



CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS
ZONING HEARING EXAMINER
NOTIFICATION OF DECISION

EDWARD GARCIA (VAN H. GILBERT ARCHITECT PC, AGENT) requests a special exception to Section 14-16-3-19(A)(2)(a) and PG 85 LOS DURANES SDP: a VARIANCE of 5' to the allowed 3' height in the front yard setback area for all or a portion of Lot A, JOHNSON--MELVIN & SHERRY zoned SU-2 LD RA-2, located on 2206 GABALDON RD NW (H12)

Special Exception No:..... **15ZHE-80028**
Project No:..... **Project# 1010368**
Hearing Date:..... 03-17-15
Closing of Public Record:..... 03-17-15
Date of Decision: 03-31-15

On the 17th day of March, 2015 (hereinafter “**Hearing** VAN H. GILBERT ARCHITECT PC, (hereinafter “**Agent**”) acting as agent on behalf of the property owner EDWARD GARCIA (hereinafter “**Applicant**”) appeared before the Zoning Hearing Examiner (hereinafter “**ZHE**”) requesting a VARIANCE of 5' to the allowed 3' height in the front yard setback area (hereinafter “**Application**”) upon the real property located at 2206 GABALDON RD (“**Subject Property**”). Below are the findings of facts:

FINDINGS:

24. Applicant is requesting a VARIANCE of 5' to the allowed 3' height in the front yard setback area.
25. The City of Albuquerque Zoning Code of Ordinances Section § 14-16-4-2 (C) (2) “SPECIAL EXCEPTIONS – VARIANCE” reads in part: “A variance application shall be approved by the Zoning Hearing Examiner, if and only if, the Zoning Hearing Examiner finds all of the following:
(a) The application is not contrary to the public interest or injurious to the community, or to property or improvements in the vicinity;
(b) There are special circumstances applicable to the subject property which do not apply generally to other property in the same zone and vicinity such as size, shape, topography, location, surroundings, or physical characteristics created by natural forces or government action for which no compensation was paid;
(c) Such special circumstances were not self-imposed and create an unnecessary hardship in the form of a substantial and unjustified limitation on the reasonable use or return on the property that need not be endured to achieve the intent and purpose of the Zoning Code (§14-16-1-3) and the applicable zoning district; and
(d) Substantial justice is done.”
26. The ZHE finds that the Applicant has met its burden of providing evidence (both oral testimony and written material) that establishes that the Application is not going to be: (i) contrary to the public interest, (ii) injurious to the community; or (iii) injurious

to the property/improvements located in the nearby vicinity of the Subject Property. Specifically, the Applicant provided testimony that they submitted the Application to build a site wall along the property line at the south and east edge of the property. This new wall will be a continuation of an existing and approved wall (Permit Number: 201500009). This wall will not be injurious because the Applicant is rehabilitating an older property and re-investing in to this community and this wall will be a historic design that is common in this neighborhood [as required pursuant to Section § 14-16-4-2 (C) (2) (a)]. Further, the Application and testimony of the Applicant at the Hearing suggest that there is no neighborhood opposition to the Application.

27. The ZHE finds that the Applicant has met its burden of providing evidence (both oral testimony and written material) that establishes that there are “special circumstances” applicable to the Subject Property which do not apply generally to other property in the same zone and vicinity. Specifically, the Applicant provided testimony that this Subject Property is located on a “double corner lot” – which is to say that it is fronting on three sides by public roadway. This is a special circumstance that is rarely experienced by residential lots in this community [as required pursuant to Section § 14-16-4-2 (C) (2) (b)]
28. The ZHE finds that the Applicant has met its burden of providing evidence (both oral testimony and written material) that establishes that the special circumstances presented hereinabove were not “self-imposed”, and that those special circumstances create an unnecessary hardship upon the Applicant. Specifically, the Applicant provided testimony that the “double corner lot” orientation was not self-imposed and it would prohibit the construction of an 8’ wall (per the Zoning Code) which constitutes an “*unjustified limitation on the reasonable use of the Subject Property*” [as required pursuant to Section § 14-16-4-2 (C) (2) (c)].
29. The ZHE forwarded this design to the DMD Mr. Paul Sanchez, Traffic Engineer. He reviewed the site plan and determined that it does not create a Clear Sight Triangle issue on the property. As a result of the fact that the DMD has approved the wall in terms of CST’s, the ZHE believes that it is not injurious in design to the community or adjacent neighbors.
30. The Applicant indicated that the neighbors support the design of this wall.
31. The ZHE finds that the Applicant has met its burden of providing evidence (both oral testimony and written material) that establishes that substantial justice will be done if this Application is approved. [as required pursuant to Section § 14-16-4-2 (C) (2) (d)]
32. Applicant testified at the Hearing that the yellow “Notice of Hearing” signs were posted for the required time period as articulated within City of Albuquerque Code of Ordinances § 14-16-4-2 (B) (4).

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The Applicant has met their burden of submitting an Application that provides evidence that satisfies the elements required within §14-16-4-2 (C) (2) of the Albuquerque Zoning Code.

