

## Tesuque Community Plan Meeting – Via WebEx

July 12, 2021

5:30 – 7:30 p.m.

### Summary of Meeting

**Facilitator:** Rosemary Romero

**Staff Present:** Robert Griego, Lucy Foma

#### Goals for the Meeting:

- Review expectations for planning committee
- Review and discuss the consensus document from subcommittee
- Develop next steps and framework

**Welcome:** Rosemary Romero introduced herself and asked those on the call to introduce themselves through the chat function. Rosemary noted that she is under contract to Santa Fe County to help facilitate the Community Plan update meetings. She reviewed Virtual Meeting Protocols, ground rules and agenda for the meeting. Rosemary noted that her contract was limited to a set number of meetings in order to resolve issues (fences and walls) and after resolution the County will continue with the planning process that will culminate in a plan sometime in the fall.

#### Overview of Planning Committee Purpose and Planning Policy/Regulatory Framework:

Robert Griego and Lucy Foma planners for Santa Fe County Santa Fe County, reminded the committee about how the process was initiated. The County adopted Resolution 2019-47 on March 27<sup>th</sup>, 2019, which established the Tesuque Community Planning Committee and authorized a community planning process for the Tesuque Community District. The committee has been meeting virtually via webex. The Tesuque Community Plan is being developed in accordance with the County's Sustainable Growth Management Plan and Sec. 2.1.4 & 2.1.5 of the Sustainable Land Development Code. County Planning staff has been working with the community to update the existing 2013 Tesuque Village Community Plan.

Lucy gave an overview of the process. Noting that the purpose of the planning committee is to develop a framework. The committee is informing a draft that will go out to the larger community and then information is integrated as possible. The point is to inform the policy upon which the plan will be reviewed by SF County staff and the final point in the process will be approval by the Board of County Commissioners.

Rosemary asked Robert and Lucy to describe the outreach process used for all of the community planning efforts. Lucy reported that the County uses the Assessor's database to send notice to all of the property owners; postcards are sent and sometimes flyers had been used. Lucy and Robert developed an invitation letter, sent it out to the planning group for suggestions and it was sent to approximately 800 names.

**Review of Subcommittee Work:** When the group reached impasse in the fall, a subcommittee was formed to work on developing a Decision-Making process for the whole group to use when the issues seemed intractable. The subcommittee was formed and over several months developed a full report and a synthesized presentation document for the group to consider. These are posted on the County website.

The facilitator noted that at the end of the meeting the group would discuss how this process will be utilized for the next meeting.

**Review previous options for fences and walls:** Three members of the Consensus Subcommittee had developed ideas from their own perspective about how to resolve the issues on fences and walls. Each presenter was given 2 minutes to give an overview of their ideas with a few clarifying questions from those present. Bruce MacAllister had written his ideas down and presented these to the group. Lyn Pickard and Randy Randolph gave overviews of their ideas. Some comments were received via chat, and these are available in a separate document.

Rosemary suggested that it would be helpful for these options to be discussed by the 3 presenters to determine if they could reach resolution. If possible, a single option would be presented to group and the consensus model would be used at the next meeting.

**Next Meeting:**

Monday, August 9, 2021 – Via WebEx

5:30 – 7:30 p.m.

documents for the planning effort can be found on the County Website as follows:

[https://www.santafecountynm.gov/growth\\_management/community\\_planning\\_center/tesuque](https://www.santafecountynm.gov/growth_management/community_planning_center/tesuque)

**Webex Chat dialogue from 7.12.21**

from Bruce MacAllister to everyone: 5:31 PM

BRB

from Dawn Williamson to everyone: 5:37 PM

Ted and Dawn Williamson - dawnwilliamson@gmail.com

from Bruce MacAllister to everyone: 5:37 PM

Bruce MacAllister, bruce@bizexteam.com, 1473 Bishops Lodge Road

from Christopher Ortega to everyone: 5:37 PM

chris ortega : crizzo\_tega@yahoo.com

from Robert Griego to everyone: 5:37 PM

Add your email here to be part of Tesuque email list.

