

Pojoaque Valley Planning Committee Meeting Summary
Thursday, April 6th, 2006 6:30pm – 8:30pm
Sammy Quintana Community Board Room

(Note: This is a meeting summary and is not intended to give the meeting contents in its entirety. If you would like to get more details about the meeting, please contact another committee member that was present at the meeting, or the SF County Planning staff.)

David Dogruel opened the meeting at 6:40pm and was assisted by County Planning staff.

Announcements:

Chuck Berger announced that 460 names were collected for the Qwest petition. He will be submitting it to the Public Regulations Commission office and will co-sign it on behalf of the PVPC. The group then talked about antennae needs to be able to receive wireless connections through adobe walls and over tall trees in the Valley.

Amelia Garcia announced that County Road 84 will finally have speed bumps implemented through County funding. The portion of the road that the County has funding for and will start construction promptly will be the section from the river, and head west to Calle Patron. This area is the narrowest section of the road.

Renee V. gave a recap of the DOT/ Louis Berger public forum for 84/285 highway construction that was held on Wednesday, March 29th. Nothing was finalized for the road design, but the public was able to express their opinions about the project. The consulting firm and the DOT promised to do more individual outreach to get input from residents, especially those living right off of the highway.

Land Use Table:

The committee went over the residential section of the land use table to determine what types of residential structures should be permitted, conditional, special, or not permitted. The points below were the discussions brought up for each section.

Residential Uses:

- ⇒ Single-Family/Manufactured Homes were kept as a Permitted Use.
 - The committee discussed the difference between studios vs. guest homes and County staff answered questions concerning the conversion of studios to guest homes and what requirements would be involved.
- ⇒ Duplexes:
 - Questions were raised about if a house that has extra bedrooms could convert that portion of the house to rental units. How would these be viewed? Jack thinks that this would be considered a separate dwelling unit and would have to follow regulations for this. There would also have to be enough acreage, water/sewage requirements to make this work.
 - Conditional vs. Permitted – Jack said we shouldn't make it harder for people to do what they originally could legally do. Duplex requires 1.5 acres anyway to build.
 - The group went back between what will actually be enforced and what should go through a review process.
 - Does the duplex housing model fit in more with what we are trying to achieve with the plan? Is this a family issue and also a density issue (preservation of rural character).
 - A duplex is also an affordable housing option.
 - Jack said it's always the aberrations of different scenarios that make things more complex to interpret the Code.

- The group changed duplexes to a Permitted use.
- ⇒ Multi-family Dwellings:
 - David D. said that it comes down to appropriate development
 - Lynne Velasco stated she supports family compounds and the practice of preserving agricultural land and open space.
 - Jack said that we should think about the difference in cost – making apartments is a cheaper option than family compounds with a higher density. There is also an economic component to them. Have to decide if the community needs apartments. The way municipalities' work is that they designate areas for apt dwellings. It works differently for rural areas.
 - Carlos stated that if you inherit land, apartments or additions to existing homes seem to be other viable options for development.
 - David Ortiz added that historically this is how family's used to deal with growth - adding rooms to the existing house.
 - Carl asked if we could we have additional constraints. David D. said that the constraints could possibly focus more on the design guidelines for building.
 - The Committee decided to keep multi-family dwellings as a Special Use.
- ⇒ Manufactured Home Communities/Subdivisions – keep as a Special use
- ⇒ Manufactured Homes vs. Mobile Home
 - There is not a clear distinction between the two; same kind of use, but they are put in two different categories
 - Mobile homes are put in there for historical purposes and the only distinction is that when using the term mobile home, the Code refers to those homes that are pre-1976.
 - Committee agreed to keep as them as a Permitted Use.
- ⇒ Upper Floor Residential:
 - Carl said that this category might be a loophole to have a commercial business within a residential area, that wouldn't necessarily comply with the land use guidelines for those commercial properties in designated commercial districts.
 - David D. said that business use would still have to commensurate with the commercial uses indicated in the rest of the land use table.
- ⇒ Community Residential Homes:
 - Committee wants to add that these developments shall be reviewed by the LDRC
 - County will need to find out more details about the requirements under State law.
- ⇒ Family Compounds –
 - These should be allowed as long as there are water and lot size requirements
 - Jack asked what would best fit for the Valley residents and family legacy?
 - David O. said that we need to keep in mind about our goals to preserve agricultural spaces. We should support this kind of development.
 - Need to look at more compound living options, not just family related options. – How can we incorporate the compound model into this plan if it loosely exists in the Code?
 - Helenty Homan's project with the Jacona Land Trust did it with the existing Code – how can we continue these types of models?

The committee decided to continue this discussion at the next meeting. The next meeting date will be on Thursday, April 20th at the Sammy Quintana Board Room from 6:30-8:30pm. Notes by R.V.