



Tract 6A Donation Proposal: Summary of Community Engagement and City Answers

The following sections (A, B) provide a comprehensive overview of the questions raised and feedback shared by the community regarding the proposed donation of Tract 6A to Homewise. This input has been gathered through both written correspondence and the July 17, 2025, community meeting hosted at the Santa Fe Main Library.

To support transparency and clarity, this content is organized into two major parts:

A. Community Questions & Answers:

The questions in this section reflect community input received through meetings and correspondence. Responses are provided by the City of Santa Fe, with some questions deferred to Homewise as the potential developer. Answers are organized according to the three categories:

1. **Questions for the City of Santa Fe** about the potential donation of Tract 6A to Homewise.
2. **Questions that cannot be answered in detail at this stage**, because the answers depend on Governing Body approval of the donation agreement and Homewise's future, proposed submissions to Land Use and, potentially, review and approval by the Planning Commission and/or other City oversight entities.
3. **Questions more appropriately directed to Homewise**, the potential developer of the site.

B. Community Feedback and Comments:

This section summarizes public concerns, ideas, and recommendations shared during the engagement process. Feedback is grouped into two categories aligned with the project's phased approach:

- **Phase 1:** Concerns related to the donation;
- **Phase 2:** Comments focused on planning, development, infrastructure, and neighborhood integration.

- In addition, detailed input gathered at the July 17 meeting is organized by four prompts used to guide discussion.
- **Emailed Concerns and Comments**

Community Questions and Answers

Section 1: Questions for the City of Santa Fe about the potential donation tract 6A to Homewise

1. Q: Why exactly was Tract 6A selected?

A: Councilor Michael Garcia, Councilor Renee Villarreal, and Mayor Alan Webber sponsored Resolution 2023-4, identifying Tract 6A as a tract of land the City should sell or donate for affordable housing.

2. Q: Will the City provide infrastructure for the development?

A: The donation agreement does not contemplate the City providing infrastructure.

3. Q: Does the City plan to connect the proposed development with the development technically known as the Northwest Quadrant Project?

A: There are currently no plans to do so.

4. Q: Why is this being rushed through?

A: The donation is not being rushed through. The Governing Body adopted Resolution 2023-4 in early 2023. The Resolution directed the donation. It is now 2.5 years later.

City of Santa Fe has spent several years preparing for the potential donation of Tract 6A to support the development of affordable housing. The overall effort has followed City processes and legal requirements. Once the donation agreement was prepared, it was scheduled for consideration by committees and the Governing Body in the normal course of business. When the City Councilors and Mayor meet to conduct the City’s business that body is collectively referred to as the “Governing Body.”

The City has made a consistent effort to engage the community and to share information as it becomes available. If the Governing Body approves the donation, Homewise will still be required to complete all standard City planning and

development steps—including submission of a Plat Application, participation in the Early Neighborhood Notification (ENN) process, and a public hearing before the Planning Commission. These steps ensure continued opportunities for public input and review.

5. **Q: Why aren't the City and Homewise considering the largest [225 acres] Tract NPR1 (across Highway 599 from Tract 6A, and opposite from Thornburg on North Ridgetop Road) for affordable housing development?**

A: The donation agreement is the result of a solicitation for developers of affordable housing on Tract 6A; the resulting agreement cannot be for land that was not part of the solicitation.

Resolution 2023-4 provided for an invitation to bid to sell the 7-Tracts with no special affordable housing component.

6. **Q: How does the City justify a transfer price of \$0 when fully 60% of the proposed residences will be sold at market price compared to 80% in a standard, SFHP-compliant single-family development? All prior public discussions indicated a possible transfer price reduction reflecting a higher percentage of affordable housing, but not a donation when over half the units were at market price.**

A: In the proposed agreement Homewise would build 40% affordable homes on Tract 6A—double the 20% required under the Santa Fe Homes Program (SFHP). This represents a significantly deeper public benefit than a typical SFHP-compliant project.

The City of Santa Fe publicly offered the land for a reduced price or no cost/donation in exchange for offers to construct affordable housing. Using the criteria established by the Governing Body, the City identified the best offer to maximize the production of affordable housing on the parcel.

A no-cost transfer supports the City's policy objective to leverage public land for the greatest affordable housing impact.

