



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

Cory Greenfield & Jennie McCary requests a permit to allow a carport in the side yard setback for Lot 8, Block 6, Chacon Addn, located at 709 16th St NW, zoned R-1A [Section 14-16-5-5(F)(2)(a)]

Special Exception No:..... **VA-2021-00128**
Project No: **Project#2021-005422**
Hearing Date: 06-15-21
Closing of Public Record: 06-15-21
Date of Decision: 06-30-21

On the 15th day of June, 2021, property owners Cory Greenfield & Jennie McCary (“Applicant”) appeared before the Zoning Hearing Examiner (“ZHE”) requesting a permit to allow a carport in the side yard setback (“Application”) upon the real property located at 709 16th St NW (“Subject Property”). Below are the ZHE’s finding of fact and decision:

FINDINGS:

1. Applicant is requesting a permit to allow a carport in the side yard setback.
2. The City of Albuquerque Integrated Development Ordinance Section 14-16-6-6(L)(3)(d), regarding carport permits lists the following requirements:
 - a. *The proposed carport would strengthen or reinforce the architectural character of the surrounding area.*
 - b. *The proposed carport would not be injurious to adjacent properties, the surrounding neighborhood, or the larger community.*
 - c. *The design of the carport complies with the provisions in Subsection 14-16-5-5(F)(2)(a)2 (Carports).*
 - d. *No carport wall is a hazard to traffic visibility, as determined by the Traffic Engineer.*
 - e. *The carport is not taller than the primary building on the lot.*
3. The 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).
4. 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).
5. All property owners within 100 feet and affected neighborhood associations were notified of the application.
6. Agent appeared and gave evidence in support of the application.
7. Applicant has met its burden of providing evidence that establishes that the proposed carport would strengthen or reinforce the architectural character of the surrounding area. Specifically, Applicant submitted evidence that the design of the carport comports with that of the residence on site and is in harmony with architecture of neighboring properties.
8. Applicant has met its burden of providing evidence that establishes that the proposed carport would not be injurious to adjacent properties, the surrounding neighborhood, or

- the larger community. Specifically, Applicant submitted evidence that the carport would not impact views from adjacent properties and that no water from the carport would flow onto adjacent properties.
9. Applicant has met its burden of providing evidence that establishes that the design of the proposed carport complies with IDO Subsection 14-16-5-5(F)(2)(a)(2) (Carports). Applicant submitted evidence confirming the same.
 10. The City Traffic Engineer issued a report indicating no objection to the proposed carport.
 11. Applicant has met its burden of providing evidence that establishes that the proposed carport is not taller than the primary building on the lot. Specifically, Applicant submitted evidence that the top of the carport would be lower than the primary residence on the lot.

DECISION:

APPROVAL of a permit to allow a carport in the side yard setback.

APPEAL:

If you wish to appeal this decision, you must do so by July 15, 2021 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 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.



Robert Lucero, Esq.
Zoning Hearing Examiner

cc: ZHE File

Zoning Enforcement

Cory Greenfield & Jennie McCary, cory@campoverdearchitecture.com



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

Cory Greenfield & Jennie McCary requests a variance of 2 feet to the required 5 foot side yard setback for a garage for Lot 8, Block 6, Chacon Addn, located at 709 16th St NW, zoned R-1A [Section 14-16-2-3(B)(2)]

Special Exception No:..... **VA-2021-00130**
Project No: **Project#2021-005422**
Hearing Date: 06-15-21
Closing of Public Record: 06-15-21
Date of Decision: 06-30-21

On the 15th day of June, 2021, property owner Cory Greenfield & Jennie McCary (“Applicant”) appeared before the Zoning Hearing Examiner (“ZHE”) requesting a variance of 2 feet to the required 5 foot side yard setback for a garage (“Application”) upon the real property located at 709 16th St NW (“Subject Property”). Below are the ZHE’s finding of fact and decision:

FINDINGS:

1. Applicant is requesting a variance of 2 feet to the required 5 foot side yard setback for a garage.
2. The City of Albuquerque Integrated Development Ordinance, Section 14-16-6-6(N)(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 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. Such special circumstances of the property either create an extraordinary hardship in the form of a substantial and unjustified limitation on the reasonable use or 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.”*
3. The 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).

4. 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).
5. Applicant appeared and gave evidence in support of the application.
6. All property owners within 100 feet of the subject property and the affected neighborhood association were notified.
7. The subject property is currently zoned R-1A.
8. 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, Applicant testified and provided written evidence that, the Subject Property has special circumstances because of its location and shape having an angled side lot line, which give rise to the need for this request. These special circumstances create an extraordinary hardship in the form of a substantial and unjustified limitation on the reasonable use or return on the Subject Property, because compliance with the minimum standards would not provide sufficient space for addition of a garage on the Subject Property.
9. 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, evidence was submitted supporting that, if granted approval, the Applicant intends to construct the project in a manner that is consistent with the IDO and the Development Process Manual (DPM).
10. 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, the proposed wall is designed to be in harmony and consistency with what currently exists in the neighborhood, which was supported by photographic evidence and oral testimony. Photographs were submitted showing the neighborhood and site plans and elevations of the proposed improvements.
11. 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 presented evidence that the intent of IDO will still be met in that the subject site will continue the existing use and the proposed variance would merely add to the safety and usability of the site.
12. 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(N)(3)(a)(5). Specifically, Applicant submitted evidence that any smaller variance would be ineffective to provide for the privacy, safety and usability of the site. Thus, the applicant is not requesting more than what is minimally necessary for a variance.
13. City Transportation submitted a report stating no objection.
14. The proper "Notice of Hearing" signage was posted for the required time period as required by Section 14-16-6-4(K)(3).
15. The Applicant has authority to pursue this Application.

DECISION:

APPROVAL of a variance of 2 feet to the required 5 foot side yard setback for a garage.

APPEAL:

If you wish to appeal this decision, you must do so by July 15, 2021 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 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.



Robert Lucero, Esq.
Zoning Hearing Examiner

cc:

ZHE File
Zoning Enforcement
Cory Greenfield & Jennie McCary, cory@campoverdearchitecture.com