



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

DON N ARNWINE requests a special exception to Section 14-16-3-3(B)(2)(e) : a VARIANCE of 9 ft to the 10 ft separation requirement for an existing accessory structure for all or a portion of Lot 5, Block 8, Heritage Hills Unit 1 zoned R-1, located on 8506 CAPULIN RD NE (D-20)

Special Exception No:..... **17ZHE-80021**
Project No:..... **Project# 1011128**
Hearing Date:..... 03-17-17
Closing of Public Record:..... 03-17-17
Date of Decision: 03-31-17

On the 17th day of March, 2017, DON N ARNWINE (“Applicant”) appeared before the Zoning Hearing Examiner (“ZHE”) requesting a variance of 9 ft to the 10 ft separation requirement for an existing accessory structure (“Application”) upon the real property located at 8506 CAPULIN RD NE (“Subject Property”). Below are the ZHE’s findings of fact and decision:

FINDINGS:

1. Applicant is requesting a variance of 9 ft to the 10 ft separation requirement for an existing accessory structure.
2. The City of Albuquerque Zoning Code of Ordinances Section 14-16-4-2 (C)(2) (Special Exceptions – Variance) reads: “A *variance application shall be approved by the Zoning Hearing Examiner, if and only if, the Zoning Hearing Examiner finds all of the following:*
 - (a) *The application is not contrary to the public interest or injurious to the community, or to property or improvements in the vicinity;*
 - (b) *There are special circumstances applicable to the subject property which 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;*
 - (c) *Such special circumstances were not self-imposed and create an unnecessary hardship in the form of a substantial and unjustified limitation on the reasonable use or return on the property that need not be endured to achieve the intent and purpose of the Zoning Code (§14-16-1-3) and the applicable zoning district; and*
 - (d) *Substantial justice is done.*”
3. The Applicant bears the burden of ensuring there is evidence in the record supporting a finding that the above criteria are met under Section 14-16-4-2(C).
4. As to the first set of criterion, that the Application is not: (i) contrary to the public interest, (ii) injurious to the community; or (iii) injurious to the property or improvements located in the vicinity as required by Section 14-16-4-2 (C)(2)(a), the problem presented is the impact on the abutting property.

5. Specifically, rain/snow runoff that overflows the gutter runs off onto the neighboring property. It appears that the gutter itself may be an encroachment as well, and removal of the gutter would exacerbate the problem.
6. Additionally, the neighbor complains of the aesthetic impact of the shed.
7. Although neither of these aspects are tied directly to the separation from the principal structure, for which the variance is sought, the fact is that the variance would permit existence of these conditions.
8. As to the requirement that there are special circumstances applicable to the Subject Property which 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 14-16-4-2(C)(2)(b), the Applicant explains that the property is irregularly shaped and has a grade differential from the neighbors.
9. However, it is not clear from the evidence in the record how these circumstances create an unnecessary hardship in the form of a substantial and unjustified limitation on the reasonable use or return on the property that need not be endured to achieve the intent and purpose of the Zoning Code (§14-16-1-3) and the applicable district, as required by Section 14-16-4-2(C)(2)(c).
10. Here, the Applicants did indicate their ability to move the shed to a location where the variance would not be required, albeit with some hardship, which does not rise to the level of a substantial and unjustified limitation on the use of the property.
11. The ZHE finds that the proper “Notice of Hearing” signage was posted for the required time period as required by Section 14-16-4-2(B)(4).
12. The ZHE finds that the Applicant has authority to pursue this Application.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

The criteria within Section 14-16-4-2(C)(2) of the Albuquerque Zoning Code are not satisfied.

DECISION:

DENIAL of a variance of 9 ft to the 10 ft separation requirement for an existing accessory structure.

If you wish to appeal this decision, you must do so by April 17, 2017, in the manner described below. A non-refundable filing fee will be calculated at the Planning Department’s Land Development Coordination counter and is required at the time the Appeal is filed.

Appeal is to the Board of Appeals within 15 days of the decision. A filing fee of \$105.00 shall accompany each appeal application, as well as a written explanation outlining the reason for appeal and a copy of the ZHE decision. Appeals are taken at 600 2nd Street, Plaza Del Sol Building, Ground Level, Planning Application Counter located on the west side of the lobby. **Please present this**

letter of notification when filing an appeal. When an application is withdrawn, the fee shall not be refunded.

An appeal shall be heard by the Board of Appeals within 45 days of the appeal period and concluded within 75 days of the appeal period. The Planning Division shall give written notice of an appeal, together with a notice of the date, time and place of the hearing to the applicant, a representative of the opponents, if any are known, and the appellant.

Please note that pursuant to Section 14. 16. 4. 4. (B), of the City of Albuquerque Comprehensive Zoning Code, you must demonstrate that you have legal standing to file an appeal as defined.

You will receive notice if any other person files an appeal. If there is no appeal, you can receive building permits any time after the appeal deadline quoted above, provided all conditions imposed at the time of approval have been met. However, the Zoning Hearing Examiner may allow issuance of building permits if the public hearing produces no objection of any kind to the approval of an application. To receive this approval, the applicant agrees in writing to return the building permit or occupation tax number.

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.



Christopher L. Graeser, Esq.
Zoning Hearing Examiner

cc: Zoning Enforcement
ZHE File
seameet77@centurylink.net
Robert Shapiro 8500 Capulin Rd NE, 87109