$20=0020$
 ong the intersection with the setbbock pliding.
 . ANY ENCOSED SPACE UNDER THE SHED ROOF MAY PROTRUDE, NC.
CIRCULATOON.

Heiphts shall be measured vertically from the average of the pithed or hip roof, the gabled roof or dormer with the highest verage helight.
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(1) Elevation, Bldg 1, Front


(1)Elevation, Bldg 1, Right
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(1) Elevation, Bldg 1, Left


## FLOOR PLANS


(1) Floor Plan, Bldg 1, Level 01


(1) Floor Plan, Bldg 1, Level 02


(1)Roof Plan, Bldg 1


(1)MEP Plan, Bldg 1, Level 01


(1)MEP Plan, Bldg 1, Level 02
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## Re: Neighborhood Meeting

## david cancialosi [david@permit-partners.com](mailto:david@permit-partners.com)

Fri 5/22/2020 9:08 AM
To: Susan Benz [benz@benzresourcegroup.com](mailto:benz@benzresourcegroup.com)
Cc: eccsector7rep@gmail.com [eccsector7rep@gmail.com](mailto:eccsector7rep@gmail.com); Hon. Sabino Pio Penteria
[sabino.renteria@austintexas.gov](mailto:sabino.renteria@austintexas.gov); Derrick Dixon [derrick@waterloosurveyors.com](mailto:derrick@waterloosurveyors.com); Crisene Casper
[ccasper@c3presents.com](mailto:ccasper@c3presents.com); Farah Rivera [farahrivera@yahoo.es](mailto:farahrivera@yahoo.es); Julio Perez [Azucar_a1@att.net](mailto:Azucar_a1@att.net); Kristen Heaney
[kristen.e.heaney@gmail.com](mailto:kristen.e.heaney@gmail.com); Kristen Hotopp [kristen.hotopp@gmailcom](mailto:kristen.hotopp@gmailcom); RENEE LOPEZ
[reneelop218@yahoo.com](mailto:reneelop218@yahoo.com); Sara Pedrosa [sara.pedrosa@gmailcom](mailto:sara.pedrosa@gmailcom); Eric Pace [ericryanpace@gmail.com](mailto:ericryanpace@gmail.com); Kasey Jaegers [kasey@permit-partners.com](mailto:kasey@permit-partners.com)
Good morning Susan,
I have forwarded your email to my client, the property owner and the architect. Unfortunately there is not appear to be any consensus nor any details that specifically address your concerns. I apologize but since I was not involved whatsoever in the permitting nor construction phase of this project, I am unable to provide you with details myself as well.

As the board requested, we intend to provide existing elevation exhibits, proposed elevation exhibits, pictures, and fire rating information. The owner intends on installing a sprinkler system throughout the houses, and closing some windows along the upper side of the west facing façade, and relocating the doors to face Navasota.

We will be sharing this information with the city today so it could be uploaded in their back up material.

I am more than happy to facilitate an ongoing conversation in hopes to get your questions answered to her satisfaction. Please let me know how I can help do that.

Respectfully, David

## Sent from a mobile device. There will be typos. Communications sent via this device are CONFIDENTIAL and shall not be shared unless authorized by sender.

On May 21, 2020, at 16:14, Susan Benz [benz@benzresourcegroup.com](mailto:benz@benzresourcegroup.com) wrote:

David,
My apologies for the delay in responding. I've had a crazy couple of weeks!
Our ECC NPCT have not been meeting because the library is closed but we did figure out how to meet and vote via ZOOM and had our May meeting yesterday. We did go over the issue of your project and we would very much like to talk with you further. If necessary, we could schedule a special meeting but we'd prefer not to do that as it's difficult to get everyone's schedules coordinated. Perhaps we can do this via email? I've copied the whole team so that they can read your responses and ask their own questions. Once we've had a few conversations and folks have had a chance to ask their own questions, perhaps we can come to a conclusion to report to the BOA.

I understand that you had conflicting surveys. It happens. I'm wondering who the builder was and if the pins were difficult to locate, why the builder didn't get a surveyor out there to establish the they do the layout?

