

# MINUTES

ADLC Planning Board

ADLC Courthouse, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor Courtroom



---

*Monday, March 21st, 2022, at 6:00 pm | Meeting called to order at 6:03 pm by Rose Nyman, Chairperson*

---

## Attendance

---

Members Present: Rose Nyman, Chairperson; John Lombardi, Vice-Chairperson; Christine Klanecky; Bob Wren; Frank Fitzpatrick; Art Villasenor; Dan Reardon

Members Absent: Annette Smith, excused; Colleen Riley, excused

Staff Present: Carl Hamming, Planning Director; Gayla Hess, Planner II; Carlye Hansen Planning Department Secretary

Guests Present: Please see sign-in sheet. **Please see attachment**

---

## Approval of Minutes

---

January 10<sup>th</sup>, 2022

Motion was made by Bob Wren to approve minutes from January 10<sup>th</sup>, 2022; seconded by Frank Fitzpatrick. Motion passes 7-0.

---

## Introduction of New Member

---

Rose Nyman, Chairperson, took the opportunity to introduce the newest member of the Planning Board, Dan Reardon.

---

## Public Hearings

---

### Derzay Subsequent Minor Subdivision

PUBLIC HEARING on a Subsequent Subdivision application submitted by John Derzay. Applicant proposes to subdivide a 33.35-acre parcel with 2 existing residences north of Lost Creek Rd. The preliminary plat proposes 2-residential lots to separate the homes within the Lost Creek Development District. Property is legally described as:

GALLE II MINOR, S25, T05 N, R11 W, Lot 1A, ACRES 33.35, 200B, 252B AMENDED PLAT

Pursuant to Sec. 16-165 of the Code of Ordinances of ADLC, a public hearing is required before the Planning Board for consideration of the subdivision application.

### Staff Report

Gayla Hess, Planner II, reviewed and presented the staff report put together by she and her office. All content can be located on the ADLC website. She discussed the nature of the request as subdividing a 33.35-acre parcel with 2 existing residences north of Lost Creek Rd. The preliminary plat proposes 2-residential lots to separate the homes within the Lost Creek Development District.

The department did not receive any comments when reached out to various departments regarding this, as well as surrounding neighbors. We did receive a letter as part of the subdivision application from the Lost Creek/Antelope Fire Volunteer Fire Department. They have evaluated this request and found that an easement through one of the properties to the other would be sufficient to gain access in the event of an emergency as one bridge is more suitable than the other. The plat does show that easement and we will request that we see draft documents detailing more of that easement and how the maintenance will move forward with the new owners. She also wanted to note that one of the residences is near the creek and is in a flood zone, however, as no development is being proposed, they just wanted to make folks aware.

The Planning Department does recommend that the Planning Board send a recommendation of approval and has three (3) recommendations/conditions, and these were gone over in detail.

#### Questions from the Board

Frank Fitzpatrick

Mr. Fitzpatrick wanted to know what the lot sizes will be? The one will be shy of 20 acres and the second will be just over 13 acres.

Mr. Fitzpatrick stated that he talked to Art Jette, from the volunteer fire department about the bridges and Ms. Hess did indicate that there was a letter submitted regarding this.

#### Applicant Report

John Derzay, 288 Homestead Drive

Mr. Derzay just wanted to state that the bridge is rated at 50-ton. It has three 2 ft x 8 in eye beams supporting this underneath and those are on 10-inch pipes set in concrete and they are all cut off at the same height. The bridge is not welded or bolted, so if a cement truck or logging truck goes across this or a heavy firetruck full of water, it will flex and come back and that was the idea with the engineering that was done for the bridge.

Mr. Derzay stated that this would make a nice home for someone along the creek, and it makes sense. There are water rights that go with this. He feels that this would be a nice dwelling for someone to raise their children.

#### Questions from the Board

Dan Reardon

Mr. Reardon asked what the possibility would be of this being further subdivided further down the road? Mr. Derzay stated that he did what they needed to do regarding the 5-acre county requirement for zoning and that he did need to redo the lines a little bit, but this is on the new house that he will be living in up in the canyon. The other residence has just under 20 acres. At this point in time, he would see no reason to further subdivide this property moving forward.

#### PUBLIC HEARING

Proponents: None

Opponents: None

Public Comment: None.

