

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8

**MINUTES**  
**VILLAGE OF LOS RANCHOS**  
**Planning and Zoning Commission**  
**6718 Rio Grande Blvd. NW**  
**Warren J. Gray Hall**  
**March 10, 2015**  
**7:00 P.M.**

9  
10

**Present:**

11

**STAFF**

12  
13

**Administrator:** Kelly Ward

**Attorney:** Bill Chappell

14  
15

**Planning Staff:** Tim McDonough, Director

16  
17

1. **CALL TO ORDER – Vice-Chairman** called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

18  
19

A. Oath of Office – Debra Colman.

20  
21  
22  
23

**Vice-Chair Seligman** stated that they have a new Commissioner and introduced Debra Colman, who would now take her oath of office. Then asked Attorney Chappell to swear in Commissioner Colman.

24  
25

**Attorney Chappell** swore in Commissioner Colman.

26  
27  
28

**Vice-Chair Seligman** welcomed Commissioner Colman and continued with the Roll Call.

29  
30  
31  
32

B. **ROLL CALL** - Commissioner Craig, Commissioner Seligman, Commissioner Brawley, Commissioner Colman, Commissioner Tourville. Commissioner Riccobene has been excused.

33  
34  
35  
36

**Planner McDonough** stated that Tom Riccobene was also confirmed as a Commissioner, but was unable to be at tonight's meeting and will be giving his oath at the next meeting.

37  
38  
39

**Vice-Chair Seligman** then conducted a roll call and stated for the record that there was a quorum.

40  
41  
42

B. **APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

43  
44  
45

**Vice-Chair Seligman** asked Planner McDonough if there were any changes to the agenda.

46  
47  
48  
49

**Planner McDonough** stated there was not a change to the agenda and gave a background as to what was being presented; a site development plan and what was originally public noticed as a special use permit.

1                   **Vice-Chair Seligman** asked if there was a motion.

2  
3                   **MOTION: Commissioner Brawley** moved approval of the agenda.

4  
5                   **SECOND: Commissioner Tourville** seconded the motion.

6  
7                   **VOTE:** The motion carried unanimously (5-0).

8  
9  
10  
11           **2. PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD--NONE**

12  
13           **3. CONSENT AGENDA**

14  
15           **A. APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA**

16  
17                   **1. Minutes of the November 18, 2014 Regular meeting.**

18  
19           **Vice-Chair Seligman** asked if there were changes or corrections and  
20 recognized Commissioner Brawley.

21  
22           **Commissioner Brawley** stated on page 8 of 13, Line 5 take out “in the” add  
23 in “near” and “level”. So that it reads “near ground level” instead of “in the  
24 ground”.

25  
26           **Vice-Chair Seligman** asked if there were any more comments then asked for  
27 a motion.

28  
29           **MOTION: Commissioner Craig** moved approval of the minutes of the  
30 November 18, 2014 meeting as amended.

31  
32           **SECOND: Commissioner Tourville** seconded the motion.

33  
34           **VOTE:** The motion carried unanimously (5-0).

35  
36           **4. PUBLIC HEARINGS AND APPLICATIONS**

37  
38           **Vice-Chair Seligman** asked all those that are going to speak please stand  
39 and asked Attorney Chappell to swear them in.

40  
41           **Attorney Chappell** swore in those present who would be speaking before  
42 the Commission.

43  
44           **A. SDP-15-01** A request by Lesa Newberry for a Sketch Plat Review for a  
45 Mixed Used Development in the C-1 Retail Commercial Zone of the Fourth  
46 Street Commercial Character Area. The property is located at 7315 4<sup>th</sup> St.  
47 NW and is legally known as Tract A-1 Lands of Tintara projected Sec. 21,  
48 T11N, R3E, NMPM, Elena Gallegos Grant, Village of Los Ranchos, Bernalillo  
49 County, New Mexico filed on November 5, 2004. The property contains .5918  
50 acres more or less.

