

**Kristine Scherer**

---

**From:** Joseph Joyner <josephejoyner@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 3, 2023 2:08 AM  
**To:** Kristine Scherer  
**Subject:** YES to Sucette Harbor

Dear Ms. Scherer,

As the City Council Clerk, I wanted you to have a copy of the email I sent each member on the City Council.

Dear Council Member,

I wish I could be at Wednesday's meeting on Sucette Harbor but out of town business won't allow me. I wrote a wordy missive to the Council last week voicing my firm support of the project. I mentioned that I have lived in one of the end units of Tops L Condominiums, [REDACTED] for 30+ years. I am a 40+ year resident of Mandeville. As pointed out in that email, I will be one of the residents most affected by the development. I also mentioned that I would be losing a significant part of my treasured lake view. Still, I believe the benefits of Sucette Harbor are overwhelming. I am very concerned about the vocal minority taking over the hearings on Sucette Harbor. Please do not cave into this mob that are out to block anything and everything.

While everyone should have a voice, I don't think the people who show up at these meetings speak for the population at large. If my figures are correct, the population of Mandeville as of 2021 was 13,139. The population of St. Tammany Parish is 269,388. Does the voice of 20, 100, or even a 1,000 people represent the entire city? NO! They are at most only 1%. The Nays always make more noise than the Yays.

I question how many of these objectors have ever walked the Sucette property or if they are even aware how much the area has deteriorated since Katrina. The marina portion of the development has been my front yard for 30 years. I think I have a pretty good insight on what is needed on that piece of ground and what it can do for all of Mariner's Village and the City of Mandeville. We are lucky to have so many things come together to make this development even possible. There is not much that I would be willing to give up a significant portion of my view for, but the benefits of Sucette will significantly improve my lifestyle and quality of life. Just having the marina again will be such a nice asset as I enter my retirement years.

For those of us who moved here over 40+ years ago, most would say they wished Mandeville was like it was back then. It is not! 40 years of development has changed life here and created significant traffic. Sucette Harbor is a drop in the bucket compared to all the changes I have endured over those years. This is the one development that should be approved and will be a tremendous asset to the area and the City of Mandeville.

Frankly, I am very surprised at all the revisions Woodward has made. I did not think they were necessary but if that is what it took to get the Council's approval then great. It would be a

travesty if this project was turned down and I doubt I would live to see another one come along.

Most of the objectors won't even be impacted by the development, while I will likely be affected more than anyone. This development will become a big part of my retirement life. It is perfect in so many ways. Please vote on the merits of this property and not be bullied by the crowd at these meetings. Most don't have a clue on what this will do to revitalize an area that has been deteriorating ever since Katrina took out the marina. Just look at the eyesore that has become of the land surrounding the marina area. The erosion alone is jeopardizing the integrity of the Tops'l complex.

No one has lived at Tops'l as long as I have and I suspect few in Mariner's Village have. I can't stress enough how badly I want this proposal to become reality. It would be a dream come true for me.

Please do not make the same mistake the council did years ago when it voted down the Al Copleland, Sr. residential development. I think history bears out that was a major mistake. Sucette is the next best thing. I plead for you to vote YES for Sucette Harbor.

Thank you!

Joseph Joynes

709 Tops L Drive  
985 778-7269

## Kristine Scherer

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Saturday, July 1, 2023 2:53 PM  
**To:** Rick Danielson; Jason Zuckerman; Jill McGuire; Rebecca Bush; Skelly Kreller  
**Cc:** Clay Madden; Kristine Scherer  
**Subject:** Sucette Hearing July 5, 2023 Submission for inclusion in application record. Please read before July 5, 2023 meeting

Dear Council Members:

Although the complete tenor of the Developers change request email is demeaning and dismissive to all, this part sort of goes overboard:

Woodward is asking the Council: "If you are in agreement with the above changes, we will have our attorney work with the City's attorney to amend the ordinance. We will also include revisions requested on parcel D based on the discussions surrounding the marina services."

Isn't this premature (at the least); shouldn't the Council respond by saying; "We will review your proposed changes and we will let you know if you can amend your application for our consideration or require you to reapply"?

This intimidating stance and the "mantle" of LSU association helps explain how the Developer was able to roll over the Planning Commission proceedings without responding to the public's questions that might have unearthed many of the questions now surfacing in the Council review phase.

This also serves to remind Council of some of its unaddressed filed comments/questions that should be placed on the Council agenda for discussion and response. Among these are:

- When the Council "answer file" was updated just after the printing of answers before the June 20 meeting the question of project compatibility was supposedly added and addressed. Upon scrutiny it is an explanation of how the P&Z process SHOULD be undertaken. It does not claim that P&Z did or would do so. So, the question is still unanswered by PC and now falls to the Council.
- The public supplied 12-point CLURO analysis is the only valid such analysis existing in the Council's application files!
- Because the P&Z process failed to acknowledge or answer the nominal 50 pp of public filed comments, these have been placed in the Council files to answer; they must be addressed by Council before any decision other than rejection; especially relevant is the unchallenged claims of net revenue benefits to Mandeville from the project without any acknowledgement of concomitant costs.
- The existential threat to the residential nature of old Mandeville through the commercial rezoning and the height waiver must be evaluated. The most interested people in the outcome are future developers who would use this precedent over and over. This council would be responsible for the disastrous results to Old Mandeville if the requested Sucette Harbor zoning change were approved.

This does raise two process questions: Does the Council intend to address all written questions it has received; and, will it do so before taking a final vote on the project?

We appreciate the Council's diligent pursuit of public input before making this momentously important decision that will forever impact our City's future.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

## Kristine Scherer

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, July 3, 2023 10:33 AM  
**To:** Rick Danielson; Jason Zuckerman; Jill McGuire; Rebecca Bush; Skelly Kreller  
**Cc:** Kristine Scherer; Clay Madden  
**Subject:** Process questions regarding the Sucette Harbor application Proceedings before the Council

Dear Council Members;

TWO specific questions:

Will the council respond to all the public's questions it has received, including:

- 1) Those imbedded in the 50 or so pages of documents from the public that were filed during the P&Z hearings and never published or addressed then, but now are on the Council website under the Comments Section; and,
- 2) Those directed by the public to the Council that are imbedded along with public comments and published on the Council website under the Comments Section?

Will the Council answer these questions before making any final decision on the Sucette application?

Thank you for your diligence in vetting this important and momentous decision on the future of our town.

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED], LA

[REDACTED]

[Faint, illegible text, possibly bleed-through from the reverse side of the page]

[REDACTED]