Discussion From the Board: None

#### Motion

Motion is made by Bob Wren to approve the Derzay Subsequent Minor Subdivision and move this onto the ADLC Commission with the three (3) recommendations/conditions set forth by the Planning Department Staff, seconded by Art Villasenor. Motion passes 7-0.

#### **Rural Planned Unit Development (PUD) - Southern Cross Company, LLC - John Fitzpatrick**

PUBLIC HEARING on a Proposed Rural Planned Unit Development (PUD) submitted by Southern Cross Company, LLC. Developers propose to subdivide a 23.76-acre parcel into 23-residential lots and common areas. Preliminary plat depicts proposed subdivision located approximately 1.4 miles from the intersection of MT-1 and Southern Cross Road in the Georgetown Lake Development District. Property is legally described as:

S08, T05 N, R13 W, C.O.S. 448A, ACRES 23.76, TRACT 3

Pursuant to Sec. 16-165 of the Code of Ordinances of ADLC, a public hearing is required before the Planning Board for consideration of the subdivision application.

## Staff Report

Carl Hamming, Planning Director, reviewed and presented the staff report put together by he and his office. All content can be located on the ADLC website. He discussed the nature of the request as proposing to subdivide a 23.76-acre parcel into 23-residential lots and common areas. Preliminary plat depicts proposed subdivision locate approximately 1.4 miles from the intersection of MT-1 and Southern Cross Road in the Georgetown Development District.

There were no comments on behalf of other departments. They did receive feedback from the Georgetown Rural Fire District. They spent a lot of time with Mr. Fitzpatrick, and they will continue these meetings until they all come to an agreement with those improvements with the community water supply, as well as access roads, turnaround space, cul-de-sacs, and proposed fire hydrant location.

The lot sizes will range from 0.52 acres to just under 1 acre at 0.92 acre. There will be a 7-acre parcel of land that they will use for open space, and this will be maintained by the homeowner's association.

The Planning Department does recommend that the Planning Board send a recommendation of approval and has six (6) recommendations/conditions, and these were gone over in detail.

## Questions from the Board

Frank Fitzpatrick

Mr. Fitzpatrick asked if the DEQ will be involved with this. Mr. Hamming stated that they are and that Chad Lanes, Tri-County Sanitarian will oversee enforcement.

Dan Reardon

Mr. Reardon asked where the water supply for the fire hydrants will come from. The well supply will be contained to a 30,000-cistern placed above the properties. Mr. Hamming stated that this well will be used for both the individual properties as well as the hydrants but will use separate lines. Each property will have its own septic and drain field.

## Applicant Report

John Fitzpatrick is present this evening on behalf of the Southern Cross Company. We stated that they had a rather robust discussion about the proposal at the January 2022 meeting and he doesn't think he has much more to cover at this time unless there are specific questions. He did spend a considerable amount of time working with Fred Bjorklund and Kurt Unger from the volunteer fire department and they did agree with a plan that he believes will provide the first Cadillac system for the Georgetown area regarding a fire protection system. This will be a pressurized hydrant system, which will give a fire flow rate of 1000 gallons per minute. He will continue to work with them to set specific locations for the hydrants in conjunction with the roadways as they are developed.

## PUBLIC HEARING

Proponents: None

Opponents: None

Public Comment: None.

Discussion From the Board:

Frank Fitzpatrick stated that this is a very good proposal, and the Planning Department Staff did a good job on the information provided for this evening's meeting.

## Motion

Motion is made by Art Villasenor to approve the Rural Planned Unit Development (PUD) and move this on to the ADLC Commission with the six (6) recommendations/conditions set forth by Planning Department Staff; seconded by Frank Fitzpatrick. Motion passes 7-0.

## **MDP 22-002 Higher Standard, LLC**

PUBLIC HEARING on a Major Development Permit (MDP) application submitted by The Higher Standard LLC to open a marijuana dispensary at a vacant lot between 1090 W Park and the roundhouse in the Highway Commercial Development District. Property is legally described as:

ROUNDHOUSE, S04, T04 N, R11 W, Lot 2, 352C

Pursuant to Ordinance No. 265, an MDP is required before the issuance of a business license can be approved for a dispensary business.

### Staff Report

Carl Hamming, Planning Director, reviewed and presented the staff report put together by he and his office. All content can be located on the ADLC website. He discussed the nature of the request as wanting to open a marijuana dispensary at a vacant lot between 1090 W. Park and the Roundhouse in the Highway Commercial Development District.