7. **Q: Why is the city unable to remove 6A from the Las Estrellas Master Association?**

A: The City of Santa Fe is not seeking any actions related to the Non-Residential Covenants. Furthermore, the terms of the Non-Residential Covenants do not provide for the Declarant to remove Tract 6A.

8. Q: Can you provide specific reasons for Homewise' request that 6A be removed from the Residential HOA?

A: In **Resolution 2023-4**, the Governing Body anticipated that an affordable housing developer would want to remove Tract 6A from the Residential Declaration of Covenants, Conditions, and Restrictions ("Residential Covenants"), in order to facilitate the flexibility that might be needed to build affordable housing. The Resolution provided that, if the selected Qualifying Entity (in this case, Homewise) deems it is necessary to remove Tract 6A from the Residential Covenants to provide affordable housing, then the City would remove the Tract from the Residential Covenants.

Important clarification: The City of Santa Fe is not taking any action in relation to the Non-Residential ("Master") Declaration of Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions (aka Non-Residential Covenants). The Non-Residential Covenants is a separate governing document and its modification would involve a different process. Mr. Garrison, acting as the City's agent, would process the removal from the Residential Covenants only.

9. Q: Why does the subordinate mortgage repayment provision as described in Exhibit D, section II-iii-d of the Donation Agreement Packet call for lien repayment to Homewise instead of the City, as is the case with standard SFHP-compliant single-family developments?

A: The Homes Program ordinance contemplates that City agents will administer key components of the City's affordable housing programs. See SFCC 1987, Section 26-1.18(D) ("Upon resale of an SFHP home or manufactured home lot, the affordability lien may be assumed by another SFHP buyer as approved by the city or its agent, or the seller must repay the SFHP lien to the city or its agent."). Homewise acts as an agent for the administration and delivery of the City's affordable housing programs. In addition, because the affordable units above and beyond 20 percent exceed the percentage of affordable homes required by the Santa Fe Homes Program (SFHP), they are subject to the affordability requirements in the SFHP

pursuant to the restrictive covenants in the donation agreement rather than pursuant to the ordinance.

10. Q: How will the sale of affordable units be regulated such that they cannot be purchased and used as rental properties, especially not vacation rentals, but also not for long-term rentals (6+ month leases).

A: The Santa Fe Homes Program is governed by Chapter 26 of the City of Santa Fe Code of Ordinances.

Section 2: Questions that cannot be answered in detail at this stage, as they depend on Governing Body approval of the donation agreement and submission of a development plan and plat application by Homewise.

1. Q: The Las Estrellas CCRs were created for good reasons and served Las Estrellas well for years.

A: If Tract 6A is no longer governed by the Residential Covenants, development on the property will be regulated by City ordinances, zoning, and any applicable Master Plan requirements—not the CCRs. The following are related questions/answers:

c) If the Tract 6A development abandons them, what are the height restrictions?

A: Height will be governed by the property’s zoning designation and any specific limitations in the Las Estrellas Master Plan, if applicable.

c) What are the setback restrictions from South Ridgetop Road?

A: Setback restrictions will be regulated by the underlying zoning district and further regulated by the Master Plan, if applicable.

c) What are the parking restrictions, the restrictions on unused vehicles and trailers on streets, driveways and yards, any noise/nuisance restrictions, any restrictions on outbuildings, etc.?

A: These issues will be subject to existing City ordinances. For example:

- The **City’s noise ordinance** applies to all neighborhoods.
- The **junk vehicle ordinance** governs the presence of inoperable vehicles.
- The **Land Development Code (SFCC Chapter 14)** addresses the placement of **accessory structures** like sheds, fences, and garages.
- Parking and street use are regulated under the **City’s traffic and code enforcement rules**.

2. **Q: What assurances are there for the maintenance and upkeep of the Units and landscaping in the development?**

A: Homewise and or the future property owner will be responsible for abiding by all city codes relevant to Chapter 14 and Chapter 10.

3. **Q: How will this increase in traffic affect the intersection of South Ridgetop Road and Highway 599?**

A: Subject to City review and approval, Homewise will be required to submit a traffic impact analysis which will be part of a development plan application

4. **Q: Are the ramps at that intersection compliant with State Highway standards?**

A: Homewise will submit a development plan application which will be subject to City review and approval.

