

70

From: Nikelle Meade
To: Beaudet, Annick; greg.guernsey@ci.austin.tx.us
Date: 03/03/2005 02:26:13 PM
Subject: Re: FW: Dement Tract Zoning.

Greg and all:

First, Carl did not just find out "late Monday" that we did not agree to further postpone. The e-mail attached below (you will see) was sent to Carl at 11:30 a.m. Monday. - FYI

OHAN's recent meetings have only been for the purpose of preparing for the neighborhood planning process. To my knowledge, they are not in a position at this time nor do they desire to either make any zoning recommendations or oppose or support a rezoning based upon the area's future plan. They are just in the very beginning stages of the process. I am copying Bruce Perrin, President of OHAN, on this e-mail so that he may clarify if I have misstated the position of the Association.

Concerning the postponement to allow time for Carl to meet with OHAN, we do not see how this reason is justified. Valley View Homeowners Association is a member of OHAN. As you all know is the custom of Associations such as OHAN, in supporting or opposing zoning the Association typically will defer to its member organization most directly impacted by the property that is the subject of the request. Valley View Homeowners Association is the member of OHAN most directly affected by this zoning request, and Valley View has reviewed the case several times and has determined that it is opposed. I would be surprised if OHAN took a position to support this case in contrast to Valley View's position.

This case has been pending for a year. It has been pending before the Council since September. Carl has already requested postponement, to which Valley View Homeowners Association agreed to not object. The time has come to get it resolved. As you all know, I believe that postponements should be granted when there is cause. For instance, if the applicant were unable to attend the hearing (as was the reason for the applicant's previous request for postponement) or if negotiations between the parties were still pending a postponement would be appropriate. In this matter, neither is the case. The parties convened in good faith to discuss whether a compromise was possible and reached an impasse. Postponements cost all parties time and money, and there is no more to be accomplished if the case is postponed again.

For these reasons, we object to the request for additional postponement.

Nikelle S. Meade, Esq.
Brown McCarroll, L.L.P.
111 Congress Avenue, Suite 1400
Austin, TX 78701-4043
512.479.1147/Direct
512.479.1101/Fax
nmeade@mailbmc.com
www.brownmccarroll.com

BROWN MCCARROLL, L.L.P. EMAIL CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE

This email message and any attachments are for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and/or privileged information. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited and shall not constitute a waiver of any privilege or confidentiality associated herewith. If you are not the intended recipient, you may not disclose, print, copy or disseminate this information. If you received this message in error, please contact the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message and any attachments.