There were no locations identified in the 600 ft radius as far as schools, churches, or playground being located within the radius of 600 ft.

If the recommendation is made by the Board to move this on to the ADLC Commission, there are four (4) recommendations for approval that they would like to see met.

The staff did receive several questions and comments. There are several residential neighbors who live across the street on Park Street to the south and west of the old Anaconda Motors who have voiced concerns regarding the business, and this generated several comments that have been listed with the staff report that the Board has before them this evening. There was one other comment received today. This was from Mary Carol Radonich, stating that was unable to attend the meeting this evening but she is very against a marijuana dispensary this close to her home. She states that her neighborhood is very nice, and she does not want this ruined by folks selling drugs whether it is legal or not.

There was a very lengthy and detailed discussion between the Board and Mr. Hamming. This involved all topics including sewer and water hook-up, site plans, parking plans, approaches to the property, landscaping, whether this would be a permanent or mobile structure, and what kind of a foundation would be put under this. The hours of operation were also discussed comparing this to liquor store hours which are mandated by the state. The discussion was also had regarding the level of business that would be seen at the dispensary regarding both vehicle traffic, as well as foot traffic.

### Applicant Report

Don Buhrman, Higher Standard

Mr. Buhrman is here this evening to introduce his business to the Planning Board, giving a brief history of the other dispensaries that he is involved with around the state of Montana and states that they have been in full compliance with the State of Montana since 2014. He presented several pictures of the present stores that he has open. He is trying to model them after the look of Starbuck's. He fielded many questions from the Board like the questions that were asked of Mr. Hamming earlier in the meeting and again, there was significant conversation. He did note that he is leasing the lot, so he really doesn't want to go overboard as he doesn't want to dig up the asphalt too much. He would like to fit right in with the other new development that he has seen within the county and wants to help the county progress in changing the atmosphere here in Anaconda.

He states that a typical day with a dispensary is actually very quiet. Adults drive up, go in, and are typically in the store for less than 10 minutes. They come out and leave. It is not a late-night business and they do not want that.

### Questions from the Board

Discussion was then brought up regarding average traffic and the average customers in a day. He states that in Butte, they see an average of about 160 folks per day, but we are a smaller community. He does think that there would be more foot traffic in Anaconda as it is easier to get around in and does not appear to be congested in anyway. There was also discussion regarding the engineered dimensions for the dispensary, itself. This will be a stick-built construction.

There was some discussion about the neighbors that are listed on the report to this project who are opposed to the project. Mr. Buhrman stated that there were similar concerns in 2015 when they opened the dispensary in Dillon. These concerns have proven to be nothing more than a fear of the unknown. Once folks see that there is no change to the flavor of the neighborhood, this whole thing becomes a nonissue. He did suggest that the Board talk to the ex-mayor of Dillon or the Chief of Police of Dillon.

There was also some discussion on the variation of medical vs recreational marijuana use. He states that currently he has no statistics as recreational is too new in the State of Montana.

Andrew Gordon, Contractor/ Consultant for Mr. Buhman. He just wanted to make some clarification that they were understanding that the Anaconda Local Development were the drivers of all new development projects in town and there was an assumption about a 3% excise tax that would provide additional tax revenues to support any ongoing community development project. He just wanted to clarify that obviously this was an error in putting this into the proposal.

## PUBLIC HEARING

Proponents: None

Opponents:

Donna Kostelecky, on behalf of the SWMFCU

Ms. Kostelecky states that the lot looks quite small to her and with the setbacks, she wants to know exactly how large this building will be. It states that in the packet it is 32 x 32 square foot building with the proposal. She feels that this seems to be small, but on the presentation, you see something elite and elaborate and she doesn't think that this will fit on that lot. She also wanted to state the information and opposition from Mr. Dedmond's letter. She stated that she views this as a problem as the story keeps changing regarding what type of building, water connections, permits, etc.

Public Comment: None.

## Discussion From the Board

Significant discussion was again held in regarding all the information provided this evening.

