Planning Commission Meeting
October 11, 2012
6:00 p.m.
City Council Chambers
405 N. Paseo de Onate, Espanola, New Mexico
Agenda

I. Call to Order

II. Pledge of Allegiance

III. Approval of Agenda

IV. Public Concerns.

V. Items for Consideration

1. **Variance Request.** Brian Fordham, property owner, is requesting a variance from development code requirements on front and side setbacks for the construction of a proposed portal addition located at 417 Camino Miramontes. This property is zoned R-6, Urban Residential District.

2. **Variance Request.** Brian Fordham, property owner, is requesting a variance from development code requirements on lot coverage for the construction of a portal addition on property located at 417 Camino Miramontes. The property is zoned R-6, Urban Residential District.

3. **Variance Request.** Eloy Salazar, property owner, is requesting a variance from development code requirements on front and side setbacks for an unpermitted, 20' X 31' metal carport located at 1203 Calle Sombra. This property is zoned R-6, Urban Residential District.

4. **Variance Request.** Debbie Martinez, applicant, is requesting a variance from development code requirements, on property belonging to Marci Davis, to allow a second residential dwelling on the same lot, located at 304 S. McCurdy Road. The property is zoned R-6, Urban Residential District.

VI Approval of Minutes

September 13, 2012

VII Matters from the Planning Commission

VIII Matters from the Planning Staff

IX Adjournment

Meeting Date: October 11, 2012

CITY OF ESPAÑOLA
Planning & Zoning Department

405 N. Paseo de Oñate
Espanola, NM 87532
(505) 747-6061

NAME:	PHONE #:
Eloy Salazar	753-1905
David D. DeAguero	747-1069
Brian Fordham	412-9992
Rebekah Fordham	927-8700
Adam Dotterrera	603-0542
JoAnn Salazar	753-1905
Laura S. Vigil	753-7548
Tina Cordova	753-5096
Kenneth Vigil	500-5344
Berniece A. Coriz	927-2331
Marilyn Peabody	927-4341
Patricia A. Alvarado	929-7298
Tim Martinez	927-0507
Brandon Martinez	927-0874
JEANETTE R. MARTINEZ	412-2829
JoAnn Talbot	927-0576

1430 West Peachtree Street, NW
Suite 200
Atlanta, GA 30309
t: 404 601 4000
f: 404 601 3970

GreenbergFarrow

ATLANTA
NEW YORK
CHICAGO
LOS ANGELES
BOSTON
DALLAS
NEW JERSEY
PHOENIX

October 11, 2012

City of Española
Planning Department
405 N. Paseo de Onate
Española, NM. 87532

RE: **Murphy Express- 1628 North Riverside Drive, Española, NM**

On behalf of Murphy Oil USA, Inc. please accept this letter as formal request to withdraw the Subdivision Lot Application for the proposed Murphy Express to be located at 1628 North Riverside Drive within the jurisdiction of the City of Española, Rio Arriba County, New Mexico.

The preliminary plat submitted to your department on August 22nd, subdivided the approximate 1.2017 tract of land into two lots (Lot A 0.507 ac and Lot B 0.6938 ac) respectively.

Please feel free to contact me at 404-601-4000 with any questions, comments, or requests for further information.

Respectfully Submitted,

Yezenia Ortiz

Yezenia Ortiz

Planning & Zoning Commission Meeting
Thursday, October 11, 2012—6:00 pm
City Council Chambers, City Hall
405 N. Paseo de Oñate, Española, NM

I. *Call to Order:*

Chairwoman Martinez called the meeting to order at 6:00 pm with the following in attendance:

Commissioners:	Anissa Martinez, Chairwoman Clyde Vigil John Ricci Julie Atencio Richard Beaudoin
Staff:	Russell Naranjo, Planning Director Larry Valdez, Planning Tech Desirae Medina, Addressor/GIS Tech
Commissioner Absent:	Amrit Khalsa Erle Wright, Vice Chairman
Others:	See Attached Sign in Sheet

II. *Pledge of Allegiance:*

Commissioner Atencio led the Pledge of Allegiance.