5. **Q: Will a northside fire station be created; will additional policing be provided in light of the increase in population?**

A: As part of the development review process, Homewise will be required to submit a development plan and plat application, which includes analysis of public infrastructure and services, and they will also need to abide by other process requirements including the Early Neighborhood Notification processes. The City evaluates each proposed development to ensure it aligns with public safety standards and that fire, police, and other essential services can be adequately provided.

The City remains committed to ensuring that emergency services are responsive and appropriately scaled as the community grows.

If Governing Body approves the Donation Agreement and Homewise submits a development plan and plat application, then City review of the proposal will begin.

Section 3: Questions more appropriately directed to Homewise, the potential developer of the site.

1. **Q: Will Homewise be establishing a separate HOA or similar association with CC&Rs for the residents in 6A?**

A: This question is best directed to Homewise.

2. **Q: Will residents of Tract 6A be members of the Las Estrellas Master Association and subject to the association fees?**

A: This is a question for Homewise, not the City of Santa Fe. The City's understanding is that Tract 6A will be subject to the provisions of the Las Estrellas Non-Residential Covenants, which apply to non-residential parcels.

3. **Q: What services will the Las Estrellas Residential and Master Association be obligated to provide to 6A?**

A: This is a question better directed to Homewise, not the City of Santa Fe.

4. **Q: To date, all new development projects in Las Estrellas have included a contribution to the Master Association Traffic Improvement Reserve Account. Will Homewise be required to continue this practice?**

A: This is a question for Homewise, not the City of Santa Fe.

5. **Q: Will Homewise detail the makeup and procedures for its HOA and its CCRs for the development?**

A: This is a question for Homewise, not the City of Santa Fe.

6. **Q: How will rules of the new HOA and its CCRs be enforced?**

A: This question is best directed to Homewise, not the City of Santa Fe.

7. **Q: Will the new HOA be autonomous from the current Las Estrellas HOA?**

A: This is a question for Homewise, not the City of Santa Fe.

8. **Q: Has Homewise conferred with all stakeholders, including Zocalo, The Tano Road Association, Thornburg, besides Las Estrellas and The Santa Fe Estates Neighborhood Association?**

A: This question is best directed to Homewise.

9. **Q: Where will worker and construction vehicles and equipment be parked, on South Ridgetop Road?**

A: This question is best directed to Homewise, not the City of Santa Fe. That said, Homewise will be required to comply with all applicable City requirements for construction, permitting, and development.

10. Q: Why are respondents not looking at condominiums, patio homes or townhomes as good solution to provide housing in the Santa Fe area?

A: This question is best directed to Homewise, not the City of Santa Fe, as Homewise will determine the type of housing product proposed for the site.

11. Q: Why are respondents not looking at where new jobs are being offered in the Santa Fe area?

A: This question is best directed to Homewise, not the City of Santa Fe. Housing proposals are developed by respondents based on their own market analysis, site suitability, and development goals.

Community Feedback and Comments

Below is a preliminary summary of community feedback and comments shared by Las Estrellas residents and other stakeholders. This input includes comments received during the July 17, 2025, community meeting at the Main Library. Community engagement is essential to this process, and we are committed to accurately reflecting the concerns, questions, and ideas raised.

This document is still a work in progress as we continue to determine the most effective and transparent way to share public input. It will remain a living document and be updated as additional feedback is received and reviewed.

To help clarify the process, community input has been grouped around the two major phases of the project's disposition framework:

- **Phase 1:** Donation consideration, legal parameters, and affordability commitments.
- **Phase 2:** If the donation is approved, full planning, neighborhood engagement, and public review through Planning Commission and other standard City processes.

Phase 1 Concerns – Donation & Legal Conditions

- Concern about only one week's notice for community input
- Requests for Facebook Live or meeting livestream options
- Discomfort with exemption from the anti-donation clause
- Loss of trust due to limited early engagement
- Objections to removing CCRs or HOA exemptions
- Requests for guarantees on long-term affordability

- Criticism of what has been perceived as a “closed” or unclear process

Phase 2 Concerns – Planning & Development Review (Post-Donation)

- Traffic and environmental impact concerns, especially near Hwy 599
- No nearby transit access; development assumes car ownership
- Alleged transparency failures since early 2023
- General support for affordable housing, but frustration with the current process
- Requests to delay the July 30 vote for more engagement
- Allegations of efforts to remove CCRs without public input
- Concerns about unsafe roads and insufficient parking
- Challenging site topography seen as unsuitable for dense development
- Emergency access concerns
- Lack of public amenities, trails, or mixed-use planning
- No apparent soil or erosion study
- Worries that HOA exemptions could financially burden current residents
- Architectural designs seen as inconsistent with surrounding neighborhood
- Requests for enforceable affordability covenants
- Strong calls for collaboration and respect for community voices

Community Input (Organized by Prompt)

In addition to the concerns summarized above, the July 17, 2025, community meeting included discussions guided by four open-ended prompts. The following input reflects ideas, questions, and perspectives shared by residents and stakeholders in response to these prompts.

