



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

AMY GORMAN requests a special exception to Section 14-16-3-3(B)(2)(E): a VARIANCE of 8' to the required 10' separation for an existing shed to a dwelling for all or a portion of Lot 1, Block 67, SNOW HEIGHTS zoned R-1, located on 10400 WOODLAND AV NE (H-21)

Special Exception No:.....14ZHE-80296  
Project No: .....Project# 1010312  
Hearing Date: .....January 23, 2015  
Closing of Public Record: .....January 23, 2015  
Date of Decision:.....02-06-15

On the 23rd day of January, 2015 (hereinafter "Hearing") AMY GORMAN (hereinafter "Applicant") appeared before the Zoning Hearing Examiner (hereinafter "ZHE") requesting a Variance of 8' to the required 10' separation for an existing shed to a dwelling (hereinafter "Application") upon the real property located at 10400 WOODLAND AV NE ("Subject Property"). Below are the findings of facts:

**FINDINGS:**

1. Applicant is requesting a Variance of 8' to the required 10' separation for an existing shed to a dwelling.
2. The City of Albuquerque Zoning Code of Ordinances Section § 14-16-4-2 (C) (2) "SPECIAL EXCEPTIONS – VARIANCE" reads in part: "*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 ZHE finds that the Applicant has met its burden of providing evidence (both oral testimony and written material) that establishes that the Application is not going to be: (i) contrary to the public interest, (ii) injurious to the community; or (iii) injurious to the property/improvements located in the nearby vicinity of the Subject Property. Specifically, the Applicant provided testimony that the sheds were on the property

when she purchased it over two years ago and that both sheds have been on the property for over 20 years without any problems on the property or with neighboring properties, and therefore is not injurious to the community [as required pursuant to Section § 14-16-4-2 (C) (2) (a)]. Further, the Application and testimony of the Applicant at the Hearing suggest that there is no neighborhood opposition to the Application. In fact, the Applicant stated that the neighbor to the north and east are both supportive of these applications to maintain the current spacing and setbacks of the existing shed and "Morgan pre-fabricated building".

4. The ZHE finds that the Applicant has met its burden of providing evidence (both oral testimony and written material) that establishes that there are "special circumstances" applicable to the Subject Property which do not apply generally to other property in the same zone and vicinity. Specifically, the Applicant provided testimony that the property is unusually narrow corner lot, and the unusual shape of the lot is a special circumstance that led to the installation of the shed and "morgan" building some 20 years ago [as required pursuant to Section § 14-16-4-2 (C) (2) (b)]
5. The ZHE finds that the Applicant has met its burden of providing evidence (both oral testimony and written material) that establishes that the special circumstances presented hereinabove were not "self-imposed", and that those special circumstances create an unnecessary hardship upon the Applicant. Specifically, the Applicant provided testimony that if the ZHE required the shed and Morgan building to meet the current city setback that they would have to remove one of the existing buildings which have been there for 20+ years which constitutes an "*unjustified limitation on the reasonable use of the Subject Property*" [as required pursuant to Section § 14-16-4-2 (C) (2) (c)]
6. The ZHE finds that the Applicant has met its burden of providing evidence (both oral testimony and written material) that establishes that substantial justice will be done if this Application is approved. [as required pursuant to Section § 14-16-4-2 (C) (2) (d)]
7. Applicant testified at the Hearing that the yellow "Notice of Hearing" signs were posted for the required time period as articulated within City of Albuquerque Code of Ordinances § 14-16-4-2 (B) (4).

#### **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:**

The Applicant has met their burden of submitting an Application that provides evidence that satisfies the elements required within §14-16-4-2 (C) (2) of the Albuquerque Zoning Code.

#### **DECISION:**

**APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS** of a VARIANCE of 8' to the required 10' separation for an existing shed to a dwelling.

#### **CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:**

- A. The Applicant shall ensure that the shed and the pre-fabricated metal building meet with the City of Albuquerque Fire Code for safety reasons.

If you wish to appeal this decision, you may do so by 5:00 p.m., on February 23, 2015 in the manner described below:

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.



