



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

A Management Corporation (Agent, Chris Lee) requests a conditional use to allow for cannabis consumption for Lot 2A, Cottonwood Crossing Phase 2, located at 10088 Coors BLVD NW, zoned MX-L [Section 14-16-4-3(D)(35)(i)]

Special Exception No: **VA-2023-00256**
Project No: **Project#2021-005816**
Hearing Date: 10-17-23
Closing of Public Record: 10-17-23
Date of Decision: 11-01-23

On the 17th day of October, 2023, Chris Lee property owner A Management Corporation (“Applicant”) appeared before the Zoning Hearing Examiner (“ZHE”) requesting a conditional use to allow for cannabis consumption (“Application”) upon the real property located at 10088 Coors BLVD NW (“Subject Property”). Below are the ZHE’s finding of fact and decision:

FINDINGS:

1. Applicant is requesting a conditional use to allow for cannabis consumption.
2. Applicant bears the burden of providing a sound justification for the required decision, based on substantial evidence, pursuant to IDO Section 14-16-6-4(E)(3).
3. Applicant bears the burden of showing compliance with required standards through analysis, illustrations, or other exhibits as necessary, pursuant to IDO Section 14-16-6-4(E)(4).
4. Applicant established that the proper “Notice of Hearing” signage was posted for the required time period.
5. Applicant established that all property owners and neighborhood association entitled to notice were notified of the Application.
6. The subject property is currently zoned MX-L zone.
7. The Applicant has authority to pursue this Application.
8. The City of Albuquerque Code of Ordinances Section 14-16-6-6(A)(3) (Review and Decision Criteria– Conditional Use) reads: *“An application for a Conditional Use Approval shall be approved if it meets all of the following criteria:*
 - (a) *It is consistent with the ABC Comp. Plan, as amended;*
 - (b) *It complies with all applicable provisions of the IDO, including, but not limited to any Use-specific Standards applicable to the use in Section 14-16-4-3; the DPM; other adopted City regulations; and any conditions specifically applied to development of the property in any prior permit or approval affecting the property, or there is a condition of approval that any Variances or Waivers needed to comply with any of these provisions must be approved or the Conditional Use Approval will be invalidated pursuant to Subsection (2)(c)2 above;*
 - (c) *It will not create significant adverse impacts on adjacent properties, the surrounding neighborhood, or the larger community;*
 - (d) *It will not create material adverse impacts on other land in the surrounding area, through increases in traffic congestion, parking congestion noise, or vibration*

without sufficient mitigation or civic or environmental benefits that outweigh the expected impacts;

(e) On a project site with existing uses, it will not increase non- residential activity within 300 feet in any direction of a lot in any Residential zone district between the hours of 10:00 P.M. and 6:00 A.M.;

(f) It will not negatively impact pedestrian or transit connectivity without appropriate mitigation

9. Applicant's agent appeared at the ZHE hearing on this matter and gave evidence in support of the Application.
10. Applicant has met the burden of providing evidence that establishes that the requested Conditional Use approval is consistent with the ABC Comp. Plan, as amended. Specifically, Applicant submitted the following evidence supporting that the requested Conditional Use approval furthers the goals and policies of the ABC Comp. Plan by helping to ensure appropriate scale and location of development and character of design, placing new development along corridors, and providing employment and services for the area.
11. Applicant has met the burden of providing evidence that establishes that the requested Conditional Use approval complies with all applicable provisions of the IDO, including, but not limited to any Use-specific Standards applicable to the use in Section 14-16-4-3; the DPM; other adopted City regulations; and any conditions specifically applied to development of the property in any prior permit or approval affecting the property. Specifically, Applicant testified and confirmed in written submittals that the requested Conditional Use approval would comport with all applicable requirements. Applicant has demonstrated compliance with the applicable use-specific standards in IDO Section 14-16-4-3(D)(35).
12. Applicant has met the burden of providing evidence that establishes that the requested Conditional Use approval will not create significant adverse impacts on adjacent properties, the surrounding neighborhood, or the larger community. Specifically, Applicant testified and confirmed in written submittals that the requested Conditional Use approval would not create any adverse impact other than as would be effectively limited by the use-specific standards and other requirements of the IDO, with which Applicant will comply. Applicant testified that this business will institute a policy to ensure that patrons are not served if intoxicated or served to a level that they would be leaving incapacitated because of cannabis use. Although neighbors complained that their neighborhood association did not receive notice of the Application, their association is located within the unincorporated area of Bernalillo County and is not a neighborhood association recognized by the City of Albuquerque. Neighbors complained about potential negative impacts caused by increased pedestrian traffic near their properties and potential trespassers. However, Applicant testified that the Subject Property would be within a walled or fenced development and would be buffered by significant space between the building and the east property boundary, then by a sizeable irrigation canal, all of which mitigate any potential negative impacts. The facility will have a City-approved odor control plan.
13. Applicant has met the burden of providing evidence that establishes that the requested Conditional Use approval will not create material adverse impacts on other land in the surrounding area, through increases in traffic congestion, parking congestion noise, or vibration without sufficient mitigation or civic or environmental benefits that outweigh the expected impacts. Specifically, Applicant testified and confirmed in written submittals that the requested Conditional Use approval would not cause any such negative impacts, as there

is sufficient parking and public transit in the area, and all activities of the proposed use would take place indoors.

14. Applicant has met the burden of providing evidence that establishes that the requested Conditional Use approval will not increase non-residential activity within 300 feet of a lot in any residential zone district between the hours of 10:00 pm and 6:00 am. Applicant testified that non-residential activity would not increase in any prohibited manner.
15. Applicant has met the burden of providing evidence that establishes that the requested Conditional Use approval will not negatively impact pedestrian or transit connectivity without appropriate mitigation. Applicant testified that no negative impact on pedestrian or transit connectivity would result.
16. The City Traffic Engineering Division stated no objection.

DECISION:

APPROVAL of a conditional use to allow for cannabis consumption.

APPEAL:

If you wish to appeal this decision, you must do so by November 16, 2023 pursuant to Section 14-16-6-4(V), 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
[Chris Lee chris@weeds.team](mailto:chris@weeds.team)
[Sharon Decatur decature45@gmail.com](mailto:decatore45@gmail.com)
[Anita Abeyta ralph_anita@msn.com](mailto:ralph_anita@msn.com)
[Adam Amestoy adam@amestoy.net](mailto:adam@amestoy.net)