



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

EDWARD & KAY BOCIAN (EFTHIMIOS MANIATIS, AGENT) requests a special exception to Section 14-16-2-6(E)(3)(b): a VARIANCE request of 6'10" to the required 10' corner side yard setback for a proposed addition for all or a portion of Lot 9, Block 13, RIDGECREST ADDN zoned R-1, located on 1611 RIDGECREST CIR SE (L-17)

Special Exception No:..... **15ZHE-80025**  
Project No:..... **Project# 1010365**  
Hearing Date:..... 03-17-15  
Closing of Public Record:..... 03-17-15  
Date of Decision: ..... 03-31-15

On the 17th day of March, 2015 (hereinafter “**Hearing**”) EFTHIMIOS MANIATIS, (hereinafter “**Agent**”) acting as agent on behalf of the property owner EDWARD & KAY BOCIAN (hereinafter “**Applicant**”) appeared before the Zoning Hearing Examiner (hereinafter “**ZHE**”) requesting a VARIANCE of 6'10" to the required 10' corner side yard setback for a proposed addition (hereinafter “**Application**”) upon the real property located at 1611 RIDGECREST CIR SE (“**Subject Property**”). Below are the findings of facts:

**FINDINGS:**

8. Applicant is requesting a Variance of 6'10" to the required 10' corner side yard setback for a proposed addition.
9. 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.”
10. 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 family is looking to extend their dining room to the south side yard facing the street, and creating a bay window seating area. The house is approximately 50 years old. The extension will increase their quality of life and limit the exposure to the sun in the affected room within the home. The Applicant testified that this extension/addition will not be injurious to any of the surrounding neighbors and will not adversely impact views or create safety concerns for neighbors [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. The Applicant stated at the Hearing that “all the neighbors agree support and like the addition”.

11. The Applicant testified that the addition will match the architectural theme and materials of the home so it will look congruent with the home.
12. 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 located on a uniquely shaped corner lot and has antiquated platting that established property lines that exceed the sidewalks in the adjacent public right of way [as required pursuant to Section § 14-16-4-2 (C) (2) (b)]
13. 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 the corner lot/platting would prohibit an expansion of this home 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)]
14. The Applicant testified that there is 9’ 2” in distance from the sidewalk to the property line (indicating that the improvements are setback from the sidewalk).
15. 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)]
16. 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 6'10" to the required 10' corner side yard setback for a proposed addition.

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:**

- C. The Applicant shall leave the pedestrian sidewalk intact.
- D. The Applicant shall ensure that the architectural style of the addition is congruent with the home.

If you wish to appeal this decision, you may do so 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

Edward & Kay Bocian 1611 Ridgecrest Circle SE Albuquerque NM 87108

Efthimios Maniatis 1618 Anderson Pl SE Albuquerque NM 87108