DECISION:

APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS of a VARIANCE of 5' to the allowed 3' height in the front yard setback area.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

- G. The Applicant shall ensure that the wall plan set is reviewed and permitted through the City of Albuquerque.
- H. The Applicant shall utilize textures and materials in the wall that preserve the historic design themes prevalent in this community.

If you wish to appeal this decision, you may do so in the manner described below:

Appeal is to the Board of Appeals within 15 days of the decision. A filing fee of \$105.00 shall accompany each appeal application, as well as a written explanation outlining the reason for appeal and a copy of the ZHE decision. Appeals are taken at 600 2nd Street, Plaza Del Sol Building, Ground Level, Planning Application Counter located on the west side of the lobby. **Please present this letter of notification when filing an appeal.** When an application is withdrawn, the fee shall not be refunded.

An appeal shall be heard by the Board of Appeals within 45 days of the appeal period and concluded within 75 days of the appeal period. The Planning Division shall give written notice of an appeal, together with a notice of the date, time and place of the hearing to the applicant, a representative of the opponents, if any are known, and the appellant.

Please note that pursuant to Section 14. 16. 4. 4. (B), of the City of Albuquerque Comprehensive Zoning Code, you must demonstrate that you have legal standing to file an appeal as defined.

You will receive notice if any other person files an appeal. If there is no appeal, you can receive building permits any time after the appeal deadline quoted above, provided all conditions imposed at the time of approval have been met. However, the Zoning Hearing Examiner may allow issuance of building permits if the public hearing produces no objection of any kind to the approval of an application. To receive this approval, the applicant agrees in writing to return the building permit or occupation tax number.

Successful applicants are reminded that other regulations of the City must be complied with, even after approval of a special exception is secured. This decision does not constitute approval of plans for a building permit. If your application is approved, bring this decision with you when you apply for any related building permit or occupation tax number. Approval of a conditional use or a variance application is void after one year from date of approval if the rights and privileges are granted, thereby have not been executed or utilized.

Joshua J. Skarsgard, Esq.
Zoning Hearing Examiner

cc: Zoning Enforcement
ZHE File
Edward Garcia 8301 Lomas Blvd Ne Albuquerque NM 87110
Van H. Gilbert Architect Pc Michael Borowski 2428 Baylor Drive SeE
Albuquerque NM 87106
Kevin Degraauw kdegaaaw@uharchitect.com



CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS
ZONING HEARING EXAMINER
NOTIFICATION OF DECISION

EDWARD GARCIA (VAN H. GILBERT ARCHITECT PC, AGENT) requests a special exception to Section 14-16-3-19(A)(2)(a)(2) and PG 85 LOS DURANES SDP: a VARIANCE of 2' to the allowed 6' height for a proposed wall visible from a public street right-of-way for all or a portion of Lot A, JOHNSON--MELVIN & SHERRY zoned SU-2 LD RA-2, located on 2206 GABALDON RD NW (H12)

Special Exception No:..... **15ZHE-80029**
Project No:..... **Project# 1010368**
Hearing Date:..... 03-17-15
Closing of Public Record:..... 03-17-15
Date of Decision: 03-31-15

On the 17th day of March, 2015 (hereinafter "Hearing VAN H. GILBERT ARCHITECT PC, (hereinafter "Agent") acting as agent on behalf of the property owner EDWARD GARCIA (hereinafter "Applicant") appeared before the Zoning Hearing Examiner (hereinafter "ZHE") requesting a VARIANCE of 2' to the allowed 6' height for a proposed wall visible from a public street right-of-way (hereinafter "Application") upon the real property located at 2206 GABALDON RD ("Subject Property"). Below are the findings of facts:

FINDINGS:

33. Applicant is requesting a Variance of 2' to the allowed 6' height for a proposed wall visible from a public street right-of-way.
34. The City of Albuquerque Zoning Code of Ordinances Section § 14-16-4-2 (C) (2) "SPECIAL EXCEPTIONS – VARIANCE" reads in part: "*A variance application shall be approved by the Zoning Hearing Examiner, if and only if, the Zoning Hearing Examiner finds all of the following:*
 - (a) The application is not contrary to the public interest or injurious to the community, or to property or improvements in the vicinity;*
 - (b) There are special circumstances applicable to the subject property which do not apply generally to other property in the same zone and vicinity such as size, shape, topography, location, surroundings, or physical characteristics created by natural forces or government action for which no compensation was paid;*
 - (c) Such special circumstances were not self-imposed and create an unnecessary hardship in the form of a substantial and unjustified limitation on the reasonable use or return on the property that need not be endured to achieve the intent and purpose of the Zoning Code (§14-16-1-3) and the applicable zoning district; and*
 - (d) Substantial justice is done.*