III. *Approval of Agenda:*

Commissioner Atencio made a motion to approve the agenda as presented.

Commissioner Beaudoin seconded the motion.

Motion carried 5-0 vote.

IV. *Public Concerns:*

There were no public concerns.

V. *Items for Consideration:*

1. ***Variance Request.*** *Brian Fordham, property owner, is requesting a variance from development code requirements on front and side setbacks for the construction of a proposed portal addition located at 417 Camino Miramontes. This property is zoned R-6, Urban Residential District.*

Mr. Valdez presented the staff report at 6:02 pm where he explained the applicant's plan for the construction of a 13' X 18' enclosed gazebo, attached to the existing portal, within the Vista Hermosa Subdivision. He stated that the plan includes a deviation from the development code on front and side setbacks. The requirements for front setbacks are 20' front, 25' rear and 5' side; however, they are proposed as 10' front, attached at rear and 0' on side. He stated that because of the deviation from code, the department cannot recommend approval. He informed that in reviewing this variance request the Planning Commission shall make a determination to approve, conditionally approve or deny based on whether all of the criteria listed on Section 156: Variance Review Criteria has been met. He stated that the applicant has anticipated approval and has thus poured the footings for the construction of the gazebo wall prior to the issuance of a building permit. He concluded that if approval is granted, the variance request for lot coverage will also require approval.

Brian Fordham, property owner, stated that he would not be changing the size or shape of the property. He purchased the property, as is, with the porch attached. He expressed that the proposed location was the best place for the gazebo and was adequate for his children's safety; the design would preserve the aesthetics of the neighborhood; he and his family could enjoy their property and overall enhance the safety and welfare for their children. Therefore, the request meets all the required criteria.

Chairwoman Martinez opened the public hearing.

Rebekah Fordham, property owner, stated that they had two (2) small children and live near an open roadway with lots of traffic. She expressed that enclosing the area would secure her children to play safely as well as enhance their home.

Wray Ortiz, Camino Miramontes neighbor, stated that he was in support of the proposed construction. He affirmed that it would beautify the area and benefit their children. He concluded that Mr. Fordham was experienced in construction and he would construct it in good taste.

Public hearing was closed at 6:09 pm.

Commissioner Ricci asked if there were penalties for beginning the work and pouring footings before a building permit is issued.

Mr. Naranjo explained that there is a portion of the Uniform Building Code that allows for the building official to charge double for a permit if the construction is started prior to approval.

Commissioner Ricci stated that he is recommending that a penalty fee be assessed as a condition of approval, should the request be approved.

Commissioner Beaudoin questioned if the whole side yard was going to be closed off or if it would be an opened portal.

Mr. Fordham asked if the commission had a copy of the elevation drawing and stated that if not, he could provide a copy for illustration.

The commission did not have the elevation drawings; therefore, Mr. Fordham showed them a copy and explained the proposed design which concluded that the north side would remain open.

Commissioner Beaudoin asked what the material was going to be.

Mr. Fordham answered that it would be fabricated from 2X6 frame with stucco to match the home and carry the motif of the subdivision.

Commissioner Vigil questioned if they were planning on running electricity for lighting.

Mr. Fordham stated no and that the thought was to utilize a metal candle chandelier for lighting and décor.

Commissioner Vigil asked if there were plans to enclose it later on.

Mr. Fordham stated that there were no plans to make it inhabitable.

Chairwoman Martinez asked what the building permit fee would be for this instance.

Mr. Naranjo explained that the permit fee is calculated by the building official and is based off the square footage and value of the project.

Chairwoman Martinez expressed that they should be charged the normal rate because they have been working simultaneously with the City; however, others that have made additions without approval and just have them sitting there should be charged a double fee.

