be paid to the Administrator.

4. The following new language shall be added to § 4.4.13:

4.4.13. Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law. Written notice of a final decision of the Planning Commission or the Board to approve, or approve with conditions, an application pursuant to NMSA 1978, Sec. 39-3-1.1, which can be in the form of a development order, shall constitute the issuance of the permit. Staff or the Hearing Officer where one is used as indicated in Table 4-1, shall prepare findings of fact and conclusions of law pursuant to NMSA 1978, Sec. 39-3-1.1 to document final action taken on each application. Such findings and conclusions shall be approved by the decision-making body and filed with the County Clerk.

5. The following new language shall be added to § 5.7.11:

5.7.11. Expiration of Preliminary Plat. An approved or conditionally approved preliminary plat shall expire unless the applicant obtains a development order granting approval of the final plat within twenty-four months (24) from the date of preliminary plat approval or conditional approval. Prior to the expiration of the approved or conditionally approved preliminary plat, the applicant may submit an application for extension, for approval by the Board, for a period of time not to exceed a total of thirty-six (36) months from the original approval date. No further extension shall be granted under any circumstances and the preliminary approval shall become null and void upon expiration of the preliminary plat. No application for final plat approval shall be allowed to be submitted after the preliminary plat has expired. The expiration of the approved or conditionally approved preliminary plat shall terminate all proceedings on the subdivision, and no final plat shall be filed without first processing a new preliminary plat.

6. The following change shall be made to Table 6-1 (Required Studies, Reports and Assessments (SRAs)):

The acronym “FIS” appearing as an SRA Type at the head of a column shall be deleted and replaced with “FIA” which stands for “fiscal impact assessment.”

7. The following changes shall be made to § 6.2.1:

6.2. PREPARATION AND FEES.

6.2.1. Applicant prepared. Except for DCIs, an applicant for discretionary development approval shall prepare their own SRAs as required in this Chapter. The applicant shall deposit, as determined in the Fee Schedule approved by the Board, cash, a

certified check, bank check or letter of credit, to cover be responsible for all of the County's expenses in reviewing the SRA, including engaging consultants.

8. The following new language shall be added to § 6.4.2.1:

6.4.2.1. Roads. The APFA shall calculate the LOS for roads consistent with Table 12-1. The impact of the proposed development shall be measured by average daily trips and peak-hour trips based upon the Transportation Research Board's "Highway Capacity Manual 2000". The APFA shall describe the means by which the transportation capacity of the system will be expanded without destroying historic and traditional built environment. For purposes of the APFA, average daily traffic assumes 10 trips per day per dwelling unit or building lot.

9. The following new language shall be added to § 7.11.11.3.2:

7.11.11.3. Access to Subdivisions, Non-Residential Development and Multi-Family Development.

2. Major subdivisions of thirty-one (31) lots or more, those with 31 or more development units, or those non-residential developments consisting of 25,000 square feet or more, shall provide access to an existing County road, highway, state highway or federal highway and shall provide a minimum of two (2) access points to the referenced roadway. Such development shall also provide for connections to roads and highways identified on the Official Map.

10. Table 7-12 shall be changed as follows:

a. The word Major shall be added before "Arterial or highway" in the far left column; the reference 2- shall be added before the number "6" under the "# of driving lanes" column; the number 100 shall be stricken and replaced with 150 under the "Minimum ROW (ft)" column.

b. In the "Minor arterial" row, the numbers 60 to 100 shall stricken and replaced with 120 under the "Minimum ROW (ft)" column.

c. In the "Collector" row, the numbers 45 to 72 shall be stricken and replaced with 80 under the "Minimum ROW (ft)" column.

d. In the "Local" row, the numbers 34 to 48 shall be stricken and replaced with 50 under the "Minimum ROW (ft)" column.

e. In the "Cul-de-Sac" row, the number 20 shall be stricken and replaced with 38 under the "Minimum ROW (ft)" column.

A complete version of Table 7-12 depicting all technical changes follows: An Ordinance amending the Sustainable Land development code

7.11. ROAD DESIGN STANDARDS.

Table 7-12: Urban Road Classification and Design Standards (SDA-1 and SDA-2).

	Avg. daily traffic	# of driving lanes	Lane width (ft)	Sidewalks	Bike lanes	Minimum ROW (ft)	Design Speeds (mph)	Max % Grade	Min. agg. base course	Min. bit. pavement	Max % Super-elev.
Major Arterial or highway	5000 +	<u>2-6</u>	12	Two 5'	Two 5 ft on-road	40 <u>50</u>	Level: 50+ Rolling: 50+ Mount.: 50+	5%	6"	6"	Refer to AASH TO
Minor arterial	2000 to 4999	2 - 4	12	Two 5'	Two 5 ft on-road	60 to 100 <u>120</u>	Level: 30-60 Rolling: 30-60 Mount.: 30-60	5%	6"	5"	Refer to AASH TO
Collector	601 to 1999	2	11	Two 5'	Two 5 ft on-road	45 to 72 <u>80</u>	Level: 30+ Rolling: 30+ Mount.: 30+	8%	6"	4"	5%
Sub-collector	301 to 600	2	11	Two 5'	Two 5 ft on-road	60	Level: 30+ Rolling: 30+ Mount.: 30+	8%	6"	4"	5%
Local	0 to 400	2	10	One 5'	n/a	34 to 48 <u>50</u>	Level: 20-30 Rolling: 20-30 Mount.: 20-30	7%	6"	3"	5%
Cul-de-Sac	0 to 300	2	10	n/a	n/a	20 <u>38</u>	Level: 30-50 Rolling: 20-40 Mount.: 20-30	9%	6"	3"	n/a
Alley	n/a	1	12	n/a	n/a	19	n/a	7%	6"	3"	n/a
Driveway	n/a	1	14	n/a	n/a	20	n/a	6%	n/a	n/a	n/a

11. Table 7-13 shall be changed as follows:

a. In the “Major arterial” row, the reference 2- shall be added before the number “4” under the “# of driving lanes” column.

b. In the “Minor arterial” row, the numbers ~~70 to 100~~ shall be stricken and replaced with 120 under the “Minimum ROW (ft)” column.

c. In the “Collector” row, the reference ~~60 to~~ shall be stricken under the “Minimum Row (ft)” column.

d. In the “Local” row, the reference ~~0 to 400~~ shall be stricken and replaced with 201-400 under the top half of the “Avg. daily traffic” column; in the same row, add the reference 0-200 under the bottom half of the “Avg. daily traffic” column.

e. In the “Local” row, the number ~~56~~ shall be stricken and replaced with 50 under the “Minimum ROW (ft)” column.

f. In the “Local” row, the number ~~6~~ shall be stricken and replaced by 4 under the top half of the “Min. agg. Base course” column; in the same row, add the reference n/a under the bottom half of the “Min. agg. Base course” column.

g. In the “Cul-de-Sac” row, the number ~~20~~ shall be stricken and replaced with 38 under the “Minimum ROW (ft)” column; in the same row, the number 4 shall be stricken and replaced with 6 under the “Min. agg. Base course” column.

h. A new column entitled Double penetration chipseal with fog coat shall be added between the “Min. agg. Base course” and “Min. bit. pavement” columns; under the same new column, the reference n/a shall be added in each corresponding box except for the word yes which shall be added under the bottom half of the box in the corresponding “Local” row.

A complete version of Table 7-13 depicting all technical changes follows:

Table 7-13: Rural Road Classification and Design Standards (SDA-3).

	Avg. daily traffic	# of driving lanes	Lane width (ft)	Non-vehicular side paths	Bike lanes	Minimum ROW (ft)	Design Speeds (mph)	Max % Grade	Min. agg. base course	Double penetration	Min. bit. pavement	Max % Super-elev.
Major arterial or highway	5000+	<u>2-4</u>	12	n/a	Two 5 ft on-road	150	Level: 70 Rolling: 70 Mount.: 50-60	5%	6"	<u>n/a</u>	6"	8%
Minor arterial	2000 to 4999	2 - 4	12	n/a	Two 5 ft on-road	70 100 <u>120</u>	Level: 60-75 Rolling: 50-60 Mount.: 40-50	5%	6"	<u>n/a</u>	5"	8%
Collector	401-1999	2	11	n/a	n/a	60 80	Level: 40-60 Rolling: 20-50 Mount.: 20-40	8%	6"	<u>n/a</u>	4"	8%
Local	0-400 <u>201-400</u>	2	10	n/a	n/a	56 <u>50</u>	Level: 30-50 Rolling: 20-40 Mount.: 20-30	9%	6"4" <u>4"</u>	<u>n/a</u>	4"	8%
	<u>0-200</u>								<u>n/a</u>	<u>yes</u>	<u>n/a</u>	
Cul-de-Sac	0 to 300	2	10	n/a	n/a	203 <u>8</u>	Level: 30-50 Rolling: 20-40 Mount.: 20-30	9%	6" <u>4"</u>	<u>n/a</u>	n/a	n/a
Driveway	n/a	1	14	n/a	n/a	20	n/a	9%	4"	<u>n/a</u>	n/a	n/a

12. The following language shall be deleted from § 7.13.7.1:

7.13.7. Self-Supplied Water Systems.

7.13.7.1. Community Water Systems.

1. A self-supplied subdivision shall be required to create a community water system or connect to an existing community water system if specified in Table 7-19.

13. The following language shall be added to and deleted from § 7.13.10:

7.13.10. Self-Supplied Wastewater Systems. As is the case with water supply and distribution systems, the type of wastewater system required of any development is dependent upon the nature of the development, the adopted Sustainable Development Area (SDA) in which the development is located, and the proximity of the development to the County's wastewater utility. See Table 7-17 and proximity of the development to any public or publicly-regulated wastewater system; See Table 7-19.

7.13.10.1. General Requirements: Community Wastewater Systems.

1. A subdivision shall be required to create a community wastewater system or connect to an existing community water system if specified in Table 7-18.

2. A community wastewater system shall meet or exceed all applicable design standards of the New Mexico Environment Department, the Construction Industries Division of the Regulation and Licensing Department and the Office of the State Engineer.

3. A community wastewater system shall be capable of treating the volume of wastewater produced by the development at full build-out and shall be designed to treat a peak rate of flow.

4. A community wastewater system shall be designed under the supervision of a New Mexico registered professional engineer. Any expansion of an existing community wastewater system to supply new development shall likewise be designed under the supervision of a New Mexico registered professional engineer.

5. Easements, including construction easements, shall be provided.

6. Management of a community wastewater system shall be accomplished by a competent, professional manager or management consultant. A qualified and certified operator shall be employed or contracted to operate the community wastewater system. The management structure of a community wastewater system shall be capable of ensuring that all required reporting is completed and submitted on a timely basis.

7. Financial guaranty shall be deposited pursuant to § 7.22 herein to secure the construction of a new or expanded community wastewater system.

8. Regardless of whether the County's wastewater system is utilized, all development shall include wastewater systems built to standards established by the County wastewater utility and may be designed and constructed so that they may be connected to the County utility when available.

9. A wastewater system shall meet all applicable requirements of the Public Utility Act, Chapter 62, NMSA 1978.

7.13.10.2. Required Connection to County Wastewater Utility. Table 7-17 provides the requirements for connection to the County wastewater utility. In all cases, it is the responsibility of the owner/developer/applicant to provide wastewater infrastructure to

the point of connection with the County wastewater utility.

7.13.10.32. Where Alternative Wastewater System Allowed.

1. Any wastewater system provided pursuant to this Section shall meet the requirements and standards of 20.7.3 NMAC and 20.6.2 NMAC and shall comply with regulations promulgated by the New Mexico Environment Department.

2. Where a development is not required to connect to the County's wastewater system or a public system pursuant to Tables 7-17 or 7-18, an alternative wastewater disposal system shall be used when specified on Table 7-19 so long as the appropriate liquid waste permit is obtained from the New Mexico Environment Department and presented to the Administrator as a part of the application.

3. Any liquid wastewater treatment system that involves a surface discharge or land application of treated or untreated effluent, shall require presentation of the appropriate permit from the New Mexico Environment Department at the time of application.

14. The following language shall be added to and deleted from § 7.13.11.2:

7.13.11.2. Outdoor Conservation.

* * *

7. Car and truck Vehicle washing is only allowed with the use of a shut-off hose nozzle.

* * *

10. Swimming Pools of a permanent or temporary nature shall be prohibited on all newly created lots.

15. The following edits shall be made and new language shall be added to §7.16.3.1:

7.16.3.1. Development that proposes to remove, demolish or adversely affect a property listed on the new Mexico Register of Cultural Properties and/or the National register Register of historic Places is not permitted unless the applicant first obtains a beneficial use and value determination pursuant to subsection 14.9.8 of the SLDC-, and provides a copy of an excavation permit issued pursuant to 4.10.14 New Mexico Administrative Code by the State Cultural Properties Review Committee with approvals from the State Archaeologist and the State Historic Preservation Officer.

16. The following new language shall be added to §7.16.3.2:

7.16.3.2. Development that affects in any way a Registered Cultural Property (including any removal or demolishing pursuant to the previous paragraph) is not permitted unless the applicant first submits a report concerning the proposed development for review of the Historic Preservation Office, Historic Preservation Officer. The report shall describe in detail the proposed changes to the Registered Cultural Property. Such a report shall be prepared by a professional qualified under § 7.16.8 of this subsection. The report shall include a complete treatment plan for protection and preservation of the Registered Cultural Property, and shall contain at least as much information as is listed in Section 4.10.16.14 New Mexico Administrative Code ("Preliminary Reports"). The treatment plan shall be reviewed by the New Mexico State Historic Preservation Office, Historic

Preservation Officer and conditions on the development proposed by the State Historic Preservation Officer may, as appropriate, be incorporated into the development permit.

17. Four new sections with the following language shall be added as §7.16.4.1, §7.16.4.2, §7.16.4.3, and §7.16.4.4.:

7.16.4.1. On March 19, 2004, Congress enacted Public Law 108-208 as the Galisteo Basin Archaeological Sites Protection Act (“the Act”), Section 2 of which stated that its purpose was “to provide for the preservation, protection, and interpretation of the nationally significant archeological resources in the Galisteo Basin in New Mexico.” The Act found the Galisteo Basin to be “the location of many well preserved prehistoric and historic archeological resources of Native American and Spanish colonial cultures.” Further, that “these resources included the largest ruins of Pueblo Indian settlement in the United States, spectacular examples of Native American rock art, and ruins of Spanish colonial settlements...[all of which] are being threatened by natural causes, urban development, vandalism, and uncontrolled excavations.”

7.16.4.2. The Act designated some 24 specific sites, comprising 4,591 total acres, as constituting the Galisteo Basin Archaeological Protection Sites. Those sites consist of: Arroyo Hondo Pueblo, Burn Corn Pueblo, Chamisa Locita Pueblo, Comanche Gap Petroglyphs, Espinoso Ridge Site, La Cienega Pueblo & Petroglyphs, La Cienega Pithouse Village, La Cieneguilla Petroglyphs/Camino Real Site, La Cieneguilla Pueblo, Lamy Pueblo, Lamy Junction Site, Las Huertas, Pa’ako Pueblo, Petroglyph Hill, Pueblo Blanco, Pueblo Colorado, Pueblo Galisteo/Las Madres, Pueblo Largo, Pueblo She, Rote Chert Quarry, San Cristobal Pueblo, San Lazaro Pueblo, San Marcos Pueblo, and Upper Arroyo Hondo Pueblo. Section 3 of the Act permits any private property owner included within the boundary of the designated site upon written request to the Secretary of the Interior, to have their property immediately removed from within that boundary. Section 4 of the Act prohibits additions to or deletions from the listed sites except by an act of Congress.

7.16.4.3. Section 2 of the Act protects the archeological protection sites by restricting activity on any Federal lands within the sites including but not limited to disposal of lands, mining activity and mineral/geothermal leasing. The Act authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to enter into cooperative agreements with owners of non-Federal lands as to an archaeological protection site located on their property. Such an agreement would enable the Secretary to assist with the protection, preservation, maintenance, and administration of the archaeological resources and associated lands. Section 5 of the Act prohibits the Secretary from administering archaeological protection sites which are on non-Federal lands unless the landowner consents in a cooperative agreement.

7.16.4.4. The Act specifically prohibits the regulation of privately owned lands located within archeological protection sites and permits the Department of Interior to only acquire lands or interests within the protected sites with the consent of the owner. Similarly, Section 18-6-10 of the Cultural Properties Act deems it “an act of trespass and a misdemeanor for any person to remove, injure or destroy registered cultural properties situated on private lands or controlled by a private owner without the owner’s prior permission.” Also, under the state law, if a cultural property is on private land and the State Cultural Properties Review Committee determines that cultural property to be worthy of preservation and inclusion on the official register of cultural property, “the

Committee may recommend the procedure best calculated to ensure preservation.” The procedures include providing technical assistance to the owner to preserve the cultural property, acquiring the property outright or acquiring an easement, advising the County to consider zoning the property as an historic area/district under the Historic District Act, advising the County of the tools available to obtain control of the cultural property under the Historic District Act, and acquiring the property for the State by use of eminent domain.

18. The following changes shall be made to §7.16.5.10.

7.16.5.10. For those resources determined to be significant under the previous paragraph and for which a treatment plan is recommended, a sample of surface artifacts shall be collected and documented, and if there is any reason to believe that subsurface resources exist, excavations shall be conducted according to the most current standards of the Historic Preservation Officer set forth in Section 4.10.16.12 NMAC (~~“standards for~~ “Excavation Standards” and Test Excavation”).

19. The following changes shall be made to §7.16.5.12.

7.16.5.12. The total cost of treatment shall not exceed ten percent (10%) of the total cost of development of the applied-for development, including all future phases. If future phases are not planned sufficiently to determine ~~development~~ total development costs, then development of future phases consistent with the applied-for development shall be assumed. ~~To the extent that~~ Where the cost of treatment exceeds ten percent of development costs, treatment shall be completed up to the ten percent limit. ~~extent that funds do not exceed ten percent of the costs of development.~~ If treatment is incomplete, the applicant shall contact the State Historic Preservation Officer and the County’s Open Space and Trails Division for additional funds to complete the treatment. Only if such requests are denied may the treatment plan be terminated and a development permit issued.

20. A new section with the following language shall be added as §7.16.12:

7.16.12. Excavating an Archaeological Site on Private Land. Pursuant to Section 18-6-10 of the Cultural Properties Act, no person shall excavate an archaeological site located on private land in the State unless the person obtains a permit issued by the State Cultural Properties Review Committee with approvals from the State Archaeologist and the State Historic Preservation Officer. This requirement shall not apply to the private landowner unless the landowner transfers the property with the intent to excavate an archaeological site.

21. The following new language shall be added at the end of the sentence at § 7.17.5.2.1:

7.17.5.2. All Other Development. Subdivision, multi family, non-residential and single family residential development shall comply with the following standards:

- 1. Drainage structures shall be designed and sized to detain or safely retain storm water on site.**
- 2. Storm drainage facilities shall have the sufficient carrying capacity to accept peak discharge runoff from the development;**

3. The peak discharge of storm water resulting from the development shall not exceed the peak discharge calculated prior to the development and differences between pre- and post-development discharge shall be detained or retained on site. Calculation of the design peak discharge of storm water shall be based on a one hundred (100) year frequency, twenty-four (24) hour duration rainstorm;

4. No development shall disturb any existing watercourse or other natural drainage system, in a manner which causes a change in watercourse capacity or time to peak, time of concentration or lag time or other natural drainage system or increase of the pre-development stormwater discharge.

5. All natural drainage ways and arroyos which traverse or affect one or more lots or development sites shall be identified on the plan and/or plat.

6. Erosion setbacks shall be provided for structures adjacent to natural arroyos, channels, or streams such that: (a) a minimum setback of 25' shall be provided from all arroyos with flow rates of 100 cubic feet per second (100 cfs); or (b) a minimum setback of 75' shall be provided from all FEMA designated 100 year Floodplains. Setbacks from FEMA designated Floodplains may be reduced if bank stabilization or stream bed and bank stability is designed or provided by a professional engineer. In no case shall the setback be reduced to less than 25'.

7. For single-family residences, where a proposed development site is located outside of a regulated one hundred (100) year flood plain and on slopes less than ten percent (10%) and the proposed development site, including patios, garages, accessory structures, driveways and other development that decreases the permeability of infiltration of pre-development surfaces is no more than six thousand (6,000) square feet and total impermeable surfaces (roofs, paved areas, patios, etc.) do not exceed twenty-five hundred (2,500) square feet, a retention/detention pond(s) or checkdams(s) with a minimum volume of six hundred (600) cubic feet shall be installed at a location to be approved by the Code Administrator. Such ponds shall be integrated with the landscaping or revegetation on the lot.

22. The following changes shall be made to the Table 7-19 heading:

Table 7-19: Community Water and Wastewater System Requirement for Developments Subdivisions in SDA-2 and SDA-3.

23. The following change shall be made to § 8.5:

Zoning Map: the SLDC map that geographically depicts zoning district boundaries and classifications within the County. Also see § 8.5 § 8.4 (“Zoning Map”).

