

EXHIBIT F

3215 Exposition Boulevard:
Neighborhood Stakeholder and
Property Owner Comments

DiGiuseppe, Paul

From: Steve Beuerlein [mailto:steve.beuerlein@cityofaustin.org]
Sent: Friday, June 25, 2010 6:45 PM
To: 'Powell, Mark'
Cc: mike@hamiltonterrire.com; 'Richard Weiss'; aliceglasco@mindspring.com; DiGiuseppe, Paul; 'Trevor Dickens'; 'Dave Sullivan'; dealey@herndontx.com; 'Catherine Kyle'; vwilson@austin.rr.com
Subject: RE: 3215 Exposition Blvd.

Mark,

Sorry for my tardy response to your well-considered reply below; I was unable to access e-mail communications. Clearly the Planning Commission agreed with your rationale not to postpone their consideration of the case and the CWA plan on the 22nd.

I regret that you are not interested in meeting with the Belmont Village Senior Living representatives, as I believe that this would be a desirable, compatible, and beneficial land-use for the site – especially since it is surrounded by a State mental healthcare facility. Please let know if your (and your fellow neighbors') position should change as I intend to continue negotiations with them. It seems to me that there are still differing opinions as to a reasonable land-use for the site, and some additional discussion with a knowledgeable, independent developer might be informative.

Respectfully,
Steve

From: Powell, Mark [mailto:mark.powell@cityofaustin.org]
Sent: Friday, June 18, 2010 2:19 PM
To: Steve Beuerlein
Cc: mike@hamiltonterrire.com; Richard Weiss; aliceglasco@mindspring.com; DiGiuseppe, Paul; Trevor Dickens; Dave Sullivan; dealey@herndontx.com; Catherine Kyle; vwilson@austin.rr.com
Subject: RE: 3215 Exposition Blvd.

Re: Your requests regarding (1) Expanded land use for Elm Terrace; and (2) Postponement

Steve,

While I am sure that such a project would be interesting to discuss, this stage of the NP process is not the appropriate time for such discussions. For nearly three years, the NH has repeatedly made its strong preference clearly known (SF-3), both during your previous zoning request (2007-08) and, more recently, during the NP process (2009-10). Now that the NP process is nearing completion, the time to discuss alternative proposals such as this has passed. At this late stage of the NP process, discussing a use for this property which would clearly require exceptional zoning is simply not productive. Furthermore, since SF-3 is the clear will of the NH, we, as the NH spokespeople, would need to discuss any alternative proposals with the NH in an appropriate forum before we could make a commitment to discuss any such alternative proposals with you.

The NP process needs to be completed in a timely manner and the FLUM and zoning designation for this specific piece of property should either (a) reflect the NH's strong preference for SF-3; or, (b) leave the property un-zoned. As you know, neither option prevents you from applying for a zoning change. You will still have full access to the normal zoning process during which you can present your case for whatever zoning you seek. Once the NP process is complete, we would be delighted to work with you (or a subsequent owner) on a project of which we can all be proud.

As recognized on Wednesday night, Elm Terrace is truly unique. Because it is surrounded by un-zoned property, the zoning designation for Elm Terrace will be precedent-setting. Given the uniqueness and importance of this decision, this property clearly deserves to be considered individually – and the appropriate place for these discussions to occur is during the normal zoning process. Meanwhile, the NP and FLUM should reflect the NH's strong preference for SF-3.

6/28/2010

Furthermore, they have expressed their willingness to meet with you, the West Austin Neighborhood Group, and any other interested stakeholders to discuss the details of their proposal. Please reply at your convenience regarding your interest/availability to entertain this possibility.

Second, in light of this development and the fact that I am unable to attend the June 22nd Planning Commission hearing on the property, I am requesting a postponement of its hearing until the Commission's next meeting (July 27th). I regret any inconvenience this may cause and thank you in advance for your kind consideration.
Very Respectfully,

Steve D. Beuerlein
Burlington Ventures, Inc.
801 W. 38th Street, #301
Austin, Texas 78705

Phone – (512) 472-3020
FAX – (512) 451-0025
Cell – (512) 413-3300

Confidentiality Note: The information contained in this message, and any attachments, may contain confidential and/or privileged material. It is intended solely for the person(s) or entity to which it is addressed. Any review, retransmission, dissemination, or taking of any action in reliance upon this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient(s) is prohibited. If you received this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from any computer.

