



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

Leroy & Theresa Saiz requests a taller wall permit major for Lot 72, Block 4, Atrisco Village Unit 1 of Hoffman City, located at 10305 Cornelia CT SW, zoned R-1C [Section 14-16-5-7(D)(3)(a)]

Special Exception No: **VA-2023-00109**
Project No: **Project#2023-008517**
Hearing Date: 05-16-23
Closing of Public Record: 05-16-23
Date of Decision: 05-31-23

On the 16th day of May, 2023, property owners Leroy & Theresa Saiz (“Applicant”) appeared before the Zoning Hearing Examiner (“ZHE”) requesting a taller wall permit major (“Application”) upon the real property located at 10305 Cornelia CT SW (“Subject Property”). Below are the ZHE’s finding of fact and decision:

FINDINGS:

1. Applicant is requesting a taller wall permit major.
2. The ZHE finds that the proper “Notice of Hearing” signage was posted for the required time period as required by Section 14-16-6-4(K)(4).
3. The ZHE finds that the Applicant has authority to pursue this Application.
4. The City of Albuquerque Integrated Development Ordinance Section 14-16-6-6(H)(3) Permit-Wall or Fence-Major reads: “*An application for a Permit – Wall or Fence – Major for a wall in the front or street side yard of a lot with low-density residential development in or abutting any Residential zone district that meets the requirements in Subsection 14-16-5-7(D)(3)(g) (Exceptions to Maximum Wall Height) and Table 5-7-2 shall be approved if the following criteria are met:*
 - 6-6(H)(3)(a) *The wall is proposed on a lot that meets any of the following criteria:*
 1. *The lot is at least ½ acre.*
 2. *The lot fronts a street designated as a collector, arterial, or interstate highway.*
 3. *For a front yard wall taller than allowed in Table 5-7-1, at least 20 percent of the properties with low-density residential development with a front yard abutting the same street as the subject property and within 330 feet of the subject property along the length of the street the lot faces have a front yard wall or fence over 3 feet. This distance shall be measured along the street from each corner of the subject property's lot line, and the analysis shall include properties on both sides of the street.*
 4. *For a street side yard wall taller than allowed in Table 5-7-1, at least 20 percent of the properties with low-density residential development with a side yard abutting the same street as the subject property and within 330 feet of the subject property along the length*

of the street the lot faces have a street side yard wall or fence over 3 feet. This distance shall be measured along the street from each corner of the subject property's lot line, and the analysis shall include properties on both sides of the street.

- 6-6(H)(3)(b) *The proposed wall would strengthen or reinforce the architectural character of the surrounding area.*
- 6-6(H)(3)(c) *The proposed wall would not be injurious to adjacent properties, the surrounding neighborhood, or the larger community.*
- 6-6(H)(3)(d) *The design of the wall complies with any applicable standards in Section 14-16-5-7 (Walls and Fences), including but not limited to Subsection 14-16-5-7(E)(2) (Articulation and Alignment), Subsection 14-16-5-7(E)(3) (Wall Design), and all of the following:*
1. *The wall or fence shall not block the view of any portion of any window on the front façade of the primary building when viewed from 5 feet above ground level at the centerline of the street in front of the house.*
 2. *The design and materials proposed for the wall or fence shall reflect the architectural character of the surrounding area.*
5. Applicant bears the burden of providing a sound justification for the requested decision, based on substantial evidence, pursuant to IDO Section 14-16-6-4(E)(3).
 6. 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).
 7. All property owners within 100 feet and affected neighborhood associations were notified of the application.
 8. The subject property is currently zoned R-1C.
 9. Based on photographs, maps and oral evidence presented by Applicant, at least 20 percent of the properties within 330 feet of the lot where the wall or fence is being requested have a wall or fence over 3 feet in the applicable yard area.
 10. Based on evidence presented by Applicant, the proposed wall would strengthen or reinforce the architectural character of the surrounding area. Specifically, photographs were submitted showing several walls/fences in the neighborhood. It appears from the evidence that, provided that the proposed wall is stuccoed in a color other than grey to complement the residence on site and neighboring properties, the proposed wall would not be out of character with the surrounding area, but rather would reinforce the architectural character of the neighborhood by being in harmony with the other improvements on the Subject Property and in the vicinity.
 11. Based on evidence presented by Applicant, the proposed wall would not be injurious to adjacent properties, the surrounding neighborhood, or the larger community. Specifically, that the wall would enhance the safety of both the subject property and neighboring properties by discouraging trespassers from coming onto the property.
 12. Initially, the City Traffic Engineer objected to the Application, because the solid wall is within the mini clear sight triangle area near the driveway where a wall should not be taller than 3 feet. However, upon conferring with the City Traffic Engineer, Applicant proposes decommissioning the existing front driveway by removal of the existing drive pad and building the curb, gutter, sidewalk and landscape buffer across the existing drive pad. This would disable the use of the front driveway. The owner has been parking vehicles at the back