24. The following changes shall be made to § 8.8.5:

8.8.5. Side and Rear Setbacks. For buildings in the PI district that are over 12 feet in height, side and rear setbacks adjacent to any A/R, RUR, RUR-F, RUR-R, RES-F, RES-E, R-C, or TC

districts, and any predominantly single-family detached or attached dwelling districts or sub-districts in areas subject to community district zoning, as well as any existing or approved development consisting of predominantly single-family detached dwellings or 1- or 2-story duplex or single-family detached dwellings in MU or PDD districts, are outlines outlined in Table 8-16 below above.

25. The following new subsection shall be added as § 8.10.9.1:

8.10.9.1. Existing Neighborhood Zones. Existing Neighborhood Zones established in the Santa Fe Community College District shall have a minimum lot size of 2.5 acres per dwelling unit.

26. The following new subsection shall be added as § 8.10.11:

8.10.11. Existing Master Plans Identified as PDDs. In order to recognize existing approvals, PDDs identified on the initial zoning map may be built out in accordance with their approved master plans which were approved prior to the effective date of this SLDC.

27. Table 8-13 shall be changed as follows:

8.7. NON-RESIDENTIAL ZONING DISTRICTS.

8.7.1. Commercial General (CG).

a. In the “Density” row, add “(# acres per dwelling Unit) after the word “Density”; in the same row strike n/a and replace with 2.5**.

b. Under the first footnote marked by a single asterisk, add the following new footnote, ** density shall be 1 acre if the surrounding zoning district is RC, or reduced to 0.75 acres if the surrounding zoning district is TC.

A complete version of Table 8-13 depicting all technical changes follows:

Table 8-13: Dimensional Standards – CG (Commercial General).

CG Zoning District	CG
Density (# acres per dwelling Unit)	<u>n/a 2.5 /1/0.75**</u>
Multifamily Density*	Up to 20
Frontage (minimum, feet)	50
Lot width (minimum, feet)	n/a
Lot width (maximum, feet)	n/a
Height (maximum, feet)	48
Lot coverage (maximum, percent)	80

*Multi-Family Residential shall comply with supplemental use standards in Chapter 10.

** acres per dwelling unit may be reduced to density shall be 1 acre isf the surrounding zoning district is RC, or reduced to 0.75 acres if the surrounding zoning district is TC.

8.7.2. Commercial Neighborhood (CN).

28. Table 8-14 shall be changed as follows:

a. In the “Density” row, add (# acres per dwelling Unit) after the word “Density”; in the same row strike n/a and replace with 2.5***.

b. Under the second footnote marked by a double asterisk, add the following new footnote, *** density shall be 1 acre if the surrounding zoning district is RC, or reduced to 0.75 acres if the surrounding zoning district is TC.

A complete version of Table 8-14 depicting all technical changes follows:

Table 8-14: Dimensional Standards – CN (Commercial Neighborhood).

CN Zoning District	CN
Density (# acres per dwelling Unit)	n/a 2.5-1/0.75***
Frontage (minimum, feet)	50
Lot width (minimum, feet)	n/a
Lot width (maximum, feet)	n/a
Height (maximum, feet)	24
Lot coverage (maximum, percent)	80
Maximum building size (aggregate)	50,000*
Maximum size of individual establishments (sq.ft.)	15,000**

*Building size may be increased up to 100,000 square feet with the issuance of a conditional use permit.

**Establishment size may be increased up to 30,000 square feet with the issuance of a conditional use permit.

*** ~~acres per dwelling unit may be reduced to~~ density shall be 1 acre ~~is if the surrounding zoning district is RC, or reduced to 0.75 acres if the surrounding zoning district is TC.~~

29. Table 8-15 shall be changed as follows:

a. In the “Density” row, strike maximum dwelling units/acre and replace with # acres per dwelling Unit”; in the same row replace “n/a” with “2.5*.

b. Below Table 8-15, add a footnote with the following language, *density shall be 1 acre if the surrounding zoning district is RC, or reduced to 0.75 acres if the surrounding zoning district is TC.

8.7.3. Industrial (I).

A complete version of Table 8-15 depicting all technical changes follows:

Table 8-15: Dimensional Standards – I (Industrial).

Zoning District	I
-----------------	---

Density (maximum, dwelling units/acre <u># acres per dwelling Unit</u>)	n/a <u>2.5-1/0.75*</u>
Frontage (minimum, feet)	50
Lot width (minimum, feet)	n/a
Lot width (maximum, feet)	n/a
Height (maximum, feet)	50
Lot coverage (maximum, percent)	70%

* acres per dwelling unit may be reduced to density shall be 1 acre if the surrounding zoning district is RC, or reduced to 0.75 acres if the surrounding zoning district is TC.

30. Table 8-16 shall be changed as follows:

a. In the “Density” row, add # acres per dwelling Unit after the word “Density”; in the same row strike n/a and replace with 2.5*.

b. Below Table 8-16, add a footnote with the following language, *density shall be 1 acre if the surrounding zoning district is RC, or reduced to 0.75 acres if the surrounding zoning district is TC.

A complete version of Table 8-16 depicting all technical changes follows:

8.8 PUBLIC/INSTITUTIONAL ZONING DISTRICT.

~~**8.8.1. Purpose.** The purpose of the Public/Institutional (PI) district is to accommodate governmental, educational, and non-profit or institutional uses, including public or community parks and recreation facilities, and public, non-profit, and institutional residential uses, but excluding any such uses of an extensive heavy industrial character.~~

~~**8.8.2. Permitted Uses.** Appendix B contains a list of all permitted, accessory and conditional uses allowed within the within the PI district.~~

~~**8.8.3. Dimensional Standards.** The dimensional standards within the PI district are outlined in Table 8-15 below.~~

~~**8.8.4. Review/approval procedures.** All PI developments must meet the design standards of this section in addition to the applicable standards of Chapter 7. A master site plan shall be approved in accordance with procedures outlined in Chapter 4.~~

Table 8-16 Dimensional Standards – PI (Public/Institutional)

PI Zoning District	CN
Density- (<u># acres per dwelling Unit</u>)	n/a <u>(2) 2.5-1/0.75*</u>
Frontage (minimum, feet)	40
Lot width (minimum, feet)	n/a
Lot width (maximum, feet)	n/a
Height (maximum, feet)	48
Lot coverage (maximum, percent)	80

~~* acres per dwelling unit may be reduced to density shall be 1 acre if the surrounding zoning district is RC, or reduced to 0.75 acres if the surrounding zoning district is TC.~~

31. The following deletions and additions shall be made to § 10.15:

10.15. COMMUNITY SERVICE FACILITIES:

~~**10.15.1. General Requirements.** Community service facilities are facilities which provide service to a local community organization. These may include governmental services such as police and fire stations, elementary and secondary day care centers, schools and community centers, and churches.~~

~~**10.15.2. Standards.** Community service facilities are allowed anywhere in the County, provided all requirements of the Code are met, if it is determined that:~~

~~**10.15.2.1.** The proposed facilities are necessary in order that community services may be provided for in the County;~~

~~**10.15.2.2.** The use is compatible with existing development in the area and is compatible with development permitted under the Code; and~~

~~**10.15.2.3.** A master plan and preliminary and final development plan for the proposed development are approved.~~

10.15. TRADE CONTRACTOR.

~~**10.15.1. Applicability.** This section shall apply to all trade contractor businesses.~~

~~**10.15.2. Standards.** Trade contractor businesses located within a Residential Base Zoning District shall meet design standards within this SLDC in addition to the following standards:~~

~~**10.15.2.1.** No more than five (5) large commercial vehicles shall be permitted in a trade contractor business;~~

~~**10.15.2.2.** Outside storage shall not exceed 1500 square feet, including vehicle storage, and shall be screened by a six-foot high solid wall or fence. All other storage shall be within a building.~~

32

~~**8.10. PLANNED DEVELOPMENT ZONING DISTRICTS:**~~

~~**8.10.2.10 Existing PDD's.** PDD's identified on the initial zoning map shall be built out in accordance with their approved master plans which were approved prior to the effective date of this SLDC.~~

APPENDIX A – RULES OF INTERPRETATION, DEFINITIONS AND ACRONYMS

Religious Institution – **WILLIE DO WE NEED???**

. The following new language shall be added to § 10.15.2.3:

10.15.2.3. A master plan and preliminary and final site development plan for the proposed development are is approved.

33. The following new section shall be added directly after § 10.22:

10.23. AUTOMOTIVE PAINT AND BODY BUSINESS.

10.23.1. Applicability. This section shall apply to all automotive paint and body businesses.

10.23.2. Standards. Automotive paint and body businesses shall meet design standards within this SLDC in addition to the following standards:

10.23.2.1. All automotive paint and body work shall be conducted within an insulated building with appropriate air filters to minimize both noise and odors;

10.23.2.2. Stored vehicles shall be located behind a six-foot high solid wall or fence;

10.23.2.3. Structures related to a paint and body business shall be set back a minimum of 75 feet from residential property boundaries.

34. The following changes shall be made to § 13.7.1:

13.7. ALTERNATIVE MEANS OF COMPLIANCE.

13.7.1. A Project may alternatively meet all or a portion of its obligation to provide Affordable Housing by:

13.7.1.1. providing Affordable Units outside the Project but within central and northern Santa Fe County, as shown on Map 14-1;

13.7.1.2. making a cash payment that is equal to or greater value than would have been required if the Project had been constructed or created Affordable Units as provided in this Chapter, calculated by applying the methodology set forth in the Affordable Housing Regulations;

13.7.1.3. dedicating property suitable for construction of Affordable Units outside the Project but within central and northern Santa Fe County, as shown on Map 14-1, whose value is equal to or greater than that which would have been required if the Project had been constructed or created Affordable Units as provided in this Chapter, the required minimum value calculated by applying the methodology set forth in the Affordable Housing Regulations; or

13.7.1.4. otherwise providing Affordable Units in a manner that is consistent with the goals and objectives of this Chapter including providing rental homes affordable units in lieu of homes affordable units for purchase, so long as the initial market value rental payments do not exceed that which an affordable buyer would have to pay to purchase a home in the maximum target monthly rents of the affordable units are at or below what is the income ranges specified in the Affordable Housing Regulations.

35

The following changes shall be made to § 13.7.5.4:

13.7.5.4. a cash payment or property provides a greater overall public benefit than if the Affordable Units were constructed within the Project or Minor Project that would have otherwise provided for mixed-income development; and

36. The following changes shall be made to § 13.9:

13.9. LONG-TERM AFFORDABILITY.

13.9.1. Each Affordable Housing Agreement shall include a form of lien, mortgage or other instrument (herein after referred to as "the Affordability Mortgage or Lien") that shall be executed and recorded along with the deed conveying the Affordable Unit to the first buyer, and that instrument shall create a mortgage or lien in favor of the County in the amount of the difference between the Maximum Target Housing Price and ninety-five percent of the unrestricted fair market value of the Affordable Unit at the time of initial sale, as determined by an appraisal approved by the County, which specifies that the value of the mortgage or lien is calculated at any given point by multiplying the number of full years that have elapsed from the date of first sale of the Affordable Unit by 0.10 and then multiplying that result by the difference between the Maximum Target Housing Price and ninety five percent of the unrestricted fair market value of the Affordable Unit at the time of initial sale. The liens, mortgages or other instruments shall include a formula for reduction of the principal amount as set forth in the Affordable Housing Regulations. The liens, mortgages or other instruments shall be duly executed and recorded in the Office of the County Clerk.

* * *

13.9.3. The lien, mortgage or other instrument shall also provide that, when the Affordable Unit is sold or refinanced, the County shall share in the appreciation in the same percentage as the proportion of the county's initial lien to the initial market value of the home.

13.9.4. 13.9.3. The form of the instrument described above, and the methodology for determining the initial market value of the Affordable Unit shall be specified in the Affordable Housing Regulations.

37. The following changes shall be made to the title at § 14.9.9.7:

14.9.9.7. Changes in-Nonconforming Uses.

38. The following new definition of "Community Service Facility" shall be added to Appendix A.

Community Service Facility: is a facility which provides service to a local community organization. Such facilities may include governmental services such as police and fire stations;

elementary and secondary day care centers; schools and community centers; and churches and other places of worship.

39. The following changes shall be made to the definition of “Community Water System” found in Appendix A.

Community Water System: a water supply system or community well that is under central or common ownership and/or management that serves ~~five~~ (5) fifteen (15) or more service connections used by year-round residents or regularly serves at least twenty-five (25) year-round residents ~~dwelling units~~ or commercial units, including a Water and Sanitation District, that uses permitted water rights rather than domestic wells licensed by the State Engineer under § 72-12-1.1 NMSA 1978.

40. The following new definition of “Retreat” shall be added to Appendix A.

Retreat: A property or facility used for professional, educational, health-related or religious meetings, conferences, or seminars and which may provide meals, overnight accommodations, and/or recreation for participants.

41. The following changes shall be made to Appendix B, Use Table (attached), where new language is underlined and deleted language is stricken through:

On Page Appendix B: 1

a. Rows for “Single family detached units,” “Single family attached units,” “Duplex” and “Retirement” under the “Commercial General” column, shall change from an X which indicates “Prohibited” and shall be stricken to P indicating “Permitted.”

b. A new row shall be added for Retreats.

c. Retreats shall include a P indicating “Permitted” in the columns “Agriculture/Ranching,” “Rural,” “Rural Fringe Commercial Neighborhood,” “Mixed Use, Commercial General,” “Public Institutional” and Planned Development.” Retreats shall include a C indicating “Conditional” in the columns “Rural Residential,” “Residential Fringe,” “Residential Estate,” “Residential Community” and “Traditional Community.” Retreats shall include an X indicating “Prohibited” in the column “Industrial.”

d. Change row entitled “Parts, accessories, or tires” to add Automotive such that the row shall read “Automotive parts, accessories, or tires.”

On Page Appendix B: 2

a. Strike row entitled ~~Camps, camping, and related establishments.~~

b. Change row for “Special Trade Contractor” by removing the word ~~Special~~ and replacing it with plumbing, electrical, roofing, painting, landscaping such that the row shall read Trade contractor, plumbing, electrical, roofing, painting, landscaping. This row shall include a C indicating “Conditional” for “Traditional Community.” This row shall include a P indicating “Permitted” for the columns “Commercial Neighborhood,” “Mixed Use” and “Commercial General.”

c. Add new row entitled Automotive paint and body. Include an X indicating “Prohibited Use” in the following columns “Agriculture/Ranching,” “Rural,” “Rural Fringe,” “Rural Residential,” “Residential Fringe,” “Residential Estate,” “Residential Community,” “Traditional Community,” “Public Institutional,” and “Planned Development.” This row shall include a C indicating a “Conditional Use” in the columns “Commercial Neighborhood” and “Mixed Use.” This row shall include a P indicating “Permitted Use” in the columns “Commercial General” and “Industrial.” Add Section 10 to the “Special Conditions” column.

d. Change the columns entitled “Agriculture/Ranching,” “Rural, Rural Fringe,” “Rural Residential,” “Residential Fringe,” “Residential Estate,” “Residential Community,” “Traditional Community,” “Commercial Neighborhood,” “Mixed Use,” “Commercial General,” “Industrial,” “Public Institutional,” and “Planned Development” to DCI and strike all Cs, Xs and Ps in the row entitled “Automotive, wrecking and graveyards, salvage yards, and junkyards.”

e. Change row entitled “Demolition business” to add building and structures such that the row shall read Demolition, building and structure business. The columns entitled “Commercial General” and “Planned Development” shall be changed to a C indicating “Conditional Use.”

f. Strike the Recycling business row.

On Page Appendix B: 3

a. Add mini-storage units to “Mini-warehouse” row such that row shall read “Mini-warehouse, mini-storage units.” Columns shall change to a C indicating a “Conditional Use” in the following columns “Commercial Neighborhood” and “Mixed Use.” Column shall change to a P indicating a “Permitted Use” for the following column “Commercial Neighborhood.”

b. Add a new row “Movie Ranch.” Include a P which indicates a “Permitted Use” in the following columns “Agriculture/Ranching,” “Rural,” “Rural Fringe,” “Rural Residential,” “Residential Fringe,” “Commercial Neighborhood,” “Mixed Use,” “Commercial General,” “Industrial,” “Public Institutional,” and “Planned Development.” This row shall include a C indicating a “Conditional Use” in the following columns “Residential Estate,” “Residential Community,” and “Traditional Community.”

On Page Appendix B: 4

a. Rows for “Camps,” “camping,” and “related establishments” shall change to C indicating a “Conditional Use” in the following columns “Rural Residential,” “Residential Fringe,” “Residential Estate,” “Residential Community,” and “Traditional Community.” Change to a P indicating a “Permitted Use” in and “Planned Development.”

b. Add a new row Community Center. Include a P indicating a “Permitted Use” in the following columns “Agriculture/Ranching,” “Rural,” “Rural Fringe,” “Commercial Neighborhood,” “Mixed Use,” “Commercial General,” “Public Institutional” and “Planned Development.” This row shall include a C indicating a “Conditional Use” in the following columns “Rural Residential,” “Residential Fringe,” “Residential Estate,” “Residential Community,” and “Traditional Community.” This row shall include an X indicating a “Prohibited Use” in the column entitled “Industrial.”

c. Change the row for “Funeral Homes” to include a P indicating “Permitted” in the “Industrial” column.

On Page Appendix B: 5

a. The row for “Towing and other road service facilities, excluding automobile salvage, wrecking, or permanent vehicle storage” shall change to a P indicating “Permitted” in the column “Commercial General.” This row shall change to an X which is a “Prohibited Use” in the column “Traditional Community.” This row shall change to a C indicating a “Conditional Use” in the columns “Commercial Neighborhood” and “Planned Development.”

On Page Appendix B: 6

a. The row for “Composting facility” shall change to a P indicating a “Permitted Use” in the columns “Agriculture/Ranching,” “Rural,” “Rural Fringe,” “Commercial Neighborhood,” “Mixed Use,” “Commercial General,” “Industrial,” “Public Institutional.” This row shall change to a C indicating a “Conditional Use” in the columns “Rural Residential,” “Residential Fringe,” “Residential Estate,” and “Residential Community.”

b. A new row shall be added entitled Recycling transfer station. This row shall include a P indicating “Permitted” in the columns “Agriculture/Ranching,” “Rural,” “Rural Fringe,” “Commercial Neighborhood,” “Mixed Use,” “Commercial General,” “Industrial,” “Public Institutional” and “Planned Development.” This row shall include a C indicating a “Conditional Use” in the columns “Rural Residential,” “Residential Fringe,” “Residential Estate,” “Residential Community,” “Traditional Community.”

c. A new row shall be added entitled Solid waste collection transfer station (Governmental). This row shall include a P indicating “Permitted” in the columns “Agriculture/Ranching,” “Rural,” “Rural Fringe,” “Commercial Neighborhood,” “Mixed Use,” “Commercial General,” “Industrial,” “Public Institutional” and “Planned Development.” This row shall include a C indicating a “Conditional Use” in the columns “Rural Residential,” “Residential Fringe,” “Residential Estate,” “Residential Community” and “Traditional Community.”

d. The word (Private) shall be added to the row “Solid waste collection transfer station” such that the row shall read Solid waste collection transfer station (Private).

e. The row ~~Communication tower~~ shall be stricken.

f. A new row shall be added entitled Wireless Communication Facilities, co-location, surface mounted, new tower up to 49 feet. This row shall include a P indicating “Permitted” in the columns “Agriculture/Ranching,” “Rural,” “Rural Fringe,” “Rural Residential,” “Residential Fringe,” “Residential Estate,” “Residential Community,” “Traditional Community,” “Commercial Neighborhood,” “Mixed Use,” “Commercial General,” “Industrial,” “Public Institutional” and “Planned Development.”

g. A new row shall be added entitled Wireless Communication Facilities, new tower 50-74 feet. This row shall include a C indicating a “Conditional Use” in the columns “Agriculture/Ranching,” “Rural,” “Rural Fringe,” “Rural Residential,” “Residential Fringe,” “Residential Estate,” “Residential Community,” “Traditional Community” and “Planned Development.” This row shall include a P indicating “Permitted” in the columns “Commercial Neighborhood,” “Mixed Use,” “Commercial General,” “Industrial, Public Institutional.”

h. A new row shall be added entitled Wireless Communication Facilities, new tower 75-99 feet. This row shall include a C indicating a “Conditional Use” in the columns

“Agriculture/Ranching,” “Rural,” “Rural Fringe,” “Rural Residential,” “Residential Fringe,” “Residential Estate,” “Residential Community,” “Traditional Community,” “Commercial Neighborhood,” “Mixed Use,” “Commercial General,” “Industrial,” “Public Institutional” and “Planned Development.”

i. A new row shall be added entitled Wireless Communication Facilities, new tower 100 plus feet. This row shall include a C indicating a “Conditional Use” in the columns “Agriculture/Ranching,” “Rural,” “Rural Fringe” and “Rural Residential.” This row shall change to an X indicating a “Prohibited Use” in the columns “Residential Fringe,” “Residential Estate,” “Residential Community,” “Traditional Community” and “Planned Development.”

j. The row entitled “Telecommunications and Broadcasting station” shall be changed to strike the words ~~Telecommunications and~~ such that the row shall then read “Broadcasting station.”

THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF SANTA FE COUNTY

By: _____
Daniel W. Mayfield, Chair

ATTESTED:

Geraldine Salazar, County Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Gregory S. Shaffer, County Attorney

Item VIII

Daniel “Danny” Mayfield
Commissioner, District 1
Miguel M. Chavez
Commissioner, District 2
Robert A. Anaya
Commissioner, District 3



Kathy Holian
Commissioner, District 4
Liz Stefanics
Commissioner, District 5
Katherine Miller
County Manager

DATE: June 18, 2014

TO: Board of County Commissioners

FROM: Robert Griego, Planning Manager

VIA: Penny Ellis-Green, Growth Management Director
Katherine Miller, County Manager

RE: Zoning Map Recommendations

BACKGROUND:

The Board of County Commissioners held a Special Meeting on May 28th, 2014 which resulted in a Board decision to postpone action to publish Title and General Summary of the Official Zoning Map Adoption Draft and to allow more public review and comment time and to hold additional public meetings in each Growth Management Area of the County.

SUMMARY

Staff is in the process of reviewing the Public Comments that have been submitted as part of the Zoning Map Adoption process. Many of the public comments received are individual petitions by property owners or their representatives on specific properties requesting a change in the zoning district assignment. Staff is researching the best way to process these individual petitions within our current legal framework. Below are global changes to the Official Zoning Map Adoption Draft which includes recommendations that were presented at the May 28th BCC Meeting:

1. Amend Public Institutional (PI) Zoning District to include County properties including fire stations, community centers, Senior Centers, Transfer Stations, Parks and Open Space should be assigned to the Public Institutional Zoning District. Open Space properties should be further assigned the Environmental and Resource Protection Overlay (O-ERP) in accordance with Sections 8.11.3 and 11.2 of the SLDC. Property that has been assigned the PI zoning district and are privately owned and vacant should be changed from PI to an appropriate zoning district.
2. Planned Development Districts (PDD) should reflect the entire property of the approved master plan. Properties with approved master plan, preliminary development plan or final development plan that are still in effect should be assigned the PDD designation and

continue to be regulated by the master plan. The zoning map should provide a reference to the case number for each PDD.

3. Corrections to Zoning Map

- a. Staff will continue to review the Zoning Map to ensure consistent application of criteria, policy framework and SLDC requirements and provide recommended changes.

4. Nonresidential Districts

- a. Staff will continue to review existing approvals and variances with the Zoning Map to ensure that properties with nonresidential zoning are in the correct zoning district.

~~4. Community Districts. Staff recommends that Community Districts (O-CD) be established for Community Planning Districts. Staff recommends that the Zoning Map remove Community Districts until such time as the community develops an Overlay Community District (O-CD) in accordance with the SLDC.~~

RECOMMENDATIONS

~~Staff recommends that the Santa Fe Board of County Commissioners review the public comments and staff recommendations. This is a Public Meeting and No action is required at this time.~~

Exhibit A:

Recommended Changes

Exhibit B:

Public Comments Database

#	Parcel ID or MP	Property	Zoning Map Draft Assignment	Recommended Change	Rationale
1	239302649	Wade and Rhea Butler	Residential Estate	Commercial Neighborhood	Property received prior Master Plan zoning approval. for nonresidential development.
2	910015963	Gerard Martinez	Residential Community	Commercial Neighborhood	Property received prior Master Plan zoning approval. for nonresidential development.
3	910021060	Rancho Encantado LLC	Commercial Neighborhood	Planned Development District	Property received prior Master Plan zoning approval. Include entire Master Plan Area as PDD.
4	910021059	Rancho Encantado LLC	Commercial Neighborhood	Planned Development District	Property received prior Master Plan zoning approval. Include entire Master Plan Area as PDD
5	MP Z06-5030	Galisteo Basin Preserve	PDD, PI, Rrual, Ag/Ranch	Planned Development District	Property received prior Master Plan zoning approval. Include entire Master Plan Area as PDD
6	MP	Las Campanas	Residential Estate	Planned Development District	Property received prior Master Plan zoning approval. Include entire Master Plan Area as PDD
7	980001322	44 Acre Property owned by La Campanas Land Holdings, LLC on La Tierra Blvd	Mixed Use	Residential Estate	Project had not received prior zoning approval. Staff recommends that proposed SLDC zoning map be changed from "Mixed Use" to "Residential Estate" on this parcel, based on concerns regarding compatibility, intensity of development, building height, traffic, noise, and spillover light affecting adjacent and nearby single-family residential properties in Las Campanas.

#	Parcel ID or MP	Property	Zoning Map Draft Assignment	Recommended Change	Rationale
8	990003350 and 990003348	330 +/- acre site owned by Santa Fe 330 Investments, LLC, at intersection of N.M. 599 and La Tierra Blvd.	Mixed Use	Residential Estate	A development plan for a mixed-use project on this site ("Santa Fe Center") was approved in 1986 by the Extraterritorial Zoning Authority; however, it has been determined that the development rights granted by this approval have lapsed. Staff recommends that proposed SLDC zoning map be changed from "Mixed Use" to "Residential Estate" on this site, based on the fact that this development approval has lapsed, and based on specific concerns regarding compatibility, intensity of development, building height, traffic, noise, and spillover light that would affect adjacent and nearby single-family residential properties in Tierra de Oro, and the general Las Campanas vicinity. Furthermore, Mixed Use zoning would be inconsistent with the Santa Fe Metro Area Highway Corridor Plan, which was approved by the County Commission in 2002, and which designates these parcels for "Residential" use.
9	23451904	St. Francis South Business Park	PDD	Commercial General	Staff recommends that the proposed SLDC zoning map be changed from Planned Development District to Commercial General on this parcel, based on owner's request. Proposed Planned Development District zoning was based on approved master plan consisting of a mixture of commercial, residential, public/institutional, and light industrial uses; however, Commercial General zoning would be appropriate for this location and would apparently accommodate the owner's intentions.
10	23344102 and 910006638	Academy for the Love of Learning	Residential Estate	Public Institutional	Staff recommends that the proposed SLDC zoning map be changed from Residential Estate to Public/Institutional on this site, based on owner's request and based on existing uses and anticipated expansion of Academy for the Love of Learning (an adult learning institution).

Recommendations for Zoning Map Adoption Draft Changes - Public Institutional Zoning District

PARCEL NUMBER	SITE	OWNER NAME	DRAFT SLDC ZONING DISTRICT, 3/21/14	ACRES	DESCRIPTION OF USE
	STANLEY	SANTA FE COUNTY	Traditional Community	2	Fire Station
128310525	LAMY	SANTA FE COUNTY	Rural	36	Santa Fe County property/planned Lamy park and fire station site
910009446	GALISTEO	GALISTEO COMMUNITY CORP	Traditional Community	5	Fire Station and Galisteo Community Center
910002039	SANTA FE	COUNTY OF SANTA FE	Rural Residential	2	Fire station
126000461	SANTA FE	SANTA FE COUNTY	Residential Estate	2	Fire station
124624328	SANTA FE	SANTA FE COUNTY	Residential Estate	2	Fire station
23490816	SANTA FE	SANTA FE COUNTY	Rural Fringe	2	Fire station
0	LAMY	SANTA FE COUNTY	Residential Fringe	50	Santa Fe County property/planned Lamy fire station site
124624807	SANTA FE	BOARD OF EDUCATION CITY OF	Residential Estate	17	Santa Fe Public School District vacant property
910010204	GLORIETA	COUNTY OF SANTA FE	Residential Estate	1	Fire station
126000534	SANTA FE	ELDORADO AREA WATER &	Residential Estate	5	Eldorado water system storage tank and offices
188901364	ESPANOLA	LA PUEBLA FIRE DEPARTMENT	Traditional Community	2	Fire station
	CHIMAYO	SANTA FE COUNTY	Traditional Community	0	Chimayo fire station/community center
99304787	CHIMAYO	SANTA FE COUNTY	Traditional Community	2	County-owned community center
38901665	SANTA FE	NM STATE HIGHWAY DEPT	Commercial General	5	NMDOT road maintenance center
98402703	EDGEWOOD	SANTA FE COUNTY	Traditional Community	9	County-owned senior center
910002704	EDGEWOOD	ADELPHI INC	Residential Estate	1	Fire station
	SANTA FE	SANTA FE COUNTY	Traditional Community	1	County-owned community center in Rio En Medio
99305536	CHIMAYO	SANTA FE COUNTY	Rural	6	Head Start program facility south of Chimayo

Recommendations for Zoning Map Adoption Draft Changes - Public Institutional Zoning District

PARCEL NUMBER	SITE	OWNER NAME	DRAFT SLDC ZONING DISTRICT, 3/21/14	ACRES	DESCRIPTION OF USE
99305536	CHIMAYO	SANTA FE COUNTY	Traditional Community	1	Fire station
910004626	EDGEWOOD	NIX LIVING TRUST	Residential Estate	1	Fire station
99303570	STANLEY	SANTA FE COUNTY	Traditional Community	0	Fire station
	Jacona	Jacona Land Grant	Rural Residential	21	Proposed Transfer Station and other County facilities
74379648, 74334650	Cerrillos	Santa Fe County	Federal and State Public Land	1060	
910003008	SANTA FE	SANTA FE HOUSING AUTHORITY	Mixed Use	2	Head Start program
970000046,		SANTA FE COUNTY	Residential Fringe	95	ARROYO HONDO OPEN SPACE
910004140		SANTA FE COUNTY	Residential Estate	5	CANADA ANCHA TRAIL HYDE PARK ESTATES
910012234		SANTA FE COUNTY	Rural Residential	13	EL PANASCO BLANCO OPEN SPACE
980001603		SANTA FE COUNTY	Rural Residential	11	EL PENASCO BLANCO OPEN SPACE EL TANQUE
910012235		SANTA FE COUNTY	Rural Residential	69	EL PENASCO BLANCO OPEN SPACE LOS CARRIZALES
33760101		SANTA FE COUNTY	Traditional Community	5	EL RANCHO OPEN SPACE
64277504,		SANTA FE COUNTY	Rural Fringe	149	LA CIENEGUILLA OPEN SPACE
128310525		SANTA FE COUNTY	Rural	91	LAMY OPEN SPACE
99304035		SANTA FE COUNTY	Residential Fringe	61	LOS CAMINITOS
		SANTA FE COUNTY	Rural Fringe	468	LOS CAMINITOS
		SANTA FE COUNTY	Rural Residential	38	LOS CAMINITOS
186005501, 186005505,		SANTA FE COUNTY	Traditional Community	40	LOS POTREROS
76004133		SANTA FE COUNTY	Traditional Community	12	MADRID OPEN SPACE GREENBELT AND CHURCH LOT
76004208		SANTA FE COUNTY	Rural	45	MADRID OPEN SPACE WILDERNESS
993306436		SANTA FE COUNTY	Rural	315	MOUNT CHALCHIHUITL
993306436		SANTA FE COUNTY	Rural Residential	114	MOUNT CHALCHIHUITL
910001862		SANTA FE COUNTY	Ag / Ranch	1350	ORTIZ MTS OPEN SPACE
970000902,		SANTA FE COUNTY	Rural	122	RIO EN MEDIO OPEN SPACE
910008054		SANTA FE COUNTY	Ag / Ranch	160	SAN PEDRO OPEN SPACE

Recommendations for Zoning Map Adoption Draft Changes - Public Institutional Zoning District




PARCEL NUMBER	SITE	OWNER NAME	DRAFT SLDC ZONING DISTRICT, 3/21/14	ACRES	DESCRIPTION OF USE
405224960		SANTA FE COUNTY	Rural	105	TALAYA HILL OPEN SPACE PARKER
910014377		SANTA FE COUNTY	Rural	180	TALAYA HILL OPEN SPACE PICHACO PEAK
43943680,		SANTA FE COUNTY	Rural	156	TESUQUE CREEK OPEN SPACE
910019897,		SANTA FE COUNTY	Ag / Ranch	185	THORNTON RANCH OPEN SPACE
910002280,		SANTA FE COUNTY	Rural	1721	THORNTON RANCH OPEN SPACE
910010855		SANTA FE COUNTY	Planned Development District (PDD)	2	ARROYO HONDO TRAIL - PETCHESKY
910010855		SANTA FE COUNTY	Planned Development District (PDD)	2	ARROYO HONDO TRAIL - PETCHESKY
910010851		SANTA FE COUNTY	Planned Development District (PDD)	6	ARROYO HONDO TRAIL - PETCHESKY
		SANTA FE COUNTY		29	SANTA FE RAIL TRAIL
		SANTA FE COUNTY	Residential Estate	11	SANTA FE RIVER GREENWAY
		SANTA FE COUNTY	Traditional Community	0	SANTA FE RIVER GREENWAY
		SANTA FE COUNTY	Commercial Neighborhood	2	SANTA FE RIVER GREENWAY SAN ISIDRO
		SANTA FE COUNTY	Residential Estate	23	SANTA FE RIVER GREENWAY SAN ISIDRO
		SANTA FE COUNTY	Traditional Community	13	SANTA FE RIVER GREENWAY SAN ISIDRO
		SANTA FE COUNTY		7	SPUR TRAIL
99304787		SANTA FE COUNTY	Traditional Community	1	BENNIE J. CHAVEZ COMMUNITY CENTER PARK
970002726		SANTA FE COUNTY	Residential Estate	4	BURRO LANE PARK
		SANTA FE COUNTY	Traditional Community	0	CUNDIYO COMMUNITY CENTER PARK
98402703		SANTA FE COUNTY	Traditional Community	9	EDGEWOOD SENIOR CENTER PARK

Recommendations for Zoning Map Adoption Draft Changes - Public Institutional Zoning District



PARCEL NUMBER	SITE	OWNER NAME	DRAFT SLDC ZONING DISTRICT, 3/21/14	ACRES	DESCRIPTION OF USE
99598592		SANTA FE COUNTY	Traditional Community	0	EL RANCHO COMMUNITY CENTER BASKETBALL COURT
910018650		SANTA FE COUNTY	Traditional Community	0	GALISTEO COMMUNITY PARK
		SANTA FE COUNTY	Traditional Community	5	LA PUEBLA PARK
		SANTA FE COUNTY	Residential Fringe	50	LAMY PARK
		SANTA FE COUNTY	Traditional Community	1	NAMBE COMMUNITY CENTER PARK
		SANTA FE COUNTY	Traditional Community	0	POJOAQUE SPORTS FIELDS
		SANTA FE COUNTY	Traditional Community	0	RIO EN MEDIO COMMUNITY CENTER PARK
910008683		SANTA FE COUNTY	Residential Estate	64	ROMERO PARK
910008683		SANTA FE COUNTY	Traditional Community	6	ROMERO PARK
99303572		SANTA FE COUNTY	Traditional Community	1	STANLEY COMMUNITY PARK
99305536		SANTA FE COUNTY	Rural	0	CHIMAYO HEADSTART / MULTIPURPOSE COURT





Zoning Map Public Comments






GMA	Property	Parcel #	Assigned Zoning	Requested Zoning	General Comment	Link	
1	Galisteo	Buena Vista LLC		Ag/Ranch	Rural and Rural Residential	See letter from Jim Siebert. The current draft zoning map designates this property as Arg/ranch. The current SLDC allows for lot sizes of 40 acre tracts with water conservation restrictions. The partners of Buena Vista would like to have the parcel zoned Rural for reasons stated in the letter. The UPC number for this property is 1-040-087-051-135	
2	El Centro	Ten Thousand Waves		Commercial Neighborhood		See Letter from Jim Siebert requesting a review of the zoning for this property. Previous zoning granted for this property by EZA and City of Santa Fe. Development agreement is also included in the letter.	
3	El Centro	Sunrise Springs		Commercial Neighborhood		See Letter from Jim Siebert suggesting an amendment to the SLDC which includes a provision which recognizes previously approved development plans.	
4	Galisteo	US 285 Corridor		Mixed Use		Please ensure that the 2005 US Highway 285 South Corridor Plan and Ordinance be used as an overlay to the County Zoning map. This will assure that the hard work of those who passed this Ordinance and the look of our neighborhood will be protected. After all, it is already allowed in the new code as noted above.	
5	Galisteo	US 285 Corridor		Mixed Use		Dear Commissioner Holian, The 285 South Ordinance was adopted in 2005 after a lot of hard work by the homeowners along this corridor. Please ensure that the protection the 285 South Ordinance affords this area are included in the new County Zoning Map, either directly or as an overlay. By the terms of this 2005 285 South Ordinance, if it is not included the new County Zoning Map will be neither accurate nor complete. Thank you for your help with and attention to this matter. Mark Hannan Homeowner, constituent and Treasurer of Rancho de Bosque Owners Association	



GMA	Property	Parcel #	Assigned Zoning	Requested Zoning	General Comment	Link
6	Galisteo	US 285 Corridor		Mixed Use		
					<p>Santa Fe County Commissioners, As a new ECIA Board Director as of May 5, I would like to associate myself with the below copied opinion from Los Caballos. It's easier than writing my own opinion. Obviously I cannot speak for the entire ECIA Board. Since time is short, I felt I needed to send this email now. When I get on the Board, I will try to get an official opinion from the entire Board anyway, but until then, knowing the Board members as I do, and knowing how they generally support the 285 Corridor Plan, I am sure they would be in favor of the below statement. I'm sorry I cannot forward an actual ECIA passed-resolution. Being a Community Planning fan, I will try to help with that problem in the future... (Greg Colello, Eldorado Community Improvement Association, Director Elect)</p> <p>The Los Caballos Home Owners Association Board met on April 30 and unanimously agreed that the adoption of the 2005 HWY 285 South Ordinance and its immediate inclusion in the new County Zoning Map would be in the best interest of the 285 corridor community. At the very least the 2005 ordinance should be used as a 285 south overlay since the 2005 Ordinance is currently in effect. Non-inclusion of the 2005 Ordinance would render the new County Zoning Map both inaccurate and incomplete.</p>	
7	Galisteo	US 285 Corridor		Mixed Use		
					<p>Dear Commissioner Holian, The 285 South Ordinance was adopted in 2005 after a lot of hard work by homeowners along this corridor. Please ensure that the protections it affords this area are included in the new County Zoning Map, either directly or as an overlay. By the terms of the 2005 Ordinance, if it is not included the new County Zoning Map will be neither accurate nor complete. Best, Cathy Lewis East Ranch</p>	
8	Galisteo	Madrid ballpark		Mixed Use	Public/Institutional	
					<p>Just wanted to follow-up to see if the Madrid ballpark property and connecting Parking lot property had been properly rezoned. As we reviewed during our planning meeting, the following lots should be listed as "Public Institutional." We want to make sure these changes make it into the new Zoning map so we do not have to go back and revisit this after the fact. Please let me know if this has been addressed. It will be much appreciated.</p> <p>Ballpark (MLA): 2897 Hwy 14 Ballpark (county): 2899 Hwy 14 Ballpark Parking: 2900 Hwy 14, 2903 Hwy 14, 2901 Hwy 14.</p>	





	GMA	Property	Parcel #	Assigned Zoning	Requested Zoning	General Comment	Link
9	Galisteo	US 285 Corridor		Mixed Use		See Letter/e-mail/ attachment:Letter requesting that the zoning map include an 'overlay' of design standards consistent with the US 285 South Corridor Ordinance 2005-8.	
10	Galisteo	US 285 Corridor		Mixed Use		<p>Santa Fe County Commissioners, as a new ECIA Board Director as of May 5, I would like to associate myself with the below copied opinion from Los Caballos. It's easier than writing my own opinion. Obviously I cannot speak for the entire ECIA Board. Since time is short, I felt I needed to send this email now. When I get on the Board, I will try to get an official opinion from the entire Board anyway, but until then, knowing the Board members as I do, and knowing how they generally support the 285 Corridor Plan, I am sure they would be in favor of the below statement. I'm sorry I cannot forward an actual ECIA passed-resolution. Being a Community Planning fan, I will try to help with that problem in the future...(Greg Colello, Eldorado Community Improvement Association, Director Elect)The Los Caballos Home Owners Association Board met on April 30 and unanimously agreed that the adoption of the 2005 HWY 285 South Ordinance and its immediate inclusion in the new County Zoning Map would be in the best interest of the 285 corridor community. At the very least the 2005 ordinance should be used as a 285 south overlay since the 2005 Ordinance is currently in effect. Non-inclusion of the 2005 Ordinance would render the new County Zoning Map both inaccurate and incomplete.</p>	
11	Estancia					Map correction. ST RD 41 snips off corner	
12	El Centro	330 acres-599/ Camino la Tierra		Mixed Use		See Letter in opposition of mixed use zoning at NM 599 and Camino La Tierra	

