

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

**MINUTES**  
**VILLAGE OF LOS RANCHOS**  
**Planning and Zoning Commission**  
**6718 Rio Grande Blvd. NW**  
**Warren J. Gray Hall**  
**September 10, 2013**  
**7:00 P.M.**

**Present:**

**STAFF**

**Administrator:** Kelly Ward

**Attorney:** Bill Chappell

**Planning Staff:** Linda Seebach, Director

1. **CALL TO ORDER – Chairman Hannah** called the meeting to order at 7:07 p.m.

**A. ROLL CALL** - Commissioner Craig, Commissioner Seligman, Commissioner Hannah, Commissioner Gollis. Commissioner Lewis. Commissioner Albert and Commissioner Tourville were excused.

**Chairman Hannah** stated there was a quorum present for the meeting.

**B. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

**Chairman Hannah** asked Planner Seebach if there were any changes to the agenda.

**Planner Seebach** stated that there are no changes to the posted Agenda, Item 4-A is postponed until the October 8<sup>th</sup> meeting.

**MOTION: Commissioner Seligman** moved approval of the Agenda.

**SECOND: Commissioner Gollis** seconded the motion.

**VOTE:** The motion carried unanimously (4-0).

2. **PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD**

**David Baird 8203-C Guadalupe Trail has a business at 6916 4<sup>th</sup> St NW** talked about what he felt were inadequate building permit practices and the lack of good pedestrian walkways on 4<sup>th</sup> Street.

**Chairman Hannah** stated that he should talk to the Planning Director about his concerns and that for the safety issues he should talk to the Board of Trustees, which meets tomorrow night.

3. **CONSENT AGENDA**

1                   **A. APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA**

2  
3                   **Chairman Hannah** asked if there were any changes to the minutes of the  
4 August 13, 2013 meeting.

5  
6                   **MOTION: Commissioner Seligman** moved approval of the Consent Agenda.

7  
8                   **SECOND: Commissioner Gollis** seconded the motion.

9  
10                  **VOTE:** The motion carried unanimously (4-0).

11  
12                  **Chairman Hannah** stated that he noticed there was a question from the  
13 audience.

14  
15                  **David Baird** stated he thought he had signed in to speak.

16  
17                  **Chairman Hannah** asked if he was speaking on what was on the Agenda.

18  
19                  **David Baird** stated no he was not.

20  
21                  **Chairman Hannah** clarified that as he was not wanting to speak on anything  
22 on the agenda and as they only had one item to discuss, he saw no problem in  
23 hearing what he had to say under the Public Comment Period. Then asked him  
24 to come forward state his name and address for the record. **(See notation**  
25 **under public comment)**

26  
27                  **4. PUBLIC HEARINGS AND APPLICATIONS**

28  
29                  **Chairman Hannah** asked all those who were to speak on the items presented  
30 to please stand and be sworn in by Attorney Chappell.

31  
32                  **Attorney Chappell** swore in those present who would be speaking before the  
33 Commission.

34  
35                  **A. SDP-13-02** A request by Christine Rodriguez for Preliminary Site  
36 Development Plan approval for new commercial development in the Gateway  
37 District Zone of the Fourth Street Commercial Character Area. The property is  
38 located at 8312 and 8318 4<sup>th</sup> Street NW and is legally known as Plat of Lots A-  
39 1 and A-2, Villa Christina, bring a replat of Tract "A" Paraiso Escondido within  
40 the Town of Alameda Grant, Projected Section 16, T11N, R3E, N.M.P.M.,  
41 Village of Los Ranchos de Albuquerque, Bernalillo County, New Mexico as the  
42 same is shown and designated on the Plat filed in the office of the County Clerk  
43 of Bernalillo County, New Mexico on February 24, 2010. The property contains  
44 1.1939 acres more or less.

45                  **POSTPONED UNTIL THE OCTOBER 8, 2013 MEETING**

46  
47                  **B. SDP-13-03** A request by Chant Associates for Second Street Holdings LLC  
48 for Preliminary Site Development Plan approval for new commercial  
49 development in the Gateway District Zone of the Fourth Street Commercial  
50 Character Area. The property is located at 8355 2<sup>nd</sup> Street NW and is legally  
51 known as Lot A, Plat of Lot A, El Portal at Paseo, Village of Los Ranchos de

1 Albuquerque, Bernalillo County, New Mexico, filed in the Office of the  
2 Bernalillo County Clerk on June 9, 2013. The property contains 5.1402 acres  
3 more or less.

