



Comm ent ID	First Name	Last Name	Communit y/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
35	Pam	Henline	Eldorado	7.3.3 Setbacks	Other SLDC Amendme nt	Commentor (ECIA Board Vice President) requests that side setbacks be changed to 20 ft from 25 ft in Eldorado.	As #34
34	Katherine	Mortimer	Eldorado	7.3.3 Setbacks	Other SLDC Amendme nt	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.
4	Charlie	Esquibel	Cuaratelez	7.11.11.4 & 7.11.11.5 No. 3 Road Design Standards	Other SLDC Amendme nt	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.

Comm ent ID	First Name	Last Name	Communit y/Area	Code Section	Comment Category	Staff Review	Staff Recommendation
5	Diana	Bryer	Cuaratelez	7.11.11.4 & 7.11.11.5 No. 3 Road Design Standards	Other SLDC Amendme nt	Concern regarding road width requirements in SLDC. Commentor in Cuaratelez 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 Subdivisio ns Exemption s	Other SLDC Amendme nt	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.
8	Shirley	Madrid	Cuaratelez	7.11.12 Driveways	Other SLDC Amendme nt	Concern regarding road width requirements in SLDC. Cuaratelez cannot accommodate 38 ft. road easements.	Staff is proposing changes to address this issue.
7	Carmen	Payne	Cuaratelez	7.11.12 Driveways	Other SLDC Amendme nt	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.
17	David	Dougherty	Nambe Pojoaque Tesuque Basin	7.13.11.1.2 Water Conservati on General Requireme nts	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.

Comm ent ID	First Name	Last Name	Communit y/Area	Code Section	Comment Category	Staff Review	Staff Recommendation
46	Kim	Shanahan	Santa Fe	7.13.11.3 Indoor Conservati on	Other SLDC Amendme nt	Commentor, rep for Green Building Council, suggests adding 7.13.11.3.d: use Water Efficiency Rating Score (WERS) to prove the whole-house water consumption is equal to or lower than a home using only WaterSense plumbing fixtures as an alternative.	No change
49	Kim	Shanahan	Santa Fe	7.13.11.7 Water Harvesting	Supports Proposed Change	Commentor, rep for Green Building Council, suggests broader use and requirement of rainwater catchment systems and suggests catchment systems must be proven compliant through the Water Efficiency Rating Score (WERS) analysis as an alternative.	Section changed.
22			Nambe	7.13.11.2 Outdoor Conservati on	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.
33	Lynn	Pickard	Tesuque Valley Communit y Associatio n (TVCA)	7.13.11.1. 2 Water Conservati on; 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
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
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 barrells and two pumice wicks which serve his property well.	No change

Comm ent ID	First Name	Last Name	Communit y/Area	Code Section	Comment Category	Staff Review	Staff Recommendation
47	Kim	Shanahan	Santa Fe	7.14 Energy Efficiency	Other SLDC Amendme nt	Commentor, rep for Green Building Council, suggests striking language about ASHRAE and adding a ventilation equation Fan CFM=0.01Floor +7.5 (Nbr+1) and table 7.14.2.4 Ventilation Air Requirements, cfm	Changes made to section
21	Robert	Kreger		7.14 Energy Efficiency	Other SLDC Amendme nt	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.
40	Frank	Herdman	Santa Fe	7.17.10.6 Terrain Managem ent: Setbacks	Other SLDC Amendme nt	Add language to clarify exception to setback requirement of one hundred feet; how a setback of less than one hundred feet from ridge, ridgetop, ridgeline or shoulder can result in structure being less visible from public right of way.	Change made
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.
39	Frank	Herdman	Santa Fe	7.17.10.3. 1 Terrain Managem ent: Disturbed Area Limitation	Other SLDC Amendme nt	Add exception for lots created prior to MSRD: disturbed area not to exceed 10% of total lot.	No change
41	Frank	Herdman	Santa Fe	7.17.10.8 Terrain Managem ent: Exceptions (NEW)	Other SLDC Amendme nt	Commentor proposes adding a new category to subsection Lighting, "Exceptions," with two factors: 1) whether exceptions allow for appropriate development similar to existing development, 2) whether lot was created prior to SGMP/SLDC.	No change

Comm ent ID	First Name	Last Name	Communit y/Area	Code Section	Comment Category	Staff Review	Staff Recommendation
42	Frank	Herdman	Santa Fe	7.17.11.1 Terrain Management: Development at or above 7800 Feet in Elevation	Other SLDC Amendment	Commentor proposes adding exceptions to subsection 7.17.11.1 such as in comment #41.	No change
43	Frank	Herdman	Santa Fe	7.17.11.2 (NEW) Terrain Management: Applicability	Other SLDC Amendment	Commentor proposes adding new category, "Applicability," that provisions of Section 7.18.11.1 shall not apply to lots that were created prior to adoption of regulations that governed the MSRD.	No change
38	Frank	Herdman	Santa Fe	7.17.9.2 Terrain Management: Steep Slodes, Ridge tops, Ridgelines, and Shoulders.	Other SLDC Amendment	7.17.9.2.2 Strike definition of "shoulder" of slope.	Change made
48	Kim	Shanahan	Santa Fe	7.24 Swimming Pools	Other SLDC Amendment	Commentor, rep for Green Building Council, suggests striking all of 7.24.1-2; striking 7.23.3.3.1 (allowing new pools to be exempt from restrictive water covenants); striking 7.24.4.1-2 (allow replace of pools w/o restriction). Staff met w/ applicant.	Comment withdrawn.

