

H/

CITY OF AUSTIN
Board of Adjustment - Interpretation
Decision Sheet

DATE: Monday, November 14, 2016

CASE NUMBER: C15-2015-0147

☐ Y ☐ Brooke Bailey
☐ Y ☐ Michael Benaglio
☐ Y ☐ William Burkhardt
☐ Y ☐ Eric Goff
☐ Y ☐ Melissa Hawthorne
☐ Y ☐ Bryan King
☐ Y ☐ Don Leighton-Burwell
☐ - ☐ Rahm McDaniel OUT
☐ Y ☐ Melissa Neslund
☐ Y ☐ James Valadez
☐ - ☐ Michael Von Ohlen OUT
☐ Y ☐ Kelly Blume (Alternate)

APPELLANT: Robert Kleeman
ADDRESS: 8901 SH 71


VARIANCE REQUESTED: The appellant has filed an appeal challenging a Land Use Determination and related development approvals made in connection with the approval of an outdoor amphitheater located at LifeAustin Church, 8901 West State Highway 71, including decisions to classify the use as "religious assembly" and to subsequently approve Site Plan No. SP-2011-0185C, an associated restrictive covenant, and a building permit. The appellant disagrees that, among other things, the Land Use Determination and related development approvals incorrectly treat various outdoor activities held at educational and religious assembly facilities as part of the principal use rather than as temporary activities subject to City Code Section 25-2-921(C) in an "RR-NP", Rural Residential – Neighborhood Plan zoning district. (West Oak Hill)

BOARD'S DECISION: November 9, 2015 POSTPONED TO A SPECIAL CALLED MEETING DECEMBER 9, 2015, CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS AT 7:00PM BY BOARD MEMBER ERIC GOFF, MELISSA HAWTHORNE SECOND ON A 9-0 VOTE: PP TO DEC 9, 2015; Dec 9, 2015 pp to Feb 8, 2016; FEB 8TH, 2016- REQUESTING POSTPONEMENT TO APRIL 11, 2016; APRIL 11, 2016 POSTPONED TO JUNE 13, 2016; JUNE 13, 2016 POSTPONED TO JULY 11, 2016 BY APPLICANT; July 11, 2016 POSTPONED TO AUGUST 8, 2016 BY APPLICANT; BOARD WILL NOT ENTERTAIN ADDITIONAL POSTPONEMENTS BEYOND AUGUST 8, 2016; AUG 8, 2016 POSTPONED TO SEPTEMBER 28, 2016 BY APPLICANT; Sept 28, 2016 POSTPONED TO November 14, 2016 BY APPLICANT; Sept 28, 2016 POSTPONED TO November 14, 2016 BY APPLICANT; Nov 14, 2016 POSTPONED TO DECEMBER 12, 2016 BY APPLICANT

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

H1
2