4  
5 **Chairman Hannah** asked Planner Seebach for the Planning Report.

6  
7 **Planner Seebach** gave the Planning Report with recommendation to forward  
8 to the Board of Trustees for Final Site Development Plan approval.

9  
10 **Commissioner Gollis** stated on sheet two in miscellaneous notes it confirms  
11 the zoning. It lists two different zones or did. So his question is this all C-1 at  
12 this point or is this mixed.

13  
14 **Planner Seebach** stated that it is in the Gateway District Zone, all of it.

15  
16 **Commissioner Gollis** clarified that the traditional zones go away.

17  
18 **Planner Seebach** affirmed the statement.

19  
20 **Commissioner Craig** asked for clarification on the utilities and where they are  
21 coming from.

22  
23 **Planner Seebach** stated that there is a line on the west side of the Alameda  
24 Canal.

25  
26 **Commissioner Craig** clarified rather than 4<sup>th</sup> Street.

27  
28 **Planner Seebach** stated that it does come from 4<sup>th</sup> Street. She did not know  
29 where the sewer connects to the line on the west side of the Alameda Canal  
30 was.

31  
32 **Chairman Hannah** stated that they would ask the applicant at the appropriate  
33 time and recognized Commissioner Gollis.

34  
35 **Commissioner Gollis** stated the only thing missing from the plan is signage.

36  
37 **Planner Seebach** stated that the Chants have chosen to get a separate  
38 permit. They are still deciding what to do and they'll have a better idea of what  
39 they want to do once the bridge is in.

40  
41 **Commissioner Seligman** stated that the building delineated on the plans has  
42 a certain use on this plan. If they approve this plan, will the uses stay the  
43 same or can the uses be changed?

44  
45 **Planner Seebach** stated the tenant uses can be changed within a certain  
46 range, at this time they are rated office/retail.

47  
48 **Commissioner Seligman** stated for the follow up Building 1 is listed as a  
49 brewery, can it be changed to a bar? Would it go back to the Commission or  
50 back to the Planning Department? What do they consider a change and would  
51 they have to come back?

1 **Planner Seebach** stated she was not sure as far as changing from a brewery  
2 to a bar, that would be a change in the liquor license.  
3

4 **Commissioner Seligman** asked the change in use and change in concept so  
5 that would not have any effect?  
6

7 **Planner Seebach** stated it would not.  
8

9 **Commissioner Seligman** stated, so if one of the buildings noted as an office  
10 building was going to become a restaurant, would that have to come back?  
11

12 **Planner Seebach** stated it would depend more on the building design rather  
13 than the use. If there were a dramatic change in the design such as changing  
14 to a restaurant they would have to come back.  
15

16 **Chairman Hannah** stated for clarification, for the brewery, there would have  
17 to be an approval as a conditional use or something like that.  
18

19 **Planner Seebach** stated it would be a conditional use permit.  
20

21 **Chairman Hannah** stated that a conditional use could have conditions set on  
22 that and be reviewed by the Commission, is that correct?  
23

24 **Planner Seebach** stated not necessarily if there are no protests the Director  
25 can do it, it might not come in front of the Commission.  
26

27 **Chairman Hannah** thanked Planner Seebach for the clarification and asked if  
28 any of the other Commissioners had any more questions for the Planner, then  
29 asked the applicants to come forward stating their names and addresses.  
30

31 **Chris, Greg, & Ethan Chant** 5540 Midway Park Place, Albuquerque stated  
32 they were excited about presenting the site plan and hopefully addressed  
33 some of the questions from the last meeting. They have a bridge design that  
34 the Middle Rio Grand Conservancy District (MRGCD) looks like they will  
35 approve. While meeting with them, they made a statement that in no uncertain  
36 terms that nothing can be built on the right of way and access roads, which  
37 are on both sides of the ditch. That eliminates any bike paths or sidewalks for  
38 the present, but he thinks with coordination between the Village, the County,  
39 and the MRGCD, since they all play a role in that particular area, that is all that  
40 can be done. He addressed the questions on the utilities stating that the  
41 waterline will come off of El Pueblo Road. Sanitary sewer will be handled by  
42 half going toward 4<sup>th</sup> Street and the other half going toward 2<sup>nd</sup> Street. PNM  
43 will come off of 4<sup>th</sup> Street and will do a loop with three (3) transformers, with  
44 the phone lines coming off the same way. There will be a twenty-five (25) foot  
45 utility easement, which will not conflict with the storm water drainage. They  
46 had a meeting this last week with PNM and will be meeting with them again in  
47 the next couple of weeks to sign off on all these locations and they will be  
48 moving forward. As soon as they get final approval from the Village they will  
49 start construction on the utilities. They have a lighting plan in place that will  
50 meet the Dark Skies Ordinance. They will be using LED lights, which are high  
51 energy, high efficiency lights. They don't create heat and noise. They went to