Mr. Fitzpatrick would like to know why he sees no recommendation from the Planning Department staff regarding their feelings on this project. He and Mr. Villasenor would like to get an answer for this. Mr. Hamming stated that there is a lot of discussion that needs to be had on this, including the residential aspect of where they want this located and that this is something that the Commission would be very concerned about. He said that they necessarily do or do not recommend approval but is hoping that all the issues addressed and brought forward by the neighboring residences as well as the Board this evening will be taken into consideration. Mr. Fitzpatrick then states that this packet is lacking a lot of information and he states that there are a lot of components of their plan missing. He feels that he is not sure who this should be on, whether it be the applicant or the Planning staff for not asking for more information. He states that apparently all the neighbors are against this as he has seen all the comments. Ms. Nyman was also distressed that so much of the information has changed since the proposal was submitted. Mr. Villasenor states that regardless of what the business is, we need to look at the whole picture and that he is very disappointed also that they did not get any recommendations from the staff. He states that the Planning Board is only the first step in county approval. He feels that if they are going to be hung up on a few items, then we can ask the applicant to come back with more clarification, or we are satisfied, then we can pass this to the Commissioners, and they are the ultimate say. Mr. Reardon states that the folks who are objecting to this project are the folks of our town, our people, and he feels that the Commission needs to take the concerns of those folks into consideration. Mr. Wren asked if it could come back before them again, if they were able to get more accurate information to all the board and address some of the issues brought up this evening. He also wonders if we shouldn't send the letters out to all the neighbors within 600 ft rather than just the 150 ft to get some other sort of comments in this regard.

## Motion

Motion is made by John Lombardi to accept the application and move on to the ADLC Commission for approval with the four (4) conditions noted by the Planning Department, and the addition of a fifth condition added for a plan for landscaping; seconded by Art Villasenor. Motion fails 4-3.

There was a poll taken of the Board. Rose Nyman, No; Frank Fitzpatrick, No; John Lombardi, Yes; Christine Klanacky, No; Art Villasenor, Yes; Dan Reardon, Yes; Bob Wren, No.

At this time, Mr. Villasenor asked Chairperson, Ms. Nyman if the Board could entertain another motion. He stated that with Roberts Rules of Order, a board can entertain a second motion if the first motion fails.

Motion is made by Art Villasenor to table this application until such a time that all the information that the members are requesting has been satisfied; seconded by John Lombardi.

Motion passes 7-0.

There was a poll taken of the Board. Rose Nyman, Yes; Frank Fitzpatrick, Yes; John Lombardi, Yes; Christine Klanacky, Yes; Art Villasenor, Yes; Dan Reardon, Yes; Bob Wren, Yes.

\*\*of note, several days after this meeting happened, the Montana States University was contacted and conversation was held with the person who handles all Robert's Rules of Orders questions, and he states that what the Board did regarding the second motion is deemed appropriate.

### **MDP 22-003 Overbluff , LLC and Northcon, Inc.**

PUBLIC HEARING on a Major Development Permit (MDP) application submitted by Overbluff LLC and Northcon, Inc. to develop 16-condos in the existing Alpine Apartment building. Property is located within the Central Business Development District and is legally described as:

ANACONDA ORIGINAL TOWNSITE, S03, T04 N, R11 W, BLOCK 40, Lot 1-2

Pursuant to Sec. 24-123 an MDP is required for any proposed special use.

#### Staff Report

Gayla Hess, Planner II, reviewed and presented the staff report put together by her and her office. All content can be located on the ADLC website. She discussed the nature of the request as wanting to develop 16-condos in the existing Alpine Apartment building. Property is located within the Central Business Development District.

There were comments received from the Historic Resource Board meeting where the applicant attended. They are favorable of the project and need for housing in the community.

The environmental director also commented that this could be a great redevelopment project for the community, while preserving a historic structure.

There were no comments received from the fire department. The water department did note that the water lines were upgraded as recently as 2015.

The Planning Department does recommend that the Planning Board send a recommendation of approval and has six (6) recommendations/conditions, and these were gone over in detail.

#### Questions from the Board

An extensive conversation took place at this time about the parking situation at this location and how many parking places will be required per unit, and of course, where will these parking places be located. This does seem to be the most controversial part of this development. There was also discussion on what the layout of each apartment will be, and it was discussed how in the past, this building held three room apartments with Murphy beds.

#### Applicant Report

Greg McLeod, 10615 North Government Way, Hayden, ID

Mr. McLeod is here today to discuss and present his project and to answer any questions he could. Again, the building takes up a huge amount of the lot, and there is a significant parking issue that they are trying to work out. They are going

to keep the outside as it is and do a contemporary look in the apartments as that seems to be what folks are looking for these days. The stairwell inside will stay as it is and they do want to some landscaping to give it a bit more curb appeal.