	GMA	Property	Parcel #	Assigned Zoning	Requested Zoning	General Comment	Link
13	El Centro	330 acres-599/ Camino la Tierra		Mixed Use		<p>See Letter/e-mail/ attachment: RE: Opposition to Rezoning the Camino La Tierra/ 599 interchange</p> <p>Dear Director Ellis-Green:</p> <p>Three years ago my family and I bought a home in La Tierra Nueva. We were introduced to that community by long-time friends in Santa Fe, friend who specifically steered us clear of Las Companas because of building of the kind we were trying to escape on the East Coast. (We are still trying to sell our previous home in Florida, and are having problems because of how that community was “developed”.) Now we hear that a company run by Lyle Anderson, the man most responsible for many serious problems that arose from the development of Las Companas, is trying to have 330 acres of land at the intersection of Camino la Tierra and State Road 599 rezoned for a mixed use. Our attorney tells us that such an action is incompatible with documents previously developed by the county, so we are quite surprised by this request. We bought in this area to avoid the congestion, the crime, the clutter, the compacting of homes, the bright lights and noise and all the other deleterious effects that would come along with Mixed Use zoning. It is incompatible with the lifestyle we chose. We also care about the effect this would have on the value of our property, property our children—who attend UNM—hope to inherit. Our lawyer also expresses concerns over water use. (He is considered a expert on NM water rights.) Should this plan take effect and that land be so “developed”, there would be a significant increase in water use. Well after well in the area could turn dry. The homes we who now live there purchased with certain clear expectations and need of that water's availability—in our case, we have horses and other livestock—would suffer.</p> <p>We urge you to ensure that this rezoning proposal does not take effect. One man, whose business ventures have already caused major problems in our community, must not be permitted to do so again.</p> <p>Sincerely yours, Lewie R Baxter, MD and Jane M. Gregoritch, MD</p>	

GMA	Property	Parcel #	Assigned Zoning	Requested Zoning	General Comment	Link
14	El Centro	330 acres-599/ Camino la Tierra	Mixed Use		<p>See Letter/e-mail/ attachment: In regard to the rezoning issue "Santa Fe 330" - I think the land in question should either be Residential or Recreational; but not the proposed "Mixed use". I have lived overlooking this open space since 2002. I have worked very hard to maintain and to upgrade my house and land. This was a huge investment of labor, ideas, and money. Some people just "live in a house", but I felt an obligation to do my best to keep and improve the condition of my property. We replaced nearly everything in the 25 year old house. It is my American Dream house of retirement. I worked 35 years towards this; and now I feel that the ambience; the safety; and the view is threatened. My home is directly overlooking the property in question. I wanted to see wilderness and I thought that everyone entering Las Campanas would want the same ambient atmosphere to come home to. The proposed zoning of "mixed use" is ridiculous for several reasons: increased traffic; increased lighting; residential density; and a visual blight. The Camino La Tierra mailbox parking area is heavily used by bicycle and walking enthusiasts. I monitor the number of cars which are there constantly. Camino La Tierra lies adjacent to the "La Tierra Trails." These new City of Santa Fe trails are extremely popular for young runners and bicyclists. La Tierra mailbox area provides additional needed parking. It is particularly well-suited to people who enjoy the less challenging trails - - many appear between age 50 and 100. So this adjacent land is not "empty" - it provides a marvelous "visible healthy identity" to Santa Fe. Such attractions interest visitors and healthy residents of all ages. The last thing we need there is commercial development; gas and convenience stores. Especially we do not want to attract liquor access for those who would frequent these trails at night and/or cause crime to come to this peaceful and beautiful area. The traffic on the 599 bypass is moderately heavy already. We do not have enough overpasses to make crossing 599 safe from car accidents. This is the road built with funds procured for safe transfer of nuclear waste from Los Alamos and is not meant for expansion. A nuclear waste car / truck incident on 599 would be catastrophic. Overpass bridges are extremely expensive. Already there are unsafe traffic crossings. More will be needed. I do hope that you will work to bring to light all of the benefits this open land gives to hundreds of people year round, and keep making Santa Fe attractive. It needs to remain low density. Please help us to plan it. Respectfully submitted; Catherine DiCenzo Sherman marysberman@me.com</p>	

GMA	Property	Parcel #	Assigned Zoning	Requested Zoning	General Comment	Link
15	El Centro	330 acres-599/ Camino la Tierra		Mixed Use		See Letter in opposition of mixed use zoning at NM 599 and Camino La Tierra. 
16	El Centro	330 acres-599/ Camino la Tierra		Mixed Use		See Letter which pertains to the proposed zoning of the 330 acres northwest of the Camino La Tierra exit off of Highway 599. Please consider this a submission by the Tierra de Oro Homeowners' Association during the public comment period. Individual association members are also making their own separate comments, and the Association may have additional comments, but I wanted to get this letter to you quickly because it pertains to the history of prior approvals, and the expiration of those approvals, for the 330 acres. 
17	El Centro	330 acres-599/ Camino la Tierra		Mixed Use	Residential Estate	See Letter/e-mail/ attachment: See Letter Opposing Mixed Use Zoning for NM 599 and Camino La Tierra 
18	El Centro	330 acres-599/ Camino la Tierra		Mixed Use		See letter in opposition of Mixed Use Zoning. Attached is a pdf copy of a letter, the signed copy of which is being hand delivered to your office, regarding proposed rezoning of 330 acres of land adjacent to 599 near the La Tierra exit. We request your careful review of this matter. Sincerely, Arvid and Mary Jo lundy Residents of Tierra de Oro 
19	El Centro	330 acres-599/ Camino la Tierra		Mixed Use	Residential Estate	See Letter in opposition of mixed use zoning at NM 599 and Camino La Tierra and suggesting tat the property be established as a permanent greenbelt that would prohibit development at that junction. 
20	El Centro	330 acres-599/ Camino la Tierra		Mixed Use	Residential Estate	See Letter in opposition of mixed use zoning at NM 599 and Camino La Tierra 


GMA	Property	Parcel #	Assigned Zoning	Requested Zoning	General Comment	Link
21	El Centro	330 acres-599/ Camino la Tierra	Mixed Use		<p>See Letter/e-mail/ attachment: Several years ago my wife and I bought a home in La Tierra Nueva. We specifically steered clear of Las Campanas because of what we felt was a congestion of homes, albeit high priced ones. Imagine our shock when we learned that a company run by Lyle Anderson, the man most responsible for the monstrous problems that arose from the development of Las Companas, is trying to have 330 acres of land at the intersection of Camino la Tierra and State Road 599 rezoned as a mixed use district - a MUD. I'm not yet fully familiar with the legality of such a change, although our attorney tells us that such an action is incompatible with documents previously developed by the county, so my sense is it's legality is in serious question. For those neighbors who have already deeply invested in personal homes and property, the effect would be disastrous. We bought in this area to avoid the congestion, the crime, the clutter, the compacting of homes, the bright lights and noise and all the other deleterious effects that would come along with MUD. None of us bought here to be next to condos or collections of houses on small single lots. It is incompatible with the lifestyle we chose. Lyle Anderson doesn't live in our area; he could hardly care less. But we do; we care about preserving our life styles and we care about the devastation that would follow to the values of our properties. Then, of course there's water. Do we suppose water is going to become less scarce in coming years? Or that the Anderson 330 company will take it upon themselves to "make" some? Should this plan you're considering be passed, there would be a significant increase in population density and hence, an enormous amount of additional water use. Well after well would become dried out and the homes we, who already live there, who purchased with certain clear expectations, would lose a fortune in property value. I urge you in the strongest terms to do everything possible to make sure this rezoning proposal is halted in it's tracks. One man, whose ventures have already caused monumental problems for our area must not be permitted to harm us again.</p>	
22	Galisteo	ST RD 14	Mixed Use		<p>See Letter/e-mail/ attachment: 287 Signatures on Petition. "Stop Santa Fe County from rezoning land along Highway 14 east and north of the Rancho San Marcos subdivision from Rural Residential to Mixed Use which inludes high density residential (up to 3 stories) and commercial structures."</p>	


GMA	Property	Parcel #	Assigned Zoning	Requested Zoning	General Comment	Link	
23	El Centro	330 acres-599/ Camino la Tierra		Mixed Use	Recreational	See Letter/e-mail/ attachment: Letter opposing 599 and Camino La Tierra Mixed Use .	
24	EL Centro	Santa Fe Horsepark		Mixed Use	Planned Development District	See Letter from Jim Siebert indicating that the horse park property has existing entitlements which would be limited by the Mixed Use Zoning which only allows 12 horses on the property whereas the current zoning approval allows for 350 horses.	
25	El Centro	330 acres-599/ Camino la Tierra		Mixed Use	Residential Estate	Letter opposing 599 and Camino La Tierra Mixed Use	
26	El Centro	330 acres-599/ Camino la Tierra		Mixed Use	Residential Estate	Letter in opposition of 599 and Camino La Tierra Mixed Use	
27	El Centro	330 acres-599/ Camino la Tierra		Mixed Use		Dear Ms. Ellis-Green: We have received the county's proposed re-zoning plan, and must express a serious concern to you as county homeowners. The corridor along Camino La Tierra proximate to 599 is an exceptionally lovely and pristine one, a pleasure for those who live there, and bike and drive the roads. We noticed in your proposed zoning plan that this area would be rezoned as "mixed use." This would clearly allow for commercial development of the area. We encourage the county to rethink this especially as there appears to be no Master Plan in place. Mixed use would not be compatible with the current residents, their homes and land use in the area, and not a good vision for the future of our county. We ask that you change the zoning to one that better suits the needs of these particular local neighborhoods. With all best wishes. Joan Zegree and Spider Kedelsky, 273 Headquarters Trail, Santa Fe, 87506	

GMA	Property	Parcel #	Assigned Zoning	Requested Zoning	General Comment	Link
28	El Centro	330 acres-599/ Camino la Tierra	Mixed Use		<p>Dear Ms. Ellis-Green: I am writing to voice concern about the proposed zonal change that will grievously affect Tierra De Oro residents. We purposely bought our residence in the county of Santa Fe because of the rural atmosphere. We have no light pollution nor do we have congested traffic. With this proposed change, our peaceful living will be negatively impacted. Our property values will be negatively impacted also. Mr. Lyle Anderson, who wants this change, does not appear to be interested in the negative impact of our community but is primarily interested in his economic gain, disregarding the potentially negative impact on property values. He lives in Scottsdale, Arizona, and my perception is that he would not be caring about the negative impact regarding neither property values nor the sense of peace and tranquility in rural Santa Fe.</p> <p>Sincerely yours, Mrs. Judith Lehman</p>	
29	El Centro	CCD	Planned Development District		<p>Concerning the SLDC designations for the Community College District: It would be an incalculable loss to the life of Santa Fe County to cover this area with residential development. The area near the Community College is already dense enough with planned and present subdivisions. To continue that endlessly to the east and south would destroy one of the last great natural landscapes. It is a refuge between El Dorado and Ranch Viejo, for a huge range of wildlife. It should be used for open space, conservation areas, trails, etc. To consider it as a great pie to be sliced up for more houses would be a profound error. Thank you.</p>	





GMA	Property	Parcel #	Assigned Zoning	Requested Zoning	General Comment	Link
30	EL Norte	Bishops Lodge	Planned Development District	Planned Development District	<p>Thank you for your time meeting with me to discuss the proposed Sustainable Land Use Code for Santa Fe County. Congratulations on an extensive, thorough and well-conceived piece of work. As you know, I represent the owners of The Bishop's Lodge Ranch Resort and Spa. I would ask that you and the Board of County Commissioners consider the following comments regarding the zoning designation proposed for the Bishop's Lodge property: The proposed Planned Development District is an appropriate zoning designation for the property, provided it is based upon and inclusive of the current Santa Fe County land use approvals for the Master Plan (aka Master Development Plan) and Final Development Plans for The Bishop's Lodge Resort, Areas B and G as identified in the Master Plan, as amended. The plan for future development in Area B includes new equestrian facilities with related paddocks, corrals, clubhouse with lounge, snack bar, tackroom, bathroom and storage; pool and outdoor barbeque area; road access, parking, trails, utility infrastructure, landscaping, signage, lighting and other accessory improvements. The Area B plans were approved as part of the Final Development Plan for The Hills and Villas at Bishop's Lodge, which Vicki will recall, at the request of the County staff, included relocating the condominiums previously approved for Area B, and replacing the condominium use with a new equestrian center. The plan for future development in Area G includes 33 guest units and related storage, access roads, parking, utility infrastructure, walkways, landscaping, lighting, signage and other accessory improvements. These plans were approved in the Final Development Plan for Phase VII of the Master Development Plan for the resort. We discussed the County's consideration of including the dedicated Open Space area east of The Hills and Villas at Bishop's Lodge in the Planned Development District. Please let us know if you or the County Commission as any interest in this idea. Thanks for the opportunity to comment on the new Land Use Code proposal. I look forward to the discussion of the Code between you and the Board of County Commissioners on May 28, 2014. Please give me a call if you wish to discuss these matters further before or after the meeting. Best regards, Steve</p>	Link

GMA	Property	Parcel #	Assigned Zoning	Requested Zoning	General Comment	Link	
31	El Centro	CCD		Planned Development District		1. If property is grandfathered previously (did not go to a public zoning process) what would be the process in the CCD? E.g. If Amigo Petroleum wanted to go back into his property that now has SF Steel-- what would the process be? 2. If a property in the CCD wanted to be developed and if it currently is zoned employment center and the proposed use if permitted under the employment center of the CCDO and under Planned Development in the new code-- what is the process? Can we just move forward with a development permit?	
32	El Centro	Vegas Verdas LLC		Planned Development District	Commercial General	See letter from Jenkins Gavin which identifies the property received master plan zoning.	
33	El Centro	Schmidt Property		Public/Institutional	Rural Residential	See Letter/e-mail/ attachment: assigned zoning is to intense for residential area- on-going issues with entitlements	
34	El Norte		43931380	Residential Community	Commercial Neighborhood	See Letter/e-mail/ attachment: assigned zoning not consistent with historic use, adjacent properties or community plan	

GMA	Property	Parcel #	Assigned Zoning	Requested Zoning	General Comment	Link
35	Estancia		Residential Estate	Ag/Ranch	<p>Commissioner Anaya: My name is Josephine Bassett, my late husband Carl and I have ranch property located in Santa Fe County which is now being proposed for zoning as part of the County's changes to it's land use code. The property in question is made up of several different pieces which each contain their own separate Property ID numbers. There are five (5) different Property ID numbers which are as follows: 910001041, 910001033, 910001029, 910001026, and 910001038. These five parcels of property amount to 405 acres of a larger 960 acre ranch that we own. The property has been used for grazing livestock since statehood in 1912. Under the County's proposed new Zone Map these parcels of property are being classified as "Residential Estate" (1 dwelling per 2.5 acres). As the comment period for the new zoning map is now underway, I would like for the County to change the zoning for all five (5) of these parcels to "Ag/Ranch" (1 dwelling per 160 acres). This property is open pasture land that we graze cattle on and we have no intention of developing it anytime soon. I have went online and submitted the information necessary to request a change in zoning for these properties at the County website. I was also advised to send this letter to my Commissioner and request the necessary change from him as well so that a proper paper trail would be established in the matter. I also intend to have my son John attend the Commission meeting on Wednesday May 28, 2014 in order to speak to our request in person. If there is anything else we need to do to insure that our request is granted please feel free to contact us by return e-mail at this e-address or by phone at the number listed below with my contact information. Thank you for your time and attention to this matter.</p>	
36	El Centro	Las Lagunitas	Residential Estate	Commercial Neighborhood	<p>Bob, As an owner of Lots 8 & 10 in the sixth tract of Las Lagunitas development, I feel that the commercial designation for Lot 106 is very necessary to provide local community commercial needs for Las Lagunitas property owners, as well as the local La Cienega community. This is an ideal spot for a mini-commercial center which could include, among other things, food, mail, fuel, and pharmaceutical uses. If you need further testimony at any public hearings regarding your zoning, I would be pleased to testify.</p>	
37	El Centro	Academy for the Love of Learning	Residential Fringe	Public/Institutional	See letter regarding Seton Castle from Jenkins Gavin	

GMA	Property	Parcel #	Assigned Zoning	Requested Zoning	General Comment	Link
38	El Centro	south of I-25/ Old Pecos Trail	Residential Fringe	Residential Estate	See Letter/e-mail/ attachment: adjacent assigned zoning is higher residential; future expectations	
39	EL Norte	Jacona Land Grant	Residential Fringe	Public/Institutional	+/- 20 acres. County seeks to lease 20-25 acres from Jacona Land grant for Public/Institutional use: transfer station, fire station, open space.	
40	Galisteo	Mt. Chalchihuitl open space	Rural	Ag/Ranch	Ross Lockridge, on behalf of the Cerrillos Hills Park Coalition, brought it to my attention that the two properties that are the subject of the Mt. Chalchihuitl open space acquisition the County is actively working to complete are shown on the SLDC Draft Zoning Map as zoned Rural (1 dwelling per 40 acres). The current zoning is Homestead Hydrologic Zone, minimum lot size 160 acres. Any further subdivision requires compliance with the subdivision regulations including an on-site hydrologic report proving long term water availability. The two properties are the Mt. Chalchihuitl parcel owned by the Glockhoff Trust and the Cerrillos Gravel Products parcel owned by Mr. Brad Aitken. I have attached plats of both parcels. The appraisals and offer packages for both parcels have been completed. I am preparing to submit them for legal review next week and to take them to BCC for approval in June. We anticipate closing this fall. The appraisals were completed based on the current zoning. The Sustainable Growth Management Plan depicts both properties within SDA-3, future land use category Agriculture and Ranching (1 dwelling per 160 acres). The change in zoning could potentially affect the valuation of the properties and our negotiations. Please review the proposed zoning and let me know as soon as possible if the Rural zoning is correct and will become effective when the zoning map is approved.	

	GMA	Property	Parcel #	Assigned Zoning	Requested Zoning	General Comment	Link
41	El Norte	Rancho Encantado		Rural Residential	Planned Development District	<p>Thank you for your time meeting with me to discuss the proposed Sustainable Land Use Code for Santa Fe County. Congratulations on an extensive, thorough and well-conceived piece of work. As you know, I represent the owners of The Four Seasons Rancho Encantado Resort. I would ask that you and the Board of County Commissioners consider the following comments regarding the Neighborhood Commercial zoning designation proposed for the resort property. The proposed Neighborhood Commercial zoning is not the appropriate designation for the property. As drafted, the Land Use Code calls for neighborhood scaled and oriented commercial uses, and does not allow a "resort" as a permitted use. I believe we agreed that a Planned Development District would be the appropriate designation, provided it is based upon and inclusive of the current Santa Fe County land use approvals for the Master Plan (aka Master Development Plan) and Final Development Plans for The Rancho Encantado Resort, as amended. The first Master Plan for the resort property was approved in 1991. Since then it has gone thru several County-approved alterations. The Master Development Plan and Final Development Plan were most recently amended to include the now constructed 65 room resort and associated facilities, and a complex of 7 condominium units. Accordingly, we request that the proposed Land Use Code be modified to establish the Four Seasons Rancho Encantado property as a Planned Development District based upon and inclusive of these most recent amendments to the resort Master Development Plan and its associated Final Development Plans. We also discussed changing the proposed Rural Residential zoning for the 5AC+/- lot and residence located at 256 SR 592 directly adjacent to the resort along its north property line to Rural Commercial Overlay, per Section 8.11.2 of the proposed Land Use Code. The resort owns this property, and is considering the feasibility of incorporating the existing adobe studio, residence, tack room and corrals into the resort as a venue for equestrian use and small gatherings. This would be located within the present buildings/corrals located on the property. A portion of the corrals already sits within the resort tract. The property currently abuts the resort and property owned by the resort on three sides, with SR 592 on the fourth side. We request that the Planning Staff and the Board of County Commissioners consider establishing Rural Commercial Overlay zoning for this property in the new Land Use Code. This would allow the resort the flexibility of resort and/or residential use of this adjacent property.</p>	



GMA	Property	Parcel #	Assigned Zoning	Requested Zoning	General Comment	Link
42	Galisteo	Apache Springs	Rural Residential	Residential Estate	See Letter from San Cristobal Development regarding existing master plan approval.	
43	County-wide				I am suggesting that all of the County's open space properties/sites (as delineated in Official Map 5) should be placed in O-ERP overlays and am happy to provide a list if need be. I have looked at the provisions in 8.11.4, and I think that these provisions would be beneficial and are aligned well with the County's open space policies. Not only would the O-ERP provide protection for the County's open space sites, but it would send the right message to our communities that the County is truly committed to the conservation of these properties.	
44	County-wide				Mr. Griego, Thank you for the information. If I may ask a further question, I am unclear on the meaning of "initial zoning map." In the following,  14.9.9.9. Nonconforming (Legal) Lots of Record. Any lot that does not conform to a dimension established in Chapter 8 for the relevant zoning district but that is shown on the initial zoning map as being within that zone, shall not be deemed nonconforming. Does the word initial apply to the current zoning map being considered, so that a lot is officially not nonconforming if it exists now, prior to the implementation of the new zoning map? But the next sentence seems to say the owner must submit evidence that the lot existed in 1981, so I am confused as to what is required. Then again, the following sections appear to say that vacant lots that are considered nonconforming can still be used to build a single family dwelling but cannot be further subdivided. If you are comfortable clarifying this for me, I would be grateful. Thank you again, Roger Enfield	
45	El Centro	330 acres-599/ Camino la Tierra		Mixed Use	See letter in opposition of Mixed Use Zoning for Camino La Tierra	
46	El Norte	Chupadero	Rural Residential	Traditional Community	Letter indicating that the property should be included in the Traditional Community District.	



