CITY OF AUSTIN Board of Adjustment Decision Sheet Interpretation A-1

DATE: July 13, 2022 CASE NUMBER: C15-2022-0051

Y	_Thomas Ates
N	_Brooke Bailey
N	Jessica Cohen
R	Melissa Hawthorne RECUSED
	Barbara Mcarthur OUT
N	_Ryan Nill
	Darryl Pruett OUT
Y	_Agustina Rodriguez
N	Richard Smith
Y	_Michael Von Ohlen
Y	_Nicholl Wade
Y	_Kelly Blume (Alternate)
Y	_Carrie Waller (Alternate)
Y	Marcel Gutierrez-Garza (Alternate)

APPELLANT: Stuart Hersh

OWNER: TDC Griffin Windsor Owner, LLC

ADDRESS: 5900 WESTMINSTER DR

VARIANCE REQUESTED: The appellant has filed an appeal challenging staff's interpretation of Chapter 25-2, Subchapter E (*Design Standards and Mixed Use*) of the Land Development Code in connection with approval of a Site Plan application for construction of a Vertical Mixed-Use (VMU) development at the above-referenced address. The appellant contends that the Site Plan does not meet the Land Development Code, Subchapter E Sections 1.1, 1.5, 2.1, 2.2, 2.8, 3.1, 4.1, and 4.3 in a "GR-V-CO-NP", Community Commercial-Vertical Mixed Use-Conditional Overlay-Neighborhood Plan zoning district (Windsor Park Neighborhood Plan).

Note: Subchapter E: Design Standards and Mixed Use, Article 1 – General Provisions, Article 2 – Site Development Standards, Article 3 – Building Design Standards, and Article 4 – Mixed Use:

Article 1 – General Provisions

- 1.1 General Intent
- 1.5 Alternative Equivalent Compliance

Article 2 – Site Development Standards

- 2.1 Intent
- 2.2 Relationship of Buildings to Streets and Walkways
- 2.8 Shade and Shelter

Article 3 – Building Design Standards

3.1 Intent

Article 4 – Mixed Use

- 4.1 Intent and
- 4.3 Vertical Mixed Use Buildings

BOARD'S DECISION: The public hearing was closed by Madam Chair Jessica Cohen, Board member Michael Von Ohlen motions to deny the appeal request and uphold City staff's interpretation; Board member Marcel Gutierrez-Garza seconds on a 7-4 vote (Board members Brooke Bailey, Jessica Cohen, Ryan Nill, Richard Smith nay, Melissa Hawthorne recused); APPEAL DENIED-UPHELD STAFF'S INTERPRETATION.

FINDING:

- 1. There is a reasonable doubt of difference of interpretation as to the specific intent of the regulations or map in that:
- 2. An appeal of use provisions could clearly permit a use which is in character with the uses enumerated for the various zones and with the objectives of the zone in question because:
- 3. The interpretation will not grant a special privilege to one property inconsistent with other properties or uses similarly situated in that:

Executive Liaison

Jessica Cohen

Madam Chair