

Kristine Scherer

From: William Hoffman <whoffman@woodward-interests.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 27, 2023 1:28 PM
To: Rick Danielson; Jason Zuckerman; Jill McGuire; Rebecca Bush; Councilmember Kreller
Cc: Kristine Scherer
Subject: Response to E-mail Read from K. Vaughan Sollberger

Councilmembers,

During the June 20th special meeting on Sucette Harbor, an e-mail written by a Mr. Sollberger was read into the record that we believe made several misinformed statements. Unfortunately, much of what was inaccurate has also made its way into various media accounts of the special meeting, which of course, seems to be the intent of those comments. I would like to address each of those statements to clarify and set the record straight.

1. "Simply put, the black outline of the proposed buildings in Sucette are bigger than Rouse's, Winn Dixie, Aquistapace's and all of the surrounding retail in that commercial area just to the north, and these are two major shopping centers and all on our highways, not streets."
 - a. This type of comparison has limited value, in addition to the fact that it is simply incorrect (see following chart). Rouse's, Winn Dixie, and Aquistapace's are commercial shopping centers with land uses that are more intense than those found in a mixed-use community, such as Sucette Harbor. Nonetheless, comparing solely the building footprints or "black outlines" of the buildings confirms that Sucette Harbor's proposed five (5) buildings are smaller than the combined building footprints of Rouse's, Winn Dixie, Aquistapace's, and the commercial retail space in close proximity to the stores. Below is a side-by-side comparison of the aforementioned shopping center complexes and Sucette Harbor. Notably, the footprints of the buildings at Sucette Harbor cover 23.04% of Parcel D while the footprints of the buildings at the shopping centers cover 24.84% of the subject land. In addition, Sucette Harbor has 33.65% of its site as green space while the shopping centers have less than 10% green space. For a full comparison, please see below.
 - b. Sucette Harbor is served by a *boulevard*, not a *street*. Specifically, Sucette Harbor is accessed by Mariners Boulevard. This boulevard is capable of conveying more traffic than a two-way street, such as Monroe Street. This is not the same for the shopping centers. For the shopping centers, traffic turns off East Causeway Approach to access the shopping centers. This makes sense as Supermarkets generate significantly more traffic than a development like Sucette Harbor. It is estimated that the shopping centers referenced have 5 to 6 times more weekday daily trips than Sucette Harbor will have.

At the shopping centers, there is limited green space due to parking, and the sites are highly visible to the public from all directions. Again, the site plans for Sucette Harbor are completely different than those of the shopping centers. Unlike the shopping centers, Sucette Harbor will *not* be visible from 99% of the surrounding streets or boulevard or highways. Intentionally or otherwise, comparisons of the shopping centers with a mixed-use community, such as Sucette Harbor, are disingenuous and misleading.

	<u>Parcel D</u>	<u>Winn Dixie, Acquistapace's Rouse's</u>	
Total Square Feet on Site	653,879	754,912	
Total Square Feet Covered by Buildings	150,647	187,495	
Percent of Site Covered by Buildings	23.04%	24.84%	-1.80%
Total Parking Spaces per CLURO	625	825 - 917	
Total Parking Spaces Provided on Site(s)	589	696	
Parking Spaces Provided as % of CLURO	94.24%	84.36% - 75.90%	
Total Uncovered Parking Provided on Site	369	696	
Uncovered Parking Spaces Per Acre of Land	24.58	40.16	
Percent of Greenspace on Site	33.65%	< 10.00%	**
* Rouses & Acquistapace Measurements taken off St. Tammany's Assessor's Office Website			
** By locating parking under the buildings, we are able to provide more greenspace			

