



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

Homewise, Inc. / Jaime Jaramillo (Agent, Consensus Planning) requests a variance of 7 ft 7 inches to the 35 ft maximum building height for a building < 20 ft from the front property line for Lot A1A, Block A1A, Silver Townhomes, located at 301 Platinum ST SW, zoned MX-FB-ID [Section 14-16-2-4(E)(3)(d)]

Special Exception No:..... **VA-2020-00417**
Project No: **Project#2019-002293**
Hearing Date: 12-15-20
Closing of Public Record: 12-15-20
Date of Decision: 12-30-20

On the 15th day of December, 2020, Consensus Planning, agent for property owner Homewise, Inc. / Jaime Jaramillo (“Applicant”) appeared before the Zoning Hearing Examiner (“ZHE”) requesting a variance of 7 ft 7 inches to the 35 ft maximum building height for a building < 20 ft from the front property line (“Application”) upon the real property located at 301 Platinum ST SW (“Subject Property”). Below are the ZHE’s finding of fact and decision:

FINDINGS:

1. Applicant is requesting a variance of 7 ft 7 inches to the 35 ft maximum building height for a building < 20 ft from the front property line.
2. The City of Albuquerque Integrated Development Ordinance, Section 14-16-6-6(N)(3)(a) (Variance-Review and Decision Criteria) reads: “... an application for a Variance-ZHE shall be approved if it meets all of the following criteria:
 - (1) *There are special circumstances applicable to the subject property that are not self-imposed and that 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. Such special circumstances of the property either create an extraordinary hardship in the form of a substantial and unjustified limitation on the reasonable use or return on the property, or practical difficulties result from strict compliance with the minimum standards.*
 - (2) *The Variance will not be materially contrary to the public safety, health, or welfare.*
 - (3) *The Variance does not cause significant material adverse impacts on surrounding properties or infrastructure improvements in the vicinity.*
 - (4) *The Variance will not materially undermine the intent and purpose of the IDO or the applicable zone district.*
 - (5) *The Variance approved is the minimum necessary to avoid extraordinary hardship or practical difficulties.”*
3. Applicant bears the burden of ensuring there is evidence in the record supporting a finding that the above criteria are met under Section 14-16-6-4(N)(1).

4. Agent appeared and gave evidence in support of the application.
5. All property owners within 100 feet of the subject property and the affected neighborhood association were notified.
6. The subject property is currently zoned MX-FB-ID.
7. Based on evidence submitted by or on behalf of Applicant, it appears that there are special circumstances applicable to the Subject Property that are not self-imposed and that 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, as required by Section 14-16-6-6(N)(3)(a)(1). Specifically, applicant testified that the surroundings and location characteristics of the site are unique and merit the requested variance.
8. Based on evidence submitted by or on behalf of Applicant, the variance will not be contrary to the public safety, health and welfare of the community as required by Section 14-16-6-6(N)(3)(a)(2). Specifically, evidence was submitted supporting that the Applicant intends to use the property in a manner that is consistent with the IDO and the Development Process Manual (DPM).
9. Based on evidence submitted by or on behalf of Applicant, the variance will not cause significant adverse material impacts on surrounding properties or infrastructure improvements in the vicinity as required by Section 14-16-6-6(N)(3)(a)(3). Specifically, the proposed layout is designed to be in harmony and consistency with what currently exists in the neighborhood, which was supported by photographic and written evidence and oral testimony.
10. Based on evidence submitted by or on behalf of Applicant, the variance will not materially undermine the intent and purpose of the IDO or applicable zone district as required by Section 14-16-6-6(N)(3)(a)(4). Specifically, Applicant presented evidence that the intent of IDO will still be met in that the subject site will continue the existing use and the proposed layout would merely add to the safety and usability of the subject property.
11. Based on evidence submitted by or on behalf of Applicant, the variance approved is the minimum necessary to avoid extraordinary hardship or practical difficulties as required by Section 14-16-6-6(N)(3)(a)(5). Specifically, Applicant testified that any lower setback would be ineffective and greatly diminish the usability of the site. Thus, the applicant is not requesting more than what is minimally necessary for a variance.
12. City Transportation submitted a report stating no objection.
13. The proper "Notice of Hearing" signage was posted for the required time period as required by Section 14-16-6-4(K)(3).
14. The Applicant has authority to pursue this Application.

DECISION:

APPROVAL of a variance of 7 ft 7 inches to the 35 ft maximum building height for a building < 20 ft from the front property line.

APPEAL:

If you wish to appeal this decision, you must do so by January 15, 2021 pursuant to Section 14-16-6-4(U), of the Integrated Development Ordinance, you must demonstrate that you have legal standing to file an appeal as defined.

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.



Robert Lucero, Esq.
Zoning Hearing Examiner

cc:

ZHE File
Zoning Enforcement
Consensus Planning, cp@consensusplanning.com



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

Homewise, Inc. / Jaime Jaramillo (Agent, Consensus Planning) requests a variance of 15 ft to the required 15 ft rear yard setback for Lot A1A, Block A1A, Silver Townhomes, located at 301 Platinum ST SW, zoned MX-FB-ID [Section 14-16-2-4(E)(3)(d)]

Special Exception No:..... **VA-2020-00418**
Project No: **Project#2019-002293**
Hearing Date: 12-15-20
Closing of Public Record: 12-15-20
Date of Decision: 12-30-20

On the 15th day of December, 2020, Consensus Planning, agent for property owner Homewise, Inc. / Jaime Jaramillo (“Applicant”) appeared before the Zoning Hearing Examiner (“ZHE”) requesting a variance of 15 ft to the required 15 ft rear yard setback (“Application”) upon the real property located at 301 Platinum ST SW (“Subject Property”). Below are the ZHE’s finding of fact and decision:

