

Comment #	Commenter	Date Received	Page Number	Comment	Staff Analysis	Staff Recommendation	Committee Consensus
1	Staff	1-Aug-22	0	captions/sources for *all* photos	Captions should be added to all photos.	add captions to all photos.	Yes, agree with Staff Recommendation
2	Staff	1-Aug-22	3	Add "Revised Land Use Map" to Table of Contents	There is a need to clarify that this is the Revised Land Use Map in the table of contents	Add "Revised Land Use Map" to Table of Contents	Yes, agree with Staff Recommendation
3	Public Meeting comment	27-Jul-22	5	Land Use Categories typo, repeats "Residential Community" and Traditional Community"	The duplicate was a result of the revised document and was an error.	delete the repeated categories and include the omitted categories, "Residential Fringe" and "Rural Residential"	Yes, agree with Staff Recommendation
4	Randolph Buckley	2-Aug-22	27	<p>On Page 27, Bishops Lodge Corridor & Roads, FENCES AND WALLS, Paragraph 3: BACKGROUND: The language in the Community Plan Fences and Walls section describing the section of Tesuque Village Road covered by the height restriction is not consistent with the language included in the County reviewed proposed language developed by the Sub-Committee group.</p> <p>Paragraph 2b of the Proposed Tesuque Community District Overlay 3.1 (attached below) defines sections of Tesuque Village Road that are covered by the Overlay Code:</p> <p>Section 2 defines what sections of road are subject to the Overlay Code</p> <p>2.b Fences and walls fronting or running parallel to Tesuque Village Road from the north boundaries of the Commercial Overlay A and the Traditional Community Districts and extending north to the boundary with Tesuque Pueblo. (emphasis added)</p> <p>Paragraph 4.a.i of the same document in defining what portion of Tesuque Village Road is subject to the Overlay Code maximum height references paragraph 2.b.</p> <p>Conclusion: Properties on Tesuque Village Road that are in the Traditional Community District and the Commercial Overlay A are subject only to the County Code.</p> <p>Current Language:</p> <p>This standard should be applied to properties along Bishops Lodge Road and Tesuque Village Road, except for properties that are located in the Rural Commercial Overlay A. Fence and wall height limits for properties in the Rural Commercial Overlay A should follow county code.</p> <p>Proposed Language:</p> <p>This standard should be applied to properties along Bishops Lodge Road and Tesuque Village, except for properties that are contained within the Rural Commercial Overlay A and the Traditional Community Districts. Fence and Wall heights for these excluded properties will follow County SLDC Code.</p>	Add proposed language This standard should be applied to properties along Bishops Lodge Road and Tesuque Village, except for properties that are contained within the Rural Commercial Overlay A and the Traditional Community Districts. Fence and Wall heights for these excluded properties will follow County SLDC Code.	This standard should be applied to properties along Bishops Lodge Road and Tesuque Village, except for properties that are contained within the Rural Commercial Overlay A and the Traditional Community Districts. Fence and Wall heights for these excluded properties will follow County regulations.	Yes, agree with Staff Recommendation
5	Public Meeting comment	27-Jul-22	33	Rio en Medio OS and Little Tesuque Creek Trail are not in Tesuque Community District.	Rio en Medio trail connects to SF National Forest and Tesuque Creek Trail is an adjacent trail which also connects to the SFNF.	Remove Rio en Medio open space and consider whether to include Little Tesuque Creek Trail	Yes, agree with Staff Recommendation- remove Rio en Medio Open Space, include Little Tesuque Creek Trail in Plan

6	Public Meeting comment	23-Jul-22	46	Acequias and Home owner associations should be shown on Land Use Map	HOA- County has incomplete information on HOAs in Tesuque . Acequias- there's a separate acequia map in the Plan	no change	Yes, agree with Staff Recommendation
7	Lynn Pickard	30-Jul-22	52	I suggest at least deleting the third bullet point about natural resources on the Bishop's Lodge property that should be preserved. There used to be a freshwater marsh there, and I very much enjoyed hearing the sound of redwing blackbirds as I biked past. But I haven't heard them lately, and I learned at the neighborhood meeting the other night that the marsh has not been in existence since that part of the property was repurposed for the horses. I don't know if the cottonwoods are still there. I was also told that the Lamy Chapel has been redone and is quite lovely, but it may have been taken off the historic register because it is no longer historic. I'm also not sure about the orchards and gardens. Although the community in 2013 wanted the Lodge to maintain these things, I'm not sure the master plan required them, and to my knowledge, the meeting last week was the first time the Lodge came to the community to formally explain what they were doing as part of the SLDC process.	Staff are not sure about the status of the marshland and cottonwoods.	Remove third bullet point	Yes, agree with Staff Recommendation
8	Stephen Marquart, Harvey Simon, and Christian Van Schayk	27-Jul-22	53	Placement of transfer station in Tesuque Village to replace transfer station recently closed in 2022. We request this be incorporated in future land use planning.	The closure of the Tesuque transfer station ois a concern for residents of the area and should be identified.	Identify that the closure of the County transfer station on Tribal Land is a concern for Tesuque Residents	Yes, agree with Staff Recommendation
9	Lynn Pickard	30-Jul-22	56	I have been in touch with County Public Works, but have not heard back, about putting three welcome signs at the entrances to the Tesuque, and I have also been in touch with someone at the historic preservation division about a marker across from the fire station. She told me that my emails were sufficient and that I did not need to fill out the form. I haven't heard from her in a while and I have not gotten around to contacting her. I'd like these sections of the Plan to reflect what we need to do in more general terms. I suggest: "Action- Community coordinate with Santa Fe County Public Works for fabricating and installing three metal signs at the entrances to Tesuque." and "Action- Community will work with New Mexico Historic Preservation Division to acquire a historic marker in the vicinity of the fire station on Tesuque Village Road."	Staff provided information to the TVCA about how to pursue signage for Tesuque. The suggest actions could be included in the Plan to help direct the implementation of this project.	Staff recommends proposed actions: Action- Community coordinate with Santa Fe County Public Worksto incstall three metal signs at the entrances to Tesuque." and "Action- Community will work with New Mexico Historic Preservation Division to request a historic marker in the vicinity of the fire station on Tesuque Village Road."	Yes, agree with Staff Recommendation
10	Randolph Buckley	2-Aug-22	56	Page 56 Identified Improvement Activities Current Language: "Request that the County specifically incorporate the setback and wall height provisions developed by the Community Planning Committee in its detailed discussions and agreement in the Fences and Walls subsection of the Bishops Lodge Corridor and Roads section of this plan." Proposed Language: Request that the County specifically incorporate the setback and wall height provisions developed by the Community Planning Committee in its detailed discussions and agreement as summarized in the Fences and Walls subsection of the Bishops Lodge Corridor and Roads section of this plan.	Staff agrees with the suggested edit.	Incorporate the setback and wall height provisions developed by the Community Planning Committee in its detailed discussions and agreement as summarized in the Fences and Walls subsection of the Bishops Lodge Corridor and Roads section of this plan.	Yes, agree with Staff Recommendation