2. "Their plat is exactly two of the city blocks in Old Mandeville, and Sucette proposes 4 separate different major uses that will be concurrent, possibly on a daily basis on the property. Compiling average to above-average occupancy rates and including employees, the site is proposing to have 750-900 humans on the 15-acre peninsula, which is well over 50 people per acre! Mandeville generally supports about 10 people per acre throughout town with the exception of commercial centers and major shopping centers."
 - a. This is another comparison that has limited value. Comparing the theoretical number of individuals in an area zoned residential to the number of hypothetical individuals in an area zoned planned district is not often done in land use planning. It would be more accurate to compare Sucette Harbor to other mixed use or planned district developments. Likewise, areas zoned for single family use, such as the majority of the land area in Old Mandeville, can be compared to other areas zoned for single family use such as New or Old Golden Shores. Simply stated, apartments, condominiums, and mixed-use developments frequently co-exist in towns across the country with subdivisions and areas zoned for single family use. Further, as Mr. Sollberger is well aware, the location of Sucette Harbor is *not* in Old Mandeville or in an area zoned for single family residential use, such a New or Old Golden Shores. Further still, Sucette Harbor is not in the limited land area of the Historic Preservation District. In fact, as you have heard me say publicly several times, the proposed Sucette Harbor would *not* be appropriate in the historic district of Mandeville. Again, this is an invalid comparison, which I believe Mr. Sollberger knows as he ends his sentence as follows: "with the exception of commercial centers and major shopping centers".
3. "The traffic study states it will add only 9 cars to the Monroe Street morning study, and this cannot be considered an acceptable answer when we all know this would be 10 times that just in the mornings alone."
 - a. This is an example of a calculated misrepresentation concerning the traffic study. Mr. Sollberger's opinion is inaccurate. The City Engineer reviewed the conclusions of the traffic study and agreed with the subject conclusions. As an architect, Mr. Sollberger is not qualified to dispute the findings of the traffic study. His opinion is based on a personal belief. Again, the traffic study, done in accordance with City requirements, states that traffic levels are projected to increase by 9 vehicles every 15 minutes during the AM peak traffic hours. I would strongly suggest that you, as a Council, ask Mr. Sollberger to please send you and us, the developers, the traffic study report that states that the Urban System's study "cannot be considered an acceptable answer when we all know this would be 10 times that just in the morning alone."
4. "Our analysis is that this is clearly not compatible with Mandeville both on horizontal and vertical density (also to be the tallest buildings in town)."

- a. Mr. Sollberger has again rendered an opinion, as opposed to an “analysis” of the project. He has no density calculations to support his position. He is rendering an opinion on compatibility. However, he fails to recognize that the proposed Sucette Harbor project is zoned as a planned district and is adjacent to other buildings in a planned district. Sucette Harbor is bordered on three sides with either water or green space. In short, we strongly disagree with the writer’s opinion. Horizontal density is calculated in accordance with the City’s CLURO, not based on the opinion of an individual. The Sucette Harbor project is in compliance with the CLURO on density. The vertical density is also in scale with the surrounding buildings and trees in the planned development of Mariners Village. You will not be able to see any of the buildings from Monroe Street or the Historic Preservation District of Mandeville. This fact is beyond dispute.
5. “Sucette, as currently proposed, would fit in a more urban setting well, such as Slidell, Metairie, New Orleans, or other areas that have the infrastructure to support it.”
 - a. The City’s Comprehensive Plan outlines that a mixed-use development or a planned district development is appropriate for the subject fifteen (15) acre site. Additionally, the surrounding infrastructure, including water and sewerage, has been designed to handle a mixed-used development such as Sucette Harbor. Again, Mr. Sollberger’s opinion is not based on an analysis of the surrounding land uses or the Comprehensive Plan. Notably, the subject site was historically used in an intense, commercial manner. Hence, Mr. Sollberger’s conclusion that the project does not “fit” in Mandeville is unsupported. Further, the proposed site is surrounded by other condominiums, apartments, and commercial uses. Mandeville has urban uses similar to Madisonville, Covington and Abita Springs. Each of these towns have residential areas, mixed use areas, and commercial areas. In short, the Sucette Harbor project is an ideal project to support the overall land uses in Mandeville, especially since the site is near the Causeway and the proposed hotel and marina would be easily accessible. The proposed project is not located in Old Mandeville.
 6. “See our attached diagrammatic studies that are to scale for reference, some in JPG and PDF formats.”
 - a. Again, we request a copy of the diagrammatic studies referenced. The e-mail we received from the City Council only has maps of the area with some overlays, but no studies with supporting data to substantiate the opinions of Mr. Sollberger.