of the property via alley access and has not been using the driveway on Cornelia Ct. SW. The City Traffic Engineer confirmed that when Applicant's proposed decommissioning work is completed. CABQ Planning Transportation will not have any objections to the existing wall location or height. However, Applicant must also obtain approval of the City Fire Department that emergency vehicles and personnel will still be able to access the Subject Property under the proposed decommissioning plan.

13. Based on evidence presented by Applicant, the design of the wall complies with any applicable standard in Section 14-16-5-7 (Walls and Fences), including, but not limited to Subsection 14-16-5-7(E)(2) (Articulation and alignment) and Subsection 14-16-5-7(E)(3) (Wall Design), and all of the following: (a) The wall or fence shall not block the view of any portion of any window on the front façade of the primary building when viewed from 5 feet above ground level at the centerline of the street in front of the house; and (b) The design and materials proposed for the wall or fence shall reflect the architectural character of the surrounding area.

DECISION:

APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS of a taller wall permit major.

CONDITIONS:

A. The wall must be stuccoed in a color other than grey, to complement the residence on site and neighboring properties.

B. Applicant must decommission the existing front driveway by removing the existing drive pad and building the curb, gutter, sidewalk and landscape buffer across the existing drive pad, to disable the use of the front driveway (the "Decommissioning Work") to the satisfaction of the City Traffic Engineer.

C. Applicant must obtain approval of the Decommissioning Work by the City Fire Department to ensure that emergency vehicles and personnel will still be able to access the Subject Property after the Decommissioning Work is complete.

D. If any of the conditions listed in paragraphs A, B, or C of these conditions fails, the Application is denied.

APPEAL:

If you wish to appeal this decision, you must do so by June 15, 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
Leroy & Theresa Saiz, Luke Saiz lukesim2966@gmail.com



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

Leroy & Theresa Saiz request a variance of 3 feet to the required 3 foot wall height in front yard for Lot 72, Block 4, Atrisco Village Unit 1 of Hoffman City, located at 10305 Cornelia CT SW, zoned R-1C [Section 14-16-5-7(D)(1)]

Special Exception No: **VA-2023-00110**
Project No: **Project#2023-008517**
Hearing Date: 05-16-23
Closing of Public Record: 05-16-23
Date of Decision: 05-31-23

On the 16th day of May, 2023, property owners Leroy & Theresa Saiz (“Applicant”) appeared before the Zoning Hearing Examiner (“ZHE”) requesting a variance of 3 feet to the required 3 foot wall height in front yard (“Application”) upon the real property located at 10305 Cornelia CT SW (“Subject Property”). Below are the ZHE’s finding of fact and decision:

FINDINGS:

1. Applicant is requesting a variance of 3 feet to the required 3 foot wall height in front yard.
2. 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 this IDO, the applicable zone district, or any applicable Overlay Zone.*
 - (5) *The Variance approved is the minimum necessary to avoid extraordinary hardship or practical difficulties.”*
3. Applicant bears the burden of providing a sound justification for the requested decision, based on substantial evidence, pursuant to IDO Section 14-16-6-4(E)(3).
4. 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).
5. Applicant appeared and gave evidence in support of the application.