### Questions from the Board

The main issue with this entire issue is the lack of parking and this being primarily a residential area with several medical offices, and a motel across the street. There were several options presented, and there is still a lot to work on to get this sorted out as this is a very difficult location and when this building was built years ago, He states that he has contacted several of the neighbors around them with no luck. The neighbor to the west of them will not even return their calls. The realtor and the marketing person left cards and finally got hold of him and he said to never call him ever. They did reach out to the motel across the street, and she said absolutely no way as she got sued a year and a half ago due to someone slipping in her parking and she is not interested in leasing any of this out. There is also some concern about the fence on the west side and Mr. McLeod stated that this will stay as this divides the property from the apartment building to the neighbors west of them. Ms. Nyman confirmed that there will also be an ADA compatible elevator installed.

### PUBLIC HEARING

Proponents:

Amy Lowe, DDS, 212 5<sup>th</sup> Street

Dr. Lowe is a dentist whose dental office is across the street on 3<sup>rd</sup> Street. She is for the project if the parking issues can be addressed. She sees anywhere between 20 to 25 per day, and there are roughly 15 employee vehicles between she, the other dental office, the CPA office, and the post office. She states that there is also an issue with the dental offices and the elderly patients as there is limited parking and the Care-A-Van is sometimes unable to be parked. She states that there is one neighbor who has quite a few vehicles and she is unsure if that can be addressed to allow for more parking. The handicap parking and ADA accessible areas also does take up room for parking. Again, she is for the project and is enthusiastic about it, but again parking is the concerning issue.

Charles Wilson, 220 Hickory

He is for the project, but it is the parking that is the issue, and he states that at the end of day they will need more parking that folks are talking about this evening. He states that there are horrible delivery problems with UPS and Fed Ex. He states that they are fortunate as they do have a driveway, but parking is extremely hard on Third Street and Hickory Street.

Bruce Stredwick, 211 West Park

Mr. Stredwick is the neighbor referenced earlier on the west side of the apartment building. Currently, he is not for or against this project. He has lived next to the building for 35 years. Over the course of time, he states there has been a lot of problems. This is the major concern and what has happened over the years. He stated that he has gotten a business card in the door and that is the only contact that he has had from these folks. He stated that Mr. McLeod stated that their calls have not been answered. He states that he has not gotten any. They have had issues over the years with trash, parking behind their house, beer cans and bottles in the back yard, one man even drained the oil of his ground and changed his oil. He stated that there was a meth lab at one point and a gentleman selling drugs out of one of the apartments. These are things that they have had to deal with it. He states that it would be nice if it was a really, really nice place. He of course, does see the parking situation as an issue and he states that folks were parking in the back of his house, so he put a gate up and a week later someone kicked the boards out of the fence. He also did note that the SW corner of the building is on Mr. Stredwick's property by 3 to 4 inches. He has never had a problem with that, this is what the surveyor told them and a few years back, he called the survey place in Butte and the records for that survey had been destroyed in a flood.

Leona Stredwick, 211 West Park

Ms. Stredwick stated that the reason she is glad that Bruce brought up the 4 inches was because when it was sold the first time, they didn't care as they are not petty people. When Dave McCarthy bought the building, they didn't care, and they let them know that this not an issue. When they discussed selling it, they let them know then too, we don't need to worry about the 4 inches, as they are not petty and don't care. She then stated that she was then approached by Mr. McLeod's people to sell their property to him because their property is not worth anything to them, as they don't have grass growing in our backyard. She finds this very offensive, and she is sorry for being emotional about this.

Marsha Hill, Pintler Portal Hostel

Ms. Hill just wanted to note that she is very excited about the project and the reuse of this building, and she is adamantly supportive. She has, however, run into the same issue with the parking for their hostel across the street on Park Street. Mr. McLeod has met with Mr. Hill, and they have been talking.

Regarding to parking, they had to put together their own parking plan when they put the hostel in place and they have learned that it is easy to express a concern, but that it is really a lot more to quantify and understand the reality of parking. She would like to suggest to the Planning Board that she feels that a parking study and plan should be investigated. She feels that there could be some creative issues that could be developed for all.

Opponents:

None

Public Comment:

None.