Once the formwork for the foundation was laid out was there an inspection by the architect and owner? What did they plan to do about the fence which is obviously closer than 5 ft to the structure? Were they going to move the fence to what they believed was their property line? If not, how did they think they would be able to open those east facing doors?

Did the owner, architect or builder talk to the adjacent neighbors about the confusion and the close proximity of the fence?

We've all noticed this project and clearly it's been on hold for quite some time - at least a year. Is this hold entirely to the property line issue?

I recognize that this question is unrelated to the BOA request but I'm confused about your statement that this is a single family home with an ADU when both residences have the same layout and size. It's laid out like a duplex. Could you help me understand the intent going forward?

Again, sorry for the delay.
Thanks,
Susan

## Susan Benz | Benz Resource Group

1101 - B E 6th St - Medina Street Entrance
Austin, TX 78702
512-220-9542
benz@BenzResourceGroup.com

Keep Calm and Carry On ... and wash your hands!

On Fri, May 15, 2020 at 3:11 PM david cancialosi [david@permit-partners.com](mailto:david@permit-partners.com) wrote: Hi Susan,

Apologies for the delayed response. It's been a very hectic week.
I have attached the information re: surveys and site information. This information was also provided to the BOA and is available online. It does not encompass the totality of the surveying exercises performed by Waterloo Surveying. I've included Derrick Dixon from Waterloo in this email.

As I understand the pins within the immediate area and in the alley behind the lot were incorrectly tagged by a former survey(s). There was also a new survey with the purchase of the house. It was not clear which survey was correct due to the very confusing nature of locating monument pins which were either missing or decades old (if they could be found). The site plan for the house was drawn to these pins assuming they were correct. That is how the house was able to pass city zoning review and this far in the construction process. Once it was understood there was an issue, the survey crews went back to the area and uncovered data which had been previously not found. Since the entire house was constructed this presented an obvious issue - do you cut off 3 ' of the entire house? demolish it and construct a house $3^{\prime}$ to the east? These are not easy to answer because any solution to the encroachment is very complex and costly.

## Previously Denied BOAacase:c-15-2020- $0020 / 11 / 137$

What my client is attempting to do is find a fair compromise. This was an honest mistake, if not an easy one to make given the myriad of surveying issues in this area (as described to me). It's not unreasonable to allow an encroachment into a side yard setback. Especially on a corner lot and especially on a lot this small. It's unfortunate the mistake occurred but we are looking for the best worst case scenario. Otherwise the house gets ripped apart literally.

At the online BOA meeting I proposed that we look changing the doors from swinging (out) to sliding. I've asked the architect to look into that as well as the fire rating of that side of the building. I also sympathize with the neighbor who feels this house is too close to his. I reminded the board this house is compliant with $100 \%$ of the City regulations with the exception of this side yard setback. The building would still be as tall as it is if it were $3^{\prime}$ back and so forth.

That said we're looking for some acceptable compromise in lieu of demolishing all or part of the house for the sake of a few feet.

As to the city compliance and inspection questions, I honestly do not know. I do know the owner cannot obtain a Certificate of Occupancy from the city due to not being bale to pass final inspection (due to the encroachment). No-one is living there at this time. I am not aware of any further on-site construction schedules nor any city enforcement actions.

Again we are trying to find a reasonable solution. This was not a malicious act by the builder. It's only a function of the best decision the builder could make using a combination survey information which the initial City-approved plans were based on.

Please feel free to contact my office directly. I would be happy to answer any questions I can.

We would also be happy to participate in any online neighborhood meetings prior to the June BOA.

Thank you.
Kind regards,
David Cancialosi

Due to the nature of the COVID19 virus, the City of Austin is experiencing longer than normal review and response times. We appreciate your patience while we diligently work to get your project approved. We hope that you and your loved ones are taking recommended precautions. - The Permit Partners Team

## PERMIT PARTNERS, LLC

TEXAS EXCAVATION SOLUTIONS, LLC | TRICO FUNDING, LLC
105 W Riverside Drive, Suite 225
Austin, TX 78704
(O) 512-593-5361 (F) 512-213-0261
www.permit-partners.com

