



Tesuque Planning Committee Meeting Meeting Summary 8.3.20

Planning Committee Participation

After a five-month break in the Tesuque Community Planning Process due to COVID-19, the Tesuque Planning Committee convened on the WebEx virtual platform to hold a meeting on Monday, August 3rd. Nineteen community members and three staff attended the meeting. Prior to the long break, the Planning Committee had met in February to work on consensus elements under which a fence and wall section could be modified to accommodate all stakeholders. The February meeting summary reflects the conditions that the group discussed. All materials related to the 2020 Tesuque Planning Process can be found at: https://www.santafecountynm.gov/growth_management/community_planning_center/tesuque

Tesuque Plan Update Progress to Date

The Tesuque Planning Process was authorized by Board Resolution 2019-47 and began in May 2019 in accordance with the Community Planning process established in the Sustainable Land Development Code. The Plan Update process was initiated to address consistency requirements between the 2013 Tesuque Community Plan and the County's Sustainable Growth Management Plan and to address inconsistency between the Plan and the 2016 Tesuque Community District Overlay in the Sustainable Land Development Code. These inconsistencies include:

- Discrepancy between the building height specified in the 2013 Tesuque Community Plan and the 2016 Tesuque Community District Overlay in the Sustainable Land Development Code
- Differences between the uses specified for certain areas of Tesuque in the 2013 Tesuque Community Plan and how they are actually regulated in the Tesuque Use Matrix in the Sustainable Land Development Code
- Reference to outdated Ordinances in the 2013 Tesuque Community Plan
- Regulatory language within the 2013 Tesuque Community Plan that must be removed
- Outdated Land Use categories in the 2013 Tesuque Community Plan
- Differences between the fence and wall language of the 2013 Tesuque Community Plan and the fence and wall regulation within the 2016 Tesuque Community District Overlay

During the 2019 meetings, the group reviewed and approved proposed changes to update the 2013 Plan document. The group worked during the end of 2019 and early 2020 on a revised fence and wall section. These changes will be incorporated into the 2020 Tesuque Community Plan Update which will amend the 2013 Tesuque Community Plan and address only the areas of the Plan to be modified. A draft of the 2020 Tesuque Community Plan Update document was distributed to the Planning Committee in advance of the August 2020 meeting. During the August 2020 meeting, the group also reviewed proposed options for the fence and wall section:

Option 1) Revert to the County's overall fence and wall standards in Chapter 7 of the Sustainable Land Development Code

Option 2) Map certain areas along Bishop's Lodge Road where road-user safety may require different fence and wall height/material standards; allow replacement fences and walls to the same standards as built previously; follow County's Chapter 7 fence and wall standards for the rest of the community.

Option 3) Leave the existing language of the 2013 Tesuque Plan as is: maintain public views of Bishop's Lodge Road corridor by minimizing fence and wall height; maintain a 25-ft setback along Bishop's Lodge Road; provide design standards for fences and walls

Mr. Randolph Buckley also brought forward a proposal for an updated Tesuque Community District Overlay in the SLDC:

- Grandfather any existing fences for repair or replacement as long as the materials, setback distance, and height of original fence are maintained for the repair or replacement.
- Exclude the commercial area and Tesuque Village Road from areas covered by the Overlay Code on Fences and Walls.
- Restrict application of the Overlay Code on Fences and Walls to those sections of Bishops Lodge Rd where the properties that abut (share a common parallel boundary with) Bishops Lodge Road and have known traffic safety incidents or a higher risk of accidents in the future.
- For those properties covered by the Overlay Code, replace 25' defined setback for opaque fences by establishing appropriate setback and design standards based on the survey of area types while recognizing where limited room exists for setbacks on individual properties.
- Exclude requirement of landscaping (Remove paragraph 3b) in the space created by the fence setback requirement.
- Paragraph 3c height limit should apply only to fences that abut (share a common parallel boundary with) Bishops Lodge Road on properties that are covered by the setback regulations. All other fence heights revert to Santa Fe County code.
- Remove paragraph 4d in its entirety (code applies to only fences that abut Bishops Lodge Road. Neither fences between properties (side fences) nor fences/walls that front side streets from Bishops Lodge Rd are covered by Overlay code. All fences not covered by those abutting Bishops Lodge Rd would revert to County code on Fences.

