

1 Opinion by Gustafson.

2 **NATURE OF THE DECISION**

3 Petitioner appeals the city's denial of an application
4 for three variances.

5 **DISCUSSION**

6 Petitioner owns two lots in the city's RM (Urban Medium
7 Density Residential) zone, each developed with one single-
8 family dwelling. Petitioner proposes to create four lots and
9 to construct two additional single-family dwellings. To do
10 so, petitioner requested variances from the city's zoning
11 ordinance to reduce the minimum lot size for each lot from
12 4,500 to 2,100 square feet, to reduce the minimum street
13 frontage for one lot from 50 to 0 feet, and to reduce the
14 minimum lot width from 50 to 38 feet. The city hearings
15 officer denied petitioner's requests. The city council
16 declined to hear petitioner's local appeal, and adopted the
17 hearings officer's decision.

18 Petitioner contends that the city denied him equal
19 protection of the law on the basis that in the past the city
20 has granted similar variances; that the hearings officer
21 failed to follow precedent in denying his requests; and that
22 the city denied him due process of law by the city council's
23 refusal to permit him to present evidence during the hearing
24 at which it declined to hear his appeal.

25 Petitioner has established no legal basis upon which to
26 remand or reverse the city's decision.

1 The city's decision is affirmed.