



Comment ID	First Name	Last Name	Community /Area	Code Section	Comment Category	Staff Review	Staff Recommendation
27	Warren	Thompson	Rancho Viejo	1.11.3 Permits and Approvals with Vested Rights	Opposes Proposed Change	Commentor is concerned regarding proposed language to permits & approvals and indicates that this may be in conflict with the definition of vested rights in SLDC.	Staff is proposing changes to address this issue.
28	Warren	Thompson	Rancho Viejo	6.6.7 Expiration of TIA	Opposes Proposed Change	Commentor is concerned that proposed language regarding expiration of TIA may place new mitigation burdens after development plan approval and create financial uncertainty and risk for developer.	No change
34	Katherine	Mortimer	Eldorado	7.3.3 Setbacks	Other SLDC Amendment	Commentor (chair of the Architecture Committee) requests that side setbacks be changed to 5 ft from 25 ft in Eldorado. Commentor argues that 25 ft side setbacks would make many of the existing homes non-conforming.	Exceptions have been proposed.
35	Pam	Henline	Eldorado	7.3.3 Setbacks	Other SLDC Amendment	Commentor (ECIA Board Vice President) requests that side setbacks be changed to 20 ft from 25 ft in Eldorado.	As #34

Comment ID	First Name	Last Name	Community /Area	Code Section	Comment Category	Staff Review	Staff Recommendation
4	Charlie	Esquibel	Cuaratelez	7.11.11.4 & 7.11.11.5 No. 3 Road Design Standards	Other SLDC Amendment	Concern regarding road width requirements in SLDC. Commentor states that Cuartelez cannot accommodate 38 ft. road easements.	Staff is proposing changes to address this issue.
5	Diana	Bryer	Cuaratelez	7.11.11.4 & 7.11.11.5 No. 3 Road Design Standards	Other SLDC Amendment	Concern regarding road width requirements in SLDC. Commentor in Cuartelez indicates she would lose 10 ft. of her house if her road needed to become 38 ft.	Staff is proposing changes to address this issue.
23			Nambe	7.11.11.4.3 Standards for Land Divisions and Subdivisions Exemptions	Other SLDC Amendment	Nambe SLDC group requests that exemptions to reduce road width in 7.11.11.4.3 be applied to offsite and on-site roads.	Staff is proposing changes to address this issue.
7	Carmen	Payne	Cuaratelez	7.11.12 Driveways	Other SLDC Amendment	Concern regarding road width requirements in SLDC. Commentor concerned that her land subdivision doesn't meet the exemptions because she has no family to transfer to and therefore still has to meet the 38' easement.	Staff is proposing changes to address this issue.
8	Shirley	Madrid	Cuaratelez	7.11.12 Driveways	Other SLDC Amendment	Concern regarding road width requirements in SLDC. Cuartelez cannot accommodate 38 ft. road easements.	Staff is proposing changes to address this issue.

Comment ID	First Name	Last Name	Community /Area	Code Section	Comment Category	Staff Review	Staff Recommendation
17	David	Dougherty	Nambe Pojoaque Tesuque Basin	7.13.11.1.2 Water Conservation General Requirements	Opposes Proposed Changes	Commentor opposes SLDC revision that requires a well use reduction even for a lot line adjustment- cites the Aamodt Settlement in the Nambe Pojoaque Tesuque Basin (states there is now adequate water for the existing users, both Pueblo and non-Pueblo).	Change made to water restriction regarding Aamodt.
33	Lynn	Pickard	Tesuque Valley Community Association (TVCA)	7.13.11.1.2 Water Conservation; 7.13.11.5 Domestic Well Use Metering	Opposes Proposed Change	TVCA requests more time to review changes. TVCA opposes SLDC revision that requires a well use reduction even for a lot line adjustment- cites the Aamodt Settlement. Members concerned about "approved" well meters, & about cost of rainwater catchment reqs	As #17
22			Nambe	7.13.11.2 Outdoor Conservation	Opposes Proposed Change	Commentor requests that water conservation requirements should only be applied to new landscaping (not existing landscaping).	Staff is proposing changes to address this issue.
14	Jeffrey and Kathy	Lewellin	Sun Ranch	7.13.11.7 Water Harvesting	Supports Proposed Changes	Supports proposed changes to water harvesting and residential catchment requirements.	No change requested

