





SUBJECT TRACT



PENDING CASE



ZONING BOUNDARY

NOTIFICATIONS

CASE#: C15-2016-0051 LOCATION: 1309 E 7th Street

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



Guadalupe Association for an Improved Neighborhood- GAIN

1111 East 8th Street - Austin, Texas 78702

15

June 27, 2016

Re: Case C15-2016-0051. GAIN opposition to variance at 1309 East 7th Street to reduce parking for a change of use to cocktail lounge.

Dear Board of Adjustment Members:

On June 25, 2016 at a regular meeting of the Guadalupe Association for an Improved Neighborhood, GAIN, the membership voted unanimously to oppose a variance requested by the Mr. Gino Troy III for 1309 East 7th Street, to reduce the minimum required parking from nine spaces to 4 spaces to coincide with a future change of use from office to cocktail lounge.

GAIN's membership understands that the property, because it is within the Saltillo TOD, is entitled to provide only 60% of the Austin Land Development Code's standard required parking. It is clear that, because of large trees, only 4 spaces can be provided on site. However, we are confident that the owner could locate the additional 5 spaces nearby and no variance would be necessary.

Our neighborhood is currently plagued by late hours parking by people going to nearby bars and restaurants. Parking enforcement of our Residential Parking Permit (RPP) zone ends at midnight. Parking patrol officers rarely enforce the RPP *at any time* in our neighborhood because it seems it is much easier for them to ticket vehicles parked in metered parking zones than to patrol our residential streets. As a result crime has increased dramatically within our residential neighborhood during the past several years during nighttime and early morning hours. Mr. Troy, who attended our meeting at our invitation, suggested a cocktail lounge at 1309 E. Street could accommodate as many as 100 patrons outdoors in addition to scores within the building. Nine spaces will not accommodate even one tenth of the vehicles transporting patrons to a bar at 1309 E. 7th Street on its busiest nights. The neighborhood residents, therefore, will oppose the conditional use permit for cocktail lounge should Mr. Troy seek it. We strongly believe he has selected an inappropriate use for that specific location.

We respectfully urge you not to grant a variance further reducing parking when it already would be totally inadequate even if it were to comply with code. Such a variance would set a terrible precedent, sending the wrong message to property owners within the Saltillo TOD.

~ Cereiy,

H. Michael Guajardo, President

153

CITY OF AUSTIN Board of Adjustment/Sign Review Board Decision Sheet

DATE: Worlday, Way 9, 2016	CASE NUMBER: C13-2016-0051
Y Brooke Bailey Y Michael Benaglio Y William Burkhardt Y Eric Goff Motion to PP to July 11, Y Melissa Hawthorne Y Don Leighton-Burwell Y Rahm McDaniel - Melissa Neslund OUT Y James Valadez Y Michael Von Ohlen 2 nd the Motion Y Kelly Blume (Alternate)	2016
APPLICANT: FAYEZ KAZI	
OWNER: Gino Troy	
ADDRESS: 1309 7TH ST	
VARIANCE REQUESTED: The applicant has a 25-6 Appendix A (Tables of Off-Street parking reduce the number of required parking space 25-6-611 is 60% of that prescribed for the prohandicapped space is provided) in order to c square foot structure from office to cocktail I Oriented District – Neighborhood Plan zoning	g and Loading Requirements) to es from 9 spaces (required, which per posed use) to 1 space (requested, 1 hange the use of an existing 1,554 ounge use in a "TOD-NP", Transit
BOARD'S DECISION: The public hearing was clear to Postpone to July 11, 2016, Board Member Mich POSTPONED TO JULY 11, 2016.	osed on Board Member Eric Goff motion ael Von Ohlen second on a 10-0 vote;
W	uested is unique to the property in that: which the property is located because: a area adjacent to the property, will not ty, and will not impair the purpose of





Board of Adjustment General/Parking Variance Application

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

This application is a fillable PDF that can be completed electronically. To ensure your information is saved, <u>click here to Save</u> the form to your computer, then open your copy and continue.

The Tab key may be used to navigate to each field; Shift + Tab moves to the previous field. The Enter key activates links, emails, and buttons. Use the Up & Down Arrow keys to scroll through drop-down lists and check boxes, and hit Enter to make a selection.

The application must be complete and accurate prior to submittal. *If more space is required, please complete Section 6 as needed.* All information is required (if applicable).

