1401 E. $3^{\text {rd }}$ St.
Case \#C15-2020-0020
Reconsideration Hearing
July 13, 2020

1. Summary of project timeline

January 9, 2017 Original survey issued (see Exhibit "A")
April 12, 2017
December 7, 2017
Original application for permit including affidavit (see Exhibit " $B$ ")
Plan review approved-case \#2017-043148 PR
(see Exhibit "C")
December 8, 2017 Permit issued—permit \#2017-152673 PR
January 3, 2018 Form survey issued (see Exhibit "D")
January 19, 2018 Layout inspection passed by City-inspection \#101
January 24, 2019 Development Services Department informed by District 3 Planning Commissioner of potential discrepancy
March 1, $2018 \quad$ Specific residential reviewers in charge of approval informed by District 3 Planning Commissioner of potential discrepancy
March 2, 2018 Residential review in charge of approval responded to Planning Commissioner
June 13, 2018 Post-permit revision approved (see Exhibit "E")
February 3, 2020 New survey issued (see Exhibit "F")
May 11, 2020
$1^{\text {st }}$ hearing for variance request-postponed
May 21, 2020 New drawings issued showing proposed modifications (see Exhibit "G")
June 8, $2020 \quad 2^{\text {nd }}$ hearing for variance request—denied
July 13, 2020 Reconsideration hearing

## 2. Rationales for reconsideration

A. In the previous meeting, it was questioned whether the project was legally approved. The previous agent mistakenly called the project a duplex. A duplex is not allowed on a lot this small or this narrow. The project was intended to be a single-family residence with an attached accessory apartment, as allowed by the zoning code in section 25-2-901. This section of code does not state a minimum lot size or dimension:

```
\S 25-2-901 - ACCESSORY APARTMENTS.
% 日 図 ■ con
```

(A) An accessory apartment is a separate dwelling unit that is contained within the principal structure of a single-family residence, and that is occupied by at least one person who is 60 years of age or older or physically disabled.
(B) If space within a principal structure is converted to an accessory apartment, the accessory apartment may not include:
(1) converted garage space; or
(2) a new entrance visible from a street.
(C) The building official may not issue a building permit for construction or remodeling of an accessory apartment unless the applicant delivers to the building official an affidavit verifying that one of the proposed occupants of the accessory apartment is 60 years of age or older or physically disabled.

Source: Sections 13-2-1 and 13-2-251; Ord. 990225-70; Ord. 031120-44; Ord. 031211-11.

An affidavit was submitted stating that the owner (over the age of 60) intended to occupy the accessory apartment (Exhibit "B"):
01 March 2017

My name is Jeffrey Blatt and I hereby affirm the following:
1.) The entity "Durham Trading Partners XII, LLC" is an entity of which 1 am a managing member [director].
2.) The aforementioned enity owns the property at 1401 East $3^{\text {® }}$ Street in Austin, Texas.
3.) The approved agent of the aforementioned entity is submitting an application to construct a primary residence with an accessory-apartment use as permitted by the City of Austin's Land Development Code (reference section 25-2-901).
4.) I am over sixty (60) years of age
5.) It is my intention to reside in the accessory apartment to be constructed on this property.

So affirmed,


Signed and sworn before me this day, the 2 of Marit1, 2017.
Eim Finmen

Notary Public
State of Texas


Exhibit " $B$ " was not presented in the previous two hearings.

As well, the local Planning Commissioner questioned whether the project was legally approved due to the fact that he thought the building was too close to the east property line. The approved plans appeared to show that the building was too close to the east property line but it was only the eave, not the wall, that was approved to be within 5 feet of the east property line:
B. As was said in the previous two meetings, the reason that the structure as-built is only 2.80 feet from the east property line, is due to a surveying error. The original survey (Exhibit " $A$ ") indicated that the neighbor's fence was the eastern property line:


Exhibit " $A$ " was not presented in the previous two hearings.

When the surveyor returned to do the form survey, they felt they had reason to believe that the original survey was incorrect, and that the neighbor's fence was actually on 1401's property (as shown on Exhibit "D"):


Exhibit "D" was not presented in the previous two hearings.
Thus the contractor, owner, and City inspectors all had reason to believe that the position of the building in relation to the east property line was correct, and thus the layout survey was approved, and thus construction continued.

It was only when the surveyor returned to the site to do the final survey, that they found that the structure is too close to the eastern property line (Exhibit "F"):

3. Proposed modifications to alleviate the neighbor's legitimate concerns about fire/life safety (not elaborated upon in $2^{\text {nd }}$ hearing):

- The entire building will be fire-sprinklered
- Windows and doors will be removed from the portion of building that is less than 3 feet from east property line (as is required by the building code for walls less than 3 feet from property lines)
- The portion of exterior wall that is less than 3 feet from east property line will be retrofitted to be 1-hour fire-rated from both inside and outside (as is required by the building code for walls less than 3 feet from property lines)
- All of the above will be submitted to the Development Services Department for review and approval prior to any resumption of construction

4. Conclusion
A. This project was legally approved.
B. This variance request is not the result of negligence nor is it the result of intentional encroachment in a side setback. The general vicinity is known for discrepancies in surveying and the surveyor made an honest mistake. Because that mistake was made in the form survey stage, everyone involved in approving the location of the building understandably thought that the building had been laid out correctly, and construction continued. The surveying mistake was not discovered until the final survey was done. Again, it was an honest mistake.
C. Had the project been laid out according to the original survey, and had the project been built as approved, it would have had virtually the same visual and spatial relationship to the neighbor's property as it does now.
D. The proposed actions to alleviate the neighbor's legitimate concerns about fire/life safety will be complex and expensive but we understand that they are required by the building code and we are more than willing and able to take them.