from Brecken Larson to everyone: 5:37 PM

Brecken Larson bnl@santafelawgroup.com

from Sue Barnum to everyone: 5:37 PM

Sue Barnum, spontasue@gmail.com

from Lynn P to everyone: 5:37 PM

Lynn Pickard lynnpickard1@yahoo.com

from David J. Perez to everyone: 5:37 PM

David Perez dj.perez@me.com

from Patrick Hanson to everyone: 5:37 PM

Paatrick Hanson

from colin to everyone: 5:37 PM

Colin & Suzette Keegan

from Megan Seret to everyone: 5:37 PM

Megan Seret meganseret@gmail.com

from Benjamin Shield to everyone: 5:37 PM

Benjamin Shield benjaminshield@gmail.com 1474 Bishops Lodge Road

from Stephen Ross to everyone: 5:38 PM

Stephen Ross srosslaw@cybermesa.com

from colin to everyone: 5:38 PM

colin.keegan635@gmail.com

from Micheline Devaurs to everyone: 5:38 PM

Micheline Devaurs devaurs@yahoo.com

from Margo Cutler to everyone: 5:38 PM

margo@margocutler.com

from Patrick Hanson to everyone: 5:38 PM

Patrick Hanson p.a.hanson@comcast.net

from Karen Buxbaum to everyone: 5:38 PM

karen.buxbaum@gmail.com

from Melanie Corcoran to everyone: 5:38 PM

Melanie and Brian Corcoram, melcor2244@gmail.com

from Tom Heinemann to everyone: 5:38 PM

Tom and Kerry Heinemann (19 Tesuque Hill Road) -- heinemann4@verizon.net; kxmwas@gmail.com

from Robert Griego to everyone: 5:38 PM

Raising the hand will recognize you

from Karen Buxbaum to everyone: 6:05 PM

At least one person is not muted. Please everyone stay muted unless called on to speak.

from Lucy Foma, SF County to everyone: 6:12 PM

Santa Fe County works with communities by engaging a Consensus Decision-Making Process. The County's definition can be found in the Sustainable Growth Management Plan (SGMP): Community planning committees should use a consensus decision-making process. A consensual process can be described as general agreement between multiple viewpoints and opinions in order to generate effective alternatives to create the most viable decisions for the community planning committee. P 251

from Lucy Foma, SF County to everyone: 6:16 PM

Subcommittee report can be found here:

[https://www.santafecountynm.gov/growth\\_management/community\\_planning\\_center/tesuque](https://www.santafecountynm.gov/growth_management/community_planning_center/tesuque)

from Sue Barnum to everyone: 6:16 PM

Bruce, are you going to go over the fences and walls issues?

from Lucy Foma, SF County to everyone: 6:17 PM

<https://www.santafecountynm.gov/media/files/Planning/Tesuque/Tesuque%20Fence%20and%20Wall%20Background%20July%202021.pdf>

from Sue Barnum to everyone: 6:20 PM

Thanks, Bruce.

from Lucy Foma, SF County to everyone: 6:22 PM

Thanks Lynn

from Lucy Foma, SF County to everyone: 6:26 PM

Thanks Randy

from Lucy Foma, SF County to everyone: 6:32 PM

Thanks Bruce

from Lucy Foma, SF County to everyone: 6:32 PM

And thank you Lynn for clarifying

from Lucy Foma, SF County to everyone: 6:33 PM

A reminder again, please everyone private message me with your email so we can keep you on the list!  
Thanks!

from Bruce MacAllister to everyone: 6:35 PM

Currently, it is my understanding that there is a blanket 6' Hieght limiitation for all fences and walls

from Marshall Hunt to everyone: 6:41 PM

marshall@nedco.com

from Jack Jackson to everyone: 6:41 PM

Jack Jackson jjac963@gmail.com

from Jamie Gagan to everyone: 6:41 PM

Jamie Gagan, dancelzard@comcast.net

from Lucy Foma, SF County to everyone: 6:41 PM

Thank you everyone!

from Annie-Laurie Coogan to everyone: 6:42 PM

Annie-Laurie Coogan email is cooganal@gmail.com

from Lynn P to everyone: 6:43 PM

My understanding of general wall heights is 6' in Tesuque and 8' elsewhere in the county. I must confess that I don't understand county standards on fences on top of retaining walls.

from Bruce MacAllister to everyone: 6:44 PM

Here! Here! Peter!

from Sue Barnum to everyone: 6:45 PM

Hooray, Peter!!!

from Lucy Foma, SF County to everyone: 6:45 PM

Thanks, Peter!

from Lynn P to everyone: 6:45 PM

Thank you Peter

from Robert Griego to everyone: 6:45 PM

Thank you!