1 a sound specialist for the site and he gave recommendations on how to  
2 mitigate noise from the brewery. Based on the information he gave them.  
3 They determined what kind of containment was needed to not have it leave  
4 the site. They feel confident that they can incorporate all the recommendations  
5 he had for them. As for the building uses, they have their offices and the  
6 brewery designated. The use of the other buildings has not been determined.  
7 Unless there is something that needs a variance they will stay within the  
8 zoning. As for the signage that Commissioner Gollis questioned.  
9

10 **Commissioner Gollis** stated that Planner Seebach had answered his  
11 question and he was satisfied with that.  
12

13 **Chris Chant** stated that they do have the sign design, they just don't have it  
14 for the entire site. He noted the sign design for each tenant and where they  
15 will be placed. The number of signs will be dependent on how many tenants  
16 they have for each building and will be incorporated into the building design.  
17

18 **Commissioner Gollis** thanked them and said that the plans were thoroughly  
19 done and done consistent with the requirements of the ordinance and to  
20 believe him when he says he has seen a lot of site development plans over  
21 the course of ten years. His question is and he is curious, the northeast side of  
22 the site will not have the infiltration pipes, but will be self ponding. Is that right?  
23

24 **Chris Chant** stated that was correct.  
25

26 **Commissioner Gollis** stated he couldn't get a sense in reading the plan. How  
27 much is that area going to be grass or landscape? Is that going to have a big  
28 dip in the middle of the thing?  
29

30 **Chris Chant** stated it will only accumulate the amount of water that falls on  
31 itself. It will be the landscape that ponds itself.  
32

33 **Commissioner Seligman** stated she wanted to thank them for all the hard  
34 work. They have come up with a beautiful plan. That being said, her question  
35 is on the noise and electronic and amplified music. She read their expert  
36 opinion and it still does not address in any manner base music, because that  
37 does not meet decibel levels, it is below decibel levels, but it carries a lot  
38 further. She was noticing there is talk about a band. If there were live music  
39 from a band, it would go 640 feet before becoming ambient and if any other of  
40 these buildings on the south side is converted to a restaurant or if used for a  
41 bar, there's a band that's going to go into the neighborhoods. The noise is not  
42 going to stay on their property, so she still has a real concern with any type of  
43 amplified or electronic music on the patios, especially the brewery, because  
44 the other buildings that are now noted as office space, can be changed  
45 according to the Planner. They can be used for a restaurant. They can be  
46 used for a bar and not come back to this Commission and do not have to go  
47 back to the Board of Trustees, so she would like to see restrictions on  
48 amplified and electronic music. She understands that they worked real hard to  
49 try to contain that, but they are talking about the decibels and not about the  
50 base and the base carries really far. They are coming into an existing  
51 neighborhood where it is quiet. That's why people live in the Village because

1 they don't have something beating in their ear. But, still, run that by the noise  
2 ordinance because of the decibel level. When they discussed another group,  
3 they restricted no electronic music, no amplified music on the outside. She  
4 would like to see that done in this particular development also because of the  
5 fact they all seem to take a lot of care, but somebody else might buy this.  
6 Somebody else might have this building and she doesn't want this to be left  
7 open for the future for somebody to turn around. They can be booming that  
8 amplifier and they could be going west. These are the issues with the music  
9 that she has, she doesn't think they've been addressed at all by their expert  
10 and she thinks if they say it is just decibels and she thinks they can start smart  
11 by the business of bands. That is a big issue, her understanding is that it is  
12 going to be like a family area; brewpubs are not necessarily. But, she would  
13 really like to restrict this whole entire complex so there is no amplified music  
14 and no electronic music or that there be enforcement some how by the Village  
15 that if there is any noise, including base music coming anywhere from beyond  
16 the confines of the property, that they know somebody could be cited. That is  
17 a real concern that she has and personal experience with base music coming  
18 over a mile and a half away from her house playing electronic music on a  
19 patio. Nothing happened here. So that's a concern she doesn't (inaudible)  
20 otherwise this plan is a great plan, they are wonderful, but because they don't  
21 know what these other buildings are going to be ultimately, she wants to  
22 restrict amplified music and electronic music, if they can do something to  
23 make her feel comfortable about this.