Commissioner Atencio asked when the footings were placed for the anticipation of approval.

Mr. Fordham answered last week and informed that he is knowledgeable of construction and ensured that they were properly done according to code. He concluded that pictures were taken for the inspectors review.

Commissioner Ricci stated that acquiring approval was part of the process and asked why he did not wait for the approval. He explained that should approval not be granted, he could be asked to take it down.

Mr. Fordham stated that he anticipated approval and with the cold weather approaching he wanted to set the concrete. He expressed that he had workers on stand-by for approval so that the project could get completed and not risk everything rotting due to weather conditions.

Mr. Naranjo stated that after some discussion with Mr. Valdez, an average permit fee for a project like this is normally $70 and if doubled would be $140.

Commissioner Ricci made a motion to approve the variance on front and side setbacks for the construction of a proposed portal addition located at 417 Camino Miramontes with current requirements and an assessed penalty charge to be a quarter of the building permit fee.

Commissioner Vigil seconded the motion.

Motion carried 4-1 vote with Commissioner Beaudoin voting against the motion.

2. ***Variance Request.*** *Brian Fordham, property owner is requesting a variance from development code requirements on lot coverage for the construction of a portal addition on property located at 417 Camino Miramontes. The property is zoned R-6, Urban Residential District.*

Mr. Valdez read the staff report stating that the request was for a variance on lot coverage to construct the portal addition, as discussed previously, at 417 Camino Miramontes. He stated that because it was a deviation from the Development Code, the Planning Department cannot recommend approval. He informed that the required lot coverage allowed is 35% and the proposed is 43%. He explained that the Planning Commission shall base a decision to approve, conditional approve or deny the request on whether or not Section 156, Variance Review Criteria, has been met.

Rebekah Fordham, property owner, stated that the project would bring value to their property and the subdivision. She reiterated that it was for the safety and security of their children.

Public hearing was closed at 6:27 pm.

Commissioner Ricci made a motion to approve the variance on lot coverage for the additional usage of a proposed portal addition located at 417 Camino Miramontes.

Commissioner Atencio seconded the motion.

Motion carried 5-0 vote.

3. ***Variance Request.*** *Eloy Salazar, property owner, is requesting a variance from development code requirements on front and side setbacks for an unpermitted, 20'X30' metal carport located at 1203 Calle Sombra. This property is zoned R-6, Urban Residential District.*

Mr. Valdez read the staff report and explained that this was a request for a variance on front and side setbacks for an unpermitted 20X30 metal carport at 1203 Calle Sombra. The applicant placed the structure with the following setbacks: 7' front, attached rear and 0' side. The required setbacks are 20' front, 25' rear and 5' side. This request is a deviation from the Development Code; therefore, staff cannot recommend approval. He explained that approval, conditional approval or denial of this request should be determined by the variance review criteria set forth within Section 156 and informed that the carport could be encroaching, by inches, unto the neighbor's property. If approval is granted, the applicant must ensure that the carport is not encroaching. He concluded that this is within the Yates Subdivision thus covenants may be set; however, the City does not enforce covenants, but approval by the neighborhood association and/or architectural review board is suggested.

Commissioner Beaudoin questioned the height of the carport.

Mr. Naranjo stated he was not sure, but estimates 12'.

Commissioner Vigil acknowledged that the City cannot enforce covenants; however, asked if they could enforce the setbacks signed by Mayor Richard Lucero.

Mr. Naranjo stated yes and explained that when a subdivision is approved, it is approved with the dimension of the lot even if the setbacks are not coherent; however, the City would utilize the astringent of the two setbacks and in this case it is those set forth within the Development Code.

Commissioner Ricci questioned the staff report's mention of approval from the Architectural Committee.

Mr. Naranjo stated that when a subdivision is created there is usually a covenants associated with it. The City does not enforce them because they may or may not be legal, but because a neighborhood association can sue, applicants are advised that a covenant may exist. He clarified that approval from the committee is not a condition of approval, but rather putting the applicant on notice.