## CONFIDENTIALITY

This email message and any attachments is intended only for use by the addressee(s) named herein and may contain legally privileged and/or confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient of this email you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this email and any attachments thereto is strictly prohibited. If

```
From: Susan Benz <benz@benzresourcegroup.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 12, 2020 12:05 PM
To: Kasey Jaegers <kasey@permit-partners.com>
Cc: eccsector7rep@gmail.com <eccsector7rep@gmail.com>; david cancialosi
<david@permit-partners.com>; Hon. Sabino Pio Renteria
<sabino.renteria@austintexas.gov>; Roig, Jose G <Jose.Roig@austintexas.gov>; Votra,
Doug <Doug.Votra@austintexas.gov>
Subject: Re: Neighborhood Meeting
```

Kasey,

Thanks for reaching out. Our meetings are required to be held in public places and we meet at the Terrazas Library on E Cesar Chavez. The library is closed and so we don't know when we will be meeting in person again. We have had several virtual votes and if you could send the documentation showing your survey problem and explain how this happened and why it was not corrected early in the process, I can share that information with the Team and see if they would change their minds from the current "strongly oppose a variance" that we have already submitted to the City.

I can tell you that one of our neighbors reported the error in the layout of the foundation to the City multiple times and we are asking for an investigation by the City to determine why this problem was not addressed as the project should have been red-flagged in January of 2018. We've noticed that your jobsite has been silent for quite some time. Is this because the owners were notified by Code Compliance of the problem? If so, when was this notice received? We'd really appreciate the full story.

Best,

Susan

## Susan Benz | Benz Resource Group

1101-BE6th St - Medina Street Entrance
Austin, TX 78702
512-220-9542
benz@BenzResourceGroup.com

Keep Calm and Carry On ... and wash your hands!

On Tue, May 12, 2020 at 11:45 AM Kasey Jaegers [kasey@permit-partners.com](mailto:kasey@permit-partners.com) wrote:

Mrs. Hotopp and Mrs. Benz,
Good afternoon. We are representing a client who is requesting a variance to allow a 2.77 ' setback in the required $5^{\prime}$ side setback due to a survey issue. The property address is 1401 E 3 rd St. Are we able to discuss this property during your next meeting? I

## Regards,

## Kasey Jaegers, Office Manager

Due to the nature of the COVID19 virus, the City of Austin is experiencing longer than normal review and response times. We appreciate your patience while we diligently work to get your project approved. We hope that you and your loved ones are taking recommended precautions. - The Permit Partners Team.

## PERMIT PARTNERS, LLC

## TEXAS EXCAVATION SOLUTIONS, LLC | TRICO FUNDING, LLC

105 W Riverside Drive, Suite 225
Austin, TX 78704
(O) 512-593-5361 (F) 512-213-0261
www.permit-partners.com

## CONFIDENTIALITY

This email message and any attachments is intended only for use by the addressee(s) named herein and may contain legally privileged and/or confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient of this email you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this email and any attachments thereto is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error please notify the sender and permanently delete the original and any copies of this email and any prints thereof.
thereof.

# Previously Denied BOA case C15-202019920140 BOA GENERAL REVIEW COVERSHEET 

CASE: C15-2022-0061
ADDRESS: 1401 E. $3^{\text {rd }} \mathrm{St}$
OWNER: Cortlandt Chalfant

BOA DATE: July $11^{\text {th }}, 2022$
COUNCIL DISTRICT: 3
AGENT: Nikelle Meade

ZONING: SF-3-NP
LEGAL DESCRIPTION: W 35.6FT OF N138FT OF W193.4 OLT 20 DIVISION O
VARIANCE REQUEST: reduce interior side setback from 5 ft . to 2.77 ft .
SUMMARY: complete construction of a Single-Family residence
ISSUES: layout error during construction

|  | ZONING | LAND USES |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Site | SF-3-NP | Single-Family |
| North | SF-3-NP | Single-Family |
| South | SF-3-H-NP | Single-Family |
| East | SF-3-NP | Single-Family |
| West | SF-3-NP | Single-Family |