This feedback provides valuable insight into what community members feel is needed for the project to be successful, inclusive, and responsive. All feedback was recorded and is summarized here by prompt to help inform next steps and raise awareness of the community’s concerns.

Prompt 1: How can this project succeed for everyone involved?

Participants emphasized that project success depends on both transparency and thoughtful planning. Key suggestions and concerns included:

- Relocate the project due to concerns about unstable soil conditions.

- Address traffic impacts, particularly at the Highway 599 exit.
- Clearly explain any proposed changes to existing covenants.
- Account for roof design and terrain challenges in site planning.
- Conduct traffic, school capacity, and habitat impact studies.
- Clarify which entities control final development approvals.
- Accurately assess the amount of truly buildable land on the site.
- Implement safeguards to prevent speculative real estate investment.
- Integrate job support and workforce development into project planning.
- Engage directly with workforce groups (e.g., teachers, service workers) to assess housing needs based on real income levels.
- Prioritize transparency with adequate lead time and full disclosure at each stage.
- Consider alternate sites, such as Tract 5A, Camino de la Montoya, or the NW Quadrant.
- Visit the site during peak hours (e.g., 5 PM) to observe traffic conditions firsthand.

Prompt 2: What should the developer do to be a good partner?

Community members offered recommendations for how the developer can demonstrate good faith and long-term commitment to the area. Suggestions included:

- Prioritize the use of local builders, contractors, and businesses.
- Integrate the new development into the existing HOA rather than creating a separate community.
- Plan for and acknowledge long-term slope stability and associated maintenance costs.
- Implement comprehensive erosion control strategies.
- Explore innovative homeownership models, such as equity share or community land trust programs.
- Establish protections to deter speculative purchasing and promote lasting affordability.

Prompt 3: What are your hopes for the project?

Community members expressed the following hopes for the future of the project:

- Inclusion of open space and parks that serve both new and existing residents.
- Direct, transparent answers to community questions.
- Development that respects the area's natural topography and character.

- A project located and designed to give affordable housing the greatest chance of long-term success.

Prompt 4: Did we miss anything?

Participants raised several additional points they felt were missing from the conversation:

- A guarantee that the land reverts to the City if not developed as intended.
- Requests for future meetings to be held in larger, more accessible public venues.
- Clarification on the difference between a land sale and a donation.
- Completion of erosion control and traffic impact studies prior to project approval.
- A reminder that the project should prioritize the needs and wellbeing of residents—not just financial considerations.

Comments/Concerns submitted via Email

PHASE 1 RESIDENT COMMENTS (~13 comments):

1. Now I want to support this project. But NOT LIKE THIS. You have given us one week to get to ONE community meeting before the City council vote on July 30th. Just bad optics.
2. Asking that you add a Facebook Live or some kind of streaming component that homeowners and key stakeholders can see, hear and ask questions.
3. We ask that you include with a longer lead time AT LEAST ONE MORE community meeting PRIOR to the City Council vote.
4. I am writing to express my concern about Tract 6A and its appropriateness for low income housing as well as other concerns that have arisen since our neighborhood association which was first informed about this project and asked for our input and support.
5. Gifting Tract 6A to a private developer planning low-income housing, as a claimed exemption to the NM Anti-Donation Clause [Article IX, Section 14 of the NM Constitution], appears to discriminate against other private developers [meeting the same exemption criteria] who would have to purchase Tract 6A if planning merely affordable housing development.
6. The Mayor and others from the City were met with an open mind when you approached us with this project, and instead of encouraging our participation you seem to be planting seeds of distrust.
7. Some residents of Las Estrellas have opened the door for collaboration and cooperation even though this project seems to make no sense to most of us.