1 **Vice-Chair Seligman** stated that there is no action to be taken by the  
2 Planning Commission and will only advise the applicant in the following  
3 manner: If the proposal has merit; if the configuration would be  
4 acceptable; if the Commission sees difficulty in the site development  
5 confirming to the 2020 Master Plan and the zone code requirements.  
6 Then asked Planner McDonough for his planning report.  
7

8 **Planner McDonough** gave the planning report stating that the planning  
9 department has no recommendations to offer.  
10

11 **Vice-Chair Seligman** asked the applicant to come forward and state his  
12 name and address.  
13

14 **Mark Snapp** 1037 Las Golondrinas NW 87107.  
15

16 **Vice-Chair Seligman** asked if he was representing the applicant.  
17

18 **Mark Snapp** stated he was representing Lesa Newberry, who bought this  
19 property a few years ago with the intent of developing this. Not only  
20 having a place for her professional work, but someplace to retire. She  
21 wants to develop this place sooner than later. They would like to get away  
22 from pure commercial development on this small piece of land. The  
23 development is behind the existing commercial salon. There will be minor  
24 modifications of the landscaping and parking to facilitate better traffic  
25 ingress/egress. The private road and utility easement are unaffected. The  
26 development is laid out in the rear with parking for the commercial space  
27 in between the salon and the rear commercial leased space. The over all  
28 design is primarily Northern New Mexico and xeriscaping landscaping.  
29

30 **Vice-Chair Seligman** asked if there were any comments or questions  
31 from the Commissioners and recognized Commissioner Brawley.  
32

33 **Commissioner Brawley** asked if they could assume the occupancy of  
34 the residential space will also control the retail space?  
35

36 **Mark Snapp** stated it is the intent that Ms. Newberry will retain ownership  
37 of the entire property and to possibly lease out the front salon to another  
38 operation as a source of income for herself.  
39

40 **Commissioner Brawley** noticed that the commercial six hundred (600)  
41 square feet is immediately adjacent to the residency. There will be an  
42 occupancy rating wall and a fire barrier. One of the things is that the  
43 Village doesn't do it's own ~~zone code~~ **building code** analysis that goes to  
44 the County. But the County doesn't deal with this very well and it may end  
45 up with issues. He just wants to point out when they do design this make  
46 sure they get a proper analysis from a ~~zone code~~ **building code** stand  
47 point. Second issue is that they will need a hydrological engineer so they  
48 need to look at areas for ponding. Otherwise he thinks it's a great project  
49 and personally he's in favor of mixed use.  
50

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  
50

**Mark Snapp** stated that the intent is to have an occupancy separation. With a single family dwelling with a separate entrance. It is not intended to be connected. He thinks they will be able to satisfy the county.

**Commissioner Brawley** stated he assumed that easement to the south side is for access to the rear property.

**Mark Snapp** affirmed that statement.

**Vice-Chair Seligman** asked if there were any more questions from any of the Commissioners.

**Mark Snapp** stated that the owner Lesa Newberry wanted to address the Commission.

**Vice-Chair Seligman** asked Ms. Newberry if she had been sworn in and to state her name and address.

**Lesa Newberry** 7315 4<sup>th</sup> Street NW 87107 stated she had been sworn in and thanked the Commission for allowing her to develop her property it exceeds her best benefit in owning the property. Then asked if there were any questions.

**Vice-Chair Seligman** asked if there were any questions from the Commissioners for Ms. Newberry.

**Vice-Chair Seligman** stated the building in front is a salon is she going to maintain it as a salon or does she care as to what use is in that building.

**Lesa Newberry** stated that of course she cared as she was going to be living on the property. She was to maintain it as a small usage. She wants to keep the salon for a few more years and then move back to the smaller studio and rent the front to some type of small business.

**Vice-Chair Seligman** asked what about the small commercial space. Is that going to be leased or will it be vacant until you move in?

**Lesa Newberry** stated she might lease it to begin with and then transition over at a later date. She is open to all possibilities right now.

**Vice-Chair Seligman** asked if there were any comments or questions.

**Lesa Newberry** thanked them for allowing them to build in the Village.

**Vice-Chair Seligman** thanked them for the presentation and as there are no comments it seems everyone is in agreement in wanting mixed use.

