

### **Recommendation for Council Action**

Austin City Council Item ID 70692 Agenda Number 25.

Meeting Date: 5/4/2017 Department: Planning and Zoning

#### Subject

Conduct a public hearing and consider an appeal of the decision of the Historic Landmark Commission to grant a demolition permit for property located at 1207 W. 22½ Street and 1209 W. 22½ Street. (HDP-2016-0468 and HDP-2016-0469) (District 9)

#### Amount and Source of Funding

# Fiscal Note Purchasing Language: **Prior Council Action:** Steve Sadowsky, Historic Preservation Officer, (512) 974-6454 For More Information: July 28, 2016 - Historic Landmark Commission: Voted 7-0 to release the permits upon completion of a City of Austin Documentation Package, with two commissioners off the dais at the time of the vote. Council Committee, Boards and February 14, 2017 - Planning Commission: Main motion by Commissioner Schissler, seconded **Commission Action:** by Commissioner Nuckols to deny the appeal was approved on a vote of 8-1. Commissioner McGraw voted nay. Commissioner De Hoyos Hart abstained on this item. Chair Oliver and Commissioners Shieh and Zaragoza absent. MBE / WBE: Related Items:

## Additional Backup Information

The appellant is appealing a decision by the Historic Landmark Commission on July 28, 2016 to release the demolition permits for two ca. 1929-1930 multi-family structures in the West Campus neighborhood. The Historic Landmark Commission voted 7-0 to release the permits upon completion of a City of Austin Documentation Package, with two commissioners off the dais at the time of the vote. Staff also recommended release of the permit.

The appellant filed a timely appeal of that decision to the Planning Commission, which was heard on February 14, 2017. The Planning Commission voted 8-1 to deny the appeal with 1 abstention and 3 commissioners absent.

Staff contends that the Historic Landmark Commission acted legally and considered all relevant evidence in making their unanimous decision to release the demolition permits, and that there is no legal or equitable justification for overturning that decision.