



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

Benito Marin Ramirez & Veronica Castillo requests a variance of 7 ft. 5 in. to the required 10 ft. side yard setback for Lot 6B, Glendale Gardens, located at 4916 Glendale Rd. NW, zoned R-1D [Section 14-16-4-1]

Special Exception No:..... **VA-2023-00380**
Project No: **Project#2023-009729**
Hearing Date: 02-20-2024
Closing of Public Record: .. 02-20-2024
Date of Decision:..... 03-06-2024

On the 20th day of February, 2024, Benito Marin Ramirez and Veronica Castillo (“Applicant”) appeared before the Zoning Hearing Examiner (“ZHE”) requesting variance of 7 ft. 5 in. to the required 10 ft. side yard setback (“Application”) upon the real property located at 4916 Glendale Rd. NW (“Subject Property”). Below are the ZHE’s finding of fact and decision:

FINDINGS:

1. Applicant is requesting a variance of 7 feet 5 inches to the required 10 ft. side yard setback.
2. The ZHE finds that the Applicant has authority to pursue this Application.
3. All property owners within 100 feet and affected neighborhood association(s) were notified.
4. 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).
5. The City of Albuquerque Integrated Development Ordinance (“IDO”), 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 a single lot 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, physical characteristics, natural forces or government actions for which no compensation was paid. Such special circumstances of the lot either create an extraordinary hardship in the form of a substantial and unjustified limitation on the reasonable use or economic 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.”

6. 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).
7. 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).
8. The subject property is currently zoned R-1D.
9. 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). Applicant provided evidence that the location of the property at the intersection of two streets results in additional vehicular and pedestrian traffic that uniquely impacts the Subject Property and stated that this increased traffic increases the likelihood of theft to Applicant’s property, which the variance would resolve by allowing Applicant to enclose a pre-existing carport- or porch-like structure.
10. 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, Applicant testified that the variance would not negatively impact the neighborhood, because the variance would merely allow for enclosure of the pre-existing cement and porch which pre-dates Applicant’s purchase of the Subject Property.
11. 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). Specifically, Applicant stated that it would not impact surrounding neighbors and received no negative feedback after properly posting sign, only feedback from neighbors stating they do not have a problem with the variance.
12. 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). 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 existing and potential development in the area.
13. Based on evidence submitted by or on behalf of Applicant, the variance approved meets the minimum necessary to avoid extraordinary hardship or practical difficulties as required by Section 14-16-6-6(N)(3)(a)(5). Any lesser variance would not allow for enclosure of the pre-existing structure.
14. The City Traffic Engineer submitted a report stating no objection to the Application.

DECISION:

APPROVAL of a variance of 7 ft 5 inches to the required 10 ft side yard setback.

APPEAL:

If you wish to appeal this decision, you must do so by March 21, 2024 pursuant to Section 14-16-6-4(V), of the IDO, 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 black ink, appearing to read "Robert Lucero". The signature is fluid and cursive, written in a professional style.

Robert Lucero, Esq.
Zoning Hearing Examiner

ZHE File
Zoning Enforcement