**Vice-Chair Seligman** asked if there was anyone in the audience who wanted to comment on this application.

1 **Vice-Chair Seligman** recognized an audience member and asked him if  
2 he had been sworn-in. Receiving a negative then asked Attorney Chappell  
3 to please swear him in.  
4

5 **Vice-Chair Seligman** asked the gentleman to state his name and address  
6 for the record.  
7

8 **Paul Dominguez** 7315 B 4<sup>th</sup> Street NW 87107 stated he lived behind Lesa  
9 Newberry's salon. They agreed that they like Lesa and that a mixed-use is  
10 a good idea. Their concern is the maintenance of the easement and road  
11 and the traffic. They just wanted to let everyone know what their concerns  
12 were. He said he didn't know how this plan would work as his property  
13 starts where the plan ends.  
14

15 **Vice-Chair Seligman** asked if he had any concerns about the  
16 development?  
17

18 **Paul Dominguez** stated the main concern is traffic as this is the road to  
19 their house. The plan starts and ends with them. They just have the normal  
20 concerns.  
21

22 **Vice-Chair Seligman** asked if he wanted to keep the road open is that  
23 what he is saying.  
24

25 **Paul Dominguez** confirmed the statement.  
26

27 **Vice-Chair Seligman** asked if there were any questions or comments  
28 from the Commissioners. Then recognized Commissioner Brawley.  
29

30 **Commissioner Brawley** asked could he tell them how the road is  
31 maintained now?  
32

33 **Paul Dominguez** stated it is just an easement.  
34

35 **Commissioner Brawley** stated that from the plat it looks like a dedicated  
36 access easement. His question was in terms of maintenance of the road  
37 do you share the maintenance.  
38

39 **Paul Dominguez** stated they are supposed to share.  
40

41 **Commissioner Brawley** stated so there is some sort of plan.  
42

43 **Paul Dominguez** stated that there is.  
44

45 **Vice-Chair Seligman** asked if that was a concern to him with an increase  
46 in traffic or will there be an increase of traffic?  
47

48 **Paul Dominguez** stated he didn't know if there would be an increase in  
49 traffic. He didn't know if these are even legitimate concerns or not. He just  
50 wanted them to know. He just wants to know that they have an  
51 understanding.

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  
50  
51

**Vice-Chair Seligman** stated she appreciated that they are concerns and they want to make sure that access stays open.

**Lesa Newberry** stated she could answer that for Paul.

**Vice-Chair Seligman** stated sure.

**Lesa Newberry** stated she didn't know if Paul knows this but it is a private 25' foot easement that is to be maintained by both parties, but she has been maintaining it all this time.

**Vice-Chair Seligman** asked if there was anyone else who wanted to make comments. Then asked if there were any more comments from the Commissioners. And recognized Commissioner Craig.

**Commissioner Craig** stated that this seemed to be a very appropriate development that we have been talking about in the Village. And they certainly have properties across the street that are taking advantage of the full 300' foot and this seems like a low impact to the land being developed. Glad to see something happen there. He thinks they need to take along the residents concerns.

**Vice-Chair Seligman** stated she had a question for the agent. She noticed that this is a 2-story dwelling is this going to have any impact to the neighbor to the west.

**Mark Snapp** stated they don't believe so at this point because of the setback that is on the attached studio and carport offers an additional buffer. Which is single story the 2-story is mainly focused around the main house.

**Vice-Chair Seligman** thanked Mr. Snapp. Then asked if there were any more comments from anybody. Then recognized Planner McDonough.

**Planner McDonough** stated he really was looking forward to having a discussion of mixed-use in the Village because it is something they have talked a lot about. And they are getting ready to look at the zone code and how they are going to maybe adapt that a little differently to address these kinds of things. They have requirements for open space that go with commercial development so that 15% of the un-built lot is to be landscaped. We also have a requirement that the separation between the commercial and the residential is to have a 15' landscape buffer. In this case it is a commercial zone with a residential use. Whereas if it was a developed as a residential use he didn't think that would apply. So he just put that on the table for them to consider. He didn't think the open space would be a challenge given the site plan that he has seen. That 15% of the open lot be landscaped. He didn't know about the 15' foot landscape buffer adjoining the residential lot. He would like some input on that.

1 **Vice-Chair Seligman** recognized Mr. Snapp.

2  
3 **Mark Snapp** stated as he mentioned earlier that this is their conceptual  
4 step to get the project going with the site development plan. Obviously  
5 there are going to be landscape requirements. Open space requirements  
6 will be all addressed as they move through the site plan approval process.  
7

8 **Vice-Chair Seligman** recognized Commissioner Tourville.

9  
10 **Commissioner Tourville** stated he had two comments. Looking through  
11 this where the private workshop area that Planner McDonough referred to  
12 there is a 10' foot setback there and on residential properties it is 15' foot.  
13 So that is something you want to be aware of. The access easement he  
14 recommends they have a **recorded** maintenance agreement. So there are  
15 no future arguments as to how it is going to be maintained.  
16

17 **Mark Snapp** thanked Commissioner Tourville.