Eloy Salazar, property owner, expressed that he purchased the carport unaware that he needed a permit for such a structure because it was temporary and did not attach to the house. He stated that the company he

purchased it from said that no permits were required as did the Planning Department when he called to inquire. He shared that he wanted something that would protect his RV from the elements and since there are 6-7 of these types of structures in the neighborhood, he did not think there would be an issue. He acknowledged that he was close to his neighbor's lot line; therefore, he is willing to move it, but as far as the front, he stated that he had pictures measuring to the edge of curb at 16'-10".

Commissioner Martinez asked how the 7' front setback was calculated.

Mr. Naranjo stated that based on the plat it was 7'.

Mr. Salazar stated that the survey was incorrect.

Mr. Naranjo suggested that he get a surveyor to re-stake it; however, at this time it was all they had to go by.

Adam de Herrera stated that his father-in-law was unaware that permits were required. He expressed that there were many other carports in the area and they too did not meet setbacks. He concluded that he has been a contractor for 14 years and the structure does meet all codes and requirements for safety; therefore, if he had to remove it so should the others.

Berniece Coriz, 1200 Calle Sombra, stated that she did submit a letter to staff regarding this structure. She summarized it by stating that it did not conform to the style of the subdivision; it was larger than a carport and it distracted from the aesthetics of the area. She explained that she installed her coyote fence inside her property line, so to the naked eye, it appears that it could be on her property by inches and may cause issues if the property were sold. She acknowledged that the City does not enforce covenants, but stated that it makes good points ***(read articles within the Yates Subdivision covenant).*** She concluded that she was concerned with its current look, the precedents it would set and the effects it would have on the value of the homes.

Tina Cordova, 1148 Calle Sombra, stated that the applicant was a wonderful neighbor; however, the structure was a real eye sore. She suggested that he lease a place to store the RV.

JoAnn Tarbet, 1154 Bobcat Lane, stated that she is selling her property and the buyers are questioning the structure. She affirmed that it was affecting her property value.

Laura Vigil, 1146 Calle Sombra, stated that the houses on the street are nice and well kept, but this structure is quite large and the first thing to be seen. She reiterated that it devalues her property.

Commissioner Beaudoin asked if the subdivision had an active committee.

Ms. Vigil stated no.

Kenneth Vigil stated that the applicant has a beautiful home, but the structure is an eye sore and devalues the area.

David DeAguero, 1135 Calle Verde, expressed that he had received a variance for his carport, but he spent $15,000 to build one that would match his home and increase value. He stated that the concern with this carport was that it devalues. He explained that there were two (2) similar structures in the area and allowing them would imply to his neighbor, also with a large RV, that he could do the same.

Ms. Vigil announced that the covenant asks for 25' setbacks, but Mr. Salazar stated he has 17'.

Commissioner Ricci asked if he was aware of his association board.

Mr. De Herrera affirmed that there was not one set-up.

Chairwoman Martinez asked what the permit cost would be for the carport.

Mr. Naranjo estimated that it would not cost more than $140.

Commissioner Beaudoin asked if a covenant was signed and received with the purchase of the property.

Mr. Salazar expressed that he was one of the first three (3) houses to move in and could not recall if a copy was within his packet.

Jeanette Martinez, 1143, Calle Sombra, affirmed that she received one and she too was one of the first houses to move in.

Mr. Salazar stated that he was willing to down-size and move from Ms. Coriz's lot line, as long as the RV was covered. He expressed that he had nowhere to move it and could not see storing it elsewhere. He questioned if a single carport could work out.

Commissioner Beaudoin stated that by going outside of the rules he has created a problem for himself and his neighbors. He asked what his options were and if it were possible to call the contractor and have the structure removed.