Comm ent ID	First Name	Last Name	Communit y/Area	Code Section	Comment Category	Staff Review	Staff Recommendation
50	Jose	Varela-Lopez	County	7.3.3 Setbacks	Other SLDC Amendme nt	Commentor reccomends that Setbacks in the larger scale zoning districts be amended to allow for clustering housing in order to preserve contiguous open space.	No change
19	Robert	Romero	La Cienega	8.11.3.5 Community Overlay District Regulations	Other SLDC Amendme nt	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 Ammend ment	Commentor wants reduction of minimum lot size for family transfer in AR district to be eliminated.	No change
2	Nancy	Tapp	Los Cerrillos/ Madrid	9.4 Los Cerrillos Community District Overlay & 9.6 Madrid Community District Overlay	Other SLDC Amendme nt	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 Amendme nt	Concerns regarding rezoning requirements in SLDC. Dissatisfied with restrictions on small businesses in Cerrillos.	No change

Comm ent ID	First Name	Last Name	Communit y/Area	Code Section	Comment Category	Staff Review	Staff Recommendation
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.
54	Rick	Iannucci	San Marcos	9.14	Other SLDC Amendme nt	Commentor concerned that provisions in code for agricultural uses and accessory structures should be consistent throughout the County. Standards for setbacks in San Marcos are too restrictive in rural distirct.	Horse section changed. Still is a C for non-personal horses.
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
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

Comm ent ID	First Name	Last Name	Communit y/Area	Code Section	Comment Category	Staff Review	Staff Recommendation
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
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
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
15	Ross	Lockridge	Cerrillos	10.19. Small Scale Sand and Gravel Extraction & Section 11.10 DCIs	Other SLDC Amendme nt	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



Comm ent ID	First Name	Last Name	Communit y/Area	Code Section	Comment Category	Staff Review	Staff Recommendation
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
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
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
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

Comm ent ID	First Name	Last Name	Communit y/Area	Code Section	Comment Category	Staff Review	Staff Recommendation
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
55	Jim	Kuipers	Cerrillos (on behalf of Ross Lockridge)	10.19. Small Scale Sand and Gravel Extraction	Other SLDC Amendme nt	Commentor, a mining engineer, examined whether a "less than 5 acre" mine can be designated to extract 20,000 tons and found that this acreage would be technically sufficient for that operation. Comment supports recategorizing small scale extraction.	No change. BCC direction to stay at 10 acres.
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
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

Comm ent ID	First Name	Last Name	Communit y/Area	Code Section	Comment Category	Staff Review	Staff Recommendation
37	Oscar	Huber	Madrid	10.19 Small Scale Sand and Gravel Extraction & Section 11.10 DCIs	Opposes Proposed Change	Opposes restrictions on sand and gravel extraction. Set-backs should remain the same, duration should not be limited (no other business has a time limit) and size of operation should remain. BCC directed add. setback & duration, remains 10 acres	No change
26	Allyn	McCray	Rancho San Marcos	10.19. Small Scale Sand and Gravel Extraction	Other SLDC Amendme nt	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
44	Lori		Madrid	10.24.2.2 Tap Room or Tasting Room	Other SLDC Amendme nt	Commentor requests Madrid community allow tap & tasting rooms in Commercial Neighborhood District. Staff met with Madrid Planning Committee & committee members supported this use for CN.	Change made
51	Jose	Varela-Lopez	County	10.3 Accessory Structures	Other SLDC Amendme nt	Commentor concerned about administriation of code requiremens for accessory uses specifically if code requirements are not applicale for permit. Staff spoke to commentor about specific issue.	No change
53	Rick	Iannucci	San Marcos	10.3.2.4	Other SLDC Amendme nt	Commentor concerned that provisions in code for agricultural uses and accessory structures need to be clarified and process should be straightforward.	No change
36	Oscar	Huber	Madrid	11.3 DCI Designatio n	Other SLDC Amendme nt	Commentor requests adding a new designation, "11.3.7 Reclamation" to differential reclaiming tailings from the extractive process of mining. DCI section to be revised in 2017.	No change

Comm ent ID	First Name	Last Name	Communit y/Area	Code Section	Comment Category	Staff Review	Staff Recommendation
45	Michael	Wright	Madrid	11.3 DCI Designatio n	Other SLDC Amendme nt	Commentor requests adding a new designation, "11.3.7 Reclamation" to differential reclaiming tailings from the extractive process of mining. DCI section to be revised in 2017.	As #36
52	Jose	Varela- Lopez	County	Use Matrix	Other SLDC Amendme nt	Need to identify shooting ranges on the Use Matrix and define standards so that this use can be regulated.	No change