FINDINGS:

1. Applicant is requesting a variance of 15 ft to the required 15 ft rear yard setback.
2. The City of Albuquerque Integrated Development Ordinance, Section 14-16-6-6(N)(3)(a) (Variance-Review and Decision Criteria) reads: “... an application for a Variance-ZHE shall be approved if it meets all of the following criteria:
 - (1) *There are special circumstances applicable to the subject property that are not self-imposed and that 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. Such special circumstances of the property either create an extraordinary hardship in the form of a substantial and unjustified limitation on the reasonable use or return on the property, or practical difficulties result from strict compliance with the minimum standards.*
 - (2) *The Variance will not be materially contrary to the public safety, health, or welfare.*
 - (3) *The Variance does not cause significant material adverse impacts on surrounding properties or infrastructure improvements in the vicinity.*
 - (4) *The Variance will not materially undermine the intent and purpose of the IDO or the applicable zone district.*
 - (5) *The Variance approved is the minimum necessary to avoid extraordinary hardship or practical difficulties.”*
3. Applicant bears the burden of ensuring there is evidence in the record supporting a finding that the above criteria are met under Section 14-16-6-4(N)(1).
4. Agent appeared and gave evidence in support of the application.

5. All property owners within 100 feet of the subject property and the affected neighborhood association were notified.
6. The subject property is currently zoned MX-FB-ID.
7. Based on evidence submitted by or on behalf of Applicant, it appears that there are special circumstances applicable to the Subject Property that are not self-imposed and that 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, as required by Section 14-16-6-6(N)(3)(a)(1). Specifically, applicant testified that the surroundings and location characteristics of the site are unique and merit the requested variance.
8. Based on evidence submitted by or on behalf of Applicant, the variance will not be contrary to the public safety, health and welfare of the community as required by Section 14-16-6-6(N)(3)(a)(2). Specifically, evidence was submitted supporting that the Applicant intends to use the property in a manner that is consistent with the IDO and the Development Process Manual (DPM).
9. Based on evidence submitted by or on behalf of Applicant, the variance will not cause significant adverse material impacts on surrounding properties or infrastructure improvements in the vicinity as required by Section 14-16-6-6(N)(3)(a)(3). Specifically, the proposed layout is designed to be in harmony and consistency with what currently exists in the neighborhood, which was supported by photographic and written evidence and oral testimony.
10. Based on evidence submitted by or on behalf of Applicant, the variance will not materially undermine the intent and purpose of the IDO or applicable zone district as required by Section 14-16-6-6(N)(3)(a)(4). Specifically, Applicant presented evidence that the intent of IDO will still be met in that the subject site will continue the existing use and the proposed layout would merely add to the safety and usability of the subject property.
11. Based on evidence submitted by or on behalf of Applicant, the variance approved is the minimum necessary to avoid extraordinary hardship or practical difficulties as required by Section 14-16-6-6(N)(3)(a)(5). Specifically, Applicant testified that any lower setback would be ineffective and greatly diminish the usability of the site. Thus, the applicant is not requesting more than what is minimally necessary for a variance.
12. City Transportation submitted a report stating no objection.
13. The proper "Notice of Hearing" signage was posted for the required time period as required by Section 14-16-6-4(K)(3).
14. The Applicant has authority to pursue this Application.

DECISION:

APPROVAL of a variance of 15 ft to the required 15 ft rear yard setback.

APPEAL:

If you wish to appeal this decision, you must do so by January 15, 2021 pursuant to Section 14-16-6-4(U), of the Integrated Development Ordinance, you must demonstrate that you have legal standing to file an appeal as defined.

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.



Robert Lucero, Esq.
Zoning Hearing Examiner

cc:

ZHE File
Zoning Enforcement
Consensus Planning, cp@consensusplanning.com



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

Homewise, Inc. / Jaime Jaramillo (Agent, Consensus Planning) requests a variance of 1 ft 6 inches to the required 10 ft minimum ground floor height for Lot A1A, Block A1A, Silver Townhomes, located at 301 Platinum ST SW, zoned MX-FB-ID [Section 14-16-2-4(E)(3)(d)]

Special Exception No:..... **VA-2020-00419**
Project No: **Project#2019-00293**
Hearing Date: 12-15-20
Closing of Public Record: 12-15-20
Date of Decision: 12-30-20

On the 15th day of December, 2020, Consensus Planning, agent for property owner Homewise, Inc. / Jaime Jaramillo (“Applicant”) appeared before the Zoning Hearing Examiner (“ZHE”) requesting a variance of 1 ft 6 inches to the required 10 ft minimum ground floor height (“Application”) upon the real property located at 301 Platinum ST SW (“Subject Property”). Below are the ZHE’s finding of fact and decision:

FINDINGS:

1. Applicant is requesting a variance of 1 ft 6 inches to the required 10 ft minimum ground floor height.
2. The City of Albuquerque Integrated Development Ordinance, Section 14-16-6-6(N)(3)(a) (Variance-Review and Decision Criteria) reads: “... an application for a Variance-ZHE shall be approved if it meets all of the following criteria:
 - (1) *There are special circumstances applicable to the subject property that are not self-imposed and that 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. Such special circumstances of the property either create an extraordinary hardship in the form of a substantial and unjustified limitation on the reasonable use or return on the property, or practical difficulties result from strict compliance with the minimum standards.*
 - (2) *The Variance will not be materially contrary to the public safety, health, or welfare.*
 - (3) *The Variance does not cause significant material adverse impacts on surrounding properties or infrastructure improvements in the vicinity.*
 - (4) *The Variance will not materially undermine the intent and purpose of the IDO or the applicable zone district.*
 - (5) *The Variance approved is the minimum necessary to avoid extraordinary hardship or practical difficulties.”*
3. Applicant bears the burden of ensuring there is evidence in the record supporting a finding that the above criteria are met under Section 14-16-6-4(N)(1).

