



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

Alexis & Joseph Artery request a variance of 14 ft to the required 15 ft rear yard setback for Lot 12, Block 23, Parkland Hills Addn, located at 724 Carlisle BLVD SE, zoned R-1D [Section 14-16-5-1(C)(1)]

Special Exception No:..... **VA-2022-00147**
Project No: **Project#2022-007116**
Hearing Date: 07-19-22
Closing of Public Record: 07-19-22
Date of Decision: 08-03-22

On the 19th day of July, 2022, property owners Alexis & Joseph Artery (“Applicant”) appeared before the Zoning Hearing Examiner (“ZHE”) requesting a variance of 14 ft to the required 15 ft rear yard setback (“Application”) upon the real property located at 724 Carlisle BLVD SE (“Subject Property”). Below are the ZHE’s finding of fact and decision:

FINDINGS:

1. Applicant is requesting a variance of 14 ft to the required 15 ft rear yard setback.
2. The City of Albuquerque Integrated Development Ordinance, Section 14-16-6-6(O)(3)(a) (Variance-Review and Decision Criteria) reads: “... *an application for a Variance-ZHE shall be approved if it meets all of the following criteria:*
 - (1) *There are special circumstances applicable to the subject property that are not self-imposed and that 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. Such special circumstances of the property either create an extraordinary hardship in the form of a substantial and unjustified limitation on the reasonable use or return on the property, or practical difficulties result from strict compliance with the minimum standards.*
 - (2) *The Variance will not be materially contrary to the public safety, health, or welfare.*
 - (3) *The Variance does not cause significant material adverse impacts on surrounding properties or infrastructure improvements in the vicinity.*
 - (4) *The Variance will not materially undermine the intent and purpose of the IDO or the applicable zone district.*
 - (5) *The Variance approved is the minimum necessary to avoid extraordinary hardship or practical difficulties.”*
3. The 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).
4. The 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).

5. Applicant appeared and gave evidence in support of the application.
6. The subject property is currently zoned R-1D.
7. Based on evidence submitted by or on behalf of Applicant, it appears that there are special circumstances applicable to the Subject Property that are not self-imposed and that 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 14-16-6-6(N)(3)(a)(1). Specifically, Applicant confirmed in oral testimony and submitted evidence that, the Subject Property's unique location in relation to existing improvements and curb cuts create special circumstances. These special circumstances create an extraordinary hardship in the form of a substantial and unjustified limitation on the reasonable use or return on the Subject Property, because compliance with the minimum standards would not allow for the reasonably proposed use that otherwise would be in compliance with the IDO.
8. Based on evidence submitted by or on behalf of Applicant, the variance will not be contrary to the public safety, health and welfare of the community as required by Section 14-16-6-6(N)(3)(a)(2). Specifically, evidence was submitted supporting that, if granted approval, the Applicant intends to construct the proposed project in a manner that is consistent with the IDO and the Development Process Manual (DPM). Owners of an adjacent property complained that the proposed addition would encroach upon the neighboring property, but the plans and drawings in the record and Applicant's testimony confirm that there will be no encroachment. Neighbors also complained that water runoff from the improvement would flow onto the neighboring property, but Applicant confirmed that gutters and roof shape and slope would prevent any increase in flows from what has been the case prior to the Application.
9. Based on evidence submitted by or on behalf of Applicant, the variance will not cause significant adverse material impacts on surrounding properties or infrastructure improvements in the vicinity as required by Section 14-16-6-6(N)(3)(a)(3). See evidence cited in Finding 8, above. Also, Applicant testified that it has obtained an encroachment agreement regarding the overhead public utility easement onto which the proposed improvement encroaches (and onto which the existing historic improvement also encroaches).
10. Based on evidence submitted by or on behalf of Applicant, the variance will not materially undermine the intent and purpose of the IDO or applicable zone district as required by Section 14-16-6-6(N)(3)(a)(4). Specifically, Applicant confirmed in written submittals that the intent of IDO will still be met in that the subject site will be in harmony with existing uses and the proposed variance would merely add to the safety and useability of the site.
11. Based on evidence submitted by or on behalf of Applicant, the variance approved is the minimum necessary to avoid extraordinary hardship or practical difficulties as required by Section 14-16-6-6(N)(3)(a)(5). Specifically, Applicant submitted evidence that any smaller variance would be ineffective to provide for the useability of the site. Thus, the applicant is not requesting more than what is minimally necessary for a variance.
12. The City Traffic Engineer submitted a report stating no objection to the Application.
13. All property owners within 100 feet and affected neighborhood association(s) were notified.
14. The ZHE finds that the proper "Notice of Hearing" signage was posted for the required time period as required by Section 14-16-6-4(K)(3).

15. The ZHE finds that the Applicant has authority to pursue this Application.

DECISION:

APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS of a variance of 14 ft to the required 15 ft rear yard setback.

CONDITIONS:

- A. No improvement may encroach off the Subject Property and onto any neighboring property.
- B. The improvements must be constructed to minimize any increase in water runoff from the new improvements onto neighboring properties.

APPEAL:

If you wish to appeal this decision, you must do so by August 18, 2022 pursuant to Section 14-16-6-4(V), 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 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.



Robert Lucero, Esq.
Zoning Hearing Examiner

cc:

ZHE File
Zoning Enforcement
Alexis & Joseph Artery, alexis.artery@gmail.com
Victoria Vandame, victoriavandame@gmail.com
Paul Valarde, 9905 2ND ST NW, 87114