47	GMA	Property	Parcel #	Assigned Zoning	Requested Zoning	General Comment	Link
		Glorieta Mesa				<p>Dear Sirs, we have property -0 Gloriaeta Mesa-TR1 T15N R11E S3-86.119 AC</p> <p>TR15 n R11E S3 78.839 AC TR2</p> <p>We have had this property for 11 years! In one of the letters sent concerning Approval of the County Zoning Map Pursuant to Ordinance 2013-6 The previous owner's name is on the letter with our address (Burttram, JH & Louise M). Why has this not been changed before now? My second question is will this zoning cause my property taxes to increase? We also have 2 lots in Santa Fe-- 0 Ridge Rd-- TR1 Overlook Unit 2 Area B T16N R10E S21(2.437 AC) and 21 RidgeRd--(7.233 AC) TR 13 Overlook Unit 2--Area</p> <p>A. You, Stanton Rd Clarksville,TN,37042 645-3984</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Thank John and Catherine 1550 Hazelwood 931-</p>	

GMA	Property	Parcel #	Assigned Zoning	Requested Zoning	General Comment	Link
48	EL Centro				<p>Dear Penny Ellis-Green, For various reasons, including the death of my wife, I was unable to stay current regarding the status of the ranch for several years. Since I've returned to being active as a citizen of Santa Fe County, I am frankly appalled by decisions being made by the County, not only about the ranch, but the entire La Bajada Mesa. I have lived off grid in western Santa Fe County for over thirty two years. The view from my kitchen window is of the escarpment and mesa. The County formed a steering committee to help determine the best use of the ranch. I've been able to attend several of their meetings. On one hand, it seems that several members of the committee want to develop the ranch to return as much money to the coffers of the county as possible. The money is not gone, it's invested. If it were to be developed, it would be the most secure/ protected/exclusive developments in the state! Only one way in/out, natural barriers on the other sides - I would bet that there wouldn't be any low income housing! I can't imagine the price of the lots enough to recover the \$7million price tag. I've neglected to mention water. The county wants to run a water main from La Cienega to the ranch - water to be provided by the Buckman Diversion. This borders on laughable. With our current history and projections of continued drought, the Buckman Diversion is sticking its straw into an almost empty glass. And when we do get rain, it is more likely than not to be the catastrophic type such as we received last September. At that point, there was plenty of water - it was just too silty to pump/use. We cannot continue to keep our heads in the sand regarding water issues and growth. Aquifers all over the world, are rapidly depleting. The Ogalala, once the source of many artesian wells, has no more. They are now being pumped from hundreds of feet down. How many thousands of years did it take to charge this aquifer? In our community, a fairly large off grid community, I've heard reports from innumerable people regarding the depletion of their aquifers, drilling wells deeper, and having some go completely dry. We cannot under any circumstances, approve development anywhere. We just don't have the water! To move it for miles to build a subdivision that WILL run out of water will certainly leave the county vulnerable to lawsuits when it dries up. As witnessed by the opposition to the strip mine, there are many of us opposed to these proposed uses for La Bajada Mesa, and we're growing stronger. Water is the motivating factor, followed closely by corporate greed. We all want to protect the environment! The best proposal I've seen for the Ranch and the rest of the Mesa is to have it declared a National Monument. The positive</p>	

GMA	Property	Parcel #	Assigned Zoning	Requested Zoning	General Comment	Link
48					<p>outcomes for the county could be enormous. The Ranch would be a perfect visitor center. Lots of opportunities for "green education - for our schools, the Community Colleges outstanding "Green" curriculum, a perfect place for the YCC to build trails/practice permaculture - I could go on but I'm sure you get it. It is of the up most importance that the County Commission takes into account ALL of the input from the Steering Committee and from the public prior to making ANY zoning changes that could be harmful to La Bajada Mesa or any other part of the county facing unwanted zoning changes, especially ones that require water. Thank You, Philip F. Taccetta 183 Baja Waldo Road Santa Fe County 505.920.2240</p>	


GMA	Property	Parcel #	Assigned Zoning	Requested Zoning	General Comment	Link
49	Galisteo	Hwy 14			<p>All through the planning and writing of the new code Steve Ross had promised us to include an overlay zone for the Turquoise Trail intended to help protect it from encroachment of negative impacts to its scenic qualities preserving it for the future. We would like to incorporate into SF county zoning an overlay preservation zone at least 5 miles on both side of the Turquoise Trail placing mineral extraction and other industrial activities well away from our national scenic byway and the communities along it. While heavy industrial traffic and through truck traffic would be routed away from this scenic byway. Please include our request in the upcoming zoning review meeting. Below I have quoted pertinent information for SGMP. Thank you for your attention to this urgent matter, Karen Yank@vicepresident@ttpt.org 505-281-0243/505-269-9959 ttpt.org KEYS TO ISSUES protection and conservation of the County's natural resources is key in maintaining the integrity of the environment. The overall goals are to protect the archaeological , historic and cultural resources, species, habitat and biodiversity, scenic beauty and environmentally sensitive lands. Preserving and supporting the conservation of these resources will enhance the character and function of communities, neighborhoods and rural areas.</p> <p>The scenic quality of Santa Fe County as a whole is very vulnerable. The scenic quality of Santa Fe County are being threatened by uncontrolled development patterns. Lack of emphasis on gateways, rural highways, scenic routes and corridors. Gateways and corridors are extremely important to the first impression of a place. These negative impacts on the counties Scenic and National Scenic Byways should be prevented to ensure a strong tourist trade and economic vitality in this area of the county. Maintaining the integrity of view-sheds and scenic byways as a resource, is a priority with regard to tourism, the arts, and the movie industry. Heavy industrial traffic and through truck traffic should be routed away from scenic byways. KEYS TO SUSTAINABILITY Development should be sited and designed to limit the impact on viewsapes that define the County as a tourist destination, such as near designated National Scenic Byways. In addition to its scenic qualities, historic, cultural and archeological resources in Santa Fe County draw visitors to the area, making historic preservation a key element of the County's economy. Scenic vistas and the natural landscape as viewed from the highways should be protected. The County should require the preservation of distinctive natural features such as vistas, arroyos, significant rock outcrop</p>	


	GMA	Property	Parcel #	Assigned Zoning	Requested Zoning	General Comment	Link
49						<p>pings and large trees in the development review process. Site mineral extraction and related industrial activities well away from existing communities and scenic byways. VISUAL RESOURCES Santa Fe County is filled with a variety of visual resources, ranging from small, definable places to vast, almost limitless plains and vistas. Some of the County's most significant resources are the views from the National Turquoise Trail Scenic Byway (State Highway 14). This highway offers a wonderful view of the basin for motorists who travel to and from Santa Fe and Albuquerque and make stops at local communities and tourist attractions (see Map 5-1 for visual resources). The Santa Fe County Visual Resources Inventory and Analysis, October 1995 report presented the following findings: Scenic places valued by the public. Major landforms such as the Sangre de Cristo, Ortiz, South and San Pedro Mountains; less well-known scenic areas, such as Diablo Canyon, Lamy train station and village, and Devil's throne near Waldo. Scenic Vistas. Important scenic points, such as those from Galisteo toward Ortiz and San Pedro Mountains, From 1-25 coming north up La Bajada looking toward Santa Fe and the Sangre de Cristo Mountains, and the 360-degree views from Tetilla peak near La Bajada. Scenic roads and trails. Scenic roads and trails, such as the El Camino Real, Hyde Park, Turquoise Trail (Highway 14), segments of Highway 285, 41, and 1-25, and trails along Rio Medio and Rio Frijoles. Because of its open landscapes, vast panoramas, and pronounced topography, the scenic quality of Santa Fe County as a whole is very vulnerable. Maintaining the integrity of view sheds is a priority with regard to tourism and the movie industry. This means that if development is not carefully planned it could easily degrade the County's scenic beauty and economic vitality.</p>	
50	El Centro	330 acres-599/ Camino la Tierra		Mixed Use		See Letter in opposition of proposed mixed use zoning for 330 acres at Camino La Tierra	
51	El Centro	Las Campanas		Residential Estate	Planned Development District	See letter requesting Las Campanas zoning request to Planned Development District	

GMA	Property	Parcel #	Assigned Zoning	Requested Zoning	General Comment	Link
52	EL Norte	Truchas y Zorro Subdivision	Rural Residential	Residential Community	See letter from Jenkins Gavin small subdivision(2008) and several lots are covered by two zoning districts	
53	Galisteo	Bonanza Creek		Commerical General	See Letter/e-mail/ attachment: A.pre-existing movie set - request that area be included in SDA 1 and zoned commercial general. Due to lack of "density bonus" language in the SLDC request min lot size of 10 acre= Rural Residential adjacent zoning & water line to turquoise trail elementary; C. reasons above interior ranch land change form Rural to Rural Fringe	

GMA	Property	Parcel #	Assigned Zoning	Requested Zoning	General Comment	Link
54	Galisteo	Trenza	Mixed Use	Planned Development District & Rural	<p>Commonweal Conservancy is the nonprofit founder of the Galisteo Basin Preserve, a land conservation and community development initiative located in central Santa Fe County. The Preserve is planned to conserve and restore more than 13,000 acres of open space as well as promote thoughtful, stewardship-oriented community development. As a large landowner in the Galisteo Basin, Commonweal has been an engaged participant in the public meetings and forums that took place prior to the adoption of Santa Fe County’s Sustainable Growth Management Plan (SGMP) in 2010 and the Sustainable Land Development Code (SLDC) in 2013.</p> <p>Commonweal’s concern about the recently released Adoption Draft of the Zoning Map is that it changes the land use and zoning designations that have been assigned to the Galisteo Basin Preserve over the past four years. When the SGMP was approved in 2010, it included a Future Land Use Map (page 48), which designated the lands associated with the Galisteo Basin Preserve as being part of the “Rural Fringe” land use category. The SGMP describes Rural Fringe as allowing, “Residential development at low densities while protecting agricultural and environmental areas that are inappropriate for more intense development due to their sensitivity. Review factors [are] to be based on [a] balance between conservation, environmental protection and reasonable opportunity for development.”</p> <p>The Future Land Use Map also included a star designating a “Community Center” in the location of Trenza (aka the Village at the Galisteo Basin Preserve). Carefully sited in the northeast corner of the Preserve, Trenza is the Mixed Use , mixed-income community of 965 homes that received Master Plan approval from Santa Fe County in June of 2007 and Preliminary Plat approval for its first phase of development in February of 2010.</p> <p>On October 4, 2012, Santa Fe County released a Preliminary Draft Zoning Map, which showed the lands associated with the Galisteo Basin Preserve as being located within the “Rural” zoning designation of 1 dwelling unit per 40 acres. This Rural zoning designation for the Preserve’s open space lands was confirmed in October 2013 when the County released another Preliminary Draft Zoning Map. The October 2013 draft zoning map also included approximately 500 acres in the vicinity of Trenza as being part of a “Planned Development District”.</p> <p>Then on March 21, 2014, the County released an “Adoption Draft” of the Official Zoning Map. For the first time in four years, the Preserve’s open space lands were shown as being part of the “Agriculture/Ranch” zoning</p>	

GMA	Property	Parcel #	Assigned Zoning	Requested Zoning	General Comment	Link
54					<p>designation, which only allows for 1 dwelling unit per 160 acres. This zoning change was made without any prior notification or explanation to Commonwealth by County Land Use staff.</p> <p>Santa Fe County's down zoning of approximately 10,000 acres will have a devastating effect on the value of the property that local banks are using as collateral for the land loans they are holding in the Preserve. In addition, by down-zoning the property, Santa Fe County will also be taking away a key incentive for Commonwealth and private landowners to overlay their large parcels with conservation easements, thereby undermining the organization's vision of creating approximately 10,000 acres of permanently-protected wildlife habitat, cultural resources and scenic vistas in this keystone property in the heart of the Galisteo Basin.</p> <p>Commonwealth therefore requests that the Final Zoning Map that will be adopted by the Santa Fe Board of County Commissioners restores the zoning designations for the Galisteo Basin Preserve as shown on the Preliminary Draft Zoning Map, dated October 2013, which includes Rural zoning of 1 dwelling unit per 40 acres for the majority of the Preserve's open space lands and a Planned Development District zoning designation of approximately 500 acres for Trenza.</p>	

GMA	Property	Parcel #	Assigned Zoning	Requested Zoning	General Comment	Link
55	El Centro	330 acres-599/ Camino la Tierra			<p data-bbox="1020 180 1919 238">See Letter/e-mail/ attachment: Re: Proposed Zoning for 330 Acres formerly known as "Santa Fe Center"</p> <p data-bbox="1020 289 1919 493">We are writing to you to express our distress with the proposed zoning designation of "Santa Fe 330" to a "Mixed Use District." Our home is on the ridge directly above this property, and in fact abuts it. The proposed development of this land into a commercial/residential property with street and parking lot lighting, would forever change the nature of our property and the surrounding neighborhood.</p> <p data-bbox="1020 544 1919 849">Prior to purchasing our home in 2005, we had been frequent visitors to Santa Fe. We fell in love with the city, cuisine, and the people, but most of all we fell in love with the night skies, the quiet, and the outdoors. In fact, we planned several of our trips around the perennial meteor showers. So, when we decided to acquire a property, we looked for an area that was close enough to the culture of Santa Fe -- the Plaza, the museums, the restaurants -- but also one which was far enough from development for us to be able to enjoy the great outdoors that make northern New Mexico so special.</p> <p data-bbox="1020 899 1919 1243">We settled on Tierra de Oro for its uninterrupted views and open space. We made several inquiries before we purchased our place as to the status of the land between our home and the 599 by-pass because we understood how important this undeveloped land was to the neighborhood generally and to the house we were looking at specifically. We were told that in 2002, a 599 Corridor Plan had been passed into law that would keep the area residential and avoid the commercial development that threatened to turn the 599 into another Cerrillos Road. No matter what, this kind of development will lead to greater traffic congestion, pollution, residential density, visual blight, and increased noise and light pollution.</p> <p data-bbox="1020 1255 1919 1495">Admittedly, this impacts us directly, but, having lived in our house for ten years now, we see that it is the Santa Fe community at large which also gets value out of this undeveloped tract. Hikers, joggers, and bikers enjoy unfettered access to the arroyo which cuts below Tierra de Oro and leads up into the Tierra Trails area. As a society, we don't put enough of a premium on open and undeveloped spaces, but in places like Santa Fe and northern New Mexico, we must. It seems like now there is a unique opportunity for Santa</p>	

GMA	Property	Parcel #	Assigned Zoning	Requested Zoning	General Comment	Link
55					<p>Fe to make a stand against the sprawl that has become a blight to so many cities across the Southwest. There is no shortage of gas stations, convenience stores or chain drugstores in the area. We urge you to either restrict the development on this site OR perhaps even find a way to set it aside as a green-space for all Santa Feans to enjoy. "Undeveloped land" is a natural resource that, one rezoned and redeveloped, will be changed forever.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p>	
56	El Centro	330 acres-599/ Camino la Tierra	Mixed Use	Mixed Use	<p>See Letter/e-mail/ attachment: Supports Mixed Use Zoning District Assignment-See Letter from Al Lilly and Karl Sommars which identifies project history and fact sheet. FACT sheet history: County General Plan, SNAC Plan, SLDC, 1986 EZA approval preliminary & special exception, Approvals for Municipal utilities= should be in SDA-1</p>	

57	GMA	Property	Parcel #	Assigned Zoning	Requested Zoning	General Comment	Link
		County-wide				<p>From: Ryan Toups [mailto:findingrien@yahoo.com] Sent: Monday, May 12, 2014 2:43 PM To: Penny Ellis-Green Subject: Re: Drip, Drip, Drip...</p> <p>Penny-</p> <p>I have today learned of this new National Climate Assessment report... It is a comprehensive scientific study weighing the choices to mitigate vs. adapt to the changing climate. It thoroughly breaks down into regions as well. Here is the link to the Responses section. http://nca2014.globalchange.gov/highlights/report-findings/responses</p> <p>Please share with County Staff, especially with the County Commissioners re. their responsibility to make planning decisions based on our current scientific awareness for a sustainable future here.</p> <p>Thank you! Sincerely- Ryan Toups</p> <p>_/_</p> <p>On May 8, 2014, at 3:36 PM, Ryan Toups <findingrien@yahoo.com<mailto:findingrien@yahoo.com>> wrote: Penny-</p> <p>I am writing to voice my objection to the County's proposed zoning map. It appears that County Staff is choosing to disregard the work of the La Cienega - La Cieneguilla Planning Committee, whom met twice monthly over a period of years, working closely with community members to propose a zoning map that best represented the concerns and interests of everyone who lives in the community.</p> <p>County staff has had the results of that committee effort for over a year. Despite this community-based input, staff apparently proposed its own version of a zoning map that takes none of the community-based committee's recommendations into account.</p>	

57

On top of that is anyone in county staff paying attention to reports and articles at this critical juncture of bleak water forecasts?...

Sharing in case you missed these:

<http://www.sfreporter.com/santafe/article-8613-new-report-says-climate-change-will-hurt-sw.html>

<http://www.sfreporter.com/santafe/article-8494-times-out-for-the-rio.html>

& a poignant opinion (also in The Reporter)

Drip, Drip, Drip







Yes, clocks are dripping, and time is running out for the negligence shown our sacred rivers. As a community, we have failed to show the proper amount of outrage toward the development of Santa Fe and the political powers that seem eager to rubber-stamp this rampant growth with little or no acknowledgment of a water crisis. Laura Paskus' wonderful exposé should be required reading for Santa Fe city and county officials. Whether future generations will enjoy the river is in their hands.

I live in Rancho Viejo, where we have been at odds with the developer and county politics that would seem to be in collusion in declaring open season for runaway residential and commercial development. All of this with no clue as to the sustainability with regard to water issues. Given what Paskus has stated, there should be a moratorium on further development until there is a comprehensive water plan for our future. Instead, the powers that be are building while Rome burns (translate: while the Rio dries up).

-G Russell (Santa Fe)

Perhaps you can share these with the County Commissioners?... Perhaps moratoriums on development need to seriously enter the conversation?...

Sincerely-
Ryan Toups

GMA	Property	Parcel #	Assigned Zoning	Requested Zoning	General Comment	Link
57					Concerned citizen of La Cienega	
58	El Centro	I-25 Business Park	Residential Estate	Commercial General	See Letter/e-mail/ attachment: 1-25 Business Park approved in 2000 letter provides background info	
59	Galisteo	Canoncito	Residential Estate	Residential Community	See Letter/e-mail/ attachment: chain rational- county water to canoncito may justify higher density?	
60	Galisteo	Ojo de la Vaca	Rural Residential	Residential Estate	See email to Tim - Tradition to pass on land to children new assignemnt limits to min lot size of ten acres which will put an end to tradition	
61	Galisteo	Hasty Pluming		Commercial Neighborhood	See letter: Prior approval for plumping shop/ office in "designated Community Center District?"	
62	EL Centro	44 acres- Las Campanas Town Center	980001322 Commerical General	Commercial Neighborhood	See Letter/e-mail/ attachment: Town Center at Las Companas- 12 acre & 44 acre piece should both remain as previously planned -commercial neighborhood; Commercial General is too intense and inappropriate	
63	El Centro	Longview at Santa Fe	Rural Residential	Residential Estate	See Letter/e-mail/ attachment: Perceived DZ related to lower residential density of assigned zoning than established in Phase I subdivision approval with recorded lots and anticipated Phase II approval on remaining acreage with expected county water extension. Argues "proof of water" would allow a 2.5 acre density- the assigned zoning prescribes density (1unit per 10 acre) regardless of water source/ availability-	


GMA	Property	Parcel #	Assigned Zoning	Requested Zoning	General Comment	Link
64	Estancia	Cedar Grove			<p data-bbox="1018 180 1150 206">Ms. Green,</p> <p data-bbox="1018 253 1923 423">This message deals with questions raised by several members of the South Mountain Neighborhood Association in Cedar Grove. The questions deal primarily with the Residential Estate zoning (1 dwelling per 2.5 acres) in the area south and east of SR 344 near Cedar Grove, but apply to the rest of the areas along 472 as well.</p> <ol data-bbox="1018 469 1944 922" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="1018 469 1944 565">1. What was the rationale for reducing the lot sizes to 2.5 acres, especially since currently most of the lots are 10 acres or more, with most of the area in the 40 to 80 acres and above lot sizes? <li data-bbox="1018 612 1919 743">2. Many of the wells in the Cedar Grove area have gone dry. So, what are the county's plans for dealing with such a high density relative to water and septic, since it's unlikely that private wells and septic will be sustainable there? <li data-bbox="1018 790 1944 922">3. There's a strip of Rural Residential zoning (1 dwelling per 10 acres) starting about 3 miles east of 344 and north of 472. What was the rationale for that piece jutting down to 472, when the rest of the area around 472 is Residential Estate? <p data-bbox="1018 969 1929 1027">We would really appreciate your response to these questions so that we can understand the county's position.</p> <p data-bbox="1018 1075 1661 1205">Thank you for your time, Nancy Burton President, South Mountain Neighborhood Association 505-286-1247</p>	