Comment ID	First Name	Last Name	Community /Area	Code Section	Comment Category	Staff Review	Staff Recommendation
16	Mike	Schneider	Eldorado	7.13.11.7 Water Harvesting	Supports Proposed Changes	Supports rainwater catchment requirements, but proposes use of rainwater barrels instead of/as an alternative to costly cisterns. Commentor uses rainwater barrels and two pumice wicks which serve his property well.	No change
21	Robert	Kreger		7.14 Energy Efficiency	Other SLDC Amendment	Commentor requests that section 7.14 (HERS 70 rating) be amended to add that 3rd party verification is required at each stage of development and to require a final certification.	Staff is proposing changes to address this issue.
29	Warren	Thompson	Rancho Viejo	7.17.3 Buildable Area	Opposes Proposed Change	Commentor concerned that proposed requirement that a buildable area be identified for all lots is unnecessary for large lots and lots reserved for open space. May also create a problem with 7.17.3.2.	Staff is proposing changes to address this issue.
19	Robert	Romero	La Cienega	8.11.3.5 Community Overlay District Regulations	Other SLDC Amendment	Opposes allowing religious facilities in La Cienega as a permitted use- suggests that LC community plan predominantly expresses the intent of the community to remain agricultural and residential.	No change
6	Susan	Martin	Santa Fe County	8.12.5 Density Bonus	Other SLDC Amendment	Commentor wants reduction of minimum lot size for family transfer in AR district to be eliminated.	No change

Comment ID	First Name	Last Name	Community /Area	Code Section	Comment Category	Staff Review	Staff Recommendation
2	Nancy	Tapp	Los Cerrillos/Madrid	9.4 Los Cerrillos Community District Overlay & 9.6 Madrid Community District Overlay	Other SLDC Amendment	Concerns regarding rezoning requirements in SLDC. Dissatisfied with restrictions on small businesses in Cerrillos and Madrid	No change
32	Barbara	Briggs	Cerrillos	9.4 Los Cerrillos Community District Overlay	Other SLDC Amendment	Concerns regarding rezoning requirements in SLDC. Dissatisfied with restrictions on small businesses in Cerrillos.	No change
20	Lois	Lockwood	Eldorado	9.10 US 285 South Highway Corridor District Overlay	Opposes Proposed Changes	Commentor opposes change to use table which combines parking lots with parking garages.	Staff is proposing changes to address this issue.
10	Clint	Anderson	Madrid	10.19. Small Scale Sand and Gravel Extraction	Supports Proposed Changes	Supports restrictions on sand and gravel extraction. Requests additional restrictions on sand and gravel. Set-backs should be a minimum of 1,000 ft., duration of 2 years max, should be categories of under 5 acres and over 5 acres	No change
3	Steve	Shepherd	Madrid	10.19. Small Scale Sand and Gravel Extraction & Section 11.10 DCIs	Supports Proposed Change	Supports restrictions on sand and gravel extraction. Requests additional restrictions on sand and gravel. Set-backs should be a minimum of 1,000 ft., duration of 2 years max, should be categories of under 5 acres and over 5 acres	No change

Comment ID	First Name	Last Name	Community /Area	Code Section	Comment Category	Staff Review	Staff Recommendation
31	Karen	Yank	The Board of the Turquoise Trail Regional Alliance	10.19. Small Scale Sand and Gravel Extraction	Supports Proposed Change	Supports restrictions on gravel & sand mining. Also recommends: 1) minimum of 1,000 ft. setbacks; 2) 2-year duration for small-scale mines; 3) "under 5 acre zone" as Small Scale/DCI cutoff using external setbacks; 4) make DCI mines have 1,000 ft setbacks	No change
30	Susan	Kelly	Madrid	10.19. Small Scale Sand and Gravel Extraction	Supports Proposed Change	Madrid's Coal Slag is historical, and should remain. Supports restrictions on sand and gravel extraction. Requests: Set-backs should be a minimum of 1,000 ft., duration of 2 years max, should be categories of under 5 acres and over 5 acres	No change
18	Barbara	Briggs	Cerrillos	10.19. Small Scale Sand and Gravel Extraction & Section 11.10 DCIs	Supports Proposed Changes	Supports restrictions on sand and gravel extraction. Requests additional restrictions on sand and gravel. Set-backs should be a minimum of 1,000 ft., duration of 2 years max, should be categories of under 5 acres and over 5 acres	No change

