

Kristine Scherer

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, July 8, 2023 4:52 PM
To: Kristine Scherer
Subject: Sucette Harbor / Ordinance 23 - 16

Dear Ms. Scherer,

For the record, the two emails below were sent to the five members of the City Council on May 20, 2023 and June 14, 2023, and responded to on these dates by Council Member McGuire.

Thank you for noting this.

Sincerely,

Mandeville, LA 70448

May 20, 2023

Subject: Sucette Harbor

Dear Council Members,

I was in attendance at the May 18 City Council Meeting and would like to thank you for your patience and civility throughout the evening.

In March I had attended a meeting where a spokesperson for Sucette Harbor gave a presentation at which we were told:

- 1) there would be no problem with water or drainage, though we already have a water problem on the land where the development would be;
- 2) there would be no traffic problem because the new residents would all be over 55, though the NIH states that 88% of men and 70% of women in their early 70s drive.

Regarding the latter point, I wondered if the presenter was simply misinformed or was trying to sell the city a bill of goods.

But what most struck me was the mockup of the development itself, whose structures seemed inappropriate for a site whose flood, wind, and heat factors, according to riskfactor.com, are 8, 9, and 10 respectively, numbers that seem unlikely to improve by pouring more concrete on land beside a Gulf Coast estuary.

Could such a development, in either the short or long term, truly be beneficial for our city?

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]
Mandeville, LA 70448

June 14, 2023

Subject: Ordinance 23-16

Dear Council Members:

Regarding changing the site from Residential to Mixed Use, please consider that, according to estimates by the National Weather Service, **heat has been the single largest contributor to weather-related deaths over the last 30 years.**

Bringing in more cars, cutting down more than one large grove of trees, and concreting the land for parking lots and building foundations will only increase the temperatures in an area that, according to riskfactor.com, already has a heat factor of 10.

Also, the land on the site is flood prone, contains sinkholes, and suffers from erosion and subsidence, conditions that the planned development will only exacerbate.

I can think of many other reasons not to zone for commercial use or build a large residential building on wetlands beside a Gulf Coast estuary, especially in this century and climate, but I can think of only one reason to do so.

Thank you for your attention to this matter and for your service to Mandeville and its residents.
Sincerely,

[REDACTED]
Mandeville, LA 70448

Kristine Scherer

From: _____
Sent: Tuesday, July 11, 2023 2:27 PM
To: Rick Danielson; Jill McGuire; Jason Zuckerman; Rebecca Bush; Skelly Kreller
Cc: Kristine Scherer; Clay Madden
Subject: FW: Sucette Harbor-LSU Mariners Village Property Plans Additional (#5) Comments of _____ for inclusion in Planning Committee
Zoning Change Application Record

Dear Council Members;

Reproduced below is just one of the submittals to P&Z during its hearing phase on Sucette (of the 50 or so which are now included in your website for response since they were filed, and not published, much less answered then) that is indicative of the concerns about the deference being shown by the PC to the developer. There were virtually no independent evaluations. The answers to most of the PC's own questions came almost solely from the developer. But, the fact that there was no identifiable CLURO 4.3.3.8 evaluation is a serious deficiency that threatens the whole process.

You are now trying to build your review process on a shaky foundation at best. And if you follow the PC lead and leave unreviewed and unanswered as many questions and comments as they did, any decision, either for or against, will be vulnerable to appeal. Before, you proceed further you may want to engage an independent consultant to review the PC process for deficiencies, use another to correct them, and then use one or both to do a thorough analysis of the CLURO 4.3.3.8. criteria for the proposed project to determine if it is even possible for it to pass the hurdles contained therein. And all of this should be based on what the Developer states is his version of a final application submittal plan. That is the only way you can get something that you can legitimately act upon and on which to put any conditions if there were a positive decision. If the 4.3.3.8 supports a negative decision, then you will save both the Council and the Developer from wasting each other's time.

Finally, there is the basic question of the zoning question itself. The Zoning Change from Residential to Commercial and the Commercial use attributes were synthetically combined and encased in the single Multi-use ordinance but in reality are two distinct Zoning decisions. It is only structured as a "double entry" because the Zoning regulations of Mandeville does not forbid it. This may be another favorable deference to the developer, whether intentional or not, because if the first decision to go from Residential to Commercial were a stand-alone and made first, there would probably be no necessity to make a second one about the Commercial physical use arrangements and operations because changing from Residential to Commercial zone in the middle of other Residential zones per CLURO's 4.3.3.8 is an almost impossible obstacle to be overcome.

Please consider these thoughts as you move forward in this process.

Thank you for your diligence in pursuing what is likely the most significant of your service to the City.

Sincerely,

†

Mandeville, LA
klgrund@sbcglobal.net

From: Alex Weiner <aweiner@cityofmandeville.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 7, 2023 5:04 PM

To _____
Subject: RE: LSU Mariners Village Property Plans Additional (#5) Comments of _____
70448, for inclusion in Planning Committee Zoning Change Application Record

Lawrence,
Thank you for your comments. They will be distributed to the commission.

Alex Weiner, CFM
Planning Secretary
Department of Planning & Development
City of Mandeville
3101 E. Causeway Approach
Mandeville, LA 70448
(985) 624-3103

Permit applications and other applications are available on the website under the Planning Department page and can be emailed to permits@cityofmandeville.com.

From: _____
Sent: Tuesday, March 7, 2023 4:04 PM
To: Alex Weiner <aweiner@cityofmandeville.com>
Subject: LSU Mariners Village Property Plans Additional (#5) Comments of _____
70448, for inclusion in Planning Committee Zoning Change Application Record

Dear Alex;
As mentioned in previous submittal (#4) I did not get adequate notice of the Feb 13 meeting on this subject and could not attend. But I have reviewed the videoed session in full and have some additional comments/concerns that should be addressed.

- 1) There seems to be "creeping flexibility" into the plans that are not documented; among them are the possibility of changing to a family living if things don't work out with just 55+ occupancy, flexibility of restaurant hours and a few others casually referred to. All of these impact the decisions the PC will make based on the application submitted how are these "flexibilities" abated or how are impacts on decision assumptions accommodated to reflect the resultant impacts?
- 2) Assumptions that were made in the original submittal about situations that are still unaccepted to try to reduce code restrictions and limitations become the basis of follow on studies such as traffic. For instance, the parking for 1.5 vehicles/housing unit variance is not an accepted assumption, but the number of vehicles affects traffic (as does the nature of the rental units).
- 3) There is constant references to no children/young children, but some of the discussions undermine that precondition, including the fact that the developer has stated his intent to rebuild the beach that is most likely to become (whether intended or not) the most attractive in Mandeville. This issue has yet to be addressed in parking capacity, traffic or in the questions it opens about the ongoing responsibility for all of these public facilities on private property. When I say "responsible" I mean it in all senses of the word: maintenance, compliance with restrictions, security, etc.
- 4) In closing the last meeting, the Chairman noted there may be only a few more meetings. I, along with many others, are hoping the questions asked over all the meetings will be correlated and answered because few have been.

Thank you for your assistance in making these and my previous comments made known to the Planning Staff Director and the Commissioners.

530-680-7121