GMA	Property	Parcel #	Assigned Zoning	Requested Zoning	General Comment	Link
65	Galisteo	960002095	Ag/Ranch	Rural	<p>On prior zoning map these lots were zoned as Rural on current zoning map they are zoned Ag./Ranch.</p> <p>I own this lot of record (80 acres). My family has owned this land since before NM statehood. Under the present zoning I intended to by family transfer five a 40 acre parcel to 2 of or prior zoning map the area was proposed as rural which would have allowed me to do so. The proposed Ag/Ranch would not all a 40 acre tract under any circumstance. I would be the only such sized lot of record in the general area limited to 160 acre family transfer. The majority of lots of record in the area are smaller than 40 acres. I request the final map be reverted to the prior Rural designation to allow me to provide 40 acres lots to my children.</p>	
66	Galisteo	236009853	Ag/Ranch	Rural Residential	<p>It appears as though the zoning would eliminate any possibility of use of the land for an off-the grid home, is that right? We bought this land with the dream of retiring here and building an ecologically sustainable home. There is a structure on the adjoining property.</p>	
67	Galisteo	104596802	Ag/Ranch	Rural	<p>We are requesting this change as our adjoining neighbor has subdivided his same-sized parcel in order to grant ownership to each of his children. We would like to do the same. Thank you for your consideration.</p>	
68	Galisteo	910018260	Ag/Ranch	Rural	<p>not enough water for ag - This property is 140 acres; I was told when I received my well permit that I could maintain a residence, but was not allocated enough water rights to practice agriculture. The SFCo zoning and the State Engineer need to reconcile this.</p>	
69	Galisteo	910019161	Ag/Ranch	Ag/Ranch	<p>I commend the County staff for following the draft zoning of the Land Development Plan, as Glorieta mesa's cultural values and environment need to be preserved. Various correspondence is already on file with the County.</p>	

GMA	Property	Parcel #	Assigned Zoning	Requested Zoning	General Comment	Link
70	Galisteo	760002603	Ag/Ranch	Rural	I own, and have been paying taxes for a long time, on three properties within the proposed Ag/Ranch zoning classification. The assessments for all three parcels have been based on the their value as being developable for residential purposes. All three properties, (760002603, 940001932, 940001933), are smaller than 160 acres. My concern is that, if the 160 acre minimum lot size is adopted, these parcels will become essentially without value. This morning I attended the information meeting in Eldorado to discuss the status of these properties. Timothy Cannon, a senior planner, told me that it seemed likely that these smaller lots within the Ag/Ranch area would be "grandfathered" and would continue to be developable as residential lots. I am therefore asking the County Commissioners to ensure that, when the zoning map is adopted, smaller inholdings like mine will be "grandfathered" as described above. Should this not be the case, I hope that the County Commission will notify the owners of affected small inholdings to give us an opportunity to discuss what further steps we might be able to take.	
71	Estancia	94428900	Commercial General	Traditional Community	Commercial general first 224 +/- feet; remainder traditional community	
72	Estancia	96006873	Commercial General	Traditional Community	Commercial General Front 224 +/- feet; traditional community remainder	
73	El Norte	33667712	Commercial Neighborhood	Commercial Neighborhood	This property has always been road-side business/commercial/residential and borders commercial properties. This property has paved frontage road and access for business. Thank you.	
74	Galisteo	76008623	Commercial Neighborhood	Commercial Neighborhood	This parcel was not correct on map and has been changed at mapping department. The change should reflect my entire parcel. See attached image.	
75	El Norte	33791360	Commercial Neighborhood	Commercial Neighborhood	By phone:	

GMA	Property	Parcel #	Assigned Zoning	Requested Zoning	General Comment	Link
76	El Norte	38102382	Commercial Neighborhood	Commercial Neighborhood	By phone:	
77	El Norte	38800804	Commercial Neighborhood	Commercial Neighborhood	Our property is road-side commercial and residential historically and is surrounded by other commercial properties. This property has paved frontage road and access for business.	
78	El Norte	33727872	Commercial Neighborhood	Traditional Community	Currently is a residential property; not adjacent to US 285	
79	El Norte	33727104	Commercial Neighborhood	Traditional Community	Currently is a residential property; not adjacent to US 285	
80	Galisteo	99305418	Commercial Neighborhood	Residential Estate	Commercial properties exist north of this land that adequately serves the community- yet many of these properties are vacant at the current time. the above listed property is intrusive in the surrounding residential area. Changing the current classification to residential estate would provide a more homogeneous neighborhood.	
81	El Norte	38800803	Commercial Neighborhood	Mixed Use	The above parcel 38800803 has roadside access and is in the immediate area of a historical commercial parcel. This parcel should be identified in the proposed zoning residential/commercial map for any future commercial interests on parcel 38800803.	
82	El Norte	3375080	Commercial Neighborhood	Traditional Community	There is an existing residential dwelling. Does not want property zoned commercial. Ramona Gonzales	
83	El Norte	38402731	Commercial Neighborhood	Traditional Community	Currently building a residence on the property. All neighboring lots are residential.	

GMA	Property	Parcel #	Assigned Zoning	Requested Zoning	General Comment	Link
84	El Centro		58100838	Mixed Use	Residential Estate	We already have an ugly, useless water tank with dead trees thanks to Las Campanas. Now a shopping center with a possible 500 more people. Are you crazy ? The congestion will be impossible. Why always our neighborhood ? We will not be able to get in or out. How about the fire station...can it be responsible for all these new developments?
85	El Centro	44 acres- Las Campanas Town Center	980001322	Mixed Use	Residential Estate	I am strongly opposed to the proposed re-zoning.
86	El Centro	44 acres- Las Campanas Town Center	980001322	Mixed Use	Residential Estate	Our neighborhood deserves to be preserved in its current low population density form. High density, mixed use zoning is for the city. this plan would totally compromise our residential area.
87	El Centro	44 acres- Las Campanas Town Center	980001322	Mixed Use	Residential Estate	Commercial space not wanted in our neighborhood, brings more traffic and congestion, light pollution, water requirements; more housing would depreciate property values, and adversely affects quality of life, plus destroys wildlife habitat
88	El Centro	44 acres- Las Campanas Town Center	980001322	Mixed Use	Residential Estate	This zoning would have a detrimental effect to our quality of life as well as our property values. This area has long been established as a 2.5 acre minimum lot size.
89	El Centro		68900734	Mixed Use	Commercial General	
90	El Centro		64256256	Mixed Use	Commercial General	
91	EL Centro	330 acres- 599/ Camino la Tierra	59209130	Mixed Use		I would like to keep my view across this area to be zoned mixed use.

GMA	Property	Parcel #	Assigned Zoning	Requested Zoning	General Comment	Link	
92	El Centro	Polo Grounds	68100876	Mixed Use	Planned Development District	Property has received master plan preliminary and final development plan approval and want to keep prior entitlements on property which included the ability to keep 350 horses on the property	
93	EL Centro	330 acres-599/ Camino la Tierra	58000643	Mixed Use		<p>Dear Ms. Ellis-Green: We have received the county's proposed re-zoning plan, and must express a serious concern to you as county homeowners. The corridor along Camino La Tierra proximate to 599 is an exceptionally lovely and pristine one, a pleasure for those who live there, and bike and drive the roads. We noticed in your proposed zoning plan that this area would be rezoned as "mixed use." This would clearly allow for commercial development of the area. We encourage the county to rethink this especially as there appears to be no Master Plan in place. Mixed use would not be compatible with the current residents, their homes and land use in the area, and not a good vision for the future of our county. We ask that you change the zoning to one that better suits the needs of these particular local neighborhoods. With all best wishes. Joan Zegree and Spider Kedelsky, 273 Headquarters Trail, Santa Fe, 87506</p> 	

GMA	Property	Parcel #	Assigned Zoning	Requested Zoning	General Comment	Link	
94	EL Centro	330 acres-599/ Camino la Tierra	990003348	Mixed Use	Residential Estate	<p>My name is Steve Inman and I am a full time resident at 68 E. Wildflower Drive in the community of Tierra de Oro immediately adjacent and to the northwest of the 330 acres (parcel #990003348 and parcel #990003350)that is under consideration for rezoning from residential estates to mixed use. Mixed use, as I understand it, permits among other things, high density residential (apartments, condos), commercial, and retail. My wife and I are both retired and moved to Santa Fe approximately 3 years ago. One of the major attractions to us was the quality of life found in Santa Fe. We moved from a large metropolitan city with all the congestion, traffic, noise, and population density associated with larger cities. What specifically attracted us to Tierra de Oro was the rural setting with low density (2.5 acres per dwelling), the open spaces, the walking trails, the absence of street lights (we can actually see stars at night!), and the abundant wild life. Before we purchased our house we asked our realtor to find out what the property to the south was zoned (i.e., the 330 acres now under consideration). We were told Residential Estates which permitted only the lower density of 2.5 acres per dwelling. We relied upon that existing zoning when we made our purchase decision.</p> <p>It is my understanding that in the late 1990's the owner of the 330 acres submitted an amended master plan for Mixed Use zoning that included a resort hotel, a spa, a wellness center a corporate center. Strong neighborhood resistance was met and his attempt was defeated. The County also informed the owner that any prior master plan that he submitted in the late 1980's had expired. Why this is puzzling is that when I met with Ms. Penny Ellis-Green at the Nancy Rodriguez Center, I went away with the distinct impression that she based the proposed Mixed Use zoning now appearing on the map on an "approved master plan" that had been done in the past. She did not have a copy of this master plan available as the county was still looking for the file (???). The proposed Mixed Use high density zoning is certainly not compatible with the rural and scenic neighborhood. Given the scarce water resources, why would the county trade low density residential with high density residential and commercial development? In summary, the proposed zoning to Mixed Use will decrease both the neighborhood's quality of life AND property values as a result of (a) increased traffic, (b) increased density, (c) increased security risk, (d) increased trash generated by the commercial and multifamily development,(e) diminished scenic views, and (f) destroy the rural nature of our neighborhood and wild</p>	

	GMA	Property	Parcel #	Assigned Zoning	Requested Zoning	General Comment	Link
94						life with lighted streets and parking lots. Thank you for your attention and for this opportunity to express my views. Steve Inman	
95	EL Centro	1-25 east frontage rd	99305458	Mixed Use	Commercial General	Parcel on East Frontage Road was granted a variance for commercial zoning in July 2008. This parcel should reflect the zoning that was granted in 2008 on the zoning map.	
96	EL Centro	330 acres-599/ Camino la Tierra	990003350	Mixed Use	Residential Estate	The parcel that has been rezoned as mixed use district (MUD) directly abuts the City of Santa Fe open space, which is used by city and county residents and visitors for hiking, biking and equestrian recreation. Such a rezoning is totally incompatible with open space and trails use and the residential nature of the area.	
97	EL Centro	330 acres-599/ Camino la Tierra	990003350	Mixed Use	Residential Estate	Moved out in the county to remove our family from the commercial side of SF. This negates our initiative..... Van Horn - 471-1171	
98	EL Centro	330 acres-599/ Camino la Tierra	123330	Mixed Use	Residential Estate	the property directly abuts the City of Santa Fe open space, which is used by city and county residents and visitors for hiking, biking and equestrian recreation. Such a rezoning is totally incompatible with open space and trails use and the residential nature of the area	
99	EL Centro	330 acres-599/ Camino la Tierra	910008950	Mixed Use	Rural Residential	Mixed use would create a potential for destroying the rural nature of the area and devalue existing residential properties.	
100	EL Centro	CCD	66011909	Planned Development District	Planned Development District	9.77 ac SF Steel Planned Development District--CCD Employment Center What will be the procedure to develop if it is a special or permitted use in CCDO vs a permitted use as Planned Development District in SLDC. CCD requires MP and SLDC has no MP provision.	

GMA	Property	Parcel #	Assigned Zoning	Requested Zoning	General Comment	Link
101	County-wide	910009812	Planned Development District		<p>Interactive Zoning Map does not function well. Suggestions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Add to the menu bar a legend. 2) Link on legend bar on how to use the interactive zoning map. Need to define how to use link on menu bar. Add printing capability for any level of resolution. 3) find function does not work very well. This function does not work for my specific computer which is a MacIntosh and IPAD and possibly Iphone. Instructions should include how to search for any property not just your property. 4) No return from start page to the map. <p>PDF of zoning map does not function for zooming into properties. Interactive map does not have the names of many of the main streets. Streets that are named need to be darker print to be readable. Make more legible. Add acreage to the information on the zoning classification for each parcel. Be able to move the parcel description on the interactive zoning map.</p>	
102	El Centro	CCD	990000439	Planned Development District	Residential Estate	The Churchill Road area was not included in the Community College District PUD. All lots are 2.5 acres or more (ref. approved Community College District map).
103	El Norte		910005478	Residential Community	Residential Community	By phone: Stay as RC. Keep 1 Acre zoning.
104	El Norte		36006349	Residential Community	Commercial General	Property is surrounded by general commercial zoning right off the highway. Property is better suited for commercial use
105	El Norte		940002449	Residential Community	Traditional Community	My property has exactly 1.50 acres. It was subdivided in 2005 with the intent of constructing 2 legal residences on .75 acres each. The same land use requirement that currently exists and is proposed for the TC classification. Also note that the property directly to my north is .75 acres and the property across the street contains multiple residences, which all will become non-conforming.

GMA	Property	Parcel #	Assigned Zoning	Requested Zoning	General Comment	Link
106	Estancia	94433725	Residential Estate	Rural Residential	Please keep existing character of neighborhood. "Cedar Grove" is a very small cluster of homes on the 1st bend of 344. Please do not change our zoning just to match theirs. Theirs is grandfathered in from the 60's. For 20 years this neighborhood stayed the same acreage (10 acre lots). Peaceful, scenic. Ideal for me as landscape artist. Dark at night-- for stargazing (lunar eclipse last night). Smaller parcels are closer to Edgewood (town of). We are about 8 miles north of Rt 66/ I40 on 344. Words from our appraisal: "the lack of major services is offset by the desirable characteristics of a semi-rural atmosphere and the appeal of superior environmental qualities." Our next door neighbor--who was moving away years ago-- who my sons did yard work for and we were friends, tried to divide her property to get more money from the sale showing that she did not care what happened to the neighborhood after she left. (Thankfully zoning did not permit her). (When we moved from our previous 65 acres we did NOT sell it to the developer for the higher price as it would have changed the neighborhood. WE sold it to our neighbor who would keep it the same. Our adjacent 10 +/- acre parcels are very narrow, only 330 feet wide and dividing one for different owners would be very impactful (please see attachment).If you are trying to create clusters of homes such as at the "corner of Cedar Grove" PLEASE DON'T. That's where my kids either got in trouble or were badly influenced.	
107	Galisteo	235253587	Residential Estate	Residential Community		
108	Galisteo	235253579	Residential Estate	Traditional Community		
109	Galisteo	238601869	Residential Estate	Residential Community	My parents separated their land into one acre portions (1970s). One acre has provided sufficient space, privacy and prevents overcrowding.	

GMA	Property	Parcel #	Assigned Zoning	Requested Zoning	General Comment	Link
110	Galisteo	238800196	Residential Estate	Residential Community	The one parcel of property I own at this address was divided in the early seventies and it is a 1 acre family portion. The area is already portioned as residential community and only needs the formal classification so that the residents can have a clear title to their residences and not have three or four households on one title. However, I would not like to see parcels that are now unoccupied and of larger than 10 acres subdivided and built with one dwelling or multiple family units on one acre (commercial subdivision).	
111	Galisteo	235253585	Residential Estate	Residential Community	I would like to request a zoning reclassification because I would like to leave my property to my children, evenly divided before I die. This property was homesteaded in 1987 and has been passed down to the children since then. We humbly ask (plead) that you consider this request. It will be most deeply appreciated. Thank you so much!	
112	Galisteo	235253586	Residential Estate	Residential Community	I would like to request a zoning reclassification because I would like to leave my property to my children, evenly divided before I die. This property was homesteaded in 1987 and has been passed down to the children since then. We humbly ask (plead) that you consider this request. It will be most deeply appreciated. Thank you so much!	
113	Galisteo	238901171	Residential Estate	Residential Community	We are currently installing S.F. County water system service. Property here was initially acquired as Homestead from the United States of America in 1897 certificate no. 2316. It has been passed down as family transfer since then. This is why we would like it to be listed as residential community to allow 1 dwelling per acre. We would greatly appreciate your approval of this request. Thank you for your consideration and assistance.	
114	Galisteo	238901079	Residential Estate	Residential Community	We are currently installing S.F. County water system service. Property here was initially acquired as Homestead from the United States of America in 1897 certificate no. 2316. It has been passed down as family transfer since then. This is why we would like it to be listed as residential community to allow 1 dwelling per acre. We would greatly appreciate your approval of this request. Thank you for your consideration and assistance.	

GMA	Property	Parcel #	Assigned Zoning	Requested Zoning	General Comment	Link
115	Galisteo	99304053	Residential Estate	Residential Community	We are currently installing S.F. County water system service. Property here was initially acquired as Homestead from the United States of America in 1897 certificate no. 2316. It has been passed down as family transfer since then. This is why we would like it to be listed as residential community to allow 1 dwelling per acre. We would greatly appreciate your approval of this request. Thank you for your consideration and assistance.	
116	Galisteo	99304052	Residential Estate	Residential Community	We are currently installing S.F. County water system service. Property here was initially acquired as Homestead from the United States of America in 1897 certificate no. 2316. It has been passed down as family transfer since then. This is why we would like it to be listed as residential community to allow 1 dwelling per acre. We would greatly appreciate your approval of this request. Thank you for your consideration and assistance.	
117	El Norte	184836608	Residential Estate	Traditional Community	We have already requested this classification in the past with no action by the county. We will continue to pursue this request.	
118	El Norte	990000328	Residential Estate	Traditional Community	The community had requested this classification years ago. There was no follow-up by the county. We will again be attempting to change the current classification.	
119	El Centro	58309562	Residential Estate	Residential Estate	we do not need commercial , retail and more residential density in las tierras.leave our zoning to RES-E. thank you very much	
120	El Centro	58402041	Residential Estate	Residential Estate	Asked about guest house-- showed code section that allows. Ok with zoning.	
121	Galisteo	Old Las Vegas hwy	239302649	Residential Estate	Commercial Neighborhood	Commercial Neighborhood or Mixed Use. Has master plan MP CCD 1991-1/1991-4 Ken Hastez plumbing has 5k sq ft non res-building.
122	Estancia	94562716	Residential Estate	Ag/Ranch		

GMA	Property	Parcel #	Assigned Zoning	Requested Zoning	General Comment	Link
123	Estancia	94562716	Residential Estate	Ag/Ranch		
124	Galisteo US 285 Corridor	9100048	Residential Estate	Rural Residential	Not in an HOA. Character of N. side of Ranch Rd is Rural Residential. To follow plan of HWY 285 Ordinance goals.	
125	El Centro	980001428	Residential Estate	Traditional Community	Is not adjacent to T.C. Has almost 3 Ac.-- wanted to know if he can split the lot for his son. Said he wouldn't have bought the property if he had known he didn't have TC density. We advised him of the small lot family transfer procedure in the current code.	
126	Estancia Starlight Ranch	910008293	Residential Estate	Rural Fringe	Ken Brown; Deb Matthew Starlight Ranch Reducing will, over time, end up running out livestock (horses, cattle) as area develops; dogs chasing livestock, forcing Extranosa water use, wells going dry, people shooting livestock.	
127	Estancia	98207287	Residential Estate	Ag/Ranch	(505)281-2694 6.65 Acres Has orchard, garden, raise pigs. Check to see if he falls under a hog house (per function #) structure # 8200 raises liters, slaughters and sells. Has been operating for over 30 years.	

GMA	Property	Parcel #	Assigned Zoning	Requested Zoning	General Comment	Link
128	Estancia	960002782	Residential Estate	Rural	<p>We are landowners in Santa Fe County. Our property which consists of 40.33 acres is proposed to be zoned for "Residential Estate (1 dwelling per 2.5 acres)". The property that surrounds us is also proposed to be zoned the same. I strongly object to this zoning for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Our property along with most of the surrounding lands is currently zoned agricultural. 2. There is currently not enough water in the area to support the residences already built here. Several of our neighbors are hauling water because their wells have dried up. We, in fact, are on our second well in less than 9 years as our first well went dry two years after we drilled it. By proposing to allow one house per 2.5 acres there is a possibility of more residences being built in the area than the aquifer can support. 3. We bought 40+ acres to live and raise our children in a pollution free, traffic free area. By re-zoning the area, we would no longer have that environment. 4. Edgewood does not have enough schools to support the population that this re-zoning would create. We don't even have a high school and our children are currently bussed to Moriarty. Moriarty High School would not be able to handle the influx of students from Santa Fe County. The quality of education would be sacrificed. <p>Obviously no one from the County Commissioners has even made a trip to our area so see for themselves what is here and what type of impact this would have on your taxpayers. I was told by your representative, Robert Griego, that this action would have no impact on our agricultural status or would not raise our property taxes. I wonder then why is Santa Fe County going to the expense to re-zone the area. The whole area would have to be surveyed at an enormous expense. Where is the money coming from to do this? I find it hard to believe that the county isn't proposing these changes just to raise more money in the form of property taxes. If not, then what is the benefit of this idiotic proposal? We have lived in our current residence and paid property taxes for over 8 years now yet Santa Fe County can't even seem to give us an assigned address. Why don't you get your house in order before you take on new projects? We don't want to live in the city of Santa Fe and that is why we moved to the location that we love. Please leave us alone and quit wasting our taxpayers money.</p>	

GMA	Property	Parcel #	Assigned Zoning	Requested Zoning	General Comment	Link	
129	El Centro	I-25 west frontage rd	960001324	Residential Estate	Commercial General	This property has master plan/prelim and final development plan approval from CDRC and BCC	
130	Estancia		94408320	Residential Estate	Ag/Ranch	This property has been agriculture/ranching since NM became a state. This property is still 100% agriculture/ranching today. We don't agree with the commercial overlay zone and the increase taxes that would be incurred by that zoning change. Additionally, the map does not correctly reflect our parcel boundaries- we property extends to the otherside of the highway. Please correct the map.	
131	Estancia		910001038	Residential Estate	Ag/Ranch	This parcel of property is part of a larger 960 acre ranch that has been used for grazing livestock since statehood in 1912. We have no intention to develop this property any time soon. We therefore request that this property's zone classification be changed to reflect it's historical and continuing use as agricultural/ranch land.	
132	Estancia		910001026	Residential Estate	Ag/Ranch	This parcel of property is part of a larger 960 acre ranch that has been used for grazing livestock since statehood in 1912. We have no intention to develop this property any time soon. We therefore request that this property's zone classification be changed to reflect it's historical and continuing use as agricultural/ranch land.	
133	Estancia		910001029	Residential Estate	Ag/Ranch	This parcel of property is part of a larger 960 acre ranch that has been used for grazing livestock since statehood in 1912. We have no intention to develop this property any time soon. We therefore request that this property's zone classification be changed to reflect it's historical and continuing use as agricultural/ranch land.	
134	Estancia		910001033	Residential Estate	Ag/Ranch	This parcel of property is part of a larger 960 acre ranch that has been used for grazing livestock since statehood in 1912. We have no intention to develop this property any time soon. We therefore request that this property's zone classification be changed to reflect it's historical and continuing use as agricultural/ranch land.	