To ensure compliance with IRS requirements, we inform you that any U.S. federal tax advice contained in this communication (including any attachments) is not intended or written to be used, and cannot be used, for the purpose of (i) avoiding penalties under the Internal Revenue Code or (ii) promoting, marketing or recommending to another party any transaction or matter addressed herein. Atlantic Trust does not provide legal advice, and the information contained herein should only be used in consultation with your legal, accounting and tax advisers.

DiGiuseppe, Paul

From: Maxcy Kuykendall [mailto:mkuykendall@gmail.com]

Sent: Friday, May 21, 2010 10:13 AM

To: DiGiuseppe, Paul

Subject: CWA Neighborhood Plan

I wanted to express my support for Elm Terrace. I was raised in Tarrytown and am a current resident of Tarrytown. To me, Exposition (and Enfield) are always going to be thoroughfares that are best suited for well planned, higher density projects, not single family residences. It is a certainty that when or if the State School is sold it will be a mixed use project. To have a well done MF project, Elm Terrace, as a buffer to the neighborhoods West of Exposition makes sense. Furthermore, as I approach my 50's I am beginning to wonder where I will be able to move within the neighborhood to liveout my life after children at home years.

I think the groups that have mobilized against this project are hipocrites that will talk a big talk about being green and wanting higher density so that we avoid urban sprawl, however they are guilty of having a "Not in my Neighborhood" mind set.

Shame on you all.

--

Maxcy Kuykendall

5/21/2010

DiGiuseppe, Paul

From: Catherine Kyle [mailto:ckyle@cityofaustin.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, May 25, 2010 5:25 PM
To: sully.jumpnet@sbcglobal.net; 'Danette Chimenti'; jay_reddy@dell.com; amdealey@aol.com; dave.anderson.07@gmail.com; clint_small@hotmail.com; bdeleon78@gmail.com; vskirk@att.net; kbtovo@earthlink.net; August W. Harris III
Cc: DiGiuseppe, Paul; Guernsey, Greg; Edwards, Sue; wang-board@westaustinng.com; mcmediate@msn.com
Subject: Re: PC-Central West Austin Combined Neighborhood Plan Hearing - May 25, 2010

Commissioners--

I am writing concerning the adoption of the FLUM and the zoning request at 3215 Exposition on tonight's agenda.

Through the neighborhood planning process, the neighborhood reached a consensus that the State School property should be identified as "Civic" in the FLUM, and it recommended SF-3 zoning for the tract at 3215 Exposition. To do otherwise would run contrary to the City's planning guidelines.

If and when the State School property is developed, the neighbors support stair-stepping density from the established residential neighborhoods and toward the northeast corner of the State School at 35th Street and MoPac. This approach is in keeping with general planning principles and Smart Growth.

- **Contrary to City's Land Use Policy Guides.** The City's own planning guidelines mandate that approved zoning complies with these standards:

Ensure that the decision will not create an arbitrary development planning (i.e. spot zoning)

Minimize development in environmentally sensitive areas

Promote goals which provide additional environmental protection

Ensure adequate transition between adjacent land uses and development intensities

Avoid creating undesirable precedents for other properties

Balance individual property rights with community interests and goals

Avoid over-zoning in areas that could not be supported by the existing or proposed street and utility network

The proposed zoning application complies with NONE of these guidelines.

- **Precedent.** The State is selling off its property, which means that the rest of the State School will follow. We must be concerned about the Brackenridge tract, which includes Lions. If multi-family zoning is approved on the State School property, it will be approved all along Exposition, with much higher density than is now proposed—this project is only the first step. Overall, this would mean much more density in west Austin, and certainly more than the infrastructure can accommodate.

- **Environmental.** The tract being developed sits on the headwaters of Taylor Slough, which runs through Tarrytown to Reed Park and empties into Lake Austin. Taylor Slough is in the Edwards Aquifer recharge zone. The developer was aware that the property is in an environmentally sensitive area when he purchased it. You may remember that Reed Park was closed down for nine months last year, repairing a sewer line that was dumping into Taylor Slough. We need to continue to protect Reed Park, Taylor Slough and Lake Austin, and increased multi-family zoning is not the way to do it.
- **Consistency.** All zoning along Exposition is SF-3 from Enfield to 35th St., with the exception of some commercial development.
- **Traffic.** Exposition is already a mess, and multi-family development means increased traffic throughout the neighborhood, especially on Pecos. That's already happening. Increased traffic creates hazards for pedestrians and cyclists.
- **Schools.** Casis Elementary is already at capacity—we've had to add portables for the last several years. Brykerwoods Elementary is over capacity.
- **Affordable Housing.** We *do* have affordable housing in west Austin, but this development *will not* achieve that end. Although the developer continues to change his estimate of the cost of the proposed units, the most recent number he quoted was \$300,000 for less than 1,000 square feet.

