

CITY OF AUSTIN
Board of Adjustment
Decision Sheet

DATE: Monday April 9, 2018

CASE NUMBER: C15-2018-0004

____ Brooke Bailey
____ William Burkhardt
____ Christopher Covo
____ Eric Goff
____ Melissa Hawthorne
____ Bryan King
____ Don Leighton-Burwell
____ Rahm McDaniel
____ Veronica Rivera
____ James Valadez
____ Michael Von Ohlen
____ Kelly Blume (Alternate)
____ Martha Gonzalez (Alternate)
____ Pim Mayo (Alternate)

APPLICANT: Nikelle Meade

OWNER: Eveann Investment LP

ADDRESS: 4303 VICTORY DR, 2106, 2108, 2110 W Ben White Blvd., 2111 Fort View Drive

VARIANCE REQUESTED: The applicant has requested variance(s) from Article 10, Compatibility Standards:

A. Section 1063 (B) (Height Limitations and Setbacks for Large Sites) to decrease the required setback from a property in an urban family residence (SF-5) or more restrictive zoning district or on which a use permitted in SF-5 or more restrictive zoning district is located from 25 feet (required) to 0 feet (requested); and to

B. Section 1063 (C) (1) (Height Limitations and Setbacks for Large Sites) to increase the required height limitation for a structure that is 50 feet or less from property in a SF-5 or more restrictive zoning district or permitted use from two stories and 30 feet (required) to three stories and 40 feet (requested); and to

C. Section 25-2-1067 (G) (Design Regulations) to permit a parking area or driveway 25 feet or less from a lot that is in an SF-5 or more restrictive district or on which a use permitted in an SF-5 or more restrictive district is located in order to erect a three-story office building, screening wall and detached three-story parking structure on five tracts in a "GR", Community Commercial zoning district, a "LO-CO", Limited Office - Conditional Overlay zoning district, and a "NO-MU-CO", Neighborhood Office - Mixed Use - Conditional Overlay zoning district.

BOARD'S DECISION: Jan 8, 2018 POSTPONED TO FEBRUARY 12, 2018; Feb 12, 2018 POSTPONED TO MARCH 12, 2018; March 12, 2018 POSTPONED TO APRIL 9, 2018; April 9, 2018 POSTPONED TO MAY 14, 2018

FINDING:

1. The Zoning regulations applicable to the property do not allow for a reasonable use because:
2. (a) The hardship for which the variance is requested is unique to the property in that:
(b) The hardship is not general to the area in which the property is located because:
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:



Leane Heldenfels
Executive Liaison



William Burkhardt
Chairman