4. Agent appeared and gave evidence in support of the application.
5. All property owners within 100 feet of the subject property and the affected neighborhood association were notified.
6. The subject property is currently zoned MX-FB-ID.
7. Based on evidence submitted by or on behalf of Applicant, it appears that there are special circumstances applicable to the Subject Property that are not self-imposed and that 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, as required by Section 14-16-6-6(N)(3)(a)(1). Specifically, applicant testified that the surroundings and location characteristics of the site are unique and merit the requested variance.
8. Based on evidence submitted by or on behalf of Applicant, the variance will not be contrary to the public safety, health and welfare of the community as required by Section 14-16-6-6(N)(3)(a)(2). Specifically, evidence was submitted supporting that the Applicant intends to use the property in a manner that is consistent with the IDO and the Development Process Manual (DPM).
9. Based on evidence submitted by or on behalf of Applicant, the variance will not cause significant adverse material impacts on surrounding properties or infrastructure improvements in the vicinity as required by Section 14-16-6-6(N)(3)(a)(3). Specifically, the proposed layout is designed to be in harmony and consistency with what currently exists in the neighborhood, which was supported by photographic and written evidence and oral testimony.
10. Based on evidence submitted by or on behalf of Applicant, the variance will not materially undermine the intent and purpose of the IDO or applicable zone district as required by Section 14-16-6-6(N)(3)(a)(4). Specifically, Applicant presented evidence that the intent of IDO will still be met in that the subject site will continue the existing use and the proposed layout would merely add to the safety and usability of the subject property.
11. Based on evidence submitted by or on behalf of Applicant, the variance approved is the minimum necessary to avoid extraordinary hardship or practical difficulties as required by Section 14-16-6-6(N)(3)(a)(5). Specifically, Applicant testified that any lower setback would be ineffective and greatly diminish the usability of the site. Thus, the applicant is not requesting more than what is minimally necessary for a variance.
12. City Transportation submitted a report stating no objection.
13. The proper "Notice of Hearing" signage was posted for the required time period as required by Section 14-16-6-4(K)(3).
14. The Applicant has authority to pursue this Application.

DECISION:

APPROVAL of a variance of 1 ft 6 inches to the required 10 ft minimum ground floor height.

APPEAL:

If you wish to appeal this decision, you must do so by January 15, 2021 pursuant to Section 14-16-6-4(U), of the Integrated Development Ordinance, you must demonstrate that you have legal standing to file an appeal as defined.

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.



Robert Lucero, Esq.
Zoning Hearing Examiner

cc:

ZHE File
Zoning Enforcement
Consensus Planning, cp@consensusplanning.com



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

Homewise, Inc. / Jaime Jaramillo (Agent, Consensus Planning) requests a variance of 29% to the required 40% of clear transparent windows and/or doors on the ground floor street-facing facade for porch, stoop, urban residential, and warehouse frontage types for a building facade facing Silver Ave for Lot A1A, Block A1A, Silver Townhomes, located at 301 Platinum ST SW, zoned MX-FB-ID [Section 14-16-2-4(E)(3)(f)3.a.ii]

Special Exception No:..... **VA-2020-00420**
Project No: **Project#2019-002293**
Hearing Date: 12-15-20
Closing of Public Record: 12-15-20
Date of Decision: 12-30-20

On the 15th day of December, 2020, Consensus Planning, agent for property owner Homewise, Inc. / Jaime Jaramillo (“Applicant”) appeared before the Zoning Hearing Examiner (“ZHE”) requesting a variance of 29% to the required 40% of clear transparent windows and/or doors on the ground floor street-facing facade for porch, stoop, urban residential, and warehouse frontage types for a building facade facing Silver Ave (“Application”) upon the real property located at 301 Platinum ST SW (“Subject Property”). Below are the ZHE’s finding of fact and decision:

FINDINGS:

1. Applicant is requesting a variance of 29% to the required 40% of clear transparent windows and/or doors on the ground floor street-facing facade for porch, stoop, urban residential, and warehouse frontage types for a building facade facing Silver Ave.
2. The City of Albuquerque Integrated Development Ordinance, Section 14-16-6-6(N)(3)(a) (Variance-Review and Decision Criteria) reads: “... an application for a Variance-ZHE shall be approved if it meets all of the following criteria:
 - (1) *There are special circumstances applicable to the subject property that are not self-imposed and that 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. Such special circumstances of the property either create an extraordinary hardship in the form of a substantial and unjustified limitation on the reasonable use or return on the property, or practical difficulties result from strict compliance with the minimum standards.*
 - (2) *The Variance will not be materially contrary to the public safety, health, or welfare.*
 - (3) *The Variance does not cause significant material adverse impacts on surrounding properties or infrastructure improvements in the vicinity.*

(4) The Variance will not materially undermine the intent and purpose of the IDO or the applicable zone district.

(5) The Variance approved is the minimum necessary to avoid extraordinary hardship or practical difficulties.”