24  
25 **Chairman Hannah** asked Mr. Chant, before they respond, he wanted to point  
26 out to Commissioner Seligman that he asked Planner Seebach to supply them  
27 with the current Village ordinance on noise and he wanted to check with the  
28 lawyer, who tries to keep them on track in things legal, whether or not in a site  
29 plan like this and this whole process, if there is legally a supportable way for  
30 them to make such restrictions and limitations and asked Attorney Chappell if  
31 he could address an opinion.

32  
33 **Attorney Chappell** stated he would say that this sound ordinance got worked  
34 on with several drafts, but it never moved too much forward. He did not think  
35 the levels would be changed a great deal in the new drafts. Certainly in the  
36 enforcement, he expects that will come back and be handled again. His own  
37 view is that the site plan is not a place where they can impose conditions that  
38 are not otherwise allowed in existing ordinances. If this was a special use  
39 permit or other kinds of things they can do special conditions, but when they  
40 have a site plan that is submitted in the existing zoning, he doesn't think they  
41 can change the ordinances that apply to that zoning area in the site plan  
42 approval process.

43  
44 **Commissioner Seligman** asked how did they do that on the others? They did  
45 limit them and they restricted as to any kind of electronic or amplified music  
46 and without any issues on that.

47  
48 **Planner Seebach** stated that was during a conditional use hearing.  
49

1 **Commissioner Seligman** stated but still looking at the ordinance, it only  
2 applies to decibels it does not to apply to base music; base notes don't hit the  
3 decibel levels, they are different.  
4

5 **Attorney Chappell** stated that he understands that, but he thinks the way to  
6 address that is through the ordinance, in other words the site plan applies the  
7 ordinance that they have. In a conditional use or special use they can put  
8 special conditions on it, but, in this case he thinks it would be improper and  
9 that has to be dealt with in the context of the sound ordinance, not as a part of  
10 special conditions or restrictions on a site they approve, it is not legal.  
11

12 **Commissioner Seligman** stated if the ordinance is changed would it still  
13 apply to existing conditions. It's not grandfathering in.  
14

15 **Attorney Chappell** stated that in the research he did when he looked at the  
16 sound ordinances, he did not find any case where there was a grandfathering  
17 under a sound ordinance. If there is a use, which because of a sound or  
18 something that could not continue because of the new sound ordinance, they  
19 might have a "taking" question. But, for a purely sound ordinance, he did not  
20 see any grandfathering in. He is not sure something is not out there, but the  
21 research he did looking at the sound ordinance, he did not find such a  
22 provision. He did look to some extent because the sound rules would have  
23 made some changes. He doesn't think there is a grandfathering in effect. If in  
24 fact it's a better policy and purpose and they can show a nuisance.  
25

26 **Commissioner Seligman** stated if there is a noise issue, are there  
27 ordinances that could be used to enforce that, that can be used to stop  
28 excessive noise.  
29

30 **Attorney Chappell** stated that is a pretty broad question and since  
31 Commissioner Seligman has been at this business a long time herself, he  
32 expects that she would have some ideas, but ordinarily she would have to fall  
33 back on common law business questions as to whether or not something is a  
34 nuisance. But, common law nuisances typically are not interpreted more  
35 strictly than a nuisance that is defined by ordinance. He thinks to have a  
36 common law nuisance more restrictive than a codified nuisance would be  
37 unusual. He doesn't think it would be impossible, he just doesn't see that.  
38

39 **Commissioner Seligman** thanked Attorney Chappell.  
40

41 **Planner Seebach** commented in reference to the previous question, none of  
42 the buildings on the north side could be turned into a bar or a brewery or any  
43 kind of alcohol service center because of the proximity of the school. The  
44 brewpub is three hundred feet from the church and school. It meets the  
45 qualifications of the Gaming and Alcohol Division, but none of the properties  
46 on the north side of the property could be used for those purposes.  
47

48 **Chairman Hannah** thanked Planner Seebach for the explanation and  
49 recognized Commissioner Gollis.  
50

51 **Commissioner Gollis** had another question for the applicant.