Mr. DeHerrera asked if there were covenants against parking an RV and questioned if the concern was with setbacks or the RV. He stated that they were willing to meet the setbacks, but require a 4' front setback variance.

Commissioner Beaudoin asked Mr. Salazar if there was anything he could do protect his RV that would accommodate his neighbors and meet City code.

Mr. DeAguero encouraged the applicant to request a variance for a structure that would match the home and offered to help design and fabricate one that would be acceptable.

Commissioner Ricci stated that the installer had to be licensed, therefore, they are responsible to know the requirements and if they failed to inform you, then they are subject to wrongdoing. He stated that Development Code, Section 609: RV states that they are not allowed to be parked in the front of the property. ***(Commissioner Ricci read the beginning portion of section 609)***

Chairwoman Martinez stated that she would like to expand on that section for further understanding ***(Chairwoman Martinez completed reading section 609).*** She simplified that if the back of the lot is of an adequate shape and size then it should be parked in the back, but if it does not fit, then it can be placed in the front as long as it does not obstruct view.

Commissioner Vigil asked if he had seen the restrictive covenants and if he knew where he could acquire a copy.

Mr. Salazar stated no.

Commissioner Vigil stated that they are public record and filed at the County Clerk's Office.

Mr. Naranjo clarified that Section 609 addresses the obstruction of view as a safety measure for properties where a car pulling out would have to look beyond the obstruction for a safe execution. He stated that the code does not state that you cannot have an RV in a subdivision, but the issue is with parking the RV where the neighbor has to look out to pull out.

Commissioner Beaudoin made a motion to deny the variance request on front and side setbacks for an unpermitted 20X30 metal carport, located at 1203 Calle Sombra for failure to meet the Section 156 a-d.

Commissioner Atencio seconded the motion.

Motion carried 4-1 with Chairwoman Martinez voting against.

Mr. Naranjo informed the applicant that he had 15 calendar days to appeal the decision. The request would need to be made in writing so that it can be placed on the council's agenda.

4. ***Variance Request.*** *Debbie Martinez, applicant, is requesting a variance from development code requirements, on property belonging to Marci Davis, to allow a second residential dwelling on the same lot, located at 304 S. McCurdy Road. The property is zoned R-6, Urban Residential District.*

At 7:10 pm, Larry Valdez read staff report to explain that Debbie Martinez was requesting a variance to allow a second residential dwelling on Marcie Davis's single lot, located at 304 S. McCurdy Road. He stated that as in any request for deviation from the Development Code, staff cannot recommend approval; however, the Commission may determine approval, conditional approval or denial based on the Variance Review Criteria set forth within Section 156.

Mr. Valdez summarized that Ms. Davis requested permission for the placement of a mobile home in September. The property is considered to be of legal nonconforming size and currently has a site built home, which is accessed off of McCurdy Road via an easement through the McCurdy School property. The status of the easement is unknown, but has been utilized for years. He informed that the owner has been encouraged to split the lot; however, decided to pursue the variance. Should this variance be granted,

conditions of approval are that city utilities must be connected and a screening be erected between the neighboring structures via a six (6) foot privacy fence.

Commissioner Ricci stated that he knew the applicant; therefore, he would be recusing himself.

Commissioner Beaudoin asked if the proposed second dwelling could be hooked-up to all city utilities.

Mr. Naranjo stated that there are services in the area, but easements would need to be obtained.

Commissioner Vigil pointed out that the plot plan did not show a north lot line and stated the plan was based off a survey that could not be used. He questioned if there was enough room for emergency access and whether it was taken into consideration.

Mr. Naranjo acknowledged that he understood the "statement of use" on the survey and explained that it was only being used to illustrate that the setbacks for the proposed mobile home can be achieved. He added that the access does need to be addressed.

Public hearing opened at 7:16 pm.

Marcie Davis, property owner, stated that she purchased the property 2 ½ years ago. She explained that it is a long piece of property that borders her other parcel across the acequia and was used for agriculture; unfortunately, her family is in a situation where temporary housing is needed until they can find a more suitable condition. She expressed that they are out of options.

