



SIGN VARIANCE REQUEST REVIEW

Date: 11 August, 2025

Project: BPI Partners, Inc.
13240 Rooster Springs Rd.
Austin, TX 78737

Applicant: Shane Bauerle, BPI Partners, Inc.

Submittals: ☒ Variance Application
☒ Sign Permit Application
☐ Master Signage Plan (if applicable)
☐ Planned Develop District/Development Agreement Signage Regulations (if applicable)

Variance Requests: Request 12 additional wall signs on fence screening.

The following review has been conducted for the City of Dripping Springs to determine compliance and consistency with the City of Dripping Springs CODE OF ORDINANCES, Title 2 BUILDING AND DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS, Chapter 26 SIGNS, Article 26.03.003 VARIANCES

BPI Partners, Inc is located in the City's ETJ at 13240 Rooster Springs Rd, Austin, TX. Screening material was applied to the perimeter fencing with 13 logos (signs) on the side facing Highway 290 without a permit. Per the Sign Ordinance, and the property use falling under Commercial Districts, the applicant is allowed one (1) wall sign. Code Enforcement contacted the owner in February of this year for unpermitted signs. After approximately 4 months of continued communication, we received a permit application and variance application in June. The applicant requests a variance permitting 12 additional wall signs on the fence screening. The hardship expressed in the variance application is to "obscure view of our site". There is no mitigation strategy listed in the variance applications. The applicant was advised of the need for a hardship and mitigation strategy, but opted to make no changes, with the understanding that the variance would be administratively denied with the option to appeal the decision to City Council (Board of Adjustments).

The variance requests relate to the consideration for granting variances as follows:

Considerations in granting variances (Sec. 26.03.003 (e))

(1) Special or unique hardship because of the size or shape of the property on which the sign is to be located, or the visibility of the property from public roads.

☐ Applicable ☒ Not Applicable

(2) Hardship claim based on the exceptional topographic conditions or physical features uniquely affecting the property on which a sign is to be located.

☐ Applicable ☒ Not Applicable

(3) Proposed sign location, configuration, design, materials and colors are harmonious with the hill country setting.

☒ Applicable ☐ Not Applicable

(4) Natural colors (earth tones) and muted colors are favored. Color schemes must be compatible with the surrounding structures. Predominate use of bold and/or bright colors is discouraged under this section.

☒ Applicable ☐ Not Applicable

(5) The sign and its supporting structure should be in architectural harmony with the surrounding structures.

☒ Applicable ☐ Not Applicable

(6) Mitigation measures related to the sign in question or other sign on the same premises.

☐ Applicable ☒ Not Applicable

(7) Demonstrated and documented correlation between the variance and protecting the public health and safety.

☐ Applicable ☒ Not Applicable

(8) The stage at which the variance is requested. The city will be more inclined to consider a variance request when it is sought during an earlier stage of the construction approval process, for instance, when the responsible party is submitting/obtaining a plat, planned development district, development agreement, or site plan.

☐ Applicable ☒ Not Applicable

(9) Whether the sign could have been included in a master signage plan. Master signage plans are highly encouraged. The city will be more inclined to favorably consider a variance request when the variance is part of a master signage plan. There will be a presumption against granting variances piecemeal, ad hoc, on a case-by-case basis when the sign for which a variance is sought could have been included in a master sign plan and considered in the course of a comprehensive review of the entire project's signage.

☐ Applicable ☒ Not

Applicable

(10) The sign administrator may authorize the remodeling, renovation, or alternation of a sign when some nonconforming aspect of the sign is thereby reduced.

☐ Applicable ☒ Not Applicable

Approval/Recommendations/Conditions

Denied.

As defined by the Sign Ordinance, the applicant does not have a hardship based on the size or shape of the property, visibility of the property from public roads, or exceptional topographic conditions or physical features uniquely affecting the property. There are no mitigation measures offered by the applicant and no correlation between the variance and protecting the public health and safety.

Having demonstrated no hardship and providing no mitigation strategy, this variance request is denied.

Please let me know if you have any questions about this report.

Respectfully Submitted,

Shane Pevehouse
Building Official/Sign Administrator