1 **Chairman Hannah** stated he wanted to continue on this topic if Commissioner  
2 Gollis could postpone. He was going to point out, in the noise ordinance issue,  
3 he wanted to make sure the applicants are aware of the current ordinance.  
4 That it does specify 50 decibels at the property line in the daytime and  
5 maximum 40 decibels at property line from the hours of 10:00 p.m. to 6:00  
6 a.m. He points that out because he was confused and maybe this is okay, but  
7 confused in the fact that their noise control recommendation talked about the  
8 noise that would be generated would drop to ambient levels at the property  
9 line. The ambient level that they mentioned was in the nature of 66 decibels.  
10 He thinks that's if it only dropped to 66 decibels at the property line that would  
11 not, in his opinion, meet the current ordinance and he just wanted to inform  
12 the applicants that while it is a noisy site, he understands that there are ways  
13 he understands from experts to identify where the noise is coming from and  
14 how many decibels are being produced by that source and so there is an  
15 issue of being sure that they comply to the current ordinances. But, he  
16 appreciates Attorney Chappell's comment of the fact the site plan is not the  
17 place to impose additional comments or additional requirements on that. He  
18 will say as a personal comment, that as the Chair, he is also personally  
19 opposed to outdoor electronic speakers. That is a personal bias of his and he  
20 admits it is a bias and certainly can't impose things that are in the ordinances,  
21 but in full disclosure he can give that comment. However he would greatly  
22 encourage in the implementation of their speaker system, that they think very  
23 seriously that making sure that all outside speakers are on a separate switch  
24 so they might be able to turn the outside off while those inside are still going.  
25 That is just personal recommendation, certainly nothing they can impose. Just  
26 a personal comment and then recognized Attorney Chappell.

27  
28 **Attorney Chappell** stated that is one of the things they will try to address  
29 when they got caught up in the codification project. In the sound ordinances  
30 the fact is that some of the decibel levels did not make sense, for instance, a  
31 Xerox copy machine is louder than the decibel level allowed at the property  
32 line. So those are quite low, the way decibel levels work anytime it's  
33 impossible to determine the decibels based on ambient noise and all that kind  
34 of stuff, so one of the places they sort of wrote down how to figure that out, so  
35 there will probably be some changes. He anticipates that when it is addressed  
36 again. But, some of those noise levels in many cases they could not start their  
37 cars at the end of their driveway's without meeting the ambient noise levels  
38 not even the decibel levels. So there will be some changes, he doesn't know  
39 what to call it, but it will be discussed further.

40  
41 **Chairman Hannah** stated that the bottom line is that at the moment the site  
42 plan references the existing ordinances.

43  
44 **Commissioner Gollis** stated his following question has nothing to do with  
45 noise, but he felt compelled to make a couple of comments about that  
46 because he stands at the other end of the spectrum and he does not mean to  
47 navigate the Village, but he thinks it is important that the noise issue comes up  
48 at the appropriate time and place. The site development plan process is not  
49 that place. He's been disappointed that they've spent the time they have on it.  
50 The appropriate time and place would be the conditional use permit if and  
51 when it comes before the Planning and Zoning Commission and he also wants

1 to say, in respect to that, and he says this because he thinks it is appropriate,  
2 the Chairman was very candid about his personal bias and he would say that  
3 if and when this comes up on a conditional use issue, that the Chairman  
4 needs to think long and hard about whether that personal bias to which he just  
5 admitted may cause him to recuse himself from that discussion. Now to his  
6 follow up question, during the sketch plat review there was some discussion  
7 about discussions the Chants had with the neighbors, and he wanted it known  
8 for the record, that there was no one here in favor of this proposal and also no  
9 one here in opposition. He would like to hear from the applicants if they could  
10 have a review of any subsequent discussions they have had with any of the  
11 neighbors since the sketch plat review.

12  
13 **Chris Chant** stated at this point they have not had any additional contact.  
14 They have reached out to the church, and again, have not received comments  
15 at the moment. The one comment that they did have in house with one of the  
16 neighbors was that they can't wait for something to be built there because  
17 hopefully that will stop some of the foot traffic that goes on in that area. He  
18 thinks people are looking forward to something happening and being built and  
19 make things nicer.

