



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

Kim U. Wagner requests a Variance of 9.5 feet to the maximum allowed height for an ADU for Lots 18, Block 2, Sunset Terrace Addition, located at 1120 Princeton Drive NE, zoned R-1B [IDO Section 14-16-4-3(F)(6)]	Special Exception No:	VA-2025-00155
	Project No:	PR-2025-020107
	Hearing Date:.....	11-18-2025
	Closing of Public Record:	11-18-2025
	Date of Decision:	12-03-2025

On November 18, 2025, Kim U. Wagner (“**Applicant**”) was scheduled to appear before the Zoning Hearing Examiner (the “**ZHE**”) requesting a Variance of 9.5 feet to the maximum allowed height for an ADU (“**Application**”) upon the real property located at 1120 Princeton Drive NE (the “**Subject Property**”). Below are the ZHE’s findings of fact and decision:

FINDINGS:

1. Applicant is requesting a Variance of 9.5 feet to the maximum allowed height for an ADU, pursuant to City of Albuquerque Code of Ordinances Integrated Development Ordinance (“**IDO**”) Section 14-16-6-6(O).
2. Applicant has authority to pursue this Application, pursuant to 14-16-6-4(D).
3. Applicant has no duly authorized Agent to act on Applicant’s behalf regarding the Application.
4. Applicant is not required to offer a meeting to Indian Nations, Tribes, and Pueblos before filing the application, pursuant to IDO Section 14-16-6-4(B).
5. The Planning Director’s delegee has determined that the Application is complete, pursuant to IDO Section 14-16-6-4(G).
6. The analyses and studies listed in IDO Section 14-16-6-4(H) were delivered.
7. The Application was not required to be forwarded to commenting agencies pursuant to IDO Section 14-16-6-4(I).
8. The content of the notice of the Application satisfies/does not satisfy IDO Section 14-16-6-4(J)(1).
9. Applicant has sent an electronic mail notice to the email addresses on file with the Office of Neighborhood Coordination for each pertinent Neighborhood Association as required by IDO Section 14-16-6-4(J)(2).
10. Applicant has sent a mailed notice to all property owners within 100 feet of the subject property as required by IDO Section 14-16-6-4(J)(3).
11. Applicant has posted sign notice(s) as required by IDO Section 14-16-6-4(J)(4).
12. The Subject Property is located at 1120 Princeton Drive NE in a R-1B zone district.

13. Therefore, a Variance of 9.5 feet to the maximum allowed height for an ADU on the Subject Property requires a Variance Approval pursuant to IDO Subsection 14-16-6-6(O).
14. IDO Section 14-16-6-6(O)(3)(a) (Review and Decision Criteria– Variance) 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 district and vicinity, including but not limited to size, shape, topography, location, surroundings, physical characteristics, natural forces, or by 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 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.”*
15. 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).
16. 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).
17. Applicant/Agent appeared at the November 18, 2025, ZHE hearing on the Application and gave evidence in support of the Application.
18. 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 faces new insulation mandates, which are complicated by the presence of pre-existing structures on the lot that were in place at the time of the original purchase of the property and are not self-imposed. The L-shaped structures along with the location of the structures on the lot and the dimensions of the Subject Property create 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.
19. 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). The proposed structure is entirely on the Subject Property and does not create negative impacts.
20. 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). The proposed structure is entirely on the Subject Property and does not create negative impacts. No effect on infrastructure improvements appears in the record

21. Based on evidence submitted by or on behalf of Applicant, the Variance The proposed structure is entirely on the Subject Property and does 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). Applicant intends to construct the proposed structure in compliance with all other IDO and other applicable provisions.
22. 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(O)(3)(a)(5). Any smaller variance would not be practicable to construct the reasonably proposed structure.
23. The City Traffic Engineer submitted a report stating no objection to the Application.

DECISION:

APPROVAL of a Variance of 9.5 feet to the maximum allowed height for an ADU.

APPEAL:

If you wish to appeal this decision, you must do so by December 18, 2025 pursuant to Section 14-16-6-4(U), 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 Notice of Decision does not constitute approval of plans for a building permit. If your Application is approved, bring this Notice of Decision with you when you apply for any related building permit or occupation tax number. Approval of a Conditional Use is void after two (2) years from date of approval if the rights and privileges granted thereby have not been executed or utilized. Approval of a Variance is void after one (1) year from date of approval if the rights and privileges granted thereby have not been executed or utilized.



Robert Lucero, Esq.
Zoning Hearing Examiner

cc: Ms. Kim U. Wagner (*Applicant*), kuwagner55@gmail.com
ZHE File
Zoning Enforcement