



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

ANGELA DAVIS (RYAN MAYFIELD, AGENT) requests a special exception to Section 14-16-2-6(E)(4)(b): VARIANCE of 3' 8 " to the required 10' side yard setback for a proposed addition. for all or a portion of Lot 10, Block 2A, GUITIERREZ - OFIMIANO J LOWER zoned R-1, located on 8909 LA BARRANCA AVE NE (F-20)

Special Exception No:..... **15ZHE-80123**
Project No:..... **Project# 1010431**
Hearing Date:..... 05-19-2015
Closing of Public Record:..... 05-19-2015
Date of Decision: 05-29-2015

On the 19th day of May, 2015 (hereinafter "**Hearing** RYAN MAYFIELD (hereinafter "**Agent**") acting as agent on behalf of the property owner ANGELA DAVIS (hereinafter "**Applicant**") appeared before the Zoning Hearing Examiner (hereinafter "**ZHE**") requesting a Variance of 3' 8 " to the required 10' side yard setback for a proposed addition (hereinafter "**Application**") upon the real property located at 8909 LA BARRANCA AVE NE ("**Subject Property**"). Below are the findings of facts:

FINDINGS:

1. Applicant is requesting a Variance of 3' 8" to the required 10' side yard setback for a proposed addition.
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 this two bedroom proposed addition will be architecturally harmonious with the existing home and it will maintain the same setback that currently is utilized on the side of the home and therefore it will not be injurious to the neighborhood [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, except for one letter of opposition from the home owner located at 8900 Northridge which expressed some confusion as to the location of the variance application. The ZHE has reviewed the map of the community and has identified the location of 8900 Northridge as not immediately adjacent to the Subject Property and therefore the ZHE would like to remind the property owners that this addition will not be “budding up” to their property as suggested in their letter dated May 1, 2015 (See ZHE file). As a result, the ZHE believes that this Application is not materially injurious to the neighbors or surrounding community.

4. The ZHE notes that this home was built prior to the adoption of the setback regulations (1969). The Applicant is proposing to simply maintain the current setback that exists on the Subject Property for the proposed addition (two bedrooms).
5. 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 lot is irregularly shaped, as a result of the angled back yard wall (and property line) and was constructed prior to the adoption of the setback regulations in the City of Albuquerque [as required pursuant to Section § 14-16-4-2 (C) (2) (b)].
6. 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 angled irregular shape of the property was not self-imposed and precluding the addition on this home (two bedrooms for the growing family) as a result of the setback regulations would constitute an “*unjustified limitation on the reasonable use of the Subject Property*” [as required pursuant to Section § 14-16-4-2 (C) (2) (c)]
7. 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)]
8. 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 3' 8 " to the required 10' side yard setback for a proposed addition.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

- A. The Applicant shall ensure that the addition is architecturally harmonious with the home on the Subject Property (similar colors, textures, materials, etc.).

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
mrtrim777@yahoo.com