



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

Patricia Martinez requests a wall permit major for Lot 22, Block E, Buena Ventura, located at 431 Glorieta St NE, zoned R-1B [Section 14-16-5-7(D)(3)]

Special Exception No: **VA-2023-00198**
Project No: **Project#2023-009032**
Hearing Date: 09-19-23
Closing of Public Record: 09-19-23
Date of Decision: 10-04-23

On the 19th day of September, 2023, property owner Patricia Martinez (“Applicant”) appeared before the Zoning Hearing Examiner (“ZHE”) requesting a wall permit major (“Application”) upon the real property located at 431 Glorieta St NE (“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. 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 14-16-6-4(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-1B.
 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 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 other improvements on the Subject Property.
 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. 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.

13. The City Traffic Engineer initially submitted a report stating an objection to the Application, because opaque portions of the proposed wall would be over 3-feet high within the mini clear sight triangle. However, Applicant agreed to construct the wall to have view fencing on all portions of the wall over 3 feet high located within the mini clear sight triangle. Based on this redesign, the City Traffic Engineer submitted a revised report stating no objection to the proposed wall.
14. Opponents to the proposed wall argued that the wall needed to be set back from the street side yard at least five feet, pursuant to IDO Section 14-16-5-7(D)(3)(a)(1). However, IDO Section 14-16-5-7(D)(3)(a)(1), pertaining to exceptions to Maximum Wall Height in Low Density Residential Development, presents only one such exception. A different exception is found in IDO Section 14-16-5-7(D)(3)(a)(2), which provides for taller walls meeting the requirements of Table 5-7-2 and requiring a Permit- Wall or Fence – Major, which is the permit which the Application seeks. Table 5-7-2 provides that view fencing may be placed less than 10-feet from the lot line abutting the street, provided that the maximum wall height is limited to 5 feet.

DECISION:

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

CONDITIONS:

1. The wall is limited to a maximum of 5-feet in height.
2. All portions of the wall within the front yard must have view fencing for all portions of the wall over 3 feet high.
3. The wall must not block views within any clear sight triangle area in any manner contrary to the IDO or DPM.

APPEAL:

If you wish to appeal this decision, you must do so by October 19, 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
Patricia Martinez pmartinez615@yahoo.com
Arthur Bazan <asbazan@gmail.com>



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

Patricia Martinez requests a variance of 1 ft 11 inches to the allowed 3 ft maximum wall height in the front and street side yard for Lot 22, Block E, Buena Ventura, located at 431 Glorietta St NE, zoned R-1B [Section 14-16-5-7(D)]

Special Exception No: **VA-2023-00199**
Project No: **Project#2023-009032**
Hearing Date: 09-19-23
Closing of Public Record: 09-19-23
Date of Decision: 10-04-23

On the 19th day of September, 2023, property owner Patricia Martinez (“Applicant”) appeared before the Zoning Hearing Examiner (“ZHE”) requesting a variance of 1 ft 11 inches to the allowed 3 ft maximum wall height in the front and street side yard (“Application”) upon the real property located at 431 Glorietta St NE (“Subject Property”). Below are the ZHE’s finding of fact and decision:

FINDINGS:

1. Applicant is requesting a variance of 1 ft 11 inches to the allowed 3 ft maximum wall height in the front and street side yard.
2. 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 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 at the ZHE hearing on this matter and gave evidence in support of the Application.
6. Applicant established that the proper "Notice of Hearing" signage was posted for the required time period.
7. Applicant established that all property owners and neighborhood association entitled to notice were notified of the Application.
8. Applicant established that proper notice was provided pursuant to IDO requirements.
9. Applicant has authority to pursue this Application.
10. The subject property is currently zoned R-1B.
11. 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(O)(3)(a)(1). Evidence indicates that the size, shape, topography, location, surroundings, and physical characteristics of the Subject Property are very typical of those of other properties in the vicinity and zone district. Applicant testified that no special circumstance exists.
12. 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.
13. 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.
14. Nevertheless, Applicant's companion application for a permit for a Wall or Fence - Major, VA-2023-00198, is approved with conditions by the ZHE, and a fence up to 5-feet tall complying with the requirements of the notification of decision for VA-2023-00198 may be placed on the subject property.

DECISION:

DENIAL of a variance of 1 ft 11 inches to the allowed 3 ft maximum wall height in the front and street side yard.

APPEAL:

If you wish to appeal this decision, you must do so by October 19, 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
Patricia Martinez pmartinez615@yahoo.com
Arthur Bazan asbazan@gmail.com