



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

M Maokamphiou requests a variance of 2 ft to the required 6 ft wall height on the street rear yard for Lot 1, Block 7, Rhodes Sandia Vista Addn, located at 524 Martha ST NE, zoned R-1C [Section 14-16-5-7(D)(3)(g)]

Special Exception No:..... **VA-2022-00148**
Project No: **Project#2022-007118**
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 owner M Maokamphiou (“Applicant”) appeared before the Zoning Hearing Examiner (“ZHE”) requesting a variance of 2 ft to the required 6 ft wall height on the street rear yard (“Application”) upon the real property located at 524 Martha ST NE (“Subject Property”). Below are the ZHE’s finding of fact and decision:

FINDINGS:

1. Applicant is requesting a variance of 2 ft to the required 6 ft wall height on the street rear yard.
2. The City of Albuquerque Integrated Development Ordinance, Section 14-16-6-6(N)(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. All property owners within 100 feet of the subject property and the affected neighborhood association were notified.
7. The subject property is currently zoned R1-C.
8. The proper "Notice of Hearing" signage was posted for the required time period as required by Section 14-16-6-4(K)(3).
9. The Applicant has authority to pursue this Application.
10. Applicant has not established 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). Applicant asserted in written submittals and oral testimony that the special circumstances justifying the variance are the existence of criminal activity, vagrants, alcohol and drug users in the area, all of which pose a safety hazard to the residents of the subject property. The ZHE can certainly sympathize with a difficult situation. However, these conditions appear to apply generally to many neighboring properties in the vicinity, rather than uniquely to the subject property. As such, they do not satisfy the requirement of special circumstances under the IDO. Similarly, Applicant states that the location of the Subject Property on a corner lot and across a busy street from a park are a special circumstance. However, based on evidence in the record, it appears that there are several corner lots in the vicinity and in the applicable zone code that are located on a corner lot and across a busy street from a park; therefore, the location of the Subject Property does not satisfy the requirement of special circumstances under the IDO.
11. Because all prongs of the variance test must be satisfied and, as stated above, Applicant failed to satisfy Section 14-16-6-6(N)(3)(a)(1), the Application must be denied. Out of considerations of administrative and quasi-judicial economy, the ZHE will not summarize any analysis of the remaining prongs of the variance test in this Notification of Decision.

DECISION:

DENIAL of a variance of 2 ft to the required 6 ft wall height on the street rear yard.

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.

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Robert Lucero". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a horizontal line extending from the end of the name.

Robert Lucero, Esq.
Zoning Hearing Examiner

cc:

ZHE File
Zoning Enforcement
M Maokamphiou, ninabobina18@gmail.com
John Hyman, 600 Martha ST NE, 87123