18  
19 **Vice-Chair Seligman** recognized Commissioner Brawley.

20  
21 **Commissioner Brawley** stated if he remembers the zone code properly a  
22 commercially zoned property abutting a residential zoned property needs a  
23 15' foot landscape buffer. He doesn't think this applies here because it is  
24 all zoned C-1. The only place it might apply is between the west end of the  
25 residential building and the residential zoned property further west. There  
26 is 15' feet there so apparently this could ~~be complying~~ **comply** with this  
27 plan. Regarding the 10' side setback because it is all the in C-1 zone 15'  
28 feet does not apply and in fact it ~~would~~ **could** be zero. But then again you  
29 are going to run into building code issues with a zero setback and some  
30 architectural problems as well.  
31

32 **Vice-Chair Seligman** stated her understanding of the site development  
33 plan it needs to comply with both the residential and the commercial  
34 requirements. That was the idea of this mixed-use. You have to have both  
35 compliant with both. Is that correct?  
36

37 **Attorney Chappell** stated that the previous Planning Director took the  
38 position that you could not possibly combine the two uses on a single lot.  
39 In looking at this he didn't find anything that would indicate that they were  
40 prohibited. And it appeared that they were developing in a C-1 zone, which  
41 specifically allowed residential uses. The only overlap that was obvious  
42 was that it says specifically that the floor area ratio must apply in the C-1  
43 zone. As they may recall there was an exemption for that in the Gateway  
44 District zone, but in the C-1 zone it still applies. The commercial zoning  
45 requirements still apply this is just a permitted use in the C-1 zone. There  
46 is a definition under zoning code, which is not used anywhere else in the  
47 zoning code called New Urbanism and it says: "Meets the process of re-  
48 integrating components of modern life housing, workplace, shopping and  
49 recreation into compact pedestrian friendly mixed-use neighborhoods  
50 linked by transit and set up in larger regional open space framework  
51 initially does need traditional planning. But, principles that define new

1 urbanism can be applied successfully to infill and a re-development site  
2 within existing urbanized zone.” There was some concept of this being  
3 done in the zoning code, but the zoning code never used the word new  
4 urbanization again. So his conclusion was it’s C-1 zone they have to meet  
5 the conditions on the C-1 zone. A permitted use on C-1 is residential. The  
6 only outside requirement he could find was floor area ratio. And they  
7 determine that by including all structures on the site plus the residence to  
8 calculate the floor area ratio. That was his conclusion after several days of  
9 discussion with Mr. McDonough.

10  
11 **Vice-Chair Seligman** recognized Commissioner Brawley.

12  
13 **Commissioner Brawley** stated he was going to offer some argument in  
14 as lawful activities on home occupations we don’t apply commercial  
15 restrictions to home occupations, which are in for example, A-1 zones. It’s  
16 the underlying A-1 zone that rules.

17  
18 **Vice-Chair Seligman** stated so for future clients what they are saying is if  
19 it complies with the C-1 requirements regardless of the use they can’t go  
20 higher but you can have a lighter use if it’s a C-1 requirement.

21  
22 **Attorney Chappell** stated in this particular case he didn’t think they could  
23 put everything under C-1 that is a less dense use. In the C-1 zone  
24 residential use is a permitted use so as long as it’s a permitted use in the  
25 C-1 zone, zoning requirements of C-1 apply plus whatever additional  
26 requirements there was for residential so the floor area ratio still applies.

27  
28 **Vice-Chair Seligman** stated she just wanted further guidance for them  
29 when it comes up now and in the future.

30  
31 **Attorney Chappell** stated it has to be a specific permitted use it can’t just  
32 be everything they think is less intense than C-1 zoning. It needs to be a  
33 permitted use to meet that classification.

34  
35 **Vice-Chair Seligman** thanked Attorney Chappell.

36  
37 **Mark Snapp** stated he had just a final statement. He thanked Mr. Brawley  
38 for his comments on the zone. And that is how they read it as well. And he  
39 would like to mention a specific thank you to Mr. McDonough, who has  
40 been very instrumental in all of this and has been a source of invaluable  
41 information. Mr. McDonough has the best interest of the Village at heart.  
42 He appreciates everything that Mr. McDonough has done for them.