Comment ID	First Name	Last Name	Community /Area	Code Section	Comment Category	Staff Review	Staff Recommendation
9	Cindy and Frank	Lux	Galisteo	10.19. Small Scale Sand and Gravel Extraction & Section 11.10 DCIs	Supports Proposed Changes	Supports restrictions on sand and gravel extraction. Requests additional restrictions on sand and gravel. Set-backs should be a minimum of 1,000 ft., duration of 2 years max, should be categories of under 5 acres and over 5 acres	No change
11	Kathryn	Toll	Eldorado Area	10.19. Small Scale Sand and Gravel Extraction & Section 11.10 DCIs	Supports Proposed Changes	Supports restrictions on sand and gravel extraction. Requests additional restrictions on sand and gravel. Set-backs should be a minimum of 1,000 ft., duration of 2 years max, should be categories of under 5 acres and over 5 acres	No change
12	Trevor	Burrowes	Madrid	10.19. Small Scale Sand and Gravel Extraction & Section 11.10 DCIs	Supports Proposed Changes	Supports restrictions on sand and gravel extraction. Requests additional restrictions on sand and gravel. Set-backs should be a minimum of 1,000 ft., duration of 2 years max, should be categories of under 5 acres and over 5 acres	No change

Comment ID	First Name	Last Name	Community /Area	Code Section	Comment Category	Staff Review	Staff Recommendation
13	Chuck	Norman		10.19. Small Scale Sand and Gravel Extraction & Section 11.10 DCIs	Supports Proposed Changes	Supports restrictions on sand and gravel extraction. Requests additional restrictions on sand and gravel. Set-backs should be a minimum of 1,000 ft., duration of 2 years max, should be categories of under 5 acres and over 5 acres	No change
25	Marie	Harding	Synergia Ranch	10.19. Small Scale Sand and Gravel Extraction	Supports Proposed Changes	Supports restrictions on sand and gravel extraction. Requests additional restrictions on sand and gravel. Set-backs should be a minimum of 1,000 ft., duration of 2 years max, should be categories of under 5 acres and over 5 acres	No change
15	Ross	Lockridge	Cerrillos	10.19. Small Scale Sand and Gravel Extraction & Section 11.10 DCIs	Other SLDC Amendment	Commenter indicates confusion on mining regs.set-backs should be a minimum of 1,000 ft., duration of 2 years max, should be categories of under 5 acres and over 5 acres. Clarify definitions and new terms "mining zone," "separation distance"	No change

Comment ID	First Name	Last Name	Community /Area	Code Section	Comment Category	Staff Review	Staff Recommendation
24	Ryan	Toups		10.19. Small Scale Sand and Gravel Extraction	Supports Proposed Changes	Supports restrictions on sand and gravel extraction. Requests additional restrictions on sand and gravel. Set-backs should be a minimum of 1,000 ft., duration of 2 years max, should be categories of under 5 acres and over 5 acres	No change
1	Kevin	Box	Tuquoise Trail	10.19. Small Scale Sand and Gravel Extraction & Section 11.10 DCIs	Supports Proposed Changes	Commentor supports proposed change to this section and asks for either NO gravel mining or very restricted gravel mining.	No change
26	Allyn	McCray	Rancho San Marcos	10.19. Small Scale Sand and Gravel Extraction	Other SLDC Amendment	Commentor opposes and indicates community opposition to mining in the San Marcos or Rancho Viejo Areas. Commentor indicates he represents 90 estate properties.	No change