



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

KEVIN PATTON, PULTE GROUP (JAMES STROZIER, CONSENSUS PLANNING, AGENT) requests a special exception to PG. 88 VOLCANO CLIFFS SPD: a VARIANCE request of 8' to the 10' required garage setback from main facade for all or a portion of Lot 48, MONTECITO WEST UNIT 2 zoned SU-2 VCRR, located on 99999 ESPACIO VERDE RD NW (D-9)

Special Exception No:..... **15ZHE-80073 thru 15ZHE-80120**
Project No:..... **Project# 1010428**
Hearing Date:..... 05-19-2015
Closing of Public Record:..... 05-19-2015
Date of Decision: 05-27-2015

On the 19th day of May, 2015 (hereinafter “**Hearing**”) JACKIE FISHMAN, CONSENSUS PLANNING, (hereinafter “**Agent**”) acting as agent on behalf of the property owner KEVIN PATTON, PULTE GROUP (hereinafter “**Applicant**”) appeared before the Zoning Hearing Examiner (hereinafter “**ZHE**”) requesting a Variance of 8' to the 10' required garage setback from main facade (hereinafter “**Applications**”) upon the forty eight lots of real property located at the following legal description: “Lots 1-48, Montecito West, Unit 2, City of Albuquerque, Bernalillo County New Mexico” (Address: 99999 Espacio Verde Road NW); (“**Subject Properties**”). Below are the findings of facts:

FINDINGS:

1. Applicant is requesting a Variance of 8' to the 10' required garage setback from main façade for all of the forty eight (48) lots located in Unit 2 of the Montecito West Subdivision. The Subject Properties are currently vacant and located west of the mostly developed Montecito neighborhood.
2. 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.”

3. 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 the Subject Properties are being developed as a single family subdivision under the Private Commons Development regulations contained in the City of Albuquerque Zoning Code and that the lots will be professionally designed and constructed and therefore be an aesthetically pleasing addition to the surrounding community (and therefore not injurious to the community) [as required pursuant to Section § 14-16-4-2 (C) (2) (a)]. Additionally, the ZHE finds that a reduction in front yard garage setback from 10' to 2' does not appear to materially damage the streetscape or the aesthetic qualities of the proposed subdivision. Further, the Application and testimony of the Applicant at the Hearing suggest that there is no neighborhood opposition to the Application. At the Hearing, the Agent for the Applicant spoke and there was no opposition that attended the Hearing. Additionally, as of the date of the Hearing the ZHE had received no letters of opposition further proof that the Applications are not injurious to the surrounding property owners.
4. 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 the Subject Properties are located just “north of an area that was identified by the Northwest Mesa Escarpment Plan as an area for conservation as it is a buffer for the Petroglyph National Monument, and has been identified in the VCSDP as City owned open space.” The Subject Properties being located adjacent to open space creates a situation where development of private land needs to be respectful of the Monument pursuant to the Private Commons Development [as required pursuant to Section § 14-16-4-2 (C) (2) (b)]. The ZHE agrees with the Applicant that the Subject Properties are located adjacent to open space which are considered “special circumstances” as contemplated in the Zoning Code.
5. 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 10' setback for the garages would preclude the sensible development of this subdivision 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)]
6. 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)]
7. 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 8' to the 10' required garage setback from main façade.

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
fishman@consensusplanning.com
kevinpatton@pultegroup.com