3. Applicant bears the burden of ensuring there is evidence in the record supporting a finding that the above criteria are met under Section 14-16-6-4(N)(1).
4. Agent appeared and gave evidence in support of the application.
5. All property owners within 100 feet of the subject property and the affected neighborhood association were notified.
6. The subject property is currently zoned MX-FB-ID.
7. Based on evidence submitted by or on behalf of Applicant, it appears that there are special circumstances applicable to the Subject Property that are not self-imposed and that 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, as required by Section 14-16-6-6(N)(3)(a)(1). Specifically, applicant testified that the surroundings and location characteristics of the site are unique and merit the requested variance.
8. Based on evidence submitted by or on behalf of Applicant, the variance will not be contrary to the public safety, health and welfare of the community as required by Section 14-16-6-6(N)(3)(a)(2). Specifically, evidence was submitted supporting that the Applicant intends to use the property in a manner that is consistent with the IDO and the Development Process Manual (DPM).
9. Based on evidence submitted by or on behalf of Applicant, the variance will not cause significant adverse material impacts on surrounding properties or infrastructure improvements in the vicinity as required by Section 14-16-6-6(N)(3)(a)(3). Specifically, the proposed layout is designed to be in harmony and consistency with what currently exists in the neighborhood, which was supported by photographic and written evidence and oral testimony.
10. Based on evidence submitted by or on behalf of Applicant, the variance will not materially undermine the intent and purpose of the IDO or applicable zone district as required by Section 14-16-6-6(N)(3)(a)(4). Specifically, Applicant presented evidence that the intent of IDO will still be met in that the subject site will continue the existing use and the proposed layout would merely add to the safety and usability of the subject property.
11. Based on evidence submitted by or on behalf of Applicant, the variance approved is the minimum necessary to avoid extraordinary hardship or practical difficulties as required by Section 14-16-6-6(N)(3)(a)(5). Specifically, Applicant testified that any lower setback would be ineffective and greatly diminish the usability of the site. Thus, the applicant is not requesting more than what is minimally necessary for a variance.
12. City Transportation submitted a report stating no objection.
13. The proper “Notice of Hearing” signage was posted for the required time period as required by Section 14-16-6-4(K)(3).
14. The Applicant has authority to pursue this Application.

DECISION:

APPROVAL of a variance of 29% to the required 40% of clear transparent windows and/or doors on the ground floor street-facing facade for porch, stoop, urban residential, and warehouse frontage types for a building facade facing Silver Ave.

APPEAL:

If you wish to appeal this decision, you must do so by January 15, 2021 pursuant to Section 14-16-6-4(U), of the Integrated Development Ordinance, you must demonstrate that you have legal standing to file an appeal as defined.

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.



Robert Lucero, Esq.
Zoning Hearing Examiner

cc:

ZHE File
Zoning Enforcement
Consensus Planning, cp@consensusplanning.com



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

Homewise, Inc. / Jaime Jaramillo (Agent, Consensus Planning) requests a variance of 1% to the required 40% of clear transparent windows and/or doors on the ground floor street-facing facade for porch, stoop, urban residential, and warehouse frontage types for a building facade facing Third St for Lot A1A, Block A1A, Silver Townhomes, located at 301 Platinum ST SW, zoned MX-FB-ID [Section 14-16-2-4(E)(3)(f)3.a.ii]

Special Exception No:..... **VA-2020-00422**
Project No: **Project#2019-002293**
Hearing Date: 12-15-20
Closing of Public Record: 12-15-20
Date of Decision: 12-30-20

On the 15th day of December, 2020, Consensus Planning, agent for property owner Homewise, Inc. / Jaime Jaramillo (“Applicant”) appeared before the Zoning Hearing Examiner (“ZHE”) requesting a variance of 1% to the required 40% of clear transparent windows and/or doors on the ground floor street-facing facade for porch, stoop, urban residential, and warehouse frontage types for a building facade facing Third St (“Application”) upon the real property located at 301 Platinum ST SW (“Subject Property”). Below are the ZHE’s finding of fact and decision:

FINDINGS:

1. Applicant is requesting a variance of 1% to the required 40% of clear transparent windows and/or doors on the ground floor street-facing facade for porch, stoop, urban residential, and warehouse frontage types for a building facade facing Third St.
2. The City of Albuquerque Integrated Development Ordinance, Section 14-16-6-6(N)(3)(a) (Variance-Review and Decision Criteria) reads: “... an application for a Variance-ZHE shall be approved if it meets all of the following criteria:
 - (1) *There are special circumstances applicable to the subject property that are not self-imposed and that 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. Such special circumstances of the property either create an extraordinary hardship in the form of a substantial and unjustified limitation on the reasonable use or return on the property, or practical difficulties result from strict compliance with the minimum standards.*
 - (2) *The Variance will not be materially contrary to the public safety, health, or welfare.*
 - (3) *The Variance does not cause significant material adverse impacts on surrounding properties or infrastructure improvements in the vicinity.*

(4) The Variance will not materially undermine the intent and purpose of the IDO or the applicable zone district.

(5) The Variance approved is the minimum necessary to avoid extraordinary hardship or practical difficulties.”