6. The subject property is currently zoned R-1C.
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(O)(3)(a)(1). Specifically, Applicant confirmed in oral testimony and submitted evidence that, the Subject Property's unique location in a pre-IDO platted area create special circumstances because of the property's unique orientation to existing improvements and to vehicular and pedestrian traffic. These special circumstances create an extraordinary hardship in the form of a substantial and unjustified limitation on the reasonable use or return on the Subject Property, because compliance with the minimum standards would not allow for the reasonably proposed fence, which otherwise would be in compliance with the IDO.
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(O)(3)(a)(2). Specifically, evidence was submitted supporting that, if granted approval, the Applicant intends to construct the proposed project in a manner that is consistent with the IDO and the Development Process Manual (DPM).
9. Although an anonymous complaint was submitted to the ZHE criticizing the aesthetics of the wall, it appears from the evidence that, provided that the proposed wall is stuccoed in a color other than grey to complement the residence on site and neighboring properties, the proposed wall would not be contrary to the public safety, health and welfare of the community in terms of aesthetics.
10. Initially, the City Traffic Engineer objected to the Application, because the solid wall is within the mini clear sight triangle area near the driveway where a wall should not be taller than 3 feet. However, upon conferring with the City Traffic Engineer, Applicant proposes decommissioning the existing front driveway by removal of the existing drive pad and building the curb, gutter, sidewalk and landscape buffer across the existing drive pad. This would disable the use of the front driveway. The owner has been parking vehicles at the back of the property via alley access and has not been using the driveway on Cornelia Ct. SW. The City Traffic Engineer confirmed that when Applicant's proposed decommissioning work is completed. CABQ Planning Transportation will not have any objections to the existing wall location or height. However, Applicant must also obtain approval of the City Fire Department that emergency vehicles and personnel will still be able to access the Subject Property under the proposed decommissioning plan.
11. 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(O)(3)(a)(3). Specifically, the proposal is designed to be in harmony and consistency with what currently exists in the neighborhood, including the easements of record that accommodate infrastructure.
12. 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(O)(3)(a)(4). Specifically, Applicant confirmed in written submittals that the intent of IDO will still be met in that the subject site will be in harmony with existing uses and the proposed variance would merely add to the safety and useability of the site.

13. 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(O)(3)(a)(5). Specifically, Applicant submitted evidence that any smaller variance would be ineffective to provide for the useability of the site. Thus, the applicant is not requesting more than what is minimally necessary for a variance.
14. The City Traffic Engineer submitted a report stating no objection to the Application.
15. All property owners within 100 feet and affected neighborhood association(s) were notified.
16. The ZHE finds that the proper "Notice of Hearing" signage was posted for the required time period as required by Section 14-16-6-4(k)(4).
17. The ZHE finds that the Applicant has authority to pursue this Application.

DECISION:

APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS of a variance of 3 feet to the required 3 foot wall height in front yard.

CONDITIONS:

- A. The wall must be stuccoed in a color other than grey, to complement the residence on site and neighboring properties.
- B. Applicant must decommission the existing front driveway by removing the existing drive pad and building the curb, gutter, sidewalk and landscape buffer across the existing drive pad, to disable the use of the front driveway (the "Decommissioning Work") to the satisfaction of the City Traffic Engineer.
- C. Applicant must obtain approval of the Decommissioning Work by the City Fire Department to ensure that emergency vehicles and personnel will still be able to access the Subject Property after the Decommissioning Work is complete.
- D. If any of the conditions listed in paragraphs A, B, or C of these conditions fails, the Application is denied.

APPEAL:

If you wish to appeal this decision, you must do so by June 15, 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

Leroy & Theresa Saiz, Luke Saiz lukesim2966@gmail.com