My name is Jeffrey Blatt and I hereby affirm the following:
1.) The entity "Durham Trading Partners XII, LLC" is an entity of which I am a managing member [director].
2.) The aforementioned entity owns the property at 1401 East $3^{\text {rd }}$ Street in Austin, Texas.
3.) The approved agent of the aforementioned entity is submitting an application to construct a primary residence with an accessory-apartment use as permitted by the City of Austin's Land Development Code (reference section 25-2-901).
4.) I am over sixty (60) years of age.
5.) It is my intention to reside in the accessory apartment to be constructed on this property.

So affirmed,


Signed and sworn before me this day, the $\qquad$ Marcella, 2017. Bin Firms

Notary Public State of Texas
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## REFER TO SHEET A001 FOR PROJECT INFORMATION AND AREA CALCULATIONS
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CRITCAL ROOT ZONES AT PROTECTED TREES
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1) Elevation, Bldg 1, Front

| 01 | New standing-seam metal | 06 | New 3-coat Portland-cement |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 02 | $\xrightarrow{\text { roor }}$ New 30-year compositum |  | comeric. |
|  | shingle roof | 07 | New $3.55^{\text {".thick stone }}$ |
| 03 | New horizontally-oriented cement-board siding | 08 | veneer, random-ashlar bond New brick masonry veneer, |
|  |  |  |  |
| 04 | cement-board siding. | 09 | 6 " |
| 05 | New vertically-oriented | 10 | porch or |


|  |  | SEAL OF ARCHITECT. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| New parapet at exterior porch or deck. Minimum height 36 above finish floor. |  | - |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  | 家 |
|  |  |  |
|  |  | ISSUE date |
|  |  | $\mathrm{CH}^{2}{ }^{4}$ |
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## [APPLICANT EXHIBIT "D"]




A structure may not extend beyond a setback plane..except
for gables or a shed root with a total horizontal lineght of not
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(1) Elevation, Bldg 1, Front
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[APPLICANT EXHIBIT "G"]

THIS SHEET IS FOR DEPICTION OF AS-BUILT SITE CONDITIONS ONLY. REFER TO SHEETS A101 AND A102 FOR EXTENTS OF RATED EXTERIOR WALLS
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REFER TO SHEET GO01 FOR PROJECT INFORMATION AND AREA CALCULATIONS. CONDITIONS DERIVED FROM CAD FILE OF SURVEY PROVIDED TO ARCHITECT


1 Site Plan



## [APPLICANT EXHIBIT "G"]



1 Floor Plan, Bldg 1, Level 01


## [APPLICANT EXHIBIT "G"]



1 Floor Plan, Bldg 1, Level 02




## [APPLICANT EXHIBIT "G"]



1 Elevation, Bldg 1, Front

|  | ED NOTES | CODE REFERENCES (City of Austin RDCS area only). |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 01020304 | New metal coping. Exposure | LDC TTLLE 25, CHAPTER |
|  | New metal flas | shed |
|  |  | side |
|  | porch ordeck. Minim | ARCHITECT'S Note no Provisions for "Habitablity of space" |
|  | height 36 " above finis | ARE MADE |
|  |  | IEAMYENCOSEDSPACEENDER TESHLED ROOFMAY |
|  | or deck. M finish floor | LD |
|  | New |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 06 \\ & 07 \end{aligned}$ | New meata downspout |  |
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1 Elevation, Bldg 1, Right

| KEYED NOTES. | CODE REEREENCES (City of Austin RDCS area only) |
| :---: | :---: |
| 01 | LDC |
| $06^{\prime \prime \prime}$ New metal tasting Exposure |  |
| New metal <br> 6" minim | shed roof, with a total horizontal length of not more than 18 feet on each side of the building, measured along the intersection with the setback |
| New mear raing at | ARCHIECT'S Note: no provisions for "Habitablut |
| height 36 |  |
| anin $3.5{ }^{\text {a }}$ | IE: ANY ENCLOSED SPACE UNDER THE SHED ROOF MAY PROTRU |
|  |  |
| frishtilior. | LD |
| 05 New throus | Heig |
| (1) |  |






1 Elevation, Bldg 1, Left

|  | Notes. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 01 | New metal coping. Exposure |
| 02 | New metal flashing Ex |
|  |  |
| ${ }^{0}$ | Nev |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  | Maximum opening $3.5{ }^{\text {" }}$. |
| 04 | N |
|  | or |
|  | New through-wa |
|  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 06 \\ & 07 \end{aligned}$ | Steel column (ref: structura). |
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