GMA	Property	Parcel #	Assigned Zoning	Requested Zoning	General Comment	Link
135	Estancia	910001041	Residential Estate	Ag/Ranch	This parcel of property is part of a larger 960 acre ranch that has been used for grazing livestock since statehood in 1912. We have no intention to develop this property any time soon. We therefore request that this property's zone classification be changed to reflect it's historical and continuing use as agricultural/ranch land.	
136	El Centro	330 acres-599/ Camino la Tierra	58309617	Mixed Use	Residential Estate	We are concerned about the Mixed Use zoning for Santa Fe 330 Investments, LLC property at the intersection of 599 and Camino La Tierra. This designation is inconsistent with the Sustainable Growth Management Plan since mixed use will directly impact surrounding rural single family property values and enjoyment. Mixed use will require street lighting, affecting the present dark skies and will allow commercial and high density housing development. Mixed use will also increase traffic along the designated WIPP route, defeating the purpose of 599. The Santa Fe 330 Investments property is presently receiving heavy use as access to the city's La Tierra Trails district. One possible option for the county would be purchase of the property for inclusion in the County Open Lands and Trails Program. In conclusion, we request that the county zone the property Residential Estate or purchase the property for the enjoyment of all County residents.
137	Galisteo	126000534	Residential Estate	Commercial Neighborhood	This subject property has had master plan and preliminary development plan to allow for EAWSD to have offices and maintenance shop for the district	
138	Galisteo	126000534	Residential Estate	Public/Institutional	From: James Jenkins President, Eldorado Area Water & Sanitation District 505-699-6645 president@eldoradowaterdistrict.com	
139	El Centro	910001440	Residential Estate	Residential Fringe	Our house is located on 1.75 acres. The proposed zoning allows one house per 2.5 acres. Why assign a zone where the houses in the development will not be in compliance?	
140	Estancia	910001471	Residential Estate		How do I find out if the land down the street at 40 Rancho Del Cieol which is also to be zoned Residential Estate, has or can get an exception? It currently appears to be operating as a salvage yard with over 75 vehicles on it.	



GMA	Property	Parcel #	Assigned Zoning	Requested Zoning	General Comment	Link
141	Galisteo	126000534	Residential Estate	Commercial Neighborhood	This property was zoned by master plan action for business offices and a yard for the Eldorado Area Water and Sanitation District	
142	Estancia	98801005	Residential Estate	Residential Community	This lot and others in this area are 2 acres, not 2.5 acres as RES-E is specified.	
143	El Centro	Academy for the Love of Learning	910006638	Residential Estate	Concern regarding change from Public Institutional to Residential Fringe. Existing non conforming use.	
144	Galisteo	66008314	Residential Estate	Residential Estate	Smaller lots around, why did Residential Estate line go around this property?	
145	Estancia	960000784	Residential Estate	Rural Residential	By phone: Wants all this to be 10 acres-- they believe it should be 10 acres, surrounding is 10 acres (Bernalillo County and Town)	
146	El Centro	960002391	Residential Estate	Residential Estate		
147	El Centro	910002735	Residential Estate	Residential Estate		
148	El Centro	64294144	Residential Estate		As I live out of town, what exactly is Residential Fringe zoning and how does it affect the property owner? Please reply to lariam@msn.com. Thank you.	
149	El Centro	64282880	Rural	Rural Residential	This property has two distinct zoning designations being rural fringe and rural zoning. This request is to change these designations to rural residential for the entire property being that it adjoins other properties that are classified as residential fringe.	









GMA	Property	Parcel #	Assigned Zoning	Requested Zoning	General Comment	Link
150	El Centro	64282880	Rural	Rural Residential	This property has two distinct zoning designations being rural fringe and rural zoning. This request is to change these designations to rural residential for the entire property being that it adjoins other properties that are classified as residential fringe.	
151	Galisteo	Ortiz Mine Grant	940002747	Rural	Rural	By phone: Ok with zoning.
152	Galisteo		940002747	Rural	Rural	By phone: Ok with zoning.
153	El Norte	hwy 285 frontage	38800805	Rural	Commercial Neighborhood	My interest in this parcel for on the proposed business/residential map is that the area has been historically commercial and has roadside access and I'd like it zoned as such for any future business interests.
154	El Norte	hwy 285 frontage	38800805	Rural	Commercial Neighborhood	My interest in this parcel for on the proposed business/residential map is that the area has been historically commercial and has roadside access and I'd like it zoned as such for any future business interests.
155	Galisteo		76000076	Rural	Rural Fringe	Property needs to be divided into 20 acre parcels-- 1 dwelling per 20 acres.
156	Galisteo		76008705	Rural	Rural Residential	I have a 20 acre property that is in an area proposed for 40 acres per dwelling unit. This ranch was subdivided decades ago and 80 of the properties are less than 40 acres. If you make your proposed change, I assume that you will reduce my current tax assessment fro \$60,000 to \$6,000.
157	Estancia		94411200	Rural Fringe	Rural Fringe	Singing Hills Ministries "Camp Oro Quay" Thank you folks for the work you have all done on this project! I believe rural fringe is the correct zoning. By definition on page 347 of the SLDC we should be considered a church and we do want to lose this. We host camps and retreats, and regular religious services.




GMA	Property	Parcel #	Assigned Zoning	Requested Zoning	General Comment	Link
158	Galisteo	128206524	Rural Fringe		We live in Eldorado where we have about 1 acre+ per dwelling. Our house is on a little over an acre. The zoning map says we would be Rural Fringe with 1 dwelling per 20 acres. How will this zoning proposal have an impact on our property or neighborhood?	
159	El Centro	Bobcat Bite	23363072	Rural Residential	Commercial Neighborhood	Commercial Neighborhood or Rural Commercial Overlay. This is the Bobcat Bite Cafe and is opening 20 May 2014 and has always been there and operated as such since 1953. Need Committee confirmation letter. Property/business owner would like a letter from the Land Use Administrator stating the operation of their business-- the Bobcat Bite-- will not be impacted by new County SLDC regulations if the zoning map is adopted; The use as a restaurant will be legal.
160	Galisteo	Este es el Camino	78310950	Rural Residential	Mixed Use	Multiple parcels 2, 4, 10 Este es el Camino Mixed Use--Commercial/ Residential Previously approved by the Board of County Commissioners (Commercial Residential) high tax rates for many years Adjacent San Marcos Cafe which is zoned commercial.
161	Galisteo		78310950	Rural Residential	Commercial Neighborhood	Owned property since 1982. 1 Lot has a s MH (#4) 2 lot is vacant. Went before planning commission. Adopted by San Marcos committee as commercial. Barbara Vigil & Mike Anaya-- BCC 9/12/06 San Marcos Plan Resolution NO. 2003-83
162	El Centro	Canada de Los Alamos	408311085	Rural Residential	Rural Fringe	Sustainable Development Plan is a great idea.
163	Estancia		99100648	Rural Residential	Ag/Ranch	All grazing land, wants to stay in grazing-- too expensive to develop no water-- taxes will go up if it becomes residential--

GMA	Property	Parcel #	Assigned Zoning	Requested Zoning	General Comment	Link
164	Galisteo	950000281	Rural Residential	Residential Fringe	i wish to object to the proposed zoning of my property to RUR-R (one dwelling per 10 acres), and would propose that my property be zoned RES-F (one dwelling per 5 acres). several nearby lots are already between 5 and 10 acres, and the covenants that came with our property allow division down to 5 acres. The proposed zoning would deprive me of the right to sub-divide in the future if I chose to do so. Additionally, with several nearby properties already less than 10 acres, this would create non-conforming lots, making selling and financing in the future harder, as lenders may not loan on a property that does not comply with current zoning. Similar concerns would be raised with property insurance, as you may not be allowed to rebuild from a total loss on a non-conforming lot.	
165	Estancia	94403456	Rural Residential		Our small piece of property is about one quarter acre as are the other lots around us. How do you justify zoning this area rural residential with only one dwelling per 10 acres. Which property of the 40 will be allowed to have a house? How are RV trailers classified?	
166	Galisteo	95253687	Rural Residential	Residential Fringe		
167	Estancia	95253469	Traditional Community	Commercial General	Jonnie Mae Finley signed by P.O.A William H Finley email: wfinley28@msn.com Power of attorney forms attached. The three other owners of 344 Dinkle Rd are commercial and we request commercial general for the SW corner.	
168	El Norte	910014240	Traditional Community	Traditional Community	Questions about uses. Ok with zoning.	
169	El Norte	184821248	Traditional Community	Traditional Community	Keep as TC	
170	Galisteo	235053184	Traditional Community	Traditional Community		







GMA	Property	Parcel #	Assigned Zoning	Requested Zoning	General Comment	Link
171	El Centro	58207500	Traditional Community	Mixed Use	Not sure about the one-size-fits-all TC zoning designation under the proposed SLDC zoning map. The other general classifications seem reasonable where individually property owners may request change from one zoning to another now or in the future depending on future development. But within a THC, each THC's prior zoning ordinance should be incorporated as the county's zoning for that THC. This could potentially be done as a zoning overlay.	
172	El Norte	38801585	Traditional Community	Residential Estate	Existing development on adjacent properties is 1 dwelling per 2.5 acres per covenants. County of Santa Fe should not rezone to 1 dwelling per 0.75 acres.	
173	Estancia	94407930	Traditional Community	Mixed Use	We have already obtained a business license for a small family farm. Growing and selling plants and produce is what we are licensed for. Please advice as to which zoning we will need to apply for. Thank you	
174	County-wide	126000241			Any effort to increase population density would appear to thrust NM deeper in terrible drought sooner!	
175	El Centro	44 acres- Las Campanas Town Center	980001322	Mixed Use	Planned Development District	By phone: Las Campanas Town Center LAS CAMPANAS LAND HOLDINGS LLC MU to CN CG to CN or Planned Development District if it refers to a master plan
176	Estancia	Old Rt 66	99301429	Traditional Community	Rural Residential	We believe the zoning classification to the west of us for Traditional Community zoning of 3 dwellings/acre is too much for the rural setting in the area, We would ask that it be changed to rural residential.
177	EL Centro	CCD	910000279			
178	El Centro	26002565				




GMA	Property	Parcel #	Assigned Zoning	Requested Zoning	General Comment	Link	
179	El Centro	330 acres-599/ Camino la Tierra		Mixed Use		See Letter/e-mail/ attachment: concern of possible loss of public access to trail network due to MU assigned zoning; County should secure easement; loss of property value, loss of scenic quality and inappropriate commercial uses and inappropriate residential density	
180	El Centro	330 acres-599/ Camino la Tierra		Mixed Use		See Letter/e-mail/ attachment: visual blight impact dark sky, increased traffic- property values traffic	
181	El Centro	330 acres-599/ Camino la Tierra		Mixed Use		See Letter/e-mail/ attachment: crime rates, water, impact to scenic qualities	
182	Galisteo		910020207	Planned Development District	Planned Development District	See Letter/e-mail/ attachment: appropriate zoning district	
183	Galisteo		99304009	Rural Fringe	Residential Fringe	See Letter/e-mail/ attachment: bought years ago indented to subdivide to transfer to sons- two sides Residential estate	
184	Galisteo		99304008	Rural Fringe	Residential Fringe	See Letter/e-mail/ attachment: bought years ago intended to subdivide to transfer to sons- two sides Residential estate	
185	Galisteo		99303039	Rural Residential	Residential Estate		
186	Galisteo		99303038	Rural Residential	Residential Estate		
187	El Centro	330 acres-599/ Camino la Tierra		Mixed Use	Residential Estate	See Letter/e-mail/ attachment: EZA and the Santa Fe County Board of County Commissioners. Pursuant to Ordinance 2002-1, the 330 acres, formerly referred to as the "Santa Fe Center" was and remains zoned as residential.	

GMA	Property	Parcel #	Assigned Zoning	Requested Zoning	General Comment	Link
188	El Centro				See Letter/e-mail/ attachment: questions from LVCA-Are the draft LCLC Community Plan zoning recommendations considered? Explain zoning for entire Santa Fe Canyon Ranch related to PEMP? Commercial lot in Las Lagunitas	
189	El Centro		Rural	Residential Fringe	See Letter/e-mail/ attachment: In January objected to the 10 acre min. lot size. We have been actively working with the County Water Co. regarding a service agreement and have been exploring with them the possibility of locating the County storage tank on the subject property. For this to be feasible, this would require a zoning designation of 1 DU/5 AC. The choice seems to be either 48 lots serviced by the County Water system or 35 lots served by on site wells.	
190	Galisteo	66006123	Residential Fringe	Residential Estate	See Letter/e-mail/ attachment: increase res density to provide more affordable land	
191	El Centro	330 acres-599/ Camino la Tierra		Mixed- Use	See Letter/e-mail/ attachment: opposed to mixed use will alter composition of neighborhood	
192	El Centro	330 acres-599/ Camino la Tierra		Mixed- Use	See Letter/e-mail/ attachment:opposed to mixed use; concern= water, light pollution, traffic commercial uses, county should purchase land for open space & trails	
193	El Centro	330 acres-599/ Camino la Tierra		Mixed Use	See Letter/e-mail/ attachment: sprawl & blight; highest use as open space & trails	
194	El Centro	330 acres-599/ Camino la Tierra		Mixed Use	See Letter/e-mail/ attachment: sprawl & blight; highest use as open space & trails	
195	El Centro	330 acres-599/ Camino la Tierra		Mixed Use	See Letter/e-mail/ attachment: opposed: conflicts with SGMP- doesn't protect private or public investments, Scenic quality and will increase traffic	









GMA	Property	Parcel #	Assigned Zoning	Requested Zoning	General Comment	Link	
196	El Centro	44 acres- Las Campanas Town Center	980001322	Mixed Use		See Letter/e-mail/ attachment: negative- congestion and traffic	
197	El Centro	44 acres- Las Campanas Town Center	980001322	Mixed Use		See Letter/e-mail/ attachment: delay reclassification until owner puts forward a comprehensive development plan	
198	El Centro	44 acres- Las Campanas Town Center	980001322	Mixed Use		See Letter/e-mail/ attachment: opposed 7 years ago opposed again	
199	El Centro	330 acres- 599/ Camino la Tierra		Mixed Use		See Letter/e-mail/ attachment: opposed-	
200	El Centro	330 acres- 599/ Camino la Tierra		Mixed Use	Residential Estate	See Letter/e-mail/ attachment: County assigned zoning did not include participation of surrounding property owners and no evaluation of alternatives. In prior attempts- county rejected the master plan 1999, MP expired	
201	El Centro	330 acres- 599/ Camino la Tierra		Mixed Use		See Letter/e-mail/ attachment: opposed visual blight, noise, light traffic; county should purchase for open space for recreation and conservation	
202	El Centro	330 acres- 599/ Camino la Tierra		Mixed Use		See Letter/e-mail/ attachment: inconsistent with SGMP objectives for transitions and preservation of open space, opposed visual blight, noise, light traffic;	
203	El Centro	330 acres- 599/ Camino la Tierra		Mixed Use		inconsistent with SGMP objectives for transitions and preservation of open space, opposed visual blight, noise, light traffic;	
204	El Norte	Truchas y Zorro Subdivision		Rural Residential	Residential Community	See Letter/e-mail/ attachment: two zoning categories across one parcel- error- conflicts with SLDC; should be similar to surrounding/ adjacent properties	









GMA	Property	Parcel #	Assigned Zoning	Requested Zoning	General Comment	Link
205	El Centro	44 acres- Las Campanas Town Center	980001322	Mixed Use		See Letter/e-mail/ attachment: as owner of lot 614, 5 Peregrine: objection to mixed us zoning 
206	El Centro	44 acres- Las Campanas Town Center	980001322	Mixed Use		See Letter/e-mail/ attachment: as owner of lot 612, 14 Greywolf: objection to mixed us zoning 
207	El Centro	44 acres- Las Campanas Town Center	980001322	Mixed Use		See Letter/e-mail/ attachment: as owner of lot 614, 3 Peregrine: objection to mixed us zoning 
208	El Centro	44 acres- Las Campanas Town Center	980001322	Mixed Use		See Letter/e-mail/ attachment: opposed to Mixed use default zoning is residential w min lot size of 2.5 to change now is unfair to residents; current owner has shown no commitment / interest in community or Santa FE 
209	El Centro	44 acres- Las Campanas Town Center	980001322	Mixed Use		See Letter/e-mail/ attachment: opposed to dramatic change; impacts to scenic views, low density residential character 
210	El Centro	44 acres- Las Campanas Town Center	980001322	Mixed Use		See Letter/e-mail/ attachment: opposed 
211	El Centro	44 acres- Las Campanas Town Center	980001322	Mixed Use	Residential Estate	See Letter/e-mail/ attachment: opposed to dense development being imposed on rural areas- support our rural lifestyles; value of Scenic Bypass 
212	El Centro	44 acres- Las Campanas Town Center	980001322	Mixed Use		See Letter/e-mail/ attachment: opposed - density that could bring more than 880 units would impact road and water 
213	El Centro	44 acres- Las Campanas Town Center	980001322	Mixed Use		See Letter/e-mail/ attachment: opposed: MU is inconsistent with the area; would support limitation to specific development project approved by the Las Campanas HOA 





GMA	Property	Parcel #	Assigned Zoning	Requested Zoning	General Comment	Link	
214	El Centro	44 acres- Las Campanas Town Center	980001322	Mixed Use		See Letter/e-mail/ attachment: we pay a lot of taxes to enjoy quiet lovely neighborhood	
215	El Centro	44 acres- Las Campanas Town Center	980001322	Mixed Use		See Letter/e-mail/ attachment: impact nature of the neighborhood- peace and quiet lost forever	
216	El Centro	44 acres- Las Campanas Town Center	980001322	Mixed Use		See Letter/e-mail/ attachment: alarmed at high- density commercial- does not respect height and density restrictions of the neighborhood covenants	
217	El Centro	44 acres- Las Campanas Town Center	980001322	Mixed Use	Residential Estate	See Letter/e-mail/ attachment: opposed to 48' height and 20 du per acre residential density, impacts to traffic, investment in low density residential area	
218	El Centro	44 acres- Las Campanas Town Center	980001322	Mixed Use		See Letter/e-mail/ attachment: opposed; will move if approved	
219	El Centro	44 acres- Las Campanas Town Center	980001322	Mixed Use		See Letter/e-mail/ attachment: opposed; inconsistent with current housing, expectation for low density residential neighborhood	
220	El Centro	44 acres- Las Campanas Town Center	980001322	Mixed Use		See Letter/e-mail/ attachment: The proposed zoning and density change is dramatic, to say the least.... To go from one residence per 2.5 acres to an allowed use of up to 20 units per acre at a height of up to four stories, is an extraordinary, unwarranted and completely unjustified land use change. The only benefit this could possibly bring is to allow the entity that owns the land to unreasonably profit from their recent purchase as a result of the master developer's financial problems.	