43  
44 **Vice-Chair Seligman** thanked Mr. Snapp and stated they did too. Then  
45 asked if there were any final comments on this agenda item. And then  
46 preceded to the next item of business.

47  
48  
49 **5. OLD BUSINESS—NONE**

1           **6. NEW BUSINESS**

2  
3           **A. Adoption of Resolution 2015-1-P&Z (Open Meetings Act).**

4  
5           **Vice-Chair Seligman** asked for the Planners report.

6  
7           **Planner McDonough** stated this was done annually according to the State  
8 statute. They went through it to make sure they were compliant with the  
9 more recent requirements of interpretation by the State Attorney General.  
10 And thanked and introduced Village Clerk Stephanie Dominguez, who is  
11 visiting and just went through the same with the Board of Trustees to make  
12 sure we are compliant with the law.

13  
14           **Vice-Chair Seligman** asked if there were any comments from the  
15 Commissioners.

16  
17           **Vice-Chair Seligman** stated if there were no other comments she called for  
18 a motion.

19  
20           **MOTION: Commissioner Brawley** moved to approve the adoption of  
21 Resolution 2015-1-P & Z Open Meetings Act.

22  
23           **SECOND: Commissioner Craig** seconded the motion.

24  
25           **VOTE:** the motion carried unanimously. (5-0).

26  
27           **B. Adoption of Resolution 2015-2-P&Z (Rules for the Transaction of**  
28 **Business).**

29  
30           **Vice-Chair Seligman** asked for the Planners report.

31  
32           **Planner McDonough** stated this is the second resolution that they adopt on  
33 a yearly basis. This resolution lays out the framework for the Commission  
34 and how the Commission should conduct business.

35  
36           **Vice-Chair Seligman** asked if there were any questions then recognized  
37 Commissioner Brawley.

38  
39           **Commissioner Brawley** ~~stated that they should invest in Robert's Rule~~  
40 ~~books~~ **asked as in the past would they receive Robert's Rules books.**

41  
42           **Commissioner Tourville** asked where is their complimentary Robert's Rule  
43 books?

44  
45           **Planner McDonough** stated they are on order. And stated they would  
46 provide copies to anyone who would like one.

47  
48           **Commissioner Brawley** thanked Planner McDonough.

49  
50           **Vice-Chair Seligman** asked if there were any more questions or comments.  
51

1 **Attorney Chappell** stated he looked at these every year and he doesn't  
2 know if it makes any difference, but in the Open Meetings Act it states that  
3 regular meetings will be every second Tuesday of the month. If that's a  
4 holiday that will be scheduled the following Tuesday. The Operating  
5 Resolution says the first of every month, but it can be cancelled if there's not  
6 enough business. It seems to be perhaps at some point they should put in  
7 one of these resolutions what happens when they want to move these. As  
8 being discussed at the present time to move them around at least as far as  
9 the Planning Commission goes and so this is the time to do that. Based on  
10 this 72-hour notice that meetings can be changed for whatever reason it  
11 deems appropriate. He thinks because of next month the Board of Trustees  
12 being ahead of the Planning and Zoning, but these resolutions are always a  
13 little inconsistent with what they do.

14  
15 **Vice-Chair Seligman** asked if he had any suggestions on what they need  
16 to do or any wording.

17  
18 **Attorney Chappell** stated at this point where it says any meeting that is  
19 cancelled or postponed he thinks that they can say any meeting can be  
20 cancelled or postponed or changed to a different meeting date at the  
21 discretion of the Village. If there are no pending issues or if circumstances  
22 would indicate that the meeting should be on a different date. Some  
23 language like that makes it a little more flexible is all he is concerned about.

24  
25 **Vice-Chair Seligman** asked if there were any comments on that. It might  
26 help us if we are going to make a motion so they can get that language and  
27 where exactly it needs to be.

28  
29 **Attorney Chappell** stated they can do that or they can use the procedure  
30 calling all these meetings special meetings called by the chairperson. The  
31 chairperson can call special meetings, but he thinks just to do it out of  
32 processes is not there. So perhaps they change this they change what is  
33 called special meetings that's another option.

34  
35 **Vice-Chair Seligman** asked if they can modify it tonight, can they do that  
36 now.

37  
38 **Planner McDonough** stated he thinks for the up coming situation it can be  
39 handled by calling it a special meeting. Since there is no business to come  
40 before the Commission the regular meeting can be cancelled and then they  
41 can work on some language in the future.

