



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

Debra Smith requests a variance of 1 ft to the allowed 8 ft wall height on the side yard for Lot 105-P1, Tuscan Ridge Subd, located at 10611 Vista Bella PI NW, zoned R-T [Section 14-16-5-7]

Special Exception No: **VA-2023-00180**
Project No: **Project#2023-008904**
Hearing Date: 09-19-23
Closing of Public Record: 09-19-23
Date of Decision: 10-04-23

On the 19th day of September, 2023, property owner Debra Smith (“Applicant”) appeared before the Zoning Hearing Examiner (“ZHE”) requesting a variance of 1 ft to the allowed 8 ft wall height on the side yard (“Application”) upon the real property located at 10611 Vista Bella PI NW (“Subject Property”). Below are the ZHE’s finding of fact and decision:

FINDINGS:

1. Applicant is requesting a variance of 1 ft to the allowed 8 ft wall height on the side yard.
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 this IDO, the applicable zone district, or any applicable Overlay Zone.*
 - (5) *The Variance approved is the minimum necessary to avoid extraordinary hardship or practical difficulties.*”
3. 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. 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. Agent appeared at the ZHE hearing on this matter and gave evidence in support of the Application.

6. Applicant established that the proper "Notice of Hearing" signage was posted for the required time period.
7. Applicant established that all property owners and neighborhood association entitled to notice were notified of the Application.
8. Applicant established that proper notice was provided pursuant to IDO requirements.
9. Applicant has authority to pursue this Application.
10. The subject property is currently zoned R-T.
11. 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(O)(3)(a)(1). Specifically, Applicant confirmed in oral testimony and submitted evidence that, the Subject Property's unique topography and layout based on historic development under prior approval regimes, as well as the location of existing public and private improvements on site and on neighboring properties, 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, which otherwise would be in compliance with the IDO.
12. 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(O)(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). The record contains correspondence from a professional engineer affirming the structural integrity of the wall.
13. The City Traffic Engineer submitted a report stating no objection to the proposed wall.
14. 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(O)(3)(a)(3). Specifically, the proposal is designed to be in harmony and consistency with prior approvals, what currently exists in the neighborhood, rights of way and infrastructure. It would merely replace a previous wood fence of the same height and location, which had deteriorated.
15. 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(O)(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 useability of the site in line with prior approvals.
16. The proposed variance is the minimum necessary to avoid extraordinary hardship or practical difficulties as required by Section 14-16-6-6(O)(3)(a)(5). Evidence supports that, because of the topography of the site, any shorter wall would not provide the privacy and security of the former wood fence or of other walls in the vicinity.
17. The requirements of IDO Section 14-16-6-6(O)(3)(a) are satisfied.

DECISION:

APPROVAL of a variance of 1 ft to the allowed 8 ft wall height on the side yard.

APPEAL:

If you wish to appeal this decision, you must do so by October 19, 2023 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

Debra Smith, dseagul@aol.com

Tuscany Landscape Association tuscanylandscape@icloud.com

Chris and Marie Miller, jerry@wholeearthsystems.com