Other proposals by members of the Planning Committee recommended:

- Adjust the Tesuque Community District Overlay Section 9.5.2.1.4.a to be a 4 ft. wall height limit for opaque materials, instead of a 3 ft. wall height limit for opaque materials.
- Incorporate an administrative approval process for properties where a setback or wall height requirement is not feasible.

Following the August 3rd meeting, staff identified the following points of agreement established at the meeting:

- 1) Replacement of existing fences and walls allowed to the same height and material standard as it was most recently built, but must follow current safe sight triangle requirements
- 2) Bishop's Lodge Road is the area where design standards for roads will be established with the exception of the commercial area. County standards will apply to the remainder of Tesuque.

The group discussed the options and provided suggestions and recommendations for revisions to the fence and walls section which may include either adjusting the fence and wall height to 4 ft opaque or higher with a design standard for fencing materials; having a different standard for the Rural Commercial Overlay and for all fences and walls outside of those abutting Bishop's Lodge Road.

The next Planning Committee meeting will be held on Monday, September 14th on WebEx. Meeting materials can be found at:

https://www.santafecountynm.gov/growth_management/community_planning_center/tesuque

August 3, 2020 Tesuque Planning Committee virtual chat during WebEx Meeting

8.3.20 From polafson to everyone:

We will be using chat today. Please use chat to ask a question and we will get back with you.

from Lynn P to everyone: 6:19 PM

height limitations and things in the matrix that should not have been there in the SDLC

from Ifoma to everyone: 6:22 PM

https://www.santafecountynm.gov/growth_management/community_planning_center/tesuque

from Ifoma to everyone: 6:23 PM

This is the website where all the documents in the planning process are held

from bruce mac to everyone: 6:27 PM

Lucy, how do you plan to track the other comments that people shared with you? For example, fire safety, flood setbacks, etc.?

from Lynn P to everyone: 6:27 PM

What will happen to the 2013 plan? Will that still be in existence and the new stuff just be an amendment?

from Lynn P to everyone: 6:28 PM

Thank you

from Jeanne C Boyles to everyone: 6:30 PM

Besides wall and fences what about the vegetation on BLR that block ones driving view

from Lynn P to everyone: 6:34 PM

What if we don't reach consensus?

from David Dougherty to everyone: 6:36 PM

I have a 4th option that I would like to discuss after Mr. Buckley

from bruce mac to everyone: 6:39 PM

There were some odds and ends in the February meeting that we would want to make sure do not fall through the cracks. For example confusing language about fences in the section that deals with subdividing lots, etc. How do we make sure that the whole group assesses all the issues so that nothing falls off the table?

from bruce mac to everyone: 6:40 PM

Lucy, Option 2 is the option that we reached during the February meeting, correct?

from Lynn P to everyone: 6:43 PM

I am totally confused

from David Dougherty to everyone: 6:49 PM

Chain Link, brick, board not a good idea...

from bruce mac to everyone: 6:49 PM

Robert, I do not think that permits are required for fences six feet or less. It's just that height is currently capped at 6all feet. If I'm not correct, where is the permit requirement for <6 feet???

from Lynn P to everyone: 6:49 PM

Does section 7.4 regarding safe triangles apply to existing unsafe triangels?

from Lynn P to everyone: 6:50 PM

I don't think so.

from James P. Goolsby Jr. MD to everyone: 6:50 PM

When is appropriate to ask questions or comment?

from Jeanne C Boyles to everyone: 6:51 PM

where is he

from Lynn P to everyone: 6:52 PM

Permits are required only on BLR and TVR.

from Jeanne C Boyles to everyone: 6:53 PM

I thought we has 3FT

from Jane Morrison to everyone: 6:53 PM

Dr. Tobias and I agree with Mr. Goolsby. We live on a speedway where the concept of a scenic corridor is incomprehensible. No one drives slowly enough to enjoy the scenery.

from Lynn P to everyone: 6:54 PM

9.5.2.1.2 says permits are required for BLR and TVR

from Jane Morrison to everyone: 6:54 PM

Our wall allows for some noise mitigation.

from Megan Seret to everyone: 6:57 PM

I agree regarding the traffic and speeding. Surely there are other ways to increase safety.