8. Removal of CC&Rs and HOA Exemptions Concerns.
9. Given that the land is proposed to be transferred at no cost, the public deserves clearer assurances of long-term affordability and return on public investment.
10. I appreciate the City's commitment to addressing the housing crisis, but this must not come at the expense of sound planning, community cohesion, and environmental stewardship. I urge you to slow the process down, carefully evaluate and revise this proposal before proceeding further.
11. That project, which has been completely “closed to the public,” has progressed to the point that the City Council will be discussing and voting on the donation/disposition of 6A to the non-profit developer Homewise, for the development of Affordable Housing at various levels.
12. I am forwarding, is the “packet” of documents that is being sent to the City Council. Unfortunately, it contains only a modicum of the information we all, including the City Councilors!, need to fully appreciate the consequences of developing 6A in this manner—consequences for the quality of life in our neighborhood, the integrity of our landscape, and the value of our properties.
13. Thank you for providing the materials regarding the proposed donation of Las Estrellas 6A. We appreciate the opportunity to review them earlier in the process than is normally the case.

PHASE 2 RESIDENT COMMENTS (~72 comments):

1. We have seen the plan and are just so surprised that you all think 58 large units with two-car garages and two to four unit bedrooms will not completely destroy the area called 6A and one can only imagine the environmental damage, traffic issues and potential for flooding with this particular development proposal.
2. We already have problems with the Ridgetop's entrance and exit ramps. And, with the short ramp between the two merging of the highways from Santa Fe. No way can the existing system — which is already difficult to navigate — work without an ADDITIONAL ramp off the freeway in a different spot. Also, there is no public transportation up here — so, it is all about the car and given the importance of transit-oriented development and the need to reduce pollution this seems like a bad fit. Unless, you have a new public transportation plan which we would also be very interested in seeing.
3. Of course we need affordable housing in the community of Las Estrellas and throughout Santa Fe. THE ISSUE is NOT affordable housing, It is not about WHO lives there. The issue is the complete lack of transparency since that first meeting with the Mayor last year and you all were completely unprepared and without answers to our questions. Never heard from you all again.

4. We know Homewise is a good, reputable and responsible developer — Frankly, the table of distrust that has been set for them is unfortunate.
5. We ask that the vote be taken off the July 30 agenda to a later date so that Homewise can meet directly with the homeowners and hear in advance what the community's concerns are about the current proposal and we can work TOGETHER to create something that will be welcomed by the community.
6. I understand that an attorney was hired for the sole purpose of stripping 6A of its CC&Rs. This does not indicate you have any desire to work with our association or that there is any transparency involved in this process or how it might affect the surrounding established developments.
7. 6A has insufficient space is available for the larger parking requirement.
8. Adjacent streets cannot accommodate substantially increased traffic.
9. The remote location requires all adult residents to own a reliable car and have a driver's license.
10. The remote location is distant from employment, schools, groceries, healthcare, community services, etc.
11. No public transportation serves this remote location.
12. No continuous sidewalks or bike trails connect Tract 6A to city services.
13. I'm a member of the Las Estrellas architectural board. We have extensive community experience with new home projects, Los Arbolitos development. We are not in the business of impeding the development of affordable housing in the area but we would like some design input into the project. It has been my experience that we help to improve the final design, consider water runoff issues, aesthetics etc.
14. First, I am a supporter of the proposed Homewise project. I'm not writing to you as an angry NIMBY!
15. I participated in the Las Estrellas RFQ pre-proposal Zoom call at the end of 2023.
16. I've been subscribed to the newsletters available from the sfpublicassets.org webpage since fall of 2023, but I've never seen any additional detailed updates or documents regarding 6A development.
17. I am forwarding a diagram from the Santa Fe County Website that further illustrates the severity of the slopes on 6A and how inappropriate scraping it would be in order to execute the Homewise proposal. What is Homewise and the City thinking!
18. The points of access to South Ridgetop Road are too restrictive. One proposed intersection with South Ridgetop Road is at a rather blind intersection due to a curve. The effects on traffic and traffic safety have not been studied at all.
19. This destruction of the landscape would be required not only for housing and streets on 6A but also for parking spaces that the proposed 58 units [generally assigned only one space per unit] would actually require, along with guest parking. The latter

is not even mentioned in the proposal nor is the fact that residents would often own two vehicles.