GMA	Property	Parcel #	Assigned Zoning	Requested Zoning	General Comment	Link	
221	County-wide		Residential Estate		See Letter/e-mail/ attachment: seem like it's a case of- "lets hurry up and pass this so we can see what's in it", inconsistent answers from staff, detrimental to agricultural land and production, land classified as agricultural should not now be assigned "Residential Estate" ; perhaps county is seeking to collect more taxes from smaller lots? Preserve land in a manner consistent with its history and good conservation		
222	Galisteo	NM 14	Mixed Use		See Letter/e-mail/ attachment: The San Marcos Association objects to the proposed inclusion of large blocks of "mixed use" and "industrial" zoning along State Route 14 between the County Jail and the Turquoise Trail Elementary School. We believe that it is not in the best interest of the County to extend predominantly urban zoning to what is currently a ranching and rural residential area. We also believe that the County should not dictate where such zoning should occur prior to prospective developer's submittal of a master plan - especially in large ranch holdings such as those found South of the State Penitentiary. Having the County pre-zone portions of ranch-land for either industrial or urban development provides the selected land owner with an unfair commercial advantage, greatly increases the value of the selected property, changes the character of current land use, and eliminates a significant part of the application process identified in the code. Arguments are put forward in support of these objections and suggested alternative zoning, better suited to the character of the area, are advanced.		
223	El Centro	44 acres- Las Campanas Town Center	980001322	Mixed Use	Residential Estate	Concur with the opinion of Santa Fe County Staff to change the 44 acre property owned by Las Campanas Land Holdings, LLC on Camino la Tierra and Tierra del Oro from Mixed Use to Residential Estate. Request that a methodology is established in the SLDC for "group quarter living" for all residential zoning classifications.	








GMA	Property	Parcel #	Assigned Zoning	Requested Zoning	General Comment	Link	
224	El Norte	Cuartelez	Cuartelez, NM	Residential Estate	Traditional Community	Believe community of Cuartelez more accurately reflects the defenition of Traditional Community as stated in the SLDC, and request zoning change from Residential Estate to Traditional Community for entire community.	
225	El Centro						
226	El Centro	44 acres- Las Campanas Town Center	980001322	Mixed Use		Opposed to re-zoning of 44 acre parcel in Las Campanas subdivision.	
227	El Centro	44 acres- Las Campanas Town Center	980001322	Mixed Use		Opposed to re-zoning of 44 acre parcel in Las Campanas	
228	El Centro	44 acres- Las Campanas Town Center	980001322	Mixed Use		Oppose rezoning of 44 acre tract owned by Cienda on Camino La Tierra in Las Campanas	
229	El Centro	44 acres- Las Campanas Town Center	980001322	Mixed Use		Location of 44 acre tract on zoning map sent to Las Campanas Owners Association	
230	El Centro	330 acres- 599/ Camino la Tierra		Mixed Use		Opposition to the proposed zoning change to the area of SR 599 and Camino La Tierra	
231	El Centro	44 acres- Las Campanas Town Center	980001322	Mixed Use		Oppose the rezoning of the 44 acre parcel from a current residential zoning to a mized use zoning.	
232	El Centro	44 acres- Las Campanas Town Center	980001322	Mixed Use	Residential Estate	Oppose re-zoning of Las Campanas Town Center- 44 acres.	








GMA	Property	Parcel #	Assigned Zoning	Requested Zoning	General Comment	Link	
233	El Centro	44 acres- Las Campanas Town Center	980001322	Mixed Use		Oppose rezoning to 44 acre parcel of land in the middle of Las Campanas owned by Cienda Partners.	
234	El Centro	44 acres- Las Campanas Town Center	980001322	Mixed Use		Oppose rezoning of 44 acre tract.	
235	El Centro	330 acres- 599/ Camino la Tierra		Mixed Use		Oppose rezoning of 330 acres at the junction of SR 599 and Camino la Tierra.	
236	El Centro	44 acres- Las Campanas Town Center	980001322	Mixed Use		Oppose intense development in the middle of Las Campanas by Cienda Partners or any others who seek to rezone to mixed use.	
237	El Centro	330 acres- 599/ Camino la Tierra		Mixed Use		Objection to mixed use classification on property owned by Las Campanas Land Holdings, LLC.	
238	El Centro	44 acres- Las Campanas Town Center	980001322	Mixed Use		Object to rezoning of 44 acre parcel.	
239	El Centro	44 acres- Las Campanas Town Center	980001322	Mixed Use		Objection to proposed change of zoning for the 44 acre parcel of land abutting Arroyo Calabasas and Camino la Tierra.	
240	El Centro	Las Campanas Town Center- 44 acres and 599/ Camino la Tierra-330 acres		Mixed Use		Opposition to the proposed rezoning from residential to mixed use of land across from Arroyo Vino on Camino La Tierra and the Camino la Tierra corridor from 599 to Wildflower.	










GMA	Property	Parcel #	Assigned Zoning	Requested Zoning	General Comment	Link	
241	El Centro	44 acres- Las Campanas Town Center	980001322	Mixed Use		Opposition to the proposal to rezone the 44 acre tract of land to the south of Camino la Tierra from its current residential status to mixed use status.	
242	El Centro	44 acres- Las Campanas Town Center	980001322	Mixed Use		Oppose the proposed re-zoning of the 44-acre parcel of land.	
243	El Centro	44 acres- Las Campanas Town Center	980001322	Mixed Use		Opposition to the request by Las Campanas Land Holdings, LLC to re-zone a 44 acre parcel on the south side of Camino la Tierra.	
244	El Centro	44 acres- Las Campanas Town Center	980001322	Mixed Use	Residential Estate	Opposition to the proposed establishment of Mixed Use classification for Parcel No. 980001322 through adoption of the Official County Zoning Map process.	
245	El Centro	44 acres- Las Campanas Town Center	980001322	Mixed Use		Oppose the proposed zoning change for the 44 acre parcel near Arroyo Vino restaurant which is owned by Las Campanas Land Holdings, LLC.	
246	El Centro	44 acres- Las Campanas Town Center	980001322	Mixed Use	Residential Estate	Oppose rezoning of 44 Acre parcel to mixed use.	
247	El Centro	44 acres- Las Campanas Town Center	980001322	Mixed Use		Oppose rezoning of the parcel owned by Las Campanas Land Holdings, LLC from residential to mixed use.	
248	El Centro	Las Campanas Town Center-44 acres and 599/ Camino la Tierra-330 acres		Mixed Use		Oppose mixed use zoning for both the 44 acre and the 599/ Camino la Tierra-330 acres.	

GMA	Property	Parcel #	Assigned Zoning	Requested Zoning	General Comment	Link	
249	El Centro	44 acres- Las Campanas Town Center	980001322	Mixed Use		Oppose rezoning of 44 acre parcel in Las Campanas.	
250	El Centro	44 acres- Las Campanas Town Center	980001322	Mixed Use		Oppose rezoning of 44 acre tract.	
251	El Centro	44 acres- Las Campanas Town Center and 330 acres- 599/ Camino la Tierra		Mixed Use		Opposes rezoning of both the 44 Acre and 330 Acre parcels. Hopes that the original zoning intent for the land (not retirement housing) is honored.	
252	El Centro	44 acres- Las Campanas Town Center	980001322	Mixed Use		Oppose rezoning of the 44 acre parcel.	
253	El Centro	44 acres- Las Campanas Town Center	980001322	Mixed Use	Residential Estate	Oppose the proposal to change the 44 acre tract of land south of Camino la Tierra from "residential "status to "mixed use" status.	
254	El Centro	44 acres- Las Campanas Town Center	980001322	Mixed Use		Opposed to proposed change of zoning.	
255	El Centro	44 acres- Las Campanas Town Center	980001322	Mixed Use	Residential Estate	Object to rezoning the 44 acre parcel and enlist County assistance to protect the environment and way of life.	
256	El Centro	44 acres- Las Campanas Town Center	980001322	Mixed Use		Opposes proposed rezoning of 44 acre parcel.	







GMA	Property	Parcel #	Assigned Zoning	Requested Zoning	General Comment	Link	
257	El Centro	44 acres- Las Campanas Town Center	980001322	Mixed Use		Oppose the proposed rezoning of the 44 acre parcel.	
258	El Centro	44 acres- Las Campanas Town Center	980001322	Mixed Use		Oppose the proposed change in zoning for the 44 acre tract of land owned by Las Campanas Land Holdings, LLC on Camino La Tierra, specifically the potential for high-density housing.	
259	El Centro	330 acres- 599/ Camino la Tierra		Mixed Use		Ask that the proposed rezoning not be allowed. The new zoning would impact this area environmentally and take away some of the benefits such as nature walks, biking, etc.	
260	El Centro	330 acres- 599/ Camino la Tierra		Mixed Use		Oppose proposed rezoning for 330 acre parcel at the intersection of Camino la Tierra and State Road 599.	
261	County-wide	Ranch land		Ag/Ranch		Asks Commissioner Mayfield to support reinstatement of ranch land zoning in the Proposed Zoning District Map. Certain ranch lands have been changed from one home per 140 acres to one home per 20 or 40 acres. These density changes are proposed all over the county would be better made as individual zoning changes rather than as a blanket change on the SLDC. Individual zoning changes could be approved by the Commission in a way that allowed more notification to neighborhoods near the ranch lands and more considerate thought. Reviewing each zoning change individually would provide discussions about the impacts of increased housing density on traffic density on local roads, fire protection, drinking water, and other local issues.	
262	El Centro	Las Campanas Town Center- 44 acres and 599/ Camino la Tierra-330 acres		Mixed Use		Oppose proposed rezoning of Las Campanas area to mixed use from residential.	
263	N/A					Suggestions on how to improve the interactive zoning map.	









GMA	Property	Parcel #	Assigned Zoning	Requested Zoning	General Comment	Link	
264	El Centro	44 acres- Las Campanas Town Center	980001322	Mixed Use		Oppose proposed rezoning of the 44 acre tract in Las Campanas.	
265	Galisteo	SR 14 Mixed Use Site		Mixed Use		Petition states: "Stop Santa Fe County from rezoning land along Highway 14 east and north of the Rancho San Marcos subdivision from Rural Residential to Mixed Use which includes high density residential (up to 3 stories) and commercial structures." 308 signers.	
266	El Centro	44 acres- Las Campanas Town Center	980001322	Mixed Use		Oppose rezoning of 44 acre parcel. Given the potential economic, health, and environmental impact of the proposed changes, the allotted comment time of several business days is totally inadequate.	
267	El Centro	44 acres- Las Campanas Town Center	980001322	Mixed Use		Opposition to spot zoning of parcel 980001322 (Las Campanas Town Center-44 acres).	
268	El Centro	Las Campanas Town Center-44 acres and 599/ Camino la Tierra-330 acres		Mixed Use		Oppose the rezoning from residential to mixed use in the Las Campanas area. Increased housing and commercial establishments will be a detriment and increase the water shortage problems and traffic pollution.	
269	El Centro	Hacienda del Cerezo				Attached document for the Master Plan for the tract of land.	
270	County-wide					League of Women Voters of Santa Fe County urges commissioners to finalize the approval of the zoning map so that the code will go into effect. Urge commissioners to finalize technical changes to the SLDC without weakening the code within the same time frame as the zoning map. Until the code is adopted and the zoning map approved, residents of Santa Fe County will not benefit from a consistent, up to date package of land development procedures and standards that support the sustainable growth management plan.	









GMA	Property	Parcel #	Assigned Zoning	Requested Zoning	General Comment	Link	
271	El Centro	330 acres-599/ Camino la Tierra		Mixed Use		Oppose the Proposed County Zone Map and change of zoning at La Tierra.	
272	El Centro	330 acres-599/ Camino la Tierra		Mixed Use		Oppose change in zoning in La Tierra.	
273	El Centro	44 acres- Las Campanas Town Center	980001322	Mixed Use		Oppose proposed change in zoning of the 44 acre parcel adjacent to the Fire Station.	
274	El Centro	44 acres- Las Campanas Town Center	980001322	Mixed Use		Oppose proposed mixed use development adjacent to the fire station. Would like to know where the project stands at this time and what is the process for approval.	
275	El Centro	44 acres- Las Campanas Town Center	980001322	Mixed Use		Oppose mixed use zoning proposed for a 44 acre parcel adjacent to the fire station in Camino La Tierra. Oppose for water usage, traffic, height of buildings and negative impact on property values.	
276	El Centro			Mixed Use	Rural Residential	Oppose rezoning of a section of Camino La Tierra to be Mixed Use Zoning. This is a rural residential area.	
277	County-wide	Ranch land			Ag/Ranch	The Zoning of actively utilized ranch and agricultural land (Ag/Ranch) must be shown on the official zoning map as "Ag/Ranch", regardless of where it is situated within the County. County Staff has placed several ranches in the vicinity of the City of Santa Fe (on Highway 14 near the Santa Fe Studios, for example) at risk by proposing that what is currently ranch-land be zoned as either high density "mixed use" or the highly disruptive "industrial" use. Such "pre-zoning" is inappropriate and violates the County Sustainable Growth Management Plan (SGMP) and Sustainable Land Development Code which advocate the preservation of Ranches and Agricultural properties, and that there are ample processes in the Code to permit re-zoning in the future.	


GMA	Property	Parcel #	Assigned Zoning	Requested Zoning	General Comment	Link	
278	Galisteo	235053184	Rural Fringe	Traditional Community	Comment Form. Parcel ID: 235053184. Would like to split my land for my sons. I have more than three acres.		
279	El Centro	330 acres- 599/ Camino la Tierra	Mixed Use	Rural	Oppose the MUD at 599 and Camino la Tierra.		
280	El Centro	44 acres- Las Campanas Town Center	980001322	Mixed Use	Mixed Use	Support the "Mixed Use" zoning for the 44 acre parcel in Las Campanas.	
281	El Centro	44 acres- Las Campanas Town Center	Mixed Use		Oppose mixed use classification near Las Campanas.		
282	El Centro	44 acres- Las Campanas Town Center	980001322	Mixed Use		Oppose the rezoning of the 44 acre parcel to mixed use classification.	
283	El Centro	44 acres- Las Campanas Town Center	980001322	Mixed Use		Oppose potential rezoning of Las Campanas Town Center- 44 acres to mixed use classification.	
284	El Centro	330 acres- 599/ Camino la Tierra	Mixed Use	Residential Estate		Oppose potential rezoning of 330 acres Tierra de Oro.	
285	El Centro	44 acres- Las Campanas Town Center	980001322	Mixed Use		Oppose potential rezoning of 44 acre parcel to a mixed use classification.	
286	El Centro	44 acres- Las Campanas Town Center	980001322	Mixed Use		Oppose potential rezoning for 44 acre parcel to mixed use classification.	

GMA	Property	Parcel #	Assigned Zoning	Requested Zoning	General Comment	Link	
287	El Centro	330 acres-599/ Camino la Tierra		Mixed Use		Oppose mixed use rezoning of Santa Fe Center from residential estate	
288	El Centro	44 acres- Las Campanas Town Center	980001322	Mixed Use		Object to the mixed use classification for the Las Campanas Town Center- 44 acres.	
289	El Centro	330 acres-599/ Camino la Tierra		Mixed Use		Oppose mixed use zoning in the area.	
290	El Centro	44 acres- Las Campanas Town Center	980001322	Mixed Use	Residential Estate	Oppose the rezoning of the 44 acre parcel.	
291	El Centro	44 acres- Las Campanas Town Center	980001322	Mixed Use		Oppose rezoning to the 44 acre parcel to mixed use which would allow high density development in the area.	
292	El Centro	44 acres- Las Campanas Town Center	980001322	Mixed Use	Residential Estate	Opposed to altering or change the existing zoning designation.	
293	El Centro	44 acres- Las Campanas Town Center	980001322	Mixed Use	Residential Estate	Opposed to altering or changing the existing zoning designation.	
294	El Norte	Riverside		Residential Community	Mixed Use	Would like zoning changed on Riverside A parcel. The property is, and has been for many years, a residential rental community of five residences on .9268 acres. It has been used in that manner since before 1971. Believe that the proper zoning for this property is mixed use and request that the draft SLDC zoning map be amended accordingly.	

GMA	Property	Parcel #	Assigned Zoning	Requested Zoning	General Comment	Link	
295	El Norte	Riverside		Residential Community	Mixed Use	Would like zoning changed on Riverside B. The property has been a residential rental community of eleven mobile homes and two site-built structures on 2.95 acres for many years. Classifying this property as residential community, with a maximum of one dwelling per acre, is not consistent with the uninterrupted use of the property as a mobile home park for the last forty-three + years. It is also inconsistent with the property location which is on NM 22, a high traffic area directly opposite the Tesuque post office.	
296	El Centro	330 acres-599/ Camino la Tierra		Mixed Use		Oppose proposed zoning changes because proposed development would be incompatible with surrounding area, incompatible with existing growth management plan, incompatible with existing recreational area, and incompatible with resident safety.	
297	Galisteo	Rancho San Marcos		Mixed Use	Residential Community	Oppose mixed use zoning for the large block of land stretching south from the prisons to the north edge of Rancho San Marcos and the Turquoise Trail Charter School. The proposed zoning would forever alter the residential atmosphere and could open the door for indiscriminate, unplanned and uncontrolled building on any part of the property further devaluing other parts of this rezoned property to the detriment of further development of the rezoned area.	
298	El Centro	Avanti Business Park		Commercial		Under the proposed zoning, Lot 4B of the Avanti Business park has been designated as Commercial General. Concerned that CG does not allow all the uses previously allowed in Major Commercial District. Request that uses previously allowed in Major Commercial District continue to be allowed in Commercial General District.	
299	El Centro	330 acres-599/ Camino la Tierra		Mixed Use		Oppose proposed changes from residential to mixed use.	
300	County-wide					Urge commissioners to keep the code as presented at the meeting on Dec. 3. Supports the SLDC use table as presented on December 3rd. Imposing greater restrictions on Commercial horse operations hurts individual horse owners.	

GMA	Property	Parcel #	Assigned Zoning	Requested Zoning	General Comment	Link
301	Estancia	Entranosa	Rural Residential	Rural Residential	Comment received at meeting 5.27.2014. The area north of Frost Rd (472 and North of Entranosa Rd and East of Mountain Valley Road in the far Southwest corner of Santa Fe County. All plots but 3 north of Entranosa are 10 acres or more.	
302	County-wide				Comment received at meeting 5.27.2014. Water is already at historically low levels, how can anyone consider new developments?	
303	Estancia		Residential Estate	Residential Estate	Comment received at meeting 5.27.2014. Favor the rezoning of area. Smaller acreage per residence is beneficial because 5 acres is unmanageable for most people resulting in excessive space being unkept and often littered with non-function automobiles.	
304	El Centro		Mixed Use		Comment received at meeting 5.27.2014. Against the proposed zoning change from residential to mixed use in the area of La Tierra de Oro.	
305	El Centro	Las Campanas Town Center-44 acres and 599/ Camino la Tierra-330 acres			Comment received at meeting 5.27.2014. Object to change of zoning at both 330 and 44 acre parcels in Las Campanas. Dense housing and commercial buildings will destroy habitat for wildlife, increase traffic, impact availability of water and increase flood potential, cause light pollution. There is no need to provide services to residents in the area. There will be a loss of access to trails from Camino La Tierra. Downzoning. Why is this change considered?	
306	N/A				Comment received at meeting 5.27.2014. How does a rural community with its specific ordinance with over 2 years of work (by La Cienega -La Cieneguilla Planning Committee) allow a "planned development district"?! It is counter to the mission statement and ordinance of the said communities.	
307	N/A				Comment received at meeting 5.27.2014. Need a bigger seating area.	
308	N/A				Comment received at meeting 5.27.2014. Please provide agenda at beginning of meeting.	

GMA	Property	Parcel #	Assigned Zoning	Requested Zoning	General Comment	Link	
309	Galisteo	Rancho San Marcos		Mixed Use		Comment received at meeting 5.27.2014. Adding commercial business and high density housing is not sustainable in this area. Water availability-- aquifer already serves two jails, ranches and homes. Traffic will be increasingly dangerous especially around the school. Map is impossible to read. Would like to see an analysis of increase in service, fire, education, social services and health services.	
310	N/A					I am against this it my property and I don't need the county telling me wht I can and cant do with it.	
311	El Centro	44 acres- Las Campanas Town Center	980001322	Mixed Use	Residential Estate	Oppose rezoning of 44 acre tract. Residential estate is much more appropriate.	
312	El Centro	44 acres- Las Campanas Town Center	980001322	Mixed Use		Oppose proposed rezoning of 44 acre tract near Las Campanas.	
313	El Centro	44 acres- Las Campanas Town Center	980001322	Mixed Use	Residential Estate	On behalf of Neighbors Against Mixed Use (NAMU). Do not adopt the proposed MU zoning of this parcel, zone residential estate to conform with the surrounding zoning and to avoid spot zoning per pg 58, policy 7.4 of the SGMR.	
314	El Centro	330 acres- 599/ Camino la Tierra		Mixed Use		Oppose rezoning to mixed use district of 330 acre parcel. Concerned about the problems brought on by this type of zoning, including congestion, crime and increased water use. The crass commercialization of this beautiful area is unforgivable.	
315	El Centro	330 acres- 599/ Camino la Tierra		Mixed Use		Oppose rezoning to mixed use of 330 acre parcel. Rezoning would increase congestion, crime and water use. Those who live in the area would lose a fortune in property value.	
316	El Centro	Bonanza Creek Ranch		Mixed Use	Commercial	Letter to Commissioners requesting change of zoning from Mixed Use to Commercial in order to continue filming movies in the location as well as developing opportunities for more "film tourism."	

GMA	Property	Parcel #	Assigned Zoning	Requested Zoning	General Comment	Link
317	El Centro	910001544	Residential Estate	Rural Residential	Comment Form	
318	County-wide				See attached Summary Items and Goals regarding Sand and Gravel and DCIs; and Summery on Overlay Preservation Zone for the Turquoise Trail National Scenic Byway.	