from bruce mac to everyone: 6:58 PM

The provision that you have highlighted clearly references fences built within 25' of Bishops Lodge Road

from Jeanne C Boyles to everyone: 6:58 PM

I think the traffic has become more as people are not working because of Covid

from Randy Buckley to everyone: 6:58 PM

misleading to use capital letter for term Scenic Corridor because this implies it has some official registration

from David Dougherty to everyone: 6:59 PM

no

from Lynn P to everyone: 6:59 PM

I favor option 3 with an administrative approval process

from Jane Morrison to everyone: 6:59 PM

NO

from Randy Buckley to everyone: 6:59 PM

yes

from Lynn P to everyone: 6:59 PM

I disagree with option 1

from Dave Morton to everyone: 6:59 PM

I would vote for county standard

from Lynn P to everyone: 7:00 PM

Administrative process

from David Dougherty to everyone: 7:01 PM

Can I propose Option 4?

from Jane Morrison to everyone: 7:01 PM

I think the "yes" and "no" are responses to different comments.

from Dave Morton to everyone: 7:01 PM

I would be fine with limitations on materials

from margo Cutler to everyone: 7:02 PM

didn't David say that he had an option 4 to propose? Shouldn't we hear it? Thx, Margo

from Dave Morton to everyone: 7:06 PM

I liked Randy's proposal especially the grandfathering clause.

from bruce mac to everyone: 7:07 PM

Randy, does "abut" mean right on Bishops Lodge Road, or walls within 25' of the road

from David Dougherty to everyone: 7:08 PM

I would like to hear from Lynn, Margo and Jeanne

from Jeanne C Boyles to everyone: 7:09 PM

I like the 4FT

from Megan Seret to everyone: 7:09 PM

I would like to comment and address my doubts that 3' or 4' would allow property owners to block noise and headlights. Bishops lodge road is raised above most properties along the road

from Lynn P to everyone: 7:10 PM

I would like to think about David's four foot suggestion. I don't think we should grandfather in replacement walls. I think TVR going north should be included in the Tesuque ordinance. I think there are reasons for all Tesuque walls to be 6' max.

from Lynn P to everyone: 7:10 PM

The flexibility can be addressed by an administrative process

from Jane Morrison to everyone: 7:10 PM

Dr. Tobias and I have walls and fences constructed before 2013 on Bishop's Lodge Road. We believe in the grandfather clause. They mitigate noise and reduce crime.

from Donna Strahan to everyone: 7:10 PM

I like the grandfathering clause in Randy's options.

from Lynn P to everyone: 7:11 PM

Hardship

from Lynn P to everyone: 7:12 PM

I suggested language in one of my emails.

from Jeanne C Boyles to everyone: 7:13 PM

I think we need to view the drive on BLR as a person coming down it for the first time Again fol

from bruce mac to everyone: 7:13 PM

In response to Lynn's comment regarding grandfathering, I thought we had already reached consensus that it would be ok to grandfather existing walls for repair. Otherwise, the consequences are that walls are left to fall down and look bad.

from Quinn Simons to everyone: 7:13 PM

Bill and Deborah Parker support grandfathering existing wall specs if replaced

from bruce mac to everyone: 7:14 PM

MacAllisters support grandfathering walls for repair purposes

from Jane Morrison to everyone: 7:14 PM

We agree with Bruce Mac

from Randy Buckley to everyone: 7:14 PM

My proposal would also exclude the commercial district as defined by zoning

from Jeanne C Boyles to everyone: 7:14 PM

Me continuing Siberian Elms etc block ones view as musc if not more than the fences

from Lynn P to everyone: 7:15 PM

We would not have consensus

from bruce mac to everyone: 7:15 PM

County standards apply to all walls with the exception of the visual corridor?

from Lynn P to everyone: 7:15 PM

Nope

from bruce mac to everyone: 7:16 PM

ANY fence or wall or just walls abutting Bishops Lodge? The distinction is critical

from Ifoma to everyone: 7:16 PM

fences and walls abutting Bishops Lodge Road

from bruce mac to everyone: 7:17 PM

Agree with David, landscaping requirement is onerous

from Lynn P to everyone: 7:17 PM

I agree with the idea that landscaping requirement can be eliminated

from Randy Buckley to everyone: 7:18 PM

where does the cou

from Dave Morton to everyone: 7:18 PM

I agree that requiring landscaping is onerous.

from Jeanne C Boyles to everyone: 7:18 PM

I am talking of wild vegetation

from Randy Buckley to everyone: 7:18 PM

where does the county require landscaping for residential properties?

from bruce mac to everyone: 7:20 PM

Can we be very clear about walls outside the "visual corridor" and walls elsewhere in the community? I believe that, beyond the visual corridor, Tesuque residents should have the same options as all County residents.