---

Joshua J. Skarsgard, Esq.  
Zoning Hearing Examiner

cc: Zoning Enforcement  
ZHE File  
Amy Gorman 10400 Woodland Ave NE Albuquerque Nm 87112



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

AMY GORMAN requests a special exception to Section 14-16-3-3(B)(2)(E): a VARIANCE of 5' to the required 5' separation for existing sheds. for all or a portion of Lot 1, Block 67, SNOW HEIGHTS zoned R-1, located on 10400 WOODLAND AVE (H-21)

Special Exception No:.....14ZHE-80297  
Project No: .....Project# 1010312  
Hearing Date: .....January 23, 2015  
Closing of Public Record: .....January 23, 2015  
Date of Decision:.....02-06-15

On the 23rd day of January, 2015 (hereinafter "**Hearing**") AMY GORMAN (hereinafter "**Applicant**") appeared before the Zoning Hearing Examiner (hereinafter "**ZHE**") requesting a Variance of 5' to the required 5' separation for existing sheds (hereinafter "**Application**") upon the real property located at 10400 WOODLAND AV NE ("**Subject Property**"). Below are the findings of facts:

**FINDINGS:**

1. Applicant is requesting a Variance of 5' to the required 5' separation for existing sheds.
2. The City of Albuquerque Zoning Code of Ordinances Section § 14-16-4-2 (C) (2) "**SPECIAL EXCEPTIONS – VARIANCE**" reads in part: "*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 ZHE finds that the Applicant has met its burden of providing evidence (both oral testimony and written material) that establishes that the Application is not going to be: (i) contrary to the public interest, (ii) injurious to the community; or (iii) injurious to the property/improvements located in the nearby vicinity of the Subject Property. Specifically, the Applicant provided testimony that the sheds

were on the property when she purchased it over two years ago and that both sheds have been on the property for over 20 years without any problems on the property or with neighboring properties, and therefore is not injurious to the community [as required pursuant to Section § 14-16-4-2 (C) (2) (a)]. Further, the Application and testimony of the Applicant at the Hearing suggest that there is no neighborhood opposition to the Application. In fact, the Applicant stated that the neighbor to the north and east are both supportive of these applications to maintain the current spacing and setbacks of the existing shed and "Morgan pre-fabricated building".

4. The ZHE finds that the Applicant has met its burden of providing evidence (both oral testimony and written material) that establishes that there are "special circumstances" applicable to the Subject Property which do not apply generally to other property in the same zone and vicinity. Specifically, the Applicant provided testimony that the property is unusually narrow corner lot, and the unusual shape of the lot is a special circumstance that led to the installation of the shed and "morgan" building some 20 years ago [as required pursuant to Section § 14-16-4-2 (C) (2) (b)]
5. The ZHE finds that the Applicant has met its burden of providing evidence (both oral testimony and written material) that establishes that the special circumstances presented hereinabove were not "self-imposed", and that those special circumstances create an unnecessary hardship upon the Applicant. Specifically, the Applicant provided testimony that if the ZHE required the shed and Morgan building to meet the current city setback that they would have to remove one of the existing buildings which have been there for 20+ years which constitutes an "*unjustified limitation on the reasonable use of the Subject Property*" [as required pursuant to Section § 14-16-4-2 (C) (2) (c)]
6. The ZHE finds that the Applicant has met its burden of providing evidence (both oral testimony and written material) that establishes that substantial justice will be done if this Application is approved. [as required pursuant to Section § 14-16-4-2 (C) (2) (d)]
7. Applicant testified at the Hearing that the yellow "Notice of Hearing" signs were posted for the required time period as articulated within City of Albuquerque Code of Ordinances § 14-16-4-2 (B) (4).

**CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:**

The Applicant has met their burden of submitting an Application that provides evidence that satisfies the elements required within §14-16-4-2 (C) (2) of the Albuquerque Zoning Code.

**DECISION:**

**APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS** of a VARIANCE of 5' to the required 5' separation for existing sheds.

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:**

- A. The Applicant shall ensure that the shed and the pre-fabricated metal building meet with the City of Albuquerque Fire Code for safety reasons.

If you wish to appeal this decision, you may do so by 5:00 p.m., on February 23, 2015 in the manner described below:

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.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Joshua J. Skarsgard, Esq.  
Zoning Hearing Examiner

**cc: Zoning Enforcement**  
**ZHE File**  
**Amy Gorman 10400 Woodland Ave NE Albuquerque Nm 87112**  
**Amy Gorman abgorman@aol.com**