20. The overall conclusion to be drawn is that the adoption of the Homewise Proposal should be abandoned or at the very least paused for thorough consideration and significant revision.
21. The Proposal has been “closed to the public” since the Request For Qualifications first went out. But the Homewise Proposal was submitted Jan. 29, 2024 and selected in March—one month later. And yet the Office of Economic Development has kept it from the public until we received it on July 9, 2025—14 months later! And now we are invited to a discussion of it on July 19. Only 10 days later! And the Governing Body is taking it up on July 30 already. This is the antithesis of the transparency promised by the City.
22. The public still knows virtually nothing about this project and its many problems.
23. Especially vexing is the fact that those citizens most affected by the project, namely those in Las Estrella’s, Zocalo, and Santa Fe Estates Neighborhood Association, have not been adequately informed.
24. The entirety of Tract 6A is designated by the City as “Difficult Terrain.” To impose the density of housing Homewise proposes on Tract 6A would require scraping flat the vast majority of the Tract, including arroyos with slopes greater than 30%. This destruction of landscape is exactly what the Mayor and the Office of Economic Development promised the Santa Fe Estates Neighborhood Association (in 2023) would not happen.
25. Key Concerns: Environmental Sensitivity and Grading Conflicts.
26. The site likely includes natural arroyos and steep terrain, which are protected under the City’s Land Development Code (Chapter 14). These features limit grading and disturbance, except under narrow exceptions.
27. The Homewise proposal provides no detail on the extent of land alteration or how arroyo crossings and drainage will be managed. Inadequate grading or drainage planning could lead to flood risks, erosion, and violation of City codes.
28. Traffic and Emergency Access Concerns.
29. With 58 homes proposed, this project likely triggers the threshold for a Level 1 Transportation Impact Analysis. However, the proposal makes no mention of completed traffic analysis.
30. Emergency egress in a fire-prone area like Las Estrellas is critical. A single access point could pose serious public safety risks, especially under wildfire evacuation scenarios.
31. The developer requests modification or elimination of subdivision CC&Rs, which may undermine the governance and standards of the Las Estrellas community.

32. The proposal suggests exempting affordable units from HOA assessments, creating fairness concerns for existing residents who would be left subsidizing shared infrastructure.
33. Property values: Lack of design and maintenance standards on one tract can reduce perceived value across the subdivision.
34. Infrastructure burden: If Tract 6A bypasses assessments, neighbors may bear higher costs for roads, drainage, and trails.
35. Community character: Exemptions can lead to predictable “outsider” development that clashes with Las Estrellas’ planned aesthetic and quality.
36. The proposal includes no public amenities—no trails, parks, or mixed-use components—despite the original Las Estrellas Master Plan encouraging walkable, integrated communities.
37. Architectural renderings and product descriptions suggest uniform building types, which may conflict with the subdivision’s existing diversity in style and scale.
38. While Homewise pledges that 40% of homes will serve those earning $\leq 120\%$ AMI, the proposal does not disclose pricing, resale controls, or long-term deed restrictions to preserve affordability.
39. We are urged to send our questions so they can be addressed “all at once.” This is hugely problematic for many reasons: For example, 1) the packet fails to include the detailed plan Homewise proposes to execute, including any maps; so it is impossible to form a full array of relevant questions and raise the relevant issues. (And certainly, Homewise has detailed plans to share, if it can calculate costs so exactly.) 2) Putting a filter like this in between residents and Homewise’s proposal is inappropriate.
40. The little we are told in the packet’s memo is startling: Homewise proposes to build 58 Units—24 Single Family detached houses and 39 Single Family Attached Townhouses—all requiring parking spaces for owners and for guests. We need a map to see how this is possible on 6A’s City-designated “Difficult Terrain.” Even if the Feasibility Study on 6A (2023) is correct, and there are 12.33 acres of buildable land, 58 units would require drastically scraping the arroyo-laden landscape flat—exactly what the Mayor and the Office of Economic Development promised the Association (in 2023) would not happen.
41. For a comparable project to Homewise’s mentioned plan, examine the website of Pulte’s Dos Acequias, which is on Agua Fria, close to St. Francis. It will have 74 units on 12.5 acres of naturally flat land.
42. No land should be donated to Homewise until we all know more exactly what Homewise plans to do and how it is likely to affect the neighborhood’s safety, access, quality, and values.