We want smart growth for our neighborhood. We expect developers to work with neighborhoods and respect precedent, creating projects which compliment established neighborhoods.

Thank you,

**Cathy Kyle
2700 Mountain Laurel Ln
Austin TX 78703**

PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENT FORM

File # C14-2010-0051
C14-2010-0052

Planning Commission Hearing Date: May 25, 2010

Comments: Please do NOT Re-zone tract 101.
I have lived right across the street from this
tract for 32 years. Apartments built in that
location will RUIN our street + neighborhood.

You may also send your written comments to the Planning and Development Review Department, P. O. Box 1088, Austin, TX 78767-8835. Attn: Paul DiGiuseppe

Name (please print) VIRGINIA A. HALL

Address 3404 Exposition Blvd.

☐ I am in favor
(Estoy de acuerdo)
☒ I object
(No estoy de acuerdo)

INFORMATION ON PUBLIC HEARINGS

The Planning and Development Review Department has filed an application for zoning/ rezoning to implement a neighborhood plan. This notice has been mailed to you because City Ordinance requires that all property owners, registered environmental or neighborhood organizations and utility service addresses located within 500 feet of a proposed development be notified that an application for development has been filed.

This request for zoning/rezoning will be reviewed and acted upon at two public hearings: First, before the Planning Commission and then before the City Council. After a public hearing, the Planning Commission reviews and evaluates City staff recommendation and public input and then sends its own recommendation on the zoning/rezoning request to the City Council. Meeting dates and locations are shown on this notice.

If you have any questions concerning this notice, please contact the City of Austin Planning and Development Review Department at the number shown on the first page. If you would like to express your support or opposition to this request, you may do so in several ways:

- ☐ by attending the Planning Commission hearing and conveying your concerns at that meeting
- ☐ by writing to the Planning Commission, using the form provided on the previous page
- ☐ by writing to the city contact, listed on the previous page

As a property owner or interested party within 500 feet, you are not required to attend these hearings, but if you do attend, you will be given an opportunity to speak FOR or AGAINST the change. Applicants and/or their agents are expected to attend.

You may also wish to contact any neighborhood or environmental organizations that have expressed an interest in cases affecting your neighborhood.

PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENT FORM

File # C14-2010-0051
C14-2010-0052

Planning Commission Hearing Date: May 25, 2010

Comments: I am against: Tract 101 TEAD Prop. ID 749984
11607 - 116071 - 116072 - 116073
Tract #102 TEAD Prop ID 116074 - 116075
Tract 107 - 108 - 109 - 110 - 111 - 112 - 113 - 114

AGAINST

You may also send your written comments to the Planning and Development Review Department, P. O. Box 1088, Austin, TX 78767-8835. Attn: Paul DiGiuseppe

Name (please print) Mrs. T. S. PAINTER (Dorothy B. PAINTER) ☐ I am in favor
(Estoy de acuerdo)
Address 3222 Tarryhollow Drive ☒ I object
Austin Texas 78703 (No estoy de acuerdo)

.....
INFORMATION ON PUBLIC HEARINGS

The Planning and Development Review Department has filed an application for zoning/ rezoning to implement a neighborhood plan. This notice has been mailed to you because City Ordinance requires that all property owners, registered environmental or neighborhood organizations and utility service addresses located within 500 feet of a proposed development be notified that an application for development has been filed.

This request for zoning/rezoning will be reviewed and acted upon at two public hearings: First, before the Planning Commission and then before the City Council. After a public hearing, the Planning Commission reviews and evaluates City staff recommendation and public input and then sends its own recommendation on the zoning/rezoning request to the City Council. Meeting dates and locations are shown on this notice.

If you have any questions concerning this notice, please contact the City of Austin Planning and Development Review Department at the number shown on the first page. If you would like to express your support or opposition to this request, you may do so in several ways:

- ☐ by attending the Planning Commission hearing and conveying your concerns at that meeting
- ☐ by writing to the Planning Commission, using the form provided on the previous page
- ☐ by writing to the city contact, listed on the previous page

As a property owner or interested party within 500 feet, you are not required to attend these hearings, but if you do attend, you will be given an opportunity to speak FOR or AGAINST the change. Applicants and/or their agents are expected to attend.

You may also wish to contact any neighborhood or environmental organizations that have expressed an interest in cases affecting your neighborhood.