CASE# <u>C15-2014-0082</u> ROW# <u>11147293</u> TAX# <u>02162003</u>13

CITY OF AUSTIN APPLICATION TO BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT GENERAL VARIANCE/PARKING VARIANCE

WARNING: Filing of this appeal stops all affected construction activity.

PLEASE: APPLICATION MUST BE TYPED WITH ALL REQUESTED INFORMATION COMPLETED.
STREET ADDRESS: 4701 Creekwood Rd
LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Subdivision - MIK Combined Manor Hill
Lot(s) Blocksur20 Outlot Division Section 7
I/We Wesley T Haynie on behalf of myself/ourselves as authorized agent for
affirm that on May 12, 2014,
hereby apply for a hearing before the Board of Adjustment for consideration to:
(check appropriate items below and state what portion of the Zoning Code you are seeking a variance from)
_x ERECT ATTACH COMPLETE REMODEL MAINTAIN
Minimum lot size, minimum frontage and required setback from front of property
in a SF-3 - NP district. (MUK Combined)
(zoning district)
NOTE: The Board must determine the existence of, sufficiency of and weight of evidence supporting the findings described below. Therefore, you must complete each of the applicable Findings Statements as part of your application. Failure to do so may result in your application being rejected as incomplete. Please attach any additional support documents.

VARIANCE FINDINGS: I contend that my entitlement to the requested variance is based on the following findings (see page 5 of application for explanation of findings):

REASONABLE USE:

1. The zoning regulations applicable to the property do not allow for a reasonable use because:

The property in question was annexed from an adjacent property within SF-3 zoning, however the lot size

does not allow for the required lot size or frontage and the easements severely restrike buildable area.

HARDSHIP:

2. (a) The hardship for which the variance is requested is unique to the property in that:

The triangular lot configuration and wastewater line that run through the site severely restrict building size

As well as the dimensions of the site does not allow for proper frontage.

(b) The hardship is not general to the area in which the property is located because:

This is unique from the area because the property was annex from the adjacent property in 2003

After the area had been zoned as SF-3.

AREA CHARACTER:

3. The variance will not alter the character of the area adjacent to the property, will not impair the use of adjacent conforming property, and will not impair the purpose of the regulations of the zoning district in which the property is located because:

The variance will allow for the construction of a single family home which is cohesive with the adjacent Area.

PARKING: (Additional criteria for parking variances only.)

Request for a parking variance requires the Board to make additional findings. The Board may grant a variance to a regulation prescribed Section 479 of Chapter 25-6 with respect to the number of off-street parking spaces or loading facilities required if it makes findings of fact that the following additional circumstances also apply:

1. Neither present nor anticipated future traffic volumes generated by the use of the site or the uses of sites in the vicinity reasonable require strict or literal interpretation and enforcement of the specific regulation because:

2.	The granting of this variance will not result in the parking or loading of vehicles on public streets in such a manner as to interfere with the free flow of traffic of the streets because:
3.	The granting of this variance will not create a safety hazard or any other condition inconsistent with the objectives of this Ordinance because:
4.	The variance will run with the use or uses to which it pertains and shall not run with the site because:
N	OTE: The Board cannot grant a variance that would provide the applicant with a special privilege not enjoyed by others similarly situated or potentially similarly situated.
	PLICANT CERTIFICATE – I affirm that my statements contained in the complete plication are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.
Sig	y, State & Zip_ Austin, TX 78773.
Cit	y, State & Zip. Austin, TX 78773
Pri	nted_Wisley To Hayric Phone 437-553-1616 Date U5/12/2018
OV are	WNERS CERTIFICATE – I affirm that my statements contained in the com plete application true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.
Sig	med Fair Danie Wichs Mail Address 941 Hesters Crossing \$305
	y, State & Zip_Round Rock, Tx 78681
	nted_Fairls Denice Wichs Phone 512-435-1563 Date_ 05/10/2014



SUBJECT TRACT

PENDING CASE

CASE#: C15-2014-0082 Address: 4701 CREEKWOOD RD ZONING BOUNDARY

> This product is for informational purposes and may not have been prepared for or be suitable for legal, engineering, or surveying purposes. It does not represent an on-the-ground survey and represents only the approximate relative location of property boundaries.



This product has been produced by CTM for the sole purpose of geographic reference. No warranty is made by the City of Austin regarding specific accuracy or completeness.



Heldenfels, Leane

From:

Wes Haynie

Sent:

Wednesday, May 21, 2014 11:32 AM

To:

Heldenfels, Leane

Subject:

Re: Lot size for Board of Adjustment Notice

Hello Leane,

I attended the E. MLK Combined Board meeting last night. Since I wasn't on the official agenda they couldn't give me an official answer, but the chair and other board members all seemed supportive and interested in the project and what I was wanting to do. I was pushing for them to be okay with the idea of sending back a letter to the city in response to the notification you will be sending, saying they were okay with me getting variances, but not sure what they will decide. They couldn't give me an official answer until the end of next month. So, if I get postponed until July, then I should be able to get a yes from them at that time.

The lot size on the listing is 3902 sq ft, but I believe TCAD showed it as more. However, I am not getting TCAD to work for me right now.

Do you think it would make my case harder to obtain any variances if I also tried to get the variances for impervious cover of (65%) and building coverage of (55%)? Having rear setback adjusted to (5') might be nice, but since that should fall in the weird triangle I cannot build on anyways, then I am not too concerned. By my calculations I could never get to a point where I would need more building coverage than (40%), due to site constrains, but it may be nice to have. The main set back I would like is a reduction is the front set back of (25') to whatever the city would be okay with. That setback more than any would increase my building sq ft. Sorry this is more of a series of questions than answers.

Thanks, Wes T. Haynie

On Tue, May 20, 2014 at 10:16 AM, Heldenfels, Leane < Leane. Heldenfels@austintexas.gov > wrote:

Hi Wes – just cking, is the lot size 956 sf? Also, do you think you might need impervious cover (45%) or building cover (40%) variances? Rear setback (10') or side setback (each 5')?

Thanks -

Leane