from David Dougherty to everyone: 7:20 PM

Yes, I think the intent was to break the massiveness of walls

from Randy Buckley to everyone: 7:20 PM

owners that choose to landscape between road and fence is very different than requiring it.

from Lynn P to everyone: 7:20 PM

No, Tesuque should have its own standards

from Randy Buckley to everyone: 7:21 PM

Commercial district needs to be excluded also. Very different than BLR south of school

from Lynn P to everyone: 7:21 PM

I think that part of TVR should be have the same standards as BLR.

from Jane Morrison to everyone: 7:21 PM

"Safety for Traffic?" Traffic needs to be slowed down.

from David Dougherty to everyone: 7:22 PM

Just Bishops Lodge Road

from Jeanne C Boyles to everyone: 7:22 PM

I think they are 2 different areas I agree with David I think that with

from Lynn P to everyone: 7:23 PM

May I reply to Bruce?

from Jane Morrison to everyone: 7:23 PM

We agree with Bruce Mac. Restricting property rights is offensive.

from Megan Seret to everyone: 7:23 PM

We would like to offer and write our comments as we are with our baby right now.

from Ifoma to everyone: 7:24 PM

Thank you Megan, yes please write your comments.

from David Dougherty to everyone: 7:24 PM

hear! hear!

from Megan Seret to everyone: 7:24 PM

We agree with Bruce that the County should maintain the same standards for all property owners in the county and valley. We feel in general this ordinance imposes undue hardship on those of us who happen to live along Bishops Lodge Road. Bishops Lodge Road is a main thoroughfare and not a scenic route. There are other roads in this valley that in our opinion are more scenic and reminiscent of an older time, such as Big Tesuque Canyon Road which provides access to a trail designated to the public enjoyment. We feel this ordinance is unfairly distributed among property owners in the valley. As Dr. Goolsby mentioned, BLR has

become a road with little care for the home owners. We often find trash in our property and river and loud, fast cars driving aggressively.

In our opinion, this ordinance invites additional traffic without the necessary safety measures required, such as speed humps and fence heights to address the concerns of property owners, whether it is safety of home and property, noise or aggressiv

from Megan Seret to everyone: 7:25 PM

aggressive drivers using this as a windy race track. This ordinance also does not address the topographical differences of the valley

from Megan Seret to everyone: 7:25 PM

or rather bishops lodge road

from Jane Morrison to everyone: 7:25 PM

We agree with Mr. Goolsby. Looking backwards doesn't reflect the reality on the ground in Tesuque in 2020 and for many years past.

from Randy Buckley to everyone: 7:25 PM

will the comments be distributed to all attendees?

from Jane Morrison to everyone: 7:27 PM

Thank you, Megan. We are in agreement with you. Among your other comments, we see Bishops Lodge Road as a virtual freeway, or, at least a speedway.

or rather bishops lodge road

from Jane Morrison to everyone: 7:27 PM

Thank you, Megan. We are in agreement with you. Among your other comments, we see Bishops Lodge Road as a virtual freeway, or, at least a speedway.

from David Dougherty to everyone: 7:28 PM

yes

from Randy Buckley to everyone: 7:28 PM

good with me

from Donna Strahan to everyone: 7:28 PM

yes

from Lynn P to everyone: 7:28 PM

Yes to first monday

from bruce mac to everyone: 7:28 PM

Yes

from Jeanne C Boyles to everyone: 7:29 PM

isnt thta labor day

from Jeanne C Boyles to everyone: 7:29 PM

OK

from David Dougherty to everyone: 7:29 PM

OK

from Randy Buckley to everyone: 7:29 PM

OK

from Jane Morrison to everyone: 7:30 PM

Second Monday is fine. Thank you all so much.

from James P. Goolsby Jr. MD to everyone: 7:30 PM

That sounds good

from Joanne De Phillips to everyone: 7:30 PM

Thank you!

from Megan Seret to everyone: 7:30 PM

Thank you all!

from Randy Buckley to everyone: 7:30 PM

thanks for hosting meeting

from Lynn P to everyone: 7:30 PM

Bye

from bruce mac to everyone: 7:30 PM

Thanks Lucy and Robert!

from Donna Strahan to everyone: 7:30 PM

Thank you everyone

from Quinn Simons to everyone: 7:30 PM

Thank you