Chairwoman Martinez asked who she was housing.

Ms. Davis stated her nephew, Billy Martinez and his two (2) children.

Debbie Martinez stated that she is Billy's mother and he has been residing with his grandmother, but needs his own place for him and his children. She stated that he has purchased a mobile home and needs somewhere to place it until he can buy a home. She concluded that it has been financially hard for him and they were asking for permission to temporarily place the mobile home.

Ann Martinez stated that Billy is her nephew and he found a reasonably priced mobile home. She supported his request to temporarily place the home. She expressed that he has been working hard to make the home habitable and having family together was optimal during this time.

Commissioner Atencio asked to estimate how long "temporary" was for their situation.

Billy Martinez stated no more than two (2) years.

Gerri Galdon stated that he was also her nephew and she just wanted to reiterate everything already said. She added that it was the neighborhood he was raised in and the family contact would be ideal for him and them.

Patricia Alvarado, Executive Director for McCurdy Schools, stated that they would like to address the easement issue. She explained that they were in a transition with McCurdy Charter School and they have researched for a written agreement, but could not find one. She stated that she was concerned with them moving the mobile home at the narrow opening and was pleased that they would connect to city utilities rather than borrow from the school. She made it clear that she was not opposed to the request but had concerns with the proximity to the staff dormitory in an emergency situation.

Marilyn Peabody, McCurdy Board of Trustees President, asked if the property owner had a written easement.

Ms. Davis stated that the previous owner used the easement for at least 40 years, but when she purchased the property there was not a documented easement. She explained that at one point she tried contacting McCurdy Schools to see if it was possible to widen the masonry wall, but no one knew where to direct her for the research. She added that there is a fire hydrant on McCurdy Road, 10' from her property line.

Mr. Naranjo stated that it is illegal to land block property in New Mexico and asked where the access was that she was suppose to go through.

Ms. Davis stated that she purchased it as is with water rights documented and thought the easement used was a legal easement.

Mr. Naranjo stated that the length at which an easement has been in use can determine a prescriptive easement and cannot be taken away; however, that is a civil matter. He stated that he was curious as to where she assumed the easement was to get to the property.

Ms. Davis stated at the opening that is used as the easement. She explained that the lady she purchased from used to park in the front of the house and overtime may have started driving through.

Mrs. Peabody said she used to take piano lessons from the lady and her parents would drive her up the north side. She stated it has always been that way, she is not in opposition, but concerned about safety. She informed that they had just learned about the request on Friday and were not sure what placement was being requested but they wanted to ensure that there were safe conditions.

Chairwoman Martinez stated that the warranty deed notes subjects to all easements, restrictions and reservations of record.

Commissioner Vigil explained that the verbiage is to cover all bases and "subject to," if any, is not committing. He stated that some research needs to be done and if nothing is found then an easement needs to be obtained. He encouraged that they work with McCurdy Schools.

Ms. Alvarado stated that they were obligated to provide safety awareness to the Charter School that is leasing.

Chairwoman Martinez stated that it was only a father and his children; therefore, the traffic increase would be minimal.

Ms. Davis informed that her neighbor had moved in a double-wide and they used the main entrance to McCurdy and traveled south through her property. She stated that should the variance be granted, she would like to work on an agreement with McCurdy to do the same after school hours to ensure the children's safety.

Mr. Naranjo stated that a timeframe has been asked for and "temporary" is being used; however, he would like to inform that per state statue, a timeframe cannot be included as a condition for approval. He affirmed that the request is for a variance to allow for a second dwelling on that lot and although it could only be for two (2) years, if granted, it has the ability to stay there forever.

Mrs. Peabody asked for clarification and stated that with a variance a parcel of property for a single dwelling can now have two (2) forever.

