



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

Raul Garza (Agent, Consensus Planning) requests a variance of 10 FT to the required 10 FT front setback in CPO-1 for Lot 13, Block Atlantic & Pacific Addn, located at 721 2nd Street SW, zoned RM-L [Section 14-16-3-4(B)(3)(c)]

Special Exception No: **VA-2024-00027**
Project No: **Project#2024-009934**
Hearing Date: 3-19-24
Closing of Public Record: 3-19-24
Date of Decision: 04-03-24

On the 19th day of March, 2024, agent for property owner Consensus Planning (“Applicant”) appeared before the Zoning Hearing Examiner (“ZHE”) requesting a variance of 10 FT to the required 10 FT front setback in CPO-1 (“Application”) upon the real property located at 721 2nd St SW (“Subject Property”). Below are the ZHE’s finding of fact and decision:

FINDINGS:

1. Applicant is requesting a variance of 10 ft. to the required 10 ft. front setback.
2. The ZHE finds that the Applicant has authority to pursue this Application.
3. Applicant has duly authorized Agent to act on Applicant’s behalf regarding the Application.
4. All property owners within 100 feet and affected neighborhood association(s) were notified.
5. 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).
6. The City of Albuquerque Integrated Development Ordinance (“IDO”), 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.”

7. 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. 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. Barelas is the affected neighborhood association.
10. The subject property is currently zoned RM-L.
11. 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). Applicant stated that the Subject Property was built in 1926, under a different regulatory regime before the setback regulations were promulgated, which is why the Subject Property does not currently comply with the setback standards, and compliance with current standards would create an extraordinary hardship and present practical difficulties.
12. 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). Applicant submitted evidence 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).
13. 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). Applicant submitted evidence that the proposal is designed to be in harmony and consistency with prior approvals, what currently exists in the neighborhood, rights of way and infrastructure
14. 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). Applicant submitted evidence 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 useability of the site in line with prior development in the area.
15. Based on evidence submitted by or on behalf of Applicant, the variance approved meets the minimum necessary to avoid extraordinary hardship or practical difficulties as required by Section 14-16-6-6(N)(3)(a)(5). Evidence supports that any smaller variance would not be practicable.

DECISION:

APPROVAL of a variance of 10 feet to the required 10 feet front setback.

APPEAL:

If you wish to appeal this decision, you must do so by April 19th, 2024 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



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

Raul Garza (Agent, Consensus Planning) request a variance of 15 FT to the required 15 FT rear setback for Lot 13, Block G, Atlantic & Pacific Addn, located at 721 Second Street SW, zoned RM-L [Section 14-16-5-1]

Special Exception No: **VA-2024-00028**
Project No: **Project#2024-009934**
Hearing Date: 3-19-24
Closing of Public Record: 3-19-24
Date of Decision: 04-03-24

On the 19th day of March, 2024, agent for property owner Consensus Planning (“Applicant”) appeared before the Zoning Hearing Examiner (“ZHE”) requesting a variance of 15 FT to the required 15 FT rear setback (“Application”) upon the real property located at 721 2nd 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 setback.
2. The ZHE finds that the Applicant has authority to pursue this Application.
3. Applicant has duly authorized Agent to act on Applicant’s behalf regarding the Application.
4. All property owners within 100 feet and affected neighborhood association(s) were notified.
5. 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).
6. The City of Albuquerque Integrated Development Ordinance (“IDO”), 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.”

7. 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. 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. Barelas is the affected neighborhood association.
10. The subject property is currently zoned RM-L.
11. 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). Applicant stated that the Subject Property was built in 1926, under a different regulatory regime before the setback regulations were promulgated, which is why the Subject Property does not currently comply with the setback standards, and compliance with current standards would create an extraordinary hardship and present practical difficulties.
12. 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). Applicant submitted evidence 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).
13. 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). Applicant submitted evidence that the proposal is designed to be in harmony and consistency with prior approvals, what currently exists in the neighborhood, rights of way and infrastructure
14. 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). Applicant submitted evidence 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 useability of the site in line with prior development in the area.
15. Based on evidence submitted by or on behalf of Applicant, the variance approved meets the minimum necessary to avoid extraordinary hardship or practical difficulties as required by Section 14-16-6-6(N)(3)(a)(5). Evidence supports that any smaller variance would not be practicable.

DECISION:

APPROVAL of a variance of 15 feet to the required 15 feet rear setback.

APPEAL:

If you wish to appeal this decision, you must do so by April 19th, 2024 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.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Robert Lucero".

Robert Lucero, Esq.
Zoning Hearing Examiner

cc:

ZHE File
Zoning Enforcement