## NEIGHBORHOOD ORGANIZATIONS:

Austin Independent School District
Austin Lost and Found Pets
Austin Neighborhoods Council
Barrio Unido Neighborhood Assn.
Bike Austin
Capital Metro
Del Valle Community Coalition
East Austin Conservancy
East Cesar Chavez Neighborhood Association
East Cesar Chavez Neighborhood Plan Contact Team
El Concilio Mexican-American Neighborhoods
Friends of Austin Neighborhoods
Greater East Austin Neighborhood Association
Guadalupe Neighborhood Development Corporation
Homeless Neighborhood Association
Neighborhood Empowerment Foundation
Neighbors United for Progress
Preservation Austin
SELTexas
Sierra Club, Austin Regional Group
Tejano Town

## Previously Denied BOA case C15-2929tpp20 41



July 1, 2022

Nikelle Meade
111 Congress Ave
Suite 1400
Austin, TX 78701
Property Description: W 35.6FT OF N138FT OF W193.4 OLT 20 DIVISION O

## Re: C15-2022-0061

Dear Nikelle,
Austin Energy (AE) has reviewed your application for the above referenced property, requesting that the Board of Adjustment consider a variance request from LDC Section 25-2-492 at 1401 East $3^{\text {rd }}$ Street.

Austin Energy does not oppose the request, provided that any proposed or existing improvements follow Austin Energy's Clearance \& Safety Criteria, the National Electric Safety Code, and OSHA requirements. Any removal or relocation of existing facilities will be at the owner's/applicant's expense.

Please use this link to be advised of our clearance and safety requirements which are additional conditions of the above review action:
https://library.municode.com/tx/austin/codes/utilities criteria manual?nodeld=S1AUENDECR 1 .10.0CLSARE

If you require further information or have any questions regarding the above comments, please contact our office. Thank you for contacting Austin Energy.

## Cody Shook, Planner II

Austin Energy
Public Involvement | Real Estate Services
2500 Montopolis Drive
Austin, TX 78741
(512) 322-6881

Cody.Shook@austinenergy.com

## Building a Better and Safer Austin Together

# Board of Adjustment General/Parking Variance Application 

## WARNING: Filing of this appeal stops all affected construction activity.

This application is a fillable PDF that can be completed electronically. To ensure your information is saved, click here to Save the form to your computer, then open your copy and continue.

The Tab key may be used to navigate to each field; Shift + Tab moves to the previous field. The Enter key activates links, emails, and buttons. Use the Up \& Down Arrow keys to scroll through drop-down lists and check boxes, and hit Enter to make a selection.

The application must be complete and accurate prior to submittal. If more space is required, please complete Section 6 as needed. All information is required (if applicable).

## For Office Use Only

Case \# C15-2022-0061 ROW \# 12953473 Tax \# _ 0204061201

## Section 1: Applicant Statement

Street Address: 1401 E 3rd St, Austin, TX 78702
Subdivision Legal Description:
W 35.6FT OF N138FT OF W193.4 OLT 20 DIVISION O
$\qquad$
Outlot: 20 Block(s):
Division: O
Zoning District: SF-3-NP
Council District: 3

I/We Nikelle Meade (Husch Blackwell LLP) on behalf of myself/ourselves as authorized agent for Nexus Series B, LLC affirm that on
Month June , Day 10 , Year 2022 , hereby apply for a hearing before the Board of Adjustment for consideration to (select appropriate option below):

OErect
OAttach

- Complete

○Remodel

- Maintain

Other: $\qquad$
Type of Structure: single-family residence

Portion of the City of Austin Land Development Code applicant is seeking a variance from:
Section 25-2-492 (Site Development Regulations) from setback requirements to decrease the minimum interior side setback from 5 ft (required) to 2.77 ft (requested) in order to complete a Single-Family residence in an "SF-3-NP", Single-Family Residence-Neighborhood Plan zoning district (East Cesar Chavez Neighborhood Plan).

## Section 2: Variance Findings

The Board must determine the existence of, sufficiency of, and weight of evidence supporting the findings described below. Therefore, you must complete each of the applicable Findings Statements as part of your application. Failure to do so may result in your application being rejected as incomplete. Please attach any additional supporting documents.

NOTE: The Board cannot grant a variance that would provide the applicant with a special privilege not enjoyed by others similarly situated or potentially similarly situated.

