



October 24, 2025

Via E-Mail:

Austin Board of Adjustment
Elaine Ramirez
Senior Planner, Austin Development Services
Elaine.ramirez@autintexas.gov

Re: **Objection to Standing and Jurisdiction**
Board of Adjustment ID: C15-2025-0041
Date of Board Hearing: November 10, 2025
Property: 6706 Bridge Hill Cove

To the Austin Board of Adjustment,

Austin City Code § 25-1-183 sets forth mandatory requirements for a valid notice of appeal to the Board. The Code provides:

25-1-183 – Information Required in Notice of Appeal

The notice of appeal must be on a form prescribed by the responsible director or building official and must include:

1. the name, address, and telephone number of the appellant;
2. the name of the applicant, if the appellant is not the applicant;
3. the decision being appealed;
4. the date of the decision;
5. a description of the appellant's status as an interested party; and
6. the reasons the appellant believes the decision does not comply with the requirements of this title.

The appellant's filing fails to meet these jurisdictional prerequisites. Specifically, the appeal omits both (a) the decision being appealed and (b) the date of that decision. There are at least two administrative actions that could potentially be at issue relating to the approvals issued on September 24, 2025, in connection with two separate Building Permits 2022-093202 BP and 2022-093203 BP, however, neither the permit numbers nor the approval date are identified anywhere in the notice of appeal. It is not clear to the Property's Owner which action or permit is the subject of the applicant's challenge.

Because compliance with § 25-1-183 is a mandatory condition precedent to the Board's jurisdiction, an appeal that fails to include the required information is legally defective and cannot properly invoke the Board's authority. The omission of the decision and decision date prevents both the City and affected parties from identifying the administrative action being challenged, undermining the procedural integrity of the appeal process.

October 24, 2025

Page 2

Accordingly, we respectfully object and assert that:

1. The appellant's notice of appeal is facially deficient under § 25-1-183;
2. The Board therefore lacks jurisdiction to consider the appeal;
3. The appellant lacks standing to maintain this proceeding; and
4. Because the statutory window for filing a notice of appeal has expired, the deficiencies in the notice cannot be remedied or cured, and the appeal must be dismissed as untimely and void.

We request that the Board dismiss the appeal for want of jurisdiction for lack of standing, timeliness and ripeness under its Rule C-2-a.

Best regards,



David Hartman

Cc: Ron Thrower ([REDACTED])