We respect the fact that individuals will have different opinions, and that is what this e-mail represents. It is the opinion of this individual and not a professional third-party assessment of Sucette Harbor based on any professional standards.

As appropriate, I will be happy to address these issues at the next Council meeting on the Sucette Harbor Project.

Regards,

Bill

William D. "Bill" Hoffman
President
Woodward Interests, LLC
1000 S. Norman C Francis Pkwy
New Orleans, LA 70125
Office Direct - 504-826-1150
Cell - 504-259-3600

Kristine Scherer

From: Ellen O'Connell <ellenoconnell328@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 26, 2023 3:08 PM
To: Clay Madden
Cc: Kristine Scherer
Subject: SUCETTE HARBOR QUESTION/SENT TO COUNCIL

Clay,

1.) Attorney Larry Grundman stated on June 20, 2023, that the Sucette Harbor Project needs to go back to P & Z.

I agree.

Will you send it back?

2.) With 50 Mariners Village residents signing opposition that was sent to the council, why did Bill Hoffman, in a news video, say that it was 10+ people opposing?

Sincerely,

Ellen O'Connell

Mariners Village Property Owner

Mandeville Resident

985.789.4024

Kristine Scherer

From: Steve Lee <steemudbug@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, June 25, 2023 4:15 PM
To: Kristine Scherer
Subject: Fwd: Please Deny Sucette Harbor

Ms Scherer:

Per your online request, please find correspondence sent to Councilman Kreller on May 25.

Thank you.

James Lee

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Steve Lee <steemudbug@gmail.com>
Date: Thu, May 25, 2023 at 3:29 PM
Subject: Please Deny Sucette Harbor
To: <skreller@cityofmandeville.com>

Councilman Kreller:

In regards to the consideration of allowing Sucette Harbor to proceed, I respectfully but strongly urge you to vote against the development. As a nearby resident, I attended a number of the P&Z meetings and listened carefully to the presentations. What is proposed is not congruent with historic Old Mandeville. It will increase density, use, traffic and congestion, with no appreciable benefit to current residents. Old Mandeville is a treasure to be carefully stewarded, and Sucette Harbor is simply not at all in line with our community.

Please act in the best interest of your constituents, listen to their concerns, and do not allow this to proceed any further.

Sincerely

James Lee
211 East Street
Mandeville 70448
412-977-7381

Kristine Scherer

From: Rodi Culotta, Esq. <rculotta@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, June 25, 2023 12:58 PM
To: Kristine Scherer
Subject: Sucette Harbor

Dear Ms. Scherer,

I am sending this short note to you as Clerk of Council in the hopes that it will make its way into the record regarding the Sucette Harbor development. I am **IN FAVOR** of the development. I am retired and have no financial interest in Sucette Harbor. I believe this will be an asset for Mandeville, especially the provision providing adult apartments. Thank you for your assistance.

Rodi Culotta

Rodi Culotta
265 Moss Ln
Mandeville, LA 70471

Kristine Scherer

From: Elizabeth Coco <ecoco4550@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, June 24, 2023 3:21 PM
To: Kristine Scherer; Rebecca Bush; skreller@cityofmadeville.com; Jill McGuire; Rick Danielson; jzuckermam@cityofmandeville.co
Subject: Sucette Harbor Development Project

Council members,

We strongly oppose the construction of the Sucette development. Those most affected (residents of Old Mandeville