

From: [City of Santa Fe](#)
To: [GURULE, GERALDINE A.](#)
Subject: New submission from your Planning Commission & Board of Adjustment Public Comment form
Date: Monday, June 1, 2026 8:44:27 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Submitted on: Monday, June 1, 2026 at 8:44am

- First Name: Lara
- Last Name: Miller
- Land Use Board: Planning Commission
- Case Number: #2025-11756.1802 and #2025-11753.1802
- Your Comment: Hello George,

After reviewing the additional packet materials this weekend, my concerns remain largely the same. However, the additional information provides more context for framing those concerns, so thank you for highlighting when those materials would be made public. I have outlined my reframed comments below.

This project may be a good redevelopment opportunity for a vacant and underused property on Cerrillos Road. But, I am concerned that the Special Use Permit findings are too broad to evaluate whether that is the case for this particular site. The findings generally say the project will not adversely affect the public interest because it meets Chapter 14 standards, will revitalize a vacant site, is described as a low-intensity use, and is compatible with nearby uses. However, this development is across the street from a fire station and has a well-known mural, so why is this specific use, in this specific location, not expected to create problems? For example, the traffic assessment explains why the anticipated trips generated by this project are expected to fall below the threshold for a full Traffic Impact Analysis outlined in City TIA guidelines, but it does not show whether those trips were evaluated in relation to the fire station operations across the street. My concern is that this does not fully answer the question of why this project is not expected to create problems for this particular location. In that context, the issue is not just the total number of trips the project is expected to generate. It is also whether any of the expected project trips could interfere with emergency vehicles leaving the fire station. Even a small number of additional project trips can still create problems if vehicles are turning, waiting, crossing, or blocking the road near a fire station driveway at the wrong time. I am not saying the project cannot work. I am saying a narrow site specific analysis of emergency operations should be done, and the public record should include a clear explanation of how emergency access and fire-station operations were considered before there is a conclusion that this project will not adversely affect the public interest. I also request clarification on the existing mural and whether it was evaluated or discussed as a cultural, historic, neighborhood, or design resource. It was something brought up at the ENN, but the documents do not clearly state what decision was made or whether the mural will be retained, documented, replaced, recreated, or removed. I request that the City provide this explanation before final action.

Thanks Lara Miller