

CITY OF AUSTIN
Board of Adjustment
Decision Sheet
E-4

DATE: Monday August 9, 2021

CASE NUMBER: C15-2021-0062

Y Thomas Ates
 Y Brooke Bailey
 Y Jessica Cohen
 Y Melissa Hawthorne
 Y Barbara McArthur
 Y Rahm McDaniel
 - Darryl Pruett (out – no show)
 Y Agustina Rodriguez
 Y Richard Smith
 - Michael Von Ohlen (out)
 Y Nicholl Wade
 Y Kelly Blume (Alternate)
 - Carrie Waller (Alternate)
 _____ Vacant (Alternate)

APPLICANT: David Cancialosi

OWNER: Christen Steen

ADDRESS: 3401 RIVERCREST DR

VARIANCE REQUESTED: The applicant is requesting variance(s) from the Land Development Code, Section 25-2-551 (Lake Austin District Regulations) (C) (3)
(a) increase the maximum impervious cover on a slope with a gradient of 15 percent or less from 35 percent (allowed) to 48 percent (requested), (53% existing)
(b) increase the maximum impervious cover on a slope with a gradient of 15 percent and not more than 25 percent from 10 percent (allowed) to 49 percent (requested), (54.25% existing)
(c) increase the maximum impervious cover on a slope with a gradient of more than 25 percent and not more than 35 percent from 5 percent (allowed) to 18 percent (requested), (4.41% existing)
(d) increase maximum impervious cover on a slope gradient greater than 35 percent to 3 percent (requested), (0.83% existing) in order to erect a Single-Family + associated improvements in a “LA”, Lake Austin zoning district.

***Note:** This section of the Land Development Code applies to lots that are included in a subdivision plat recorded before April 22, 1982 or a tract that is not required to be platted.
For the above address the Subdivision Plat was recorded on January 4, 1965*


The overall change in IC is from 21.51% to a proposed 20.89% IC, or 8,084 SF IC to 7,883 SF IC, when calculated on a gross lot area basis.

BOARD'S DECISION: BOA JULY 12, 2021 POSTPONED TO AUGUST 9, 2021; Aug 9, 2021 The public hearing was closed by Chair Jessica Cohen, Board Member Melissa Hawthorne motions to Postpone to October 11, 2021; Board Member Brooke Bailey seconds on a 10-0 vote; POSTPONED TO October 11, 2021.

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:


Elaine Ramirez
Executive Liaison

 for _____
Jessica Cohen
Chair