3. Applicant bears the burden of ensuring there is evidence in the record supporting a finding that the above criteria are met under Section 14-16-6-4(N)(1).
4. Agent appeared and gave evidence in support of the application.
5. All property owners within 100 feet of the subject property and the affected neighborhood association were notified.
6. The subject property is currently zoned MX-FB-ID.
7. Based on evidence submitted by or on behalf of Applicant, it appears that there are special circumstances applicable to the Subject Property that are not self-imposed and that 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, as required by Section 14-16-6-6(N)(3)(a)(1). Specifically, applicant testified that the surroundings and location characteristics of the site are unique and merit the requested variance.
8. Based on evidence submitted by or on behalf of Applicant, the variance will not be contrary to the public safety, health and welfare of the community as required by Section 14-16-6-6(N)(3)(a)(2). Specifically, evidence was submitted supporting that the Applicant intends to use the property in a manner that is consistent with the IDO and the Development Process Manual (DPM).
9. Based on evidence submitted by or on behalf of Applicant, the variance will not cause significant adverse material impacts on surrounding properties or infrastructure improvements in the vicinity as required by Section 14-16-6-6(N)(3)(a)(3). Specifically, the proposed layout is designed to be in harmony and consistency with what currently exists in the neighborhood, which was supported by photographic and written evidence and oral testimony.
10. Based on evidence submitted by or on behalf of Applicant, the variance will not materially undermine the intent and purpose of the IDO or applicable zone district as required by Section 14-16-6-6(N)(3)(a)(4). Specifically, Applicant presented evidence that the intent of IDO will still be met in that the subject site will continue the existing use and the proposed layout would merely add to the safety and usability of the subject property.
11. Based on evidence submitted by or on behalf of Applicant, the variance approved is the minimum necessary to avoid extraordinary hardship or practical difficulties as required by Section 14-16-6-6(N)(3)(a)(5). Specifically, Applicant testified that any lower setback would be ineffective and greatly diminish the usability of the site. Thus, the applicant is not requesting more than what is minimally necessary for a variance.
12. City Transportation submitted a report stating no objection.
13. The proper “Notice of Hearing” signage was posted for the required time period as required by Section 14-16-6-4(K)(3).
14. The Applicant has authority to pursue this Application.

DECISION:

APPROVAL of a variance of 1% to the required 40% of clear transparent windows and/or doors on the ground floor street-facing facade for porch, stoop, urban residential, and warehouse frontage types for a building facade facing Third St.

APPEAL:

If you wish to appeal this decision, you must do so by January 15, 2021 pursuant to Section 14-16-6-4(U), of the Integrated Development Ordinance, you must demonstrate that you have legal standing to file an appeal as defined.

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.



Robert Lucero, Esq.
Zoning Hearing Examiner

cc:

ZHE File
Zoning Enforcement
Consensus Planning, cp@consensusplanning.com



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

Homewise, Inc. / Jaime Jaramillo (Agent, Consensus Planning) requests a variance of 19% to the required 30% of clear transparent windows and/or doors on each second floor and higher facade facing a public street or alley for a building facade facing Silver Ave for Lot A1A, Block A1A, Silver Townhomes, located at 301 Platinum ST SW, zoned MX-FB-ID [Section 14-16-2-4(E)(3)(f)3.b]

Special Exception No:..... **VA-2020-00426**
Project No: **Project#2019-002293**
Hearing Date: 12-15-20
Closing of Public Record: 12-15-20
Date of Decision: 12-30-20

On the 15th day of December, 2020, Consensus Planning, agent for property owner Homewise, Inc. / Jaime Jaramillo (“Applicant”) appeared before the Zoning Hearing Examiner (“ZHE”) requesting a variance of 19% to the required 30% of clear transparent windows and/or doors on each second floor and higher facade facing a public street or alley for a building facade facing Silver Ave (“Application”) upon the real property located at 301 Platinum ST SW (“Subject Property”). Below are the ZHE’s finding of fact and decision:

FINDINGS:

1. Applicant is requesting a variance of 19% to the required 30% of clear transparent windows and/or doors on each second floor and higher facade facing a public street or alley for a building facade facing Silver Ave.
2. The City of Albuquerque Integrated Development Ordinance, Section 14-16-6-6(N)(3)(a) (Variance-Review and Decision Criteria) reads: “... an application for a Variance-ZHE shall be approved if it meets all of the following criteria:
 - (1) *There are special circumstances applicable to the subject property that are not self-imposed and that 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. Such special circumstances of the property either create an extraordinary hardship in the form of a substantial and unjustified limitation on the reasonable use or return on the property, or practical difficulties result from strict compliance with the minimum standards.*
 - (2) *The Variance will not be materially contrary to the public safety, health, or welfare.*
 - (3) *The Variance does not cause significant material adverse impacts on surrounding properties or infrastructure improvements in the vicinity.*

(4) The Variance will not materially undermine the intent and purpose of the IDO or the applicable zone district.

(5) The Variance approved is the minimum necessary to avoid extraordinary hardship or practical difficulties.”

