



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

REMAND

Judith Mori, Applicant, requests a Major Zone Permit for a front courtyard wall taller than 3 ft., for Lot 104 Amended Pino Vista at Academy Hills Unit 5 Townhouses, located at 6428 Admiral Rickover Dr. NE, zoned R-T [IDO Section 14-16-6-6(H)(3)]

Special Exception No: **MZP-2025-00011**
Project No: NONE
Hearing Date:..... 02-17-2026
Closing of Public Record: 02-17-2026
Date of Decision: **03-04-2026**

On February 17, 2026, Judith Mori (“**Applicant**”) was scheduled to appear before the Zoning Hearing Examiner (“**ZHE**”) requesting a Major Zone Permit for a front courtyard wall taller than 3 ft, (“**Application**”) upon the real property located at 6428 Admiral Rickover Dr. NE (the “**Subject Property**”). Below are the ZHE’s findings of fact and decision:

FINDINGS:

1. Applicant is requesting a Major Zone Permit for a front courtyard wall taller than 3 ft, pursuant to City of Albuquerque Code of Ordinances Integrated Development Ordinance (“**IDO**”) Section 14-16-6-6(H).
2. Applicant has authority to pursue this Application, pursuant to 14-16-6-4(D).
3. Applicant is not required to offer a meeting to Indian Nations, Tribes, and Pueblos before filing the application, pursuant to IDO Section 14-16-6-4(B).
4. The Planning Director’s delegee has determined that the Application is complete, pursuant to IDO Section 14-16-6-4(G).
5. The analyses and studies listed in IDO Section 14-16-6-4(H) are not required.
6. The Application was forwarded to commenting agencies pursuant to IDO Section 14-16-6-4(I).
7. The content of the notice of the Application satisfies IDO Section 14-16-6-4(J)(1).
8. Applicant has sent an electronic mail notice to the email addresses on file with the Office of Neighborhood Coordination for each pertinent Neighborhood Association as required by IDO Section 14-16-6-4(J)(2).
9. Applicant has sent mailed notice to all property owners within 100 feet of the subject property as required by IDO Section 14-16-6-4(J)(3).
10. Applicant has posted sign notice(s) as required by IDO Section 14-16-6-4(J)(4).
11. The Subject Property is located within an R-T zone which has a maximum street front fence height of 3 ft.

12. Therefore, a wall or fence over 3 ft on the Subject Property requires a Permit-Wall or Fence-Major pursuant to IDO Subsection 14-16-6-6(H).
13. IDO Section 14-16-6-6(H)(3) (Review and Decision Criteria for a Permit-Wall or Fence-Major) reads: “An application for a Permit – Wall or Fence - Major shall be approved if the following criteria are met:
 - (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.*
 - (b) *The proposed wall would strengthen or reinforce the architectural character of the surrounding area.*
 - (c) *The proposed wall would not be injurious to adjacent properties, the surrounding neighborhood, or the larger community.*
 - (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 both of the following criteria:*
 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.*
14. 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).
15. 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).
16. Applicant appeared at the February 17, 2026 ZHE hearing on the Application.

17. 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 front yard area.
18. Based on evidence presented by Applicant, the proposed wall would strengthen or reinforce the architectural character of the surrounding area. The proposed wall is consistent with the stucco and design of the residence on the Subject Property and generally with the neighborhood.
19. Based on evidence presented by Applicant, the proposed wall would not be injurious to adjacent properties, the surrounding neighborhood, or the larger community. There was some questions as to whether the wall is located entirely on the subject property or whether any portion of the wall encroaches on the neighboring property. As a result of survey work newly obtained, it is apparent that a portion of the wall encroaches on the neighboring property. Applicant has agreed to remove all encroaching portion of the wall and relocate and reconstruct the wall so that it is entirely on the Subject Property.
20. 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: (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; and (2) The design and materials proposed for the wall or fence shall reflect the architectural character of the surrounding area.

DECISION:

APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS of Case# MZP-2025-00011, a request for Major Zone Permit for a front courtyard wall taller than 3 ft., on Lot 104 Amended Pino Vista at Academy Hills Unit 5 Townhouses, 6428 Admiral Rickover Dr. NE based on the preceding Findings.

CONDITIONS:

1. All portions of the wall that encroach upon the neighboring property must be removed and rebuilt to be entirely within the Subject Property.
2. Applicant is responsible for acquiring all necessary building permits.

APPEAL:

If you wish to appeal this decision, you must do so by March 19, 2026, pursuant to Section 14-16-6-4-(U), 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 Notice of Decision does not constitute

approval of plans for a building permit. If your application is approved, bring this Notice of Decision with you when you apply for any related building permit or occupation tax number. Approval of a Conditional Use is void after two (2) years from date of approval if the rights and privileges granted thereby have not been executed or utilized. Approval of a Variance is void after one (1) year from date of approval if the rights and privileges granted thereby have not been executed or utilized.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Robert Lucero". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Robert" being more prominent than the last name "Lucero".

Robert Lucero, Esq.
Zoning Hearing Examiner

cc: Judi Mori, judi_mori@hotmail.com
Jan & Danuta Czubiak, czdana2@gmail.com
ZHE File
Zoning Enforcement