42  
43 **Vice-Chair Seligman** stated that would be helpful. Then asked if there were  
44 any comments or questions from the Commission. Then asked if there was  
45 a motion to adopt Resolution 2015-2-P & Z (Rule for the Transaction of  
46 Business).

47  
48 **MOTION: Commissioner Tourville** moved to approve the adoption of  
49 Resolution 2015-2-P & Z (Rules for the Transaction of Business.)

50  
51 **SECOND: Commissioner Colman** seconded the motion.

1 **VOTE:** the vote carried unanimously (5-0).

2  
3 **C. Election of Officers 2015**

4  
5 **Vice-Chair Seligman** opened the floor for nominations for Chairman.

6  
7 **NOMINATION: Commissioner Colman** nominated Commissioner  
8 Seligman given her previous role as Vice-Chair of the Commission.

9  
10 **SECOND: Commissioner Brawley** seconded the nomination.

11  
12 **VOTE:** the vote carried unanimously. (5-0)

13  
14 **Chairman Seligman** called for a nomination for Vice-Chairman.

15  
16 **NOMINATION: Commissioner Craig** nominated Commissioner Brawley  
17 because of his years of experience.

18  
19 **SECOND: Commissioner Tourville** seconded the nomination.

20  
21 **VOTE:** the vote carried unanimously. (5-0)

22  
23 **Chairman Seligman** called for a nomination for Secretary.

24  
25 **NOMINATION: Commissioner Craig** nominated Commissioner Tourville.

26  
27 **SECOND: Commissioner Colman** seconded the nomination.

28  
29 **VOTE:** the vote carried unanimously. (5-0)

30  
31 **7. REPORTS**

32  
33 **A. PLANNING DEPARTMENT REPORT**

34  
35 **Chairman Seligman** asked Planner McDonough for his planning  
36 department report.

37  
38 **Planner McDonough**

- 39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51
- Introduced Jeff Phillips who is the Emergency Services Coordinator for the Village. He will be going before the Board of Trustees meeting March 11, 2015 to be appointed to the Commission.
  - The Los Poblanos change to conditions request went before the Board of Trustees and it was decided that to handle revise the Special Use Zones (SU-Zone) Code to include all SU Zone properties and Conditions into the SU-Zone Ordinance and make them part of the code.

**Commissioner Brawley** suggested that it be would be very useful linked the list back to the checklist for site development approval. What he means by that the site development is the fundamental document for a SU-Zone. That's what they review so to be sure to touch all of the areas what they

1 have already identifies as necessary if they could link that back with the  
2 criteria they are talking about for the SU-Zone that might be helpful.  
3

4 **Attorney Chappell** stated the situation is there will be no new SU-Zone that  
5 section of the code was repealed several years ago. This is only a cleanup  
6 thing to make sure that somebody goes to buy that piece of land and asks  
7 what they can use it for it's in one place and in a zoning ordinance.  
8

9 **Commissioner Brawley** asked so someone can re-review or change an  
10 existing issue?  
11

12 **Attorney Chappell** responded they know exactly what their uses are. It's a  
13 compilation for the SU-Zones.  
14

15 **Commissioner Brawley** stated that will be a huge help.  
16

17 **Chairman Seligman** asked if there was any more to report.  
18

19 **Planner McDonough**

- 20 • Gave an update on the 4<sup>th</sup> Street Project.
- 21 • Building permits are up.
- 22 • There are only 2 Business Renewals left.  
23

24 **Chairman Seligman** asked if there were any questions for Planner  
25 McDonough.  
26

27 **9. COMMISSIONER'S INFORMAL DISCUSSION**

- 28 • Date was set for March 31, 2015 for the Special Meeting.  
29

30 **10. ADJOURNMENT**

31 **Chairman Seligman** asked if there was a motion for adjournment.  
32

33 **MOTION: Commissioner Brawley** moved to adjourn at 7:56 p.m.  
34

35 **SECOND: Commissioner Tourville** seconded the motion.  
36

37 **VOTE:** the vote carried unanimously (5-0).  
38

39 **APPROVED** by the Planning and Zoning Commission of the Village Los  
40 Ranchos de Albuquerque this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2015.  
41

42 **ATTEST:**

43 \_\_\_\_\_  
44 Tim Tourville, Secretary  
45 Planning and Zoning Commission  
46