20  
21 **Commissioner Craig** wanted to thank them for having Southwest Acoustic to  
22 look at this and it appears to him, not to go back over the noise ordinance, but  
23 it sounds from reading it, it looks like they are at the short end of the  
24 agricultural basis with a loud tractor. They need to look over the noise  
25 ordinance altogether. Commissioner Seligman's comments are valid, but don't  
26 have any thing to do with what they are doing for them right now. But he  
27 wanted to thank them for that and the Dark Skies review.

28  
29 **Chairman Hannah** stated he had a question for Planner Seebach, the  
30 landscape plan does list various plantings and types of plants. He knows they  
31 have in the long range plan a recommended planting of various places in the  
32 Village, but he did not get a chance to go through and see whether or not any  
33 of these were on that list. He wondered if the Planner had had a chance to  
34 cross check with that list.

35  
36 **Planner Seebach** stated there were several of the recommended Village  
37 flowers like the lavender and the other flowering things that were in the Master  
38 Plan for the Village.

39  
40 **Chairman Hannah** thanked Planner Seebach and then asked if any of the  
41 other Commissioners had a question of the applicants. Seeing none he thinks  
42 it's time they close the floor for comment and go for a motion.

43  
44 **MOTION: Commissioner Gollis** moved to approve forwarding to the Board of  
45 Trustees a recommendation of approval for Commercial Site Development  
46 Plan for new commercial development in the Gateway District Zone of the  
47 Fourth Street Character Area and Corridor with the following conditions:

- 48  
49 1. All the requirements of the Albuquerque/Bernalillo County Water Utility  
50 Authority shall be met in the installation of the utilities and governing rules and  
51 regulations adhered to by the development.

1  
2 2. The existing grading and drainage plan meets the storm water  
3 management ordinance as installed and shall be maintained as shown on the  
4 plan.

5  
6 3. Landscaping shall be maintained according to the Landscape Section.

7  
8 4. Dark Skies Section of the Ordinance requirements shall be met.

9  
10 5. The requirements for signage in the Ordinance shall be met and sign  
11 permits must be obtained from the Village.

12  
13 6. Construction shall meet all current Village, County and State Codes.  
14 With the findings:

15  
16 1. The 2020 Master Plan 8.2 Commerce Goal: *To revitalize Fourth Street, the*  
17 *Village Center and the Transit District as the Village's major commercial and*  
18 *mixed use centers through both public and private efforts.*

19  
20 2. The 2020 Master Plan 8.2.1 Objectives:

- 21  
22 ■ *Create a business climate in which businesses flourish*

23  
24 3. 8.2.2 Policy A. Strongly support the business community and use various  
25 economic incentives to strengthen local businesses as well as attract new  
26 ones.

27  
28 4. The Proposed Development meets the requirements of Ordinance 236  
29 Section 5, Commercial land area and permissive uses.

30  
31 5. The Site Development Plan as submitted meets all the requirements of  
32 Ordinance 183 as amended, Section 24(E)(1) Site Development Plan.

33  
34 **SECOND: Chairman Hannah** seconded the motion.

35  
36 **Chairman Hannah** asked if there were any more comments from the  
37 Commissioners at this time and seeing no further comments called for a vote.

38  
39 **VOTE:** The motion carried with a vote of (3-1) with Commissioner Seligman  
40 voting no.

41  
42 **5. OLD BUSINESS - None**

43  
44 **6. NEW BUSINESS - None**

45  
46 **7. REPORTS**

47  
48 **A. PLANNING DEPARTMENT REPORT**

49  
50 **Planner Seebach** gave a quick summary on the decision of the Biehler/Stirling  
51 appeal to the Board of Trustees, and then on the Calle del Pajarito Green

1 Infrastructure project.  
2

3 **9. COMMISSIONER'S INFORMAL DISCUSSION - None**

4  
5 **10. ADJOURNMENT**

6  
7 **MOTION: Commissioner Seligman** moved to adjourn the meeting.

8  
9 **SECOND: Commissioner Craig** seconded the motion.

10  
11 **VOTE:** The motion carried unanimously (4-0).

12  
13 The meeting adjourned at 8:09 p.m.

14  
15 **APPROVED by the Planning and Zoning Commission of the Village Los**  
16 **Ranchos de Albuquerque this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2013.**

17  
18 **ATTEST:**

19  
20  
21  
22 \_\_\_\_\_  
23 Samuel D. Gollis, Secretary  
24 Planning and Zoning Commission  
25