from Jamie Gagan to everyone: 6:47 PM

agree with the safety issues, very poor visibility and narrow curves already. Hardly space for two cars without the bikes and pedestrians in some areas. During monsoons these become rivers and accentuate erosion.

from Bruce MacAllister to everyone: 6:47 PM

+1 Jamie!

from Megan Seret to everyone: 6:47 PM

I would like to mention that the fences and walls restrictions are not cookie cutter. The current restrictions impose undue hardship on those along BLR and TVR without taking into consideration all the rights taken from property owners (privacy, security, safety, etc) for the benefit of those that do not live along those roads

from Megan Seret to everyone: 6:48 PM

there are several areas where it is not possible to move a fence farther from the road.

from Annie-Laurie Coogan to everyone: 6:48 PM

I agree with safety issues bishops lodge road is a very active wildlife corridor and more and more bicycles and walkers are present. Anything we can do to enhance safety for all three groups is very important. AL Coogan

from Sue Barnum to everyone: 6:49 PM

I would strongly encourage some focus on the wildlife corridors, side fences, and public safety. We must consider that public safety is AS important as property rights.

from Megan Seret to everyone: 6:49 PM

It should be each property owners choice to maintain a visual into their property or allow lower fences for wildlife

from Bruce MacAllister to everyone: 6:49 PM

To Megan's point, there needs to be flexibility. There are some houses located well within the 25' setback who could value privacy.

from Megan Seret to everyone: 6:49 PM

safety is of course important, but I do think that we need a more collaborative approach

from Sue Barnum to everyone: 6:50 PM

And how would that work, Megan?

from Megan Seret to everyone: 6:50 PM

million dollar question

from Megan Seret to everyone: 6:50 PM

It is hard to please everyone

from Sue Barnum to everyone: 6:50 PM

But we must take public safety into consideration, something we currently do not do.

from Megan Seret to everyone: 6:51 PM

fences are not the only way to improve public safety

from Megan Seret to everyone: 6:51 PM

what about speed humps or tables?

from Bruce MacAllister to everyone: 6:51 PM

yes, Sue. I think there is a reasonable middle that we can reach around fences, while addressing safety in a variety of ways, beyond just fences/walls

from Megan Seret to everyone: 6:52 PM

those do not require property owners to sacrifice anything and lower speed for pedestrians and bikes

from Margo Cutler to everyone: 6:52 PM

it is my understanding that you can't have speed humps or tables on that kind of road. Margo

from Margo Cutler to everyone: 6:52 PM

also drainage issues from heavy rain runoff on BL RD

from Bruce MacAllister to everyone: 6:53 PM

Thanks so much to Lucy, Robert, and Rosemary for your patience, assistance, and expertise!

from Megan Seret to everyone: 6:53 PM

I can attest that BLR currently does not drain well

from Lucy Foma, SF County to everyone: 6:53 PM

Thanks Bruce and everyone for participating!

from dale osmun to everyone: 6:53 PM

Yes speed bumps in village center!

from Sue Barnum to everyone: 6:53 PM

Being able to see around corners is critical. Speed humps are also a way to slow the traffic. Consensus usually requires some flexibility on boundaries.

from Megan Seret to everyone: 6:53 PM

in fact that is one of the areas that the fence seems to help

from Randolph Buckley to everyone: 6:53 PM

Randy Buckley [rfbuckley@earthlink.net](mailto:rfbuckley@earthlink.net)

from Lucy Foma, SF County to everyone: 6:54 PM

Thanks Randy!

from Patrick Hanson to everyone: 6:54 PM

What about slowing the flow with strategically placed stop signs?

from Bruce MacAllister to everyone: 6:54 PM

there are lots of traffic calming systems that we can recommend.

from Megan Seret to everyone: 6:54 PM

Sure. I think that is part of the flexibility that is needed. Safety is important. I love to walk around the valley but it is difficult

from Sue Barnum to everyone: 6:54 PM

I would prefer speed tables rather than stop signs. People are pretty good at running stop signs but speed tables slow them down!

from Bruce MacAllister to everyone: 6:56 PM

thank you Rosemary!

from Lynn P to everyone: 6:56 PM

Bruce, Will you coordinate the meeting between the three of us?

from Sue Barnum to everyone: 6:56 PM



Thank you, Rosemary.

from Christopher Ortega to everyone: 6:56 PM

speed tables near the school especially

from Bruce MacAllister to everyone: 6:56 PM

I will send out a Zoom invitation if that makes sense