### Heldenfels, Leane

C15-2015-0168

EZ-

From:

Robert Kleeman

Sent:

Thursday, March 24, 2016 1:38 PM

To: Subject: Heldenfels, Leane; Steve Metcalfe (SMetcalfe@mwswtexas.com)

FW: C15-2015-0147 and C15-2015-0168; Agreed Request for Two Month Postponement

#### Leane:

As you know, I represent the appellants, Covered Bridge POA and Hill Country Estates HOA, in the following interpretation appeals: C15-2015-0147 and C15-2015-0168. Steve Metcalfe, who is copied on this email, represents Life Austin, the landowner in these two appeals.

The three parties are actively engaged in discussions to find a mutually agreeable resolution to the present disputes.

As documented by Steve Metcalfe's email in the string below, Covered Bridge POA, Hill Country Estates HOA, and Life Austin are making a joint request to the Austin Board of Adjustment for a two month postponement to allow the parties additional time to work on reaching an agreement. The requested postponement would place the two cases on the agenda for the June 2016 meeting of the Austin Board of Adjustment.

Please let me know if there are any questions.

Robert Kleeman Sneed, Vine & Perry, P.C. 900 Congress Avenue, Suite 300 Austin, Texas 78701 (512) 476-6955 – main (512) 494-3135 - direct (512) 476-1825 – fax

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

This communication may be protected by the attorney/client privilege and may contain confidential information intended only for the person to whom it is addressed. If it has been sent to you in error, please reply to the sender that you have received the message in error and delete this message. If you are not the intended recipient, any dissemination, distribution, copying or other reproduction of this message is strictly prohibited.

## 見る

### CITY OF AUSTIN Board of Adjustment/Sign Review Board Decision Sheet

Decision offeet		
DATE: Monday, February 8, 2015	CASE NUMBER: C15-2015-0168	
Brooke Bailey Michael Benaglio William Burkhardt Eric Goff Melissa Hawthorne Don Leighton-Burwell Rahm McDaniel Melissa Neslund James Valadez Michael Von Ohlen Kelly Blume (Alternate)		
APPELLANT: Robert Kleeman		
ADDRESS: 8901 SH 71		
VARIANCE REQUESTED: The appellant has requested that the Board of Adjustment interpret whether staff erred in making an administrative decision to approve site plan correction number 12 to the current site plan of this property (SP-2011-185C (R1)), thereby authorizing construction of a disc golf course and outdoor dog park at this church facility in a "RR-NP", Rural Residential – Neighborhood Plan zoning district. (West Oak Hill)		
BOARD'S DECISION: POSTPONED TO FEBRUAR PROPERTY OWNER; FEB 8, 2016 POSTPONED TO	· ·	
<ul><li>FINDING:</li><li>1. There is a reasonable doubt of difference of interp the regulations or map in that:</li><li>2. An appeal of use provisions could clearly permit a</li></ul>		

uses enumerated for the various zones and with the objectives of the zone in

3. The interpretation will not grant a special privilege to one property inconsistent with

Leane Heldenfels Executive Liaison

question because:

other properties or uses similarly situated in that

William Burkhardt

Chairman

# 吗多

### CITY OF AUSTIN Board of Adjustment/Sign Review Board Decision Sheet

DATE: Monday, December 14, 2015	CASE NUMBER: C15-2015-0168	
Brooke Bailey Michael Benaglio William Burkhardt Eric Goff Melissa Hawthorne Don Leighton-Burwell Melissa Neslund James Valadez Michael Von Ohlen Kelly Blume (Alternate) Rahm McDaniel (Alternate)		
APPELLANT: Robert Kleeman		
ADDRESS: 8901 SH 71		
VARIANCE REQUESTED: The appellant has requested that the Board of		

VARIANCE REQUESTED: The appellant has requested that the Board of Adjustment interpret whether staff erred in making an administrative decision to approve site plan correction number 12 to the current site plan of this property (SP-2011-185C (R1)), thereby authorizing construction of a disc golf course and outdoor dog park at this church facility in a "RR-NP", Rural Residential – Neighborhood Plan zoning district. (West Oak Hill)

**BOARD'S DECISION:** POSTPONED TO FEBRUARY 8, 2016 PER APPLICANT AND PROPERTY OWNER

#### 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:

Leane Heldenfels Executive Liaison

William Burkhardt Chairman

