

CITY OF AUSTIN
Board of Adjustment
Decision Sheet
ITEM06

DATE: Monday January 13, 2025

CASE NUMBER: C15-2024-0041

Y Thomas Ates (D1)
 Y Bianca A Medina-Leal (D2)
 Y Jessica Cohen (D3)
 Y Yung-ju Kim (D4)
 Y Melissa Hawthorne (D5)
 Y Jeffery Bowen (D6)
 Y Janel Venzant (D7)
 - Margaret Shahrestani (D8)
 Y Brian Poteet (D9)
 Y Michael Von Ohlen (D10)
 - Marcel Gutierrez-Garza (M)
 - VACANT (Alternate) (M)
 - Suzanne Valentine (Alternate) (M)
 - VACANT (Alternate) (M)

OWNER/APPLICANT: Thomas M Schiefer and Meghann Elena Rosales

ADDRESS: 1607 10TH ST

VARIANCE REQUESTED: The applicant is requesting the following variance(s) from the Land Development Code, **Section 25-2-492 (Site Development Regulations)** from impervious coverage requirements to increase from 45 percent (maximum allowed) to 65 percent (requested) in order to attach a Single-Family Residence in a “SF-3-NP”, Single-Family - Neighborhood Plan zoning district (Old West Austin Neighborhood Plan)

BOARD’S DECISION: November 14, 2024 Postponed to December 9, 2024 due to the absence of a sufficient number of Board Members required for a formal vote on each case; Dec 9, 2024 The public hearing was closed by Madam Chair Jessica Cohen, Madam Chair Jessica Cohen’s motion to Postpone to January 13, 2025; Vice Chair Melissa Hawthorne seconds on 10-0 votes; POSTPONED TO JANUARY 13, 2025; January 13, 2025 The public hearing was closed by Madam Chair Jessica Cohen, Vice Chair Melissa Hawthorne’s motion to Approve; Board member Michael Von Ohlen second on 9-0 votes; GRANTED.

FINDING:

1. The Zoning regulations applicable to the property do not allow for a reasonable use because: Home 1 and Home 2 were written independently and then collaborated together, maybe had

some unintended consequences for a small lot amnesty, it could be covered in the neighborhood plan, in keeping this house and making the addition to the back with the neighbor's encroachment is very reasonable, the new Home 2 remove the small lot amnesty for just a single family as opposed to the preservation portion of it.

2. (a) The hardship for which the variance is requested is unique to the property in that: it is a legal lot, it has the existing encroachment, it has a historic house, all these complications make it incredibly unique to this piece of property.

(b) The hardship is not general to the area in which the property is located because: the road expansion makes it even more interesting; your neighbor's living room is usually not on your property.
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 Landmark Commission has already approved the addition to the house, the front façade remains and the work is strictly to the rear of the property, there should be no visual impacts from neighboring properties from the front portion from the street.



Elaine Ramirez
Executive Liaison

Diana Ramirez for

Jessica Cohen
Madam Chair