3. Applicant bears the burden of ensuring there is evidence in the record supporting a finding that the above criteria are met under Section 14-16-6-4(N)(1).
4. Agent appeared and gave evidence in support of the application.
5. All property owners within 100 feet of the subject property and the affected neighborhood association were notified.
6. The subject property is currently zoned MX-FB-ID.
7. Based on evidence submitted by or on behalf of Applicant, it appears that there are special circumstances applicable to the Subject Property that are not self-imposed and that 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, as required by Section 14-16-6-6(N)(3)(a)(1). Specifically, applicant testified that the surroundings and location characteristics of the site are unique and merit the requested variance.
8. Based on evidence submitted by or on behalf of Applicant, the variance will not be contrary to the public safety, health and welfare of the community as required by Section 14-16-6-6(N)(3)(a)(2). Specifically, evidence was submitted supporting that the Applicant intends to use the property in a manner that is consistent with the IDO and the Development Process Manual (DPM).
9. Based on evidence submitted by or on behalf of Applicant, the variance will not cause significant adverse material impacts on surrounding properties or infrastructure improvements in the vicinity as required by Section 14-16-6-6(N)(3)(a)(3). Specifically, the proposed layout is designed to be in harmony and consistency with what currently exists in the neighborhood, which was supported by photographic and written evidence and oral testimony.
10. Based on evidence submitted by or on behalf of Applicant, the variance will not materially undermine the intent and purpose of the IDO or applicable zone district as required by Section 14-16-6-6(N)(3)(a)(4). Specifically, Applicant presented evidence that the intent of IDO will still be met in that the subject site will continue the existing use and the proposed layout would merely add to the safety and usability of the subject property.
11. Based on evidence submitted by or on behalf of Applicant, the variance approved is the minimum necessary to avoid extraordinary hardship or practical difficulties as required by Section 14-16-6-6(N)(3)(a)(5). Specifically, Applicant testified that any lower setback would be ineffective and greatly diminish the usability of the site. Thus, the applicant is not requesting more than what is minimally necessary for a variance.
12. City Transportation submitted a report stating no objection.
13. The proper “Notice of Hearing” signage was posted for the required time period as required by Section 14-16-6-4(K)(3).
14. The Applicant has authority to pursue this Application.

DECISION:

APPROVAL of a variance of 19% to the required 30% of clear transparent windows and/or doors on each second floor and higher facade facing a public street or alley for a building facade facing Silver Ave.

APPEAL:

If you wish to appeal this decision, you must do so by January 15, 2021 pursuant to Section 14-16-6-4(U), of the Integrated Development Ordinance, you must demonstrate that you have legal standing to file an appeal as defined.

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.



Robert Lucero, Esq.
Zoning Hearing Examiner

cc:

ZHE File
Zoning Enforcement
Consensus Planning, cp@consensusplanning.com



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

Homewise, Inc. / Jaime Jaramillo (Agent, Consensus Planning) requests a variance of 19% to the required 30% of clear transparent windows and/or doors on each second floor and higher facade facing a public street or alley for a building facade facing Nickel Rd for Lot A1A, Block A1A, Silver Townhomes, located at 301 Platinum ST SW, zoned MX-FB-ID [Section 14-16-2-4(E)(3)(f)3.b]

Special Exception No:..... **VA-2020-00427**
Project No: **Project#2019-002293**
Hearing Date: 12-15-20
Closing of Public Record: 12-15-20
Date of Decision: 12-30-20

On the 15th day of December, 2020, Consensus Planning, agent for property owner Homewise, Inc. / Jaime Jaramillo (“Applicant”) appeared before the Zoning Hearing Examiner (“ZHE”) requesting a variance of 19% to the required 30% of clear transparent windows and/or doors on each second floor and higher facade facing a public street or alley for a building facade facing Nickel Rd (“Application”) upon the real property located at 301 Platinum ST SW (“Subject Property”). Below are the ZHE’s finding of fact and decision:

FINDINGS:

1. Applicant is requesting a variance of 19% to the required 30% of clear transparent windows and/or doors on each second floor and higher facade facing a public street or alley for a building facade facing Nickel Rd.
2. The City of Albuquerque Integrated Development Ordinance, Section 14-16-6-6(N)(3)(a) (Variance-Review and Decision Criteria) reads: “... an application for a Variance-ZHE shall be approved if it meets all of the following criteria:
 - (1) *There are special circumstances applicable to the subject property that are not self-imposed and that 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. Such special circumstances of the property either create an extraordinary hardship in the form of a substantial and unjustified limitation on the reasonable use or return on the property, or practical difficulties result from strict compliance with the minimum standards.*
 - (2) *The Variance will not be materially contrary to the public safety, health, or welfare.*
 - (3) *The Variance does not cause significant material adverse impacts on surrounding properties or infrastructure improvements in the vicinity.*
 - (4) *The Variance will not materially undermine the intent and purpose of the IDO or the applicable zone district.*

(5)The Variance approved is the minimum necessary to avoid extraordinary hardship or practical difficulties.”

3. Applicant bears the burden of ensuring there is evidence in the record supporting a finding that the above criteria are met under Section 14-16-6-4(N)(1).
4. Agent appeared and gave evidence in support of the application.
5. All property owners within 100 feet of the subject property and the affected neighborhood association were notified.
6. The subject property is currently zoned MX-FB-ID.
7. Based on evidence submitted by or on behalf of Applicant, it appears that there are special circumstances applicable to the Subject Property that are not self-imposed and that 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, as required by Section 14-16-6-6(N)(3)(a)(1). Specifically, applicant testified that the surroundings and location characteristics of the site are unique and merit the requested variance.
8. Based on evidence submitted by or on behalf of Applicant, the variance will not be contrary to the public safety, health and welfare of the community as required by Section 14-16-6-6(N)(3)(a)(2). Specifically, evidence was submitted supporting that the Applicant intends to use the property in a manner that is consistent with the IDO and the Development Process Manual (DPM).
9. Based on evidence submitted by or on behalf of Applicant, the variance will not cause significant adverse material impacts on surrounding properties or infrastructure improvements in the vicinity as required by Section 14-16-6-6(N)(3)(a)(3). Specifically, the proposed layout is designed to be in harmony and consistency with what currently exists in the neighborhood, which was supported by photographic and written evidence and oral testimony.
10. Based on evidence submitted by or on behalf of Applicant, the variance will not materially undermine the intent and purpose of the IDO or applicable zone district as required by Section 14-16-6-6(N)(3)(a)(4). Specifically, Applicant presented evidence that the intent of IDO will still be met in that the subject site will continue the existing use and the proposed layout would merely add to the safety and usability of the subject property.
11. Based on evidence submitted by or on behalf of Applicant, the variance approved is the minimum necessary to avoid extraordinary hardship or practical difficulties as required by Section 14-16-6-6(N)(3)(a)(5). Specifically, Applicant testified that any lower setback would be ineffective and greatly diminish the usability of the site. Thus, the applicant is not requesting more than what is minimally necessary for a variance.
12. City Transportation submitted a report stating no objection.
13. The proper “Notice of Hearing” signage was posted for the required time period as required by Section 14-16-6-4(K)(3).
14. The Applicant has authority to pursue this Application.