35. The ZHE finds that the Applicant has met its burden of providing evidence (both oral testimony and written material) that establishes that the Application is not going to be: (i) contrary to the public interest, (ii) injurious to the community; or (iii) injurious to the property/improvements located in the nearby vicinity of the Subject Property. Specifically, the Applicant provided testimony that they submitted the Application to build a site wall along the property line at the south and east edge of the property. This new wall will be a continuation of an existing and approved wall (Permit Number: 2015000009). This wall will not be injurious because the Applicant is rehabilitating an older property and re-investing in to this community and this wall will be a historic design that is common in this neighborhood [as required pursuant to Section § 14-16-4-2 (C) (2) (a)]. Further, the Application and testimony of the Applicant at the Hearing suggest that there is no neighborhood opposition to the Application.
36. The ZHE finds that the Applicant has met its burden of providing evidence (both oral testimony and written material) that establishes that there are “special circumstances” applicable to the Subject Property which do not apply generally to other property in the same zone and vicinity. Specifically, the Applicant provided testimony that this Subject Property is located on a “double corner lot” – which is to say that it is fronting on three sides by public roadway. This is a special circumstance that is rarely experienced by residential lots in this community [as required pursuant to Section § 14-16-4-2 (C) (2) (b)]
37. The ZHE finds that the Applicant has met its burden of providing evidence (both oral testimony and written material) that establishes that the special circumstances presented hereinabove were not “self-imposed”, and that those special circumstances create an unnecessary hardship upon the Applicant. Specifically, the Applicant provided testimony that the “double corner lot” orientation was not self-imposed and it would prohibit the construction of an 8’ wall (per the Zoning Code) which constitutes an “*unjustified limitation on the reasonable use of the Subject Property*” [as required pursuant to Section § 14-16-4-2 (C) (2) (c)].
38. The ZHE forwarded this design to the DMD Mr. Paul Sanchez, Traffic Engineer. He reviewed the site plan and determined that it does not create a Clear Sight Triangle issue on the property. As a result of the fact that the DMD has approved the wall in terms of CST’s, the ZHE believes that it is not injurious in design to the community or adjacent neighbors.
39. The Applicant indicated that the neighbors support the design of this wall.
40. The ZHE finds that the Applicant has met its burden of providing evidence (both oral testimony and written material) that establishes that substantial justice will be done if this Application is approved. [as required pursuant to Section § 14-16-4-2 (C) (2) (d)]
41. Applicant testified at the Hearing that the yellow “Notice of Hearing” signs were posted for the required time period as articulated within City of Albuquerque Code of Ordinances § 14-16-4-2 (B) (4).

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The Applicant has met their burden of submitting an Application that provides evidence that satisfies the elements required within §14-16-4-2 (C) (2) of the Albuquerque Zoning Code.

DECISION:

APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS of a **VARIANCE** of 2' to the allowed 6' height for a proposed wall visible from a public street right-of-way.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

- I. The Applicant shall ensure that the wall plan set is reviewed and permitted through the City of Albuquerque.
- J. The Applicant shall utilize textures and materials in the wall that preserve the historic design themes prevalent in this community.

If you wish to appeal this decision, you may do so in the manner described below:

Appeal is to the Board of Appeals within 15 days of the decision. A filing fee of \$105.00 shall accompany each appeal application, as well as a written explanation outlining the reason for appeal and a copy of the ZHE decision. Appeals are taken at 600 2nd Street, Plaza Del Sol Building, Ground Level, Planning Application Counter located on the west side of the lobby. **Please present this letter of notification when filing an appeal.** When an application is withdrawn, the fee shall not be refunded.

An appeal shall be heard by the Board of Appeals within 45 days of the appeal period and concluded within 75 days of the appeal period. The Planning Division shall give written notice of an appeal, together with a notice of the date, time and place of the hearing to the applicant, a representative of the opponents, if any are known, and the appellant.

Please note that pursuant to Section 14. 16. 4. 4. (B), of the City of Albuquerque Comprehensive Zoning Code, you must demonstrate that you have legal standing to file an appeal as defined.

You will receive notice if any other person files an appeal. If there is no appeal, you can receive building permits any time after the appeal deadline quoted above, provided all conditions imposed at the time of approval have been met. However, the Zoning Hearing Examiner may allow issuance of building permits if the public hearing produces no objection of any kind to the approval of an application. To receive this approval, the applicant agrees in writing to return the building permit or occupation tax number.

Successful applicants are reminded that other regulations of the City must be complied with, even after approval of a special exception is secured. This decision does not constitute approval of plans for a building permit. If your application is approved, bring this decision with you when you apply for any related building permit or occupation tax number. Approval of a conditional use or a variance application is void after one year from date of approval if the rights and privileges are granted, thereby have not been executed or utilized.



Joshua L. Skarsgard, Esq.
Zoning Hearing Examiner

cc: Zoning Enforcement
ZHE File
Edward Garcia 8301 Lomas Blvd Ne Albuquerque NM 87110
Van H. Gilbert Architect Pc Michael Borowski 2428 Baylor Drive SeE
Albuquerque NM 87106
Kevin Degraauw kdegrauw@uharchitect.com