43. The City Council should table the proposed Donation Agreement until Homewise is much more forthcoming.
44. We met with the Mayor and the Office of Economic Development and were assured that if 6A were developed it would not be scraped flat and the neighborhood would not be affected. That assurance seems wilted now. Alex Ladd even said at a Zoom meeting that 6A was unusable for multi-unit buildings.
45. We were told that Jake Garrison was hired to strip 6A of its CCRs and potentially to replace the Las Estrellas Board if it did not cooperate.
46. I emailed councilors with qualms regarding the Garrison Agreement. But when I tried to contact the committee in charge of judging the RFQs, I was barred by City Legal.
47. The Homewise Proposal was finally announced to a very few of us, but 14 months after it was selected. It was “closed to the public.” Valuable time to bring it to the neighborhoods for feedback and discussions was lost. If it had not been recently brought to attention of a few of us, it would have probably just been buried in the agendas of the two Committees and the Governing Body.
48. I would say that the City has not been a model of transparency, nor has it been eager to work with stakeholders. And the usual reply about Early Neighborhood Notification constituting sufficient public notice is unsatisfactory: The sunk cost fallacy is too strong, i.e., people tend to dig in on plans they have been working on, even if those plans are terrible. The City even admits this in their survey/study on how to improve affordable housing efforts: ENN is too late—working with the neighborhoods should be the very first step, not the penultimate step a few weeks before a vote.
49. It should be no surprise that so many area residents who have heard about the Homewise Proposal are very upset about it and are expressing their objections.
50. We are not a bunch of NIMBYs. Affordable housing is a priority and a part of every development around here. We just insist that it’s done right and not just “any available projects as soon as possible.” And the Homewise Proposal is not right.
51. When the Homewise Proposal was finally announced to a very few of us, but 14 months after it was selected. It was “closed to the public.” Valuable time to bring it to the neighborhoods for feedback and discussions was lost. If it had not been recently brought to attention of a few of us who have been in contact with Johanna Nelson, it would have probably just been buried in the agendas of the two Committees and the Governing Body, and we would likely not be having the Community Meeting on July 16.
52. The site plan is extremely dense in comparison to other developments within the neighborhood.

53. The site plan does not provide adequate minimum turning radii for emergency vehicles, such as fire trucks, in the Central Park area.
54. The site plan does not account for existing steep grades that exceed 30% and necessary handicapped accessibility required on the site.
55. There are no provisions for the control of stormwater runoff on the land indicated.
56. There are no sound barrier walls shown.
57. There is no Wildlife Study consultant noted for protection of wildlife habitats and endangered species found in the area, including Prairie Dogs and Kangaroo Rats.
58. There is no Traffic Study indicated to ensure that maximum slopes and vehicle speeds in the residential neighborhood are controlled.
59. Previous studies in the NW Quadrant in 2009 indicated Native American artifacts are present in this area.
60. The soils in the neighborhood are sandy and require stabilization with the removal of the existing pinon and juniper trees. A comprehensive Soils Study should be performed and soil stabilization plan provided.
61. The City of Santa Fe recognizes an equal need for both low income housing and affordable housing. These two housing types have much different configurations and serve different constituencies.
62. Several “affordable” houses or townhouses may be feasible on Tract 6A’s difficult topography. “Affordable housing” residents are more prepared to live in a remote location like 6A.
63. 6A's difficult topography cannot accommodate larger buildings.
64. Insufficient space is available for the larger parking requirement.
65. Adjacent streets cannot accommodate substantially increased traffic.
66. The remote location requires all adult residents to own a reliable car and have a valid driver’s license.
67. The remote location is distant from employment, schools, groceries, healthcare, community services, etc.
68. No public transportation serves this remote location.
69. No continuous sidewalks or bike trails connect Tract 6A to city services.
70. I appreciate the City's commitment to addressing the housing crisis, but this must not come at the expense of sound planning, community cohesion, and environmental stewardship.
71. I urge you to slow the process down, carefully evaluate and revise this proposal before proceeding further.
72. Requests for City Action:
 - Require a completed grading and drainage plan showing full compliance with arroyo and slope disturbance regulations.

- Mandate a Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) to ensure roadway capacity and fire/emergency access adequacy.
- Engage the HOA and affected property owners before approving any CC&R modifications or exemption of assessments.
- Ensure affordability covenants are legally binding and extend over a minimum of 45 years, with transparent pricing standards.
- Encourage inclusion of public open space, trails, or transit connectivity to align with the City's sustainable development goals.