For Office Use Only Case # (15-2016-05/ ROW # 115/6497 Section 1: Applicant Statement Street Address: 1309 E 7th Street Subdivision Legal Description: LOT 5 BLK 2 OLT 3 DIVISION A Lot(s): 5 Block(s): 2 Outlot: 3 Division: A Zoning District: TOD - NP CENTRAL @We Fayez Kazi _____ on behalf of myself/ourselves as authorized agent for Gino Troy of DGT Management, LLC affirm that on Month March , Day 14 , Year 2016 , hereby apply for a hearing before the Board of Adjustment for consideration to (select appropriate option below): OErect OAttach O Complete Remodel O Maintain O Other: Type of Structure: Existing SF Home

Portion of the City of Austin Land Development Code applicant is seeking a variance from: LDC Section 25-6 Appendix A Section 2: Variance Findings 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 Statem as part of your application. Failure to do so may result in your application being rejected as incomplete. Please attach any additional supporting documents. NOTE: The Board cannot grant a variance that would provide the applicant with a spec privilege not enjoyed by others similarly situated or potentially similarly situated. I contend that my entitlement to the requested variance is based on the following findings: Reasonable Use The zoning regulations applicable to the property do not allow for a reasonable use because: This building was built in the early 1900s before there were any parking requirements. The building has history of previous non-residential use and the lack of parking has not created apparent problem. Hardship a) The hardship for which the variance is requested is unique to the property in that: There are critical root zones of three heritage trees in the backyard and two 17" pecan trees the frontyard. There is limited opportunity to construct parking on this site. A single handicag parking space and associated landing is able to be delineated between the root zones outsid the half root zone. b) The hardship is not general to the area in which the property is located because: New redevelopment has had to comply with the parking requirements. Other properties that have not been redeveloped in the neighborhood do not have parking as currently required on have non-compliant parking.		
Section 2: Variance Findings 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 Statement as part of your application. Failure to do so may result in your application being rejected as incomplete. Please attach any additional supporting documents. NOTE: The Board cannot grant a variance that would provide the applicant with a spec privilege not enjoyed by others similarly situated or potentially similarly situated. I contend that my entitlement to the requested variance is based on the following findings: Reasonable Use The zoning regulations applicable to the property do not allow for a reasonable use because: This building was built in the early 1900s before there were any parking requirements. The building has history of previous non-residential use and the lack of parking has not created apparent problem. Hardship a) The hardship for which the variance is requested is unique to the property in that: There are critical root zones of three heritage trees in the backyard and two 17" pecan trees the frontyard. There is limited opportunity to construct parking on this site. A single handicap parking space and associated landing is able to be delineated between the root zones outside the half root zone. b) The hardship is not general to the area in which the property is located because: New redevelopment has had to comply with the parking requirements. Other properties that have not been redeveloped in the neighborhood do not have parking as currently required or the properties that have not been redeveloped in the neighborhood do not have parking as currently required or the properties that have not been redeveloped in the neighborhood do not have parking as currently required or the properties that have not been redeveloped in the neighborhood do not have parking as currently required or the property is located because:	Portion of the City of Austin Land	Development Code applicant is seeking a variance from:
Section 2: Variance Findings 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 Statement as part of your application. Failure to do so may result in your application being rejected as incomplete. Please attach any additional supporting documents. NOTE: The Board cannot grant a variance that would provide the applicant with a spec privilege not enjoyed by others similarly situated or potentially similarly situated. I contend that my entitlement to the requested variance is based on the following findings: Reasonable Use The zoning regulations applicable to the property do not allow for a reasonable use because: This building was built in the early 1900s before there were any parking requirements. The building has history of previous non-residential use and the lack of parking has not created apparent problem. Hardship a) The hardship for which the variance is requested is unique to the property in that: There are critical root zones of three heritage trees in the backyard and two 17" pecan trees the frontyard. There is limited opportunity to construct parking on this site. A single handicap parking space and associated landing is able to be delineated between the root zones outside the half root zone. b) The hardship is not general to the area in which the property is located because: New redevelopment has had to comply with the parking requirements. Other properties that have not been redeveloped in the neighborhood do not have parking as currently required or the property in the parking as currently required or the property in the parking as currently required or the properties that have not been redeveloped in the neighborhood do not have parking as currently required or the properties that have not been redeveloped in the parking as currently required or the properties that the parking as currently required or the properties that the parking as currently required or		
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 Statem as part of your application. Failure to do so may result in your application being rejected as incomplete. Please attach any additional supporting documents. NOTE: The Board cannot grant a variance that would provide the applicant with a spec privilege not enjoyed by others similarly situated or potentially similarly situated. I contend that my entitlement to the requested variance is based on the following findings: Reasonable Use The zoning regulations applicable to the property do not allow for a reasonable use because: This building was built in the early 1900s before there were any parking requirements. The building has history of previous non-residential use and the lack of parking has not created apparent problem. Hardship a) The hardship for which the variance is requested is unique to the property in that: There are critical root zones of three heritage trees in the backyard and two 17" pecan trees the frontyard. There is limited opportunity to construct parking on this site. A single handicap parking space and associated landing is able to be delineated between the root zones outside the half root zone. b) The hardship is not general to the area in which the property is located because: New redevelopment has had to comply with the parking requirements. Other properties that have not been redeveloped in the neighborhood do not have parking as currently required on the parking the parking as currently required on the parking the parking as currently required on the parking the par		
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 Statem as part of your application. Failure to do so may result in your application being rejected as incomplete. Please attach any additional supporting documents. NOTE: The Board cannot grant a variance that would provide the applicant with a spec privilege not enjoyed by others similarly situated or potentially similarly situated. I contend that my entitlement to the requested variance is based on the following findings: Reasonable Use The zoning regulations applicable to the property do not allow for a reasonable use because: This building was built in the early 1900s before there were any parking requirements. The building has history of previous non-residential use and the lack of parking has not created apparent problem. Hardship a) The hardship for which the variance is requested is unique to the property in that: There are critical root zones of three heritage trees in the backyard and two 17" pecan trees the frontyard. There is limited opportunity to construct parking on this site. A single handicap parking space and associated landing is able to be delineated between the root zones outside the half root zone. b) The hardship is not general to the area in which the property is located because: New redevelopment has had to comply with the parking requirements. Other properties that have not been redeveloped in the neighborhood do not have parking as currently required on the pa		
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 Statem as part of your application. Failure to do so may result in your application being rejected as incomplete. Please attach any additional supporting documents. NOTE: The Board cannot grant a variance that would provide the applicant with a spec privilege not enjoyed by others similarly situated or potentially similarly situated. I contend that my entitlement to the requested variance is based on the following findings: Reasonable Use The zoning regulations applicable to the property do not allow for a reasonable use because: This building was built in the early 1900s before there were any parking requirements. The building has history of previous non-residential use and the lack of parking has not created apparent problem. Hardship a) The hardship for which the variance is requested is unique to the property in that: There are critical root zones of three heritage trees in the backyard and two 17" pecan trees the frontyard. There is limited opportunity to construct parking on this site. A single handicap parking space and associated landing is able to be delineated between the root zones outside the half root zone. b) The hardship is not general to the area in which the property is located because: New redevelopment has had to comply with the parking requirements. Other properties that have not been redeveloped in the neighborhood do not have parking as currently required on the parking the parking as currently required on the parking the parking as currently required on the parking the par		