DECISION:

APPROVAL of a variance of 19% to the required 30% of clear transparent windows and/or doors on each second floor and higher facade facing a public street or alley for a building facade facing Nickel Rd.

APPEAL:

If you wish to appeal this decision, you must do so by January 15, 2021 pursuant to Section 14-16-6-4(U), of the Integrated Development Ordinance, you must demonstrate that you have legal standing to file an appeal as defined.

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.



Robert Lucero, Esq.
Zoning Hearing Examiner

cc:

ZHE File
Zoning Enforcement
Consensus Planning, cp@consensusplanning.com



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

Homewise, Inc. / Jaime Jaramillo (Agent, Consensus Planning) requests a variance of 2% to the required 30% of clear transparent windows and/or doors on each second floor and higher facade facing a public street or alley for a building facade facing Third St for Lot A1A, Block A1A, Silver Townhomes, located at 301 Platinum ST SW, zoned MX-FB-ID [Section 14-16-2-4(E)(3)(f)3.b]

Special Exception No:..... **VA-2020-00428**
Project No: **Project#2019-002293**
Hearing Date: 12-15-20
Closing of Public Record: 12-15-20
Date of Decision: 12-30-20

On the 15th day of December, 2020, Consensus Planning, agent for property owner Homewise, Inc. / Jaime Jaramillo (“Applicant”) appeared before the Zoning Hearing Examiner (“ZHE”) requesting a variance of 2% to the required 30% of clear transparent windows and/or doors on each second floor and higher facade facing a public street or alley for a building facade facing Third St (“Application”) upon the real property located at 301 Platinum ST SW (“Subject Property”). Below are the ZHE’s finding of fact and decision:

FINDINGS:

1. Applicant is requesting a variance of 2% to the required 30% of clear transparent windows and/or doors on each second floor and higher facade facing a public street or alley for a building facade facing Third St.
2. The City of Albuquerque Integrated Development Ordinance, Section 14-16-6-6(N)(3)(a) (Variance-Review and Decision Criteria) reads: “... an application for a Variance-ZHE shall be approved if it meets all of the following criteria:
 - (1) *There are special circumstances applicable to the subject property that are not self-imposed and that 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. Such special circumstances of the property either create an extraordinary hardship in the form of a substantial and unjustified limitation on the reasonable use or return on the property, or practical difficulties result from strict compliance with the minimum standards.*
 - (2) *The Variance will not be materially contrary to the public safety, health, or welfare.*
 - (3) *The Variance does not cause significant material adverse impacts on surrounding properties or infrastructure improvements in the vicinity.*
 - (4) *The Variance will not materially undermine the intent and purpose of the IDO or the applicable zone district.*

(5)The Variance approved is the minimum necessary to avoid extraordinary hardship or practical difficulties.”

3. Applicant bears the burden of ensuring there is evidence in the record supporting a finding that the above criteria are met under Section 14-16-6-4(N)(1).
4. Agent appeared and gave evidence in support of the application.
5. All property owners within 100 feet of the subject property and the affected neighborhood association were notified.
6. The subject property is currently zoned MX-FB-ID.
7. Based on evidence submitted by or on behalf of Applicant, it appears that there are special circumstances applicable to the Subject Property that are not self-imposed and that 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, as required by Section 14-16-6-6(N)(3)(a)(1). Specifically, applicant testified that the surroundings and location characteristics of the site are unique and merit the requested variance.
8. Based on evidence submitted by or on behalf of Applicant, the variance will not be contrary to the public safety, health and welfare of the community as required by Section 14-16-6-6(N)(3)(a)(2). Specifically, evidence was submitted supporting that the Applicant intends to use the property in a manner that is consistent with the IDO and the Development Process Manual (DPM).
9. Based on evidence submitted by or on behalf of Applicant, the variance will not cause significant adverse material impacts on surrounding properties or infrastructure improvements in the vicinity as required by Section 14-16-6-6(N)(3)(a)(3). Specifically, the proposed layout is designed to be in harmony and consistency with what currently exists in the neighborhood, which was supported by photographic and written evidence and oral testimony.
10. Based on evidence submitted by or on behalf of Applicant, the variance will not materially undermine the intent and purpose of the IDO or applicable zone district as required by Section 14-16-6-6(N)(3)(a)(4). Specifically, Applicant presented evidence that the intent of IDO will still be met in that the subject site will continue the existing use and the proposed layout would merely add to the safety and usability of the subject property.
11. Based on evidence submitted by or on behalf of Applicant, the variance approved is the minimum necessary to avoid extraordinary hardship or practical difficulties as required by Section 14-16-6-6(N)(3)(a)(5). Specifically, Applicant testified that any lower setback would be ineffective and greatly diminish the usability of the site. Thus, the applicant is not requesting more than what is minimally necessary for a variance.
12. City Transportation submitted a report stating no objection.
13. The proper “Notice of Hearing” signage was posted for the required time period as required by Section 14-16-6-4(K)(3).
14. The Applicant has authority to pursue this Application.