I contend that my entitlement to the requested variance is based on the following findings:

## Reasonable Use

The zoning regulations applicable to the property do not allow for a reasonable use because:
The zoning regulations do not allow for a reasonable use because they would preclude preservation of an existing structure which could house two families. The existing structure was constructed pursuant to City approval and a signed and sealed survey obtained from a professional licensed surveyor.

## Hardship

a) The hardship for which the variance is requested is unique to the property in that:

The hardship is unique to the property because a professional and licensed surveyor provided a signed and sealed survey indicating that the fence line was not the property line and that the neighboring property was encroaching on the subject property. There was no way to know that a survey produced by a professional surveyor was wrong about the location of the property line.
b) The hardship is not general to the area in which the property is located because:

The hardship is not general to the area because it results from the inaccurate permitting and surveying applied to the property.

## Area Character

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:

Allowing the existing structure to remain will not alter the character of the area, impair the use of the adjacent conforming property, or impair the purpose of the regulations because it is common for structures to be placed in setbacks in this neighborhood because of discrepancies and errors in the original surveying and lot creation.

## Parking (additional criteria for parking variances only)

Request for a parking variance requires the Board to make additional findings. The Board may grant a variance to a regulation prescribed in the City of Austin Land Development Code Chapter 25-6, Appendix A with respect to the number of off-street parking spaces or loading facilities required if it makes findings of fact that the following additional circumstances also apply:

1. Neither present nor anticipated future traffic volumes generated by the use of the site or the uses of sites in the vicinity reasonably require strict or literal interpretation and enforcement of the specific regulation because:
2. The granting of this variance will not result in the parking or loading of vehicles on public streets in such a manner as to interfere with the free flow of traffic of the streets because:
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
3. The granting of this variance will not create a safety hazard or any other condition inconsistent with the objectives of this Ordinance because:
4. The variance will run with the use or uses to which it pertains and shall not run with the site because:

## Section 3: Applicant Certificate

I affirm that my statements contained in the complete application are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Applicant Signature:
 Date: 06/08/2022
Applicant Name (typed or printed): Nikelle Meade $\qquad$
Applicant Mailing Address: 111 Congress Ave., Suite 1400
City: Austin $\qquad$ State: TX
Zip: 78701
Phone (will be public information): (512) 922-6001
Email (optional - will be public information):

## Section 4: Owner Certificate

I affirm that my statements contained in the complete application are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.

| Owner Signature: |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Owner Name (typed or printed): Cortland Chalfant |  | Date: $06 / 08 / 2022$ |
| Owner Mailing Address: 809 S Lamar Blvd, Suite D |  |  |
| City: Austin | State: IX | Zip: 78704 |
| Phone (will be public information): $(512) 230-9867$ |  |  |
| Email (optional - will be public information): |  |  |

## Section 5: Agent Information

Agent Name: Nikelle Meade
Agent Mailing Address: Husch Blackwell LLP, 111 Congress Ave., Suite 1400
City: Austin
State: TX Zip: 78701
Phone (will be public information): (512) 992-6001
Email (optional - will be public information):

## Section 6: Additional Space (if applicable)

Please use the space below to provide additional information as needed. To ensure the information is referenced to the proper item, include the Section and Field names as well (continued on next page).

Nexus Series B, LLC
809 S Lamar Blvd, Suite D
Austin, TX 78704

## AGENT DESIGNATION LETTER

June 8, 2022

City of Austin
Board of Adjustment
P.O. Box 1088

Austin, Texas 78767
Re: Letter appointing agent regarding a variance application with the Board of Adjustment and any related matters for property located at 1401 E $3^{\text {rd }}$ Street, Travis County, Texas 78744 (the "Property")

## To Whom It May Concern:

The undersigned, as the owner of the above-referenced Property, hereby appoints Husch Blackwell LLP (Nikelle Meade), as agent in connection with filing a variance application with the Board of Adjustment and related matters with the City of Austin.

Nexus Series B, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company


## THE STATE OF TEXAS

§
§
COUNTY OF TRAVIS §
This instrument was acknowledged before me on the $\underline{q^{+3}}$ day of June, 2022, by Cortland Chalfant, Managing Member of Nexus Series B, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company, on behalf of said limited liability company.


Notary Public in and for the State of Texas
My Commission Expires:
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