

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

Francisco Arguello Martinez requests a wall permit major in the front yard for Lot 47, Block 33D, Princess Jeanne Park Addn, located at 904 Lomas CT NE, zoned R-1B [Section 14-16-57(D)(3)(a)(2)]

Special Exception No: ............ VA-2023-00138
Project No: .............................. Project\#2023-008755
Hearing Date $\qquad$ 07-18-23
Closing of Public Record:
07-18-23
Date of Decision: $\qquad$ 08-02-23

On the 18th day of July, 2023, property owner Francisco Arguello Martinez ("Applicant") appeared before the Zoning Hearing Examiner ("ZHE") requesting a wall permit major in the front yard ("Application") upon the real property located at 904 Lomas CT NE ("Subject Property"). Below are the ZHE's finding of fact and decision:

## FINDINGS:

1. Applicant is requesting a taller wall permit major in the front yard.
2. The subject property is currently zoned R-1B.
3. The City of Albuquerque Integrated Development Ordinance Section 14-16-6-6(H)(3) PermitWall 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 $1 / 2$ 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.
$6-6(H)(3)(d) \quad$ 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:
5. 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.
6. The design and materials proposed for the wall or fence shall reflect the architectural character of the surrounding area.
7. The 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).
8. The 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).
9. Applicant appeared at the ZHE and gave evidence in support of the Application.
10. Applicant provided evidence that all property owners and neighborhood association entitled to notice were notified of the Application.
11. Based on photographs, maps and evidence provided by Applicant, at least 20 percent of the properties within 330 feet of the lot where the fence is being requested have a wall or fence over 3 feet in the applicable front yard area.
12. Based on evidence presented by Applicant, the proposed wall would strengthen or reinforce the architectural character of the surrounding area. Applicant submitted photographs showing several fences in the neighborhood. It appears from the evidence that the proposed wall would not be out of character with the surrounding area, rather it would reinforce the architectural character of the neighborhood by being in harmony with the other improvements in the vicinity.
13. The proposed wall will be constructed of material similar to the home. Applicant stated that after initial construction the proposed wall would be of stucco to match the aesthetic design of the home.
14. Based on evidence presented by Applicant the proposed wall would not cause injury to adjacent properties, the surrounding neighborhood, or the larger community. Applicant stated that the wall would enhance the safety of both the subject property and neighboring properties by discouraging trespassers.
15. 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.
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)(3).
17. The City Traffic Engineer submitted a report stating no objection to the Application.

## DECISION:

APPROVAL of a taller wall permit major in the front yard.

## APPEAL:

If you wish to appeal this decision, you must do so by August 17, 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
Francisco Arguello francisco1079@gmail.com
Allen Colmenares allen@rollingstonegc.com


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

| Francisco Arguello Martinez requests a Variance |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| of 3 feet view fencing to the allowed 3 feet wall | Special Exception No: ........... | VA-2023-00139 <br> Project No:........................... | Project\#2023-008755 |
| height front yard for Lot 47, Block 33D, Princess | Hearing Date:....................... | $07-18-23$ |  |
| Jeanne Park Addn, located at 904 Lomas CT NE, | Closing of Public Record:....... | $07-18-23$ |  |
| zoned R-1B [Section 14-16-5-7(D)(1)] | Date of Decision: .................. | $08-02-23$ |  |

On the 18th day of July, 2023, property owner Francisco Arguello Martinez ("Applicant") appeared before the Zoning Hearing Examiner ("ZHE") requesting a variance of 3 feet view fencing to the allowed 3 feet wall height front yard ("Application") upon the real property located at 904 Lomas CT NE ("Subject Property"). Below are the ZHE's finding of fact and decision:

## FINDINGS:

1. Applicant is requesting a variance of 3 feet view fencing to the allowed 3 feet wall height front yard.
2. The subject property is currently zoned $\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{B}$.
3. The Applicant has authority to pursue this Application.
4. The City of Albuquerque Integrated Development Ordinance, Section 14-16-6-6(O)(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."
5. The 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. The Applicant bears the burden of showing compliance with required standards through analysis, illustrations, or other exhibits as necessary, pursuant to IDO Section 14-16-64(E)(4).
7. Applicant appeared and gave evidence in support of the application.
8. Applicant provided evidence that all property owners and neighborhood association entitled to notice were notified of the Application.
9. Evidence submitted does not establish that there are special circumstances applicable to the Subject Property that are not self-imposed and that do not apply generally to other properties 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(0)(3)(a)(1). In addressing the special circumstances prong of the variance test, Applicant testified that the Subject Property is located near a high-traffic intersection. While this speaks to the character of the surrounding area, it is not a special circumstance applicable to the Subject Property itself. The ZHE can certainly sympathize with Applicant's desire to secure his property with a taller (6-foot tall) fence he proposes. However, the Application does not satisfy the requirement of special circumstances under the IDO.
10. Because all prongs of the variance test must be satisfied and, as stated above, the Application failed to satisfy Section 14-16-6-6(O)(3)(a)(1), the Application must be denied.
11. Out of considerations of administrative and quasi-judicial economy, the ZHE will not summarize any analysis of the remaining prongs of the variance test in this Notification of Decision.
12. Nevertheless, Applicant's companion application for a permit for a Wall or Fence - Major, VA-2023-00138, is approved by the ZHE, and a fence up to 5-feet tall complying with the requirements of the notification of decision for VA-2023-00138 may be placed on the subject property.

## DECISION:

DENIAL of a variance of 3 feet to the 3 foot maximum wall height in the front yard.

## APPEAL:

If you wish to appeal this decision, you must do so by August 17, 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
Francisco Arguello francisco1079@gmail.com
Allen Colmenares allen@rollingstonegc.com