findings described below. Therefore, you must complete each of the applicable Findings Statems as part of your application. Failure to do so may result in your application being rejected as incomplete. Please attach any additional supporting documents. NOTE: The Board cannot grant a variance that would provide the applicant with a spec privilege not enjoyed by others similarly situated or potentially similarly situated. I contend that my entitlement to the requested variance is based on the following findings: Reasonable Use The zoning regulations applicable to the property do not allow for a reasonable use because: This building was built in the early 1900s before there were any parking requirements. The building has history of previous non-residential use and the lack of parking has not created a apparent problem. Hardship a) The hardship for which the variance is requested is unique to the property in that: There are critical root zones of three heritage trees in the backyard and two 17" pecan trees the frontyard. There is limited opportunity to construct parking on this site. A single handicap parking space and associated landing is able to be delineated between the root zones outside the half root zone. b) The hardship is not general to the area in which the property is located because: New redevelopment has had to comply with the parking requirements. Other properties that have not been redeveloped in the neighborhood do not have parking as currently required or	Section 2: Variance Find	lings
I contend that my entitlement to the requested variance is based on the following findings: Reasonable Use The zoning regulations applicable to the property do not allow for a reasonable use because: This building was built in the early 1900s before there were any parking requirements. The building has history of previous non-residential use and the lack of parking has not created a apparent problem. Hardship a) The hardship for which the variance is requested is unique to the property in that: There are critical root zones of three heritage trees in the backyard and two 17" pecan trees the frontyard. There is limited opportunity to construct parking on this site. A single handicap parking space and associated landing is able to be delineated between the root zones outsid the half root zone. b) The hardship is not general to the area in which the property is located because: New redevelopment has had to comply with the parking requirements. Other properties that have not been redeveloped in the neighborhood do not have parking as currently required or	findings described below. Therefor as part of your application. Failure	re, you must complete each of the applicable Findings Statements to do so may result in your application being rejected as
Reasonable Use The zoning regulations applicable to the property do not allow for a reasonable use because: This building was built in the early 1900s before there were any parking requirements. The building has history of previous non-residential use and the lack of parking has not created a apparent problem. Hardship a) The hardship for which the variance is requested is unique to the property in that: There are critical root zones of three heritage trees in the backyard and two 17" pecan trees the frontyard. There is limited opportunity to construct parking on this site. A single handicap parking space and associated landing is able to be delineated between the root zones outside the half root zone. b) The hardship is not general to the area in which the property is located because: New redevelopment has had to comply with the parking requirements. Other properties that have not been redeveloped in the neighborhood do not have parking as currently required on	NOTE: The Board cannot grade privilege not enjoyed by a	nt a variance that would provide the applicant with a special others similarly situated or potentially similarly situated.
The zoning regulations applicable to the property do not allow for a reasonable use because: This building was built in the early 1900s before there were any parking requirements. The building has history of previous non-residential use and the lack of parking has not created a apparent problem. Hardship a) The hardship for which the variance is requested is unique to the property in that: There are critical root zones of three heritage trees in the backyard and two 17" pecan trees the frontyard. There is limited opportunity to construct parking on this site. A single handicap parking space and associated landing is able to be delineated between the root zones outsid the half root zone. b) The hardship is not general to the area in which the property is located because: New redevelopment has had to comply with the parking requirements. Other properties that have not been redeveloped in the neighborhood do not have parking as currently required or	I contend that my entitlement to the	e requested variance is based on the following findings:
This building was built in the early 1900s before there were any parking requirements. The building has history of previous non-residential use and the lack of parking has not created a apparent problem. Hardship a) The hardship for which the variance is requested is unique to the property in that: There are critical root zones of three heritage trees in the backyard and two 17" pecan trees the frontyard. There is limited opportunity to construct parking on this site. A single handicap parking space and associated landing is able to be delineated between the root zones outsid the half root zone. b) The hardship is not general to the area in which the property is located because: New redevelopment has had to comply with the parking requirements. Other properties that have not been redeveloped in the neighborhood do not have parking as currently required or		
building has history of previous non-residential use and the lack of parking has not created a apparent problem. lardship a) The hardship for which the variance is requested is unique to the property in that: There are critical root zones of three heritage trees in the backyard and two 17" pecan trees the frontyard. There is limited opportunity to construct parking on this site. A single handicap parking space and associated landing is able to be delineated between the root zones outside the half root zone. b) The hardship is not general to the area in which the property is located because: New redevelopment has had to comply with the parking requirements. Other properties that have not been redeveloped in the neighborhood do not have parking as currently required or		
dardship a) The hardship for which the variance is requested is unique to the property in that: There are critical root zones of three heritage trees in the backyard and two 17" pecan trees the frontyard. There is limited opportunity to construct parking on this site. A single handicap parking space and associated landing is able to be delineated between the root zones outside the half root zone. b) The hardship is not general to the area in which the property is located because: New redevelopment has had to comply with the parking requirements. Other properties that have not been redeveloped in the neighborhood do not have parking as currently required on	This building was built in the e	arly 1900s before there were any parking requirements. The
lardship a) The hardship for which the variance is requested is unique to the property in that: There are critical root zones of three heritage trees in the backyard and two 17" pecan trees the frontyard. There is limited opportunity to construct parking on this site. A single handicap parking space and associated landing is able to be delineated between the root zones outside the half root zone. b) The hardship is not general to the area in which the property is located because: New redevelopment has had to comply with the parking requirements. Other properties that have not been redeveloped in the neighborhood do not have parking as currently required or		s non-residential use and the lack of parking has not created an
 a) The hardship for which the variance is requested is unique to the property in that: There are critical root zones of three heritage trees in the backyard and two 17" pecan trees the frontyard. There is limited opportunity to construct parking on this site. A single handicap parking space and associated landing is able to be delineated between the root zones outside the half root zone. b) The hardship is not general to the area in which the property is located because: New redevelopment has had to comply with the parking requirements. Other properties that have not been redeveloped in the neighborhood do not have parking as currently required or 	аррагент рторіеті.	
 a) The hardship for which the variance is requested is unique to the property in that: There are critical root zones of three heritage trees in the backyard and two 17" pecan trees the frontyard. There is limited opportunity to construct parking on this site. A single handicap parking space and associated landing is able to be delineated between the root zones outside the half root zone. b) The hardship is not general to the area in which the property is located because: New redevelopment has had to comply with the parking requirements. Other properties that have not been redeveloped in the neighborhood do not have parking as currently required or 	The state of the s	
 a) The hardship for which the variance is requested is unique to the property in that: There are critical root zones of three heritage trees in the backyard and two 17" pecan trees the frontyard. There is limited opportunity to construct parking on this site. A single handicap parking space and associated landing is able to be delineated between the root zones outside the half root zone. b) The hardship is not general to the area in which the property is located because: New redevelopment has had to comply with the parking requirements. Other properties that have not been redeveloped in the neighborhood do not have parking as currently required or 		
There are critical root zones of three heritage trees in the backyard and two 17" pecan trees the frontyard. There is limited opportunity to construct parking on this site. A single handicap parking space and associated landing is able to be delineated between the root zones outside the half root zone. b) The hardship is not general to the area in which the property is located because: New redevelopment has had to comply with the parking requirements. Other properties that have not been redeveloped in the neighborhood do not have parking as currently required or		
the frontyard. There is limited opportunity to construct parking on this site. A single handicap parking space and associated landing is able to be delineated between the root zones outside the half root zone. b) The hardship is not general to the area in which the property is located because: New redevelopment has had to comply with the parking requirements. Other properties that have not been redeveloped in the neighborhood do not have parking as currently required or		
New redevelopment has had to comply with the parking requirements. Other properties that have not been redeveloped in the neighborhood do not have parking as currently required or	the frontyard. There is limited of parking space and associated	opportunity to construct parking on this site. A single handicapped
New redevelopment has had to comply with the parking requirements. Other properties that have not been redeveloped in the neighborhood do not have parking as currently required or	b) The hardship is not general t	o the area in which the property is located because:
have not been redeveloped in the neighborhood do not have parking as currently required or		
have non-compliant parking.	have not been redeveloped in t	the neighborhood do not have parking as currently required or
	have non-compliant parking.	