Mr. Naranjo explained that the property is large enough for two (2); however, one piece of property can only have one dwelling structure. They are asking permission to for two (2) which could be there forever if they choose.

Commissioner Beaudoin stated that a lot split would legally take care of the two (2) dwelling issues.

Mr. Naranjo stated yes and explained that the lot split would meet criteria; however, surveying costs would be associated.

Commissioner Beaudon questioned if a lot split was feasible.

Ms. Davis stated that she did not want to invest in the cost for a temporary use and expressed that if she split the lot it could be sold and be allowed a dwelling and accessory structures. She stated that it seemed more reasonable to have fewer structures. She expressed that pursuing it was possible, but it was currently a financial hardship.

Commissioner Atencio acknowledged their financial constraints, but stated that it was only fair that they first discuss unanswered questions with McCurdy Schools before a motion is made.

Ms. Martinez stated that the letter was sent to McCurdy over a month ago and they only received it on Friday due to their transition with the Charter School. She expressed that the gentlemen, from who they purchased the mobile home, graciously allowed the mobile home to stay there until a decision was made at tonight's meeting. She concluded that they did not want to be delayed and would like to get everything situated before the winter. She asked how long McCurdy needed.

Mrs. Peabody stated that their next board meeting was on Thursday and she would include the easement as an item for approval.

Ms. Martinez stated that it sounded like a legal issue and the tenants had a right to use the easement.

Commissioner Beaudoin stated that Development Code, Section 608, paragraph B-7 states that a temporary structure is allowed during construction and asked if this situation could fit within that section.

Mr. Naranjo stated that the section for temporary housing is utilized when a house is being fabricated and the owners need a temporary home until completed. He specified that this did not fit the criteria and was located in an R-6, where only allowed one dwelling is allowed.

Ms. Alvarado reiterated that they were not in opposition, but just wanted to point out some questions that had nothing to do with easement issues.

Chairwoman Martinez asked if McCurdy Schools would be fine with a decision being made tonight.

Ms. Alvarado stated yes.

Chairwoman Martinez made a motion to approve the allowance of a second residential structure for Debbie Martinez based on all four (4) criteria being met within Section 156.

Commissioner Vigil seconded the motion.

Motion carried 3-1 vote with Commissioner Atencio against and Commissioner Ricci abstaining.

Chairwoman Martinez made a second motion to approve the variance of a second residential structure at 304 S. McCurdy Road, based on meeting all four (4) criteria being met within Section 156, with the condition that they connect to all available city utilities and erect a 6' privacy fence between McCurdy Schools.

Commissioner Vigil seconded the motion.

Motion carried 3-1 vote with Commissioner Atencio against and Commissioner Ricci abstaining.

VI. Approval of Minutes, September 13, 2012:

Commissioner Beaudoin made a motion to approve the minutes as drafted.

Commissioner Vigil seconded the motion.

Motion carried 5-0 vote.

VII. Matters from the Planning Commission:

Commissioner Beaudoin suggested that perhaps Section 608 could be expanded to include something for cases such as the one heard where temporary housing is needed during financial hardship.

Mr. Naranjo agreed.

Chairwoman Martinez announced that Fall Cleaning was approaching.

Mr. Naranjo stated that it would be nice if some of the commissioners could volunteer. He explained that it would be trash detail and he would look into forwarding the information.

Chairwoman Martinez stated that the newsletter asked for residents to place their house numbers; therefore, she wanted to remind the commissioners to be sure that they post their house numbers if needed.

VIII. Matters from the Planning Staff:

Mr. Valdez stated that there was one variance for next month's meeting.

IX. Adjournment:

Commissioner Ricci made a motion to adjourn the meeting.

Commissioner Beaudoin seconded the motion.

Motion carried 5-0 vote, meeting adjourned at 8:04 pm.

Anita Martinez — 1/10/2013

Chairman Signature — ***Date***

[illegible] — 11/9/2012

Secretary Signature — ***Date***