



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

Amber Kennington requests A Variance of 9 feet to the required 75 feet lot width minimum in R-A zone for Tract A-1-A, MAX REPLAT, located at 2021 Rio Grande Blvd NW, zoned R-A [Section 14-16-2-3(A)(2), Table 2-3-1]	Special Exception No:	VA-2024-00339
	Project No:	PR-2024-011316
	Hearing Date:	02-18-25
	Closing of Public Record:	02-18-25
	Date of Decision:	03-05-25

On February 18, 2025, property owner Amber Kennington (“Applicant”) appeared before the Zoning Hearing Examiner (“ZHE”) requesting a variance of 9 feet to the required 75 feet lot width minimum in R-A zone (“Application”) upon the real property located at 2021 Rio Grande Blvd NW (“Subject Property”). Below are the ZHE’s finding of fact and decision:

FINDINGS:

1. Applicant is requesting a variance of 9 feet to the required 75 feet lot width minimum in R-A zone.
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(J)(4).
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 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.*”

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 appeared and gave evidence in support of the application.
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(N)(3)(a)(1). Specifically, the unique historic platting, as well as the shape and layout of the property in relation to existing structures and infrastructure create special circumstances that result in practical difficulties in complying strictly with IDO requirements without the requested variance.
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). Applicant submitted evidence that no negative impacts would result.
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). Applicant submitted evidence that it would not cause any adverse impact.
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 intends to comply with all IDO requirements.
13. Based on evidence submitted by or on behalf of Applicant, the variance is the minimum necessary to avoid extraordinary hardship or practical difficulties as required by Section 14-16-6-6(N)(3)(a)(5). Specifically, Applicant testified that any lesser variance would be impracticable.
14. The City Traffic Engineer submitted a report stating no objection to the Application.

DECISION:

APPROVAL of a variance of 9 feet to the required 75 feet lot width minimum in R-A zone.

APPEAL:

If you wish to appeal this decision, you must do so by March 20, 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 the 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.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Robert Lucero".

Robert Lucero, Esq.
Zoning Hearing Examiner

cc: ZHE File
Zoning Enforcement
Amber Kennington, amberk@gmail.com