	The opportunity to remodel will allow the exsiting building and neighborhood character to be maintained - instead of a teardown and dull redevelopment.
kequ Vppe	ing (additional criteria for parking variances only) est for a parking variance requires the Board to make additional findings. The Board may grant ance to a regulation prescribed in the City of Austin Land Development Code Chapter 25-6, ndix A with respect to the number of off-street parking spaces or loading facilities required if it is 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 reasonably require strict or literal interpretation and enforcement of the specific regulation because:
	This is a small building that will not generate significant traffic and will serve the local neighborhood.
<u> </u>	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: Street parking is not prohibited and can be used if necessary. There is ample street parking long Navasota north of E 7th and along E 6th East of Navasota.
3.	streets in such a manner as to interfere with the free flow of traffic of the streets because: Street parking is not prohibited and can be used if necessary. There is ample street parking long Navasota north of E 7th and along E 6th East of Navasota.
3.	Street parking is not prohibited and can be used if necessary. There is ample street parking slong Navasota north of E 7th and along E 6th East of Navasota. The granting of this variance will not create a safety hazard or any other condition inconsistent with the objectives of this Ordinance because: There is ample alley access for emergency and service vehicles.
3.	streets in such a manner as to interfere with the free flow of traffic of the streets because: Street parking is not prohibited and can be used if necessary. There is ample street parking along Navasota north of E 7th and along E 6th East of Navasota. The granting of this variance will not create a safety hazard or any other condition inconsistent with the objectives of this Ordinance because:

09/11/2015 | Page 6 of 8

City of Austin | Board of Adjustment General/Parking Variance Application

The variance will not alter the character of the area adjacent to the property, will not impair the use of

Area Character

Section 3: Applicant Certificate I affirm that my statements contained in the complete application are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief. Date: 03/15/2016 Applicant Signature: Applicant Name (typed or printed): Favez Kazi Applicant Mailing Address: 1210 Rosewood Ave State: TX_____ Zip: 78702___ City: Austin Phone (will be public information): (512) 761-6161 Email (optional – will be public information): Fayez@Civilitude.com Section 4: Owner Certificate I affirm that my statements contained in the complete application are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief. Date: 03/15/2016 Owner Name (typed or printed): Gino_Troy-of DGT Management, LLC Owner Mailing Address: PO Box 340430 State: TX _____ Zip: 78734___ City: Austin Phone (will be public information): (512) 576-0785 Email (optional – will be public information): Section 5: Agent Information Agent Name: Favez Kazi Agent Mailing Address: 1210 Rosewood Ave State: TX Zip: 78702 City: Austin Phone (will be public information): (512) 761-6161 Email (optional - will be public information): Fayez@Civilitude.com Section 6: Additional Space (if applicable) Please use the space below to provide additional information as needed. To ensure the information is referenced to the proper item, include the Section and Field names as well (continued on next page).