DECISION:

APPROVAL of a variance of 2% to the required 30% of clear transparent windows and/or doors on each second floor and higher facade facing a public street or alley for a building facade facing Third St.

APPEAL:

If you wish to appeal this decision, you must do so by January 15, 2021 pursuant to Section 14-16-6-4(U), of the Integrated Development Ordinance, you must demonstrate that you have legal standing to file an appeal as defined.

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.



Robert Lucero, Esq.
Zoning Hearing Examiner

cc:

ZHE File
Zoning Enforcement
Consensus Planning, cp@consensusplanning.com



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

Homewise, Inc. / Jaime Jaramillo (Agent, Consensus Planning) requests a variance of 5% to the required 30% of clear transparent windows and/or doors on each second floor and higher facade facing a public street or alley for a building facade facing Platinum St for Lot A1A, Block A1A, Silver Townhomes, located at 301 Platinum ST SW, zoned MX-FB-ID [Section 14-16-2-4(E)(3)(f)3.b]

Special Exception No:..... **VA-2020-00429**
Project No: **Project#2019-002293**
Hearing Date: 12-15-20
Closing of Public Record: 12-15-20
Date of Decision: 12-30-20

On the 15th day of December, 2020, Consensus Planning, agent for property owner Homewise, Inc. / Jaime Jaramillo (“Applicant”) appeared before the Zoning Hearing Examiner (“ZHE”) requesting a variance of 5% to the required 30% of clear transparent windows and/or doors on each second floor and higher facade facing a public street or alley for a building facade facing Platinum St (“Application”) upon the real property located at 301 Platinum ST SW (“Subject Property”). Below are the ZHE’s finding of fact and decision:

FINDINGS:

1. Applicant is requesting a variance of 5% to the required 30% of clear transparent windows and/or doors on each second floor and higher facade facing a public street or alley for a building facade facing Platinum St.
2. The City of Albuquerque Integrated Development Ordinance, Section 14-16-6-6(N)(3)(a) (Variance-Review and Decision Criteria) reads: “... an application for a Variance-ZHE shall be approved if it meets all of the following criteria:
 - (1) *There are special circumstances applicable to the subject property that are not self-imposed and that 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. Such special circumstances of the property either create an extraordinary hardship in the form of a substantial and unjustified limitation on the reasonable use or return on the property, or practical difficulties result from strict compliance with the minimum standards.*
 - (2) *The Variance will not be materially contrary to the public safety, health, or welfare.*
 - (3) *The Variance does not cause significant material adverse impacts on surrounding properties or infrastructure improvements in the vicinity.*
 - (4) *The Variance will not materially undermine the intent and purpose of the IDO or the applicable zone district.*

(5)The Variance approved is the minimum necessary to avoid extraordinary hardship or practical difficulties.”

3. Applicant bears the burden of ensuring there is evidence in the record supporting a finding that the above criteria are met under Section 14-16-6-4(N)(1).
4. Agent appeared and gave evidence in support of the application.
5. All property owners within 100 feet of the subject property and the affected neighborhood association were notified.
6. The subject property is currently zoned MX-FB-ID.
7. Based on evidence submitted by or on behalf of Applicant, it appears that there are special circumstances applicable to the Subject Property that are not self-imposed and that 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, as required by Section 14-16-6-6(N)(3)(a)(1). Specifically, applicant testified that the surroundings and location characteristics of the site are unique and merit the requested variance.
8. Based on evidence submitted by or on behalf of Applicant, the variance will not be contrary to the public safety, health and welfare of the community as required by Section 14-16-6-6(N)(3)(a)(2). Specifically, evidence was submitted supporting that the Applicant intends to use the property in a manner that is consistent with the IDO and the Development Process Manual (DPM).
9. Based on evidence submitted by or on behalf of Applicant, the variance will not cause significant adverse material impacts on surrounding properties or infrastructure improvements in the vicinity as required by Section 14-16-6-6(N)(3)(a)(3). Specifically, the proposed layout is designed to be in harmony and consistency with what currently exists in the neighborhood, which was supported by photographic and written evidence and oral testimony.
10. Based on evidence submitted by or on behalf of Applicant, the variance will not materially undermine the intent and purpose of the IDO or applicable zone district as required by Section 14-16-6-6(N)(3)(a)(4). Specifically, Applicant presented evidence that the intent of IDO will still be met in that the subject site will continue the existing use and the proposed layout would merely add to the safety and usability of the subject property.
11. Based on evidence submitted by or on behalf of Applicant, the variance approved is the minimum necessary to avoid extraordinary hardship or practical difficulties as required by Section 14-16-6-6(N)(3)(a)(5). Specifically, Applicant testified that any lower setback would be ineffective and greatly diminish the usability of the site. Thus, the applicant is not requesting more than what is minimally necessary for a variance.
12. City Transportation submitted a report stating no objection.
13. The proper “Notice of Hearing” signage was posted for the required time period as required by Section 14-16-6-4(K)(3).
14. The Applicant has authority to pursue this Application.

DECISION:

APPROVAL of a variance of 5% to the required 30% of clear transparent windows and/or doors on each second floor and higher facade facing a public street or alley for a building facade facing Platinum St.

APPEAL:

If you wish to appeal this decision, you must do so by January 15, 2021 pursuant to Section 14-16-6-4(U), of the Integrated Development Ordinance, you must demonstrate that you have legal standing to file an appeal as defined.

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.



Robert Lucero, Esq.
Zoning Hearing Examiner

cc:

ZHE File
Zoning Enforcement
Consensus Planning, cp@consensusplanning.com