### Board Discussion

Mr. Reardon would like to know if there has been a recent survey done and if there is a clear title on this property. Mr. McLeod stated that this is.

Mr. McLeod is very sorry and apologetic to Mr. and Mrs. Stredwick and he stated that he has never talked to them and apparently someone representing them has talked to them said something that should not have been said and that Mr. McLeod and his developers told them not to say. He states that this was never their intention and that he reached out to them and did not get a response. He asked for the realtor to reach out and he is thinking they may have said something, that was not representative of anything they wanted him to say. He would like to talk to these folks himself and again, apologized, for this situation and that the person that reached out went down that road. He also stated that the folks living in this building will be policing each other as there will be an HOA for this property.

Again, the hot button item this evening is parking and that they need to have a definitive plan before they go to the Commission. The Commission would again need to have another public hearing and will need to see if there are any other ideas brought up regarding a parking plan for the community, leasing spaces, or other solutions to see if anything would be possible. Mr. Hamming did state that a new parking plan was received this week and that the one in the packet was submitted last week, to see if there is anything else that can be done.

There was discussion about the current state of the building and with the improvements being made, this should all be safe and meet codes.

At first, this project was going to be done in phases, but with the time moving along quickly and the interest in the apartments, they have decided to do all the floors at one time.

### Motion

Bob Wren made the motion to approve this motion and move it on to the Commission with all conditions proposed by the Planning Board, with the emphasis to continue working on the parking plan; seconded by Christine Klanecky. Motion passes 7-0.

---

## New Business

### **Recap on the Public Outreach Meetings for the Proposed DPS Changes**

Carl Hamming, Planning Director, noted that Gayla Hess, Planner II, put together a fantastic summary of what is being proposed for updates, edits, and corrections to the DPS. She tallied numbers for the Outreach sessions that were attended. He wanted to say thank you to all the board members that attended one of the meetings and there were even several members who attended more than one meeting. He felt that it was very beneficial to both the department as well as the board members to sit down and discuss these things with the public. He was hoping that there was some feedback from the sessions and if there is anything that needs to be addressed before the update to the DPS, that we get this discussed. This will require several public hearings, including the Commission.

There was some feedback that he would like to share. One of the items was the frustration with short-term rentals. Folks feel like they are financially driven, and this has changed drastically as this has become so popular, so they feel that there are no rules or regulations. We really tried to hear them out, but right now the CEO and the Commission really don't want

to take the effort to police those any further than what we are doing. They are waiting on state and want to follow what they may recommend in the future.

In the rural areas, there was also concern about fire issues, access roads, subdivision roads bridge capacity. These were brought up especially when the meetings were hosted at the fire departments in these areas.

They did answer quite a few questions and had to clarify some misconceptions about zoning not existing in all parts of the county.

Ms. Hess was happy and stated that it was nice that there was some much participation.

Mr. Fitzpatrick thanked the staff for going and doing all the work for these.

### Public Comment

Janice Hagan-Dulaney, 1708 Copper Road

Ms. Hagan-Dulaney wanted to let the Board know that the Public Outreach was wonderful. She felt that it was very informative, and she was happy to see board members there. She heard a lot of different things, especially from the firefighters and volunteers. She would highly encourage that these types of sessions continues as it was quite amazing, and she found it interesting to hear different perspectives on different areas. She just hopes that this continues.

### Motion

Bob Wren made a motion to forward the DPS Updates onto the Commission with all changes as noted; seconded by Frank Fitzpatrick. Motion passes 7-0.

---

### Board Questions and Comments

Mr. Fitzpatrick wanted to know where we were with Premier out in Mill Creek. This has fallen through, and the lease was canceled awhile back.

Ms. Nyman wanted to congratulate Mr. Hamming on his 2<sup>nd</sup> year anniversary.

Ms. Nyman wanted to take the opportunity to have Mr. Reardon introduce himself and give a little history of himself and his affiliation with Anaconda.

---

### Staff Questions and Comments

None

---

### Public Comment

None

---

### Next Meeting

Monday, May 9<sup>th</sup>, 2022

---

### Adjournment

Motion was made to adjourn by John Lombardi; seconded by Art Villasenor; Motion passes 7-0.

---

### Final Minutes Approved

Respectfully Submitted,  
Carlye Hansen  
ADLC Planning Department Secretary

Attachments: Guest Sign in Sheet

DRAFT