



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

Joanne Perrine (Agent, Mark Mico) requests a variance of 5 ft to the required 10 ft side yard setback for Lot 14, Block 2, Glenwood Hills north Unit 1, located at 12928 Calle De Sandias NE, zoned R-A [14-16-5-1]

Special Exception No:..... **VA-2024-00084**
Project No: **Project#2024-010132**
Hearing Date: 5-21-24
Closing of Public Record: .. 5-21-24
Date of Decision: 6-5-24

On the 21st day of May, 2024, Mark Mico, agent for property owner (“Applicant”) appeared before the Zoning Hearing Examiner (“ZHE”) requesting variance of 5 ft to the required 10 ft side yard setback (“Application”) upon the real property located at 12928 Calle De Sandias NE, (“Subject Property”). Below are the ZHE’s finding of fact and decision:

FINDINGS:

1. Applicant is requesting a variance of 5 ft 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. 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).
 8. Applicant/agent appeared and gave evidence in support of the application.
 9. The subject property is currently zoned R-A.
 10. 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). Applicant stated that the existing home on the Subject Property was built in accordance with pre-IDO standards, which then mandated only a five-foot (5') side yard setback. The adoption of the IDO was government action for which no compensation was paid to Applicants, and which resulted in the nonconformance of the existing house to the new 10' setback under the IDO. These special circumstances create an extraordinary hardship, because they create a legal nonconformity that would be impracticable to bring into compliance with current code.
 11. 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 established that the proposed variance is merely to allow new construction upon the existing footprint of the existing home.
 12. 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 testified that no such adverse impacts would occur, because the side setback is not being reduced from what it has been for years.
 13. 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 established that, if granted the variance, the Subject Property would be developed in accordance with IDO procedures.
 14. Based on evidence submitted by or on behalf of Applicant, the requested variance is the minimum necessary to avoid extraordinary hardship or practical difficulties as required by Section 14-16-6-6(N)(3)(a)(5). Applicant testified that any smaller setback would involve impractical demolition of existing structures.
 15. The City Traffic Engineer submitted a report stating no objection to the Application.

DECISION:

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

APPEAL:

If you wish to appeal this decision, you must do so by June 20, 2024 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 black ink, appearing to read "Robert Lucero". The signature is written in a cursive style and is positioned above a horizontal line.

Robert Lucero, Esq.
Zoning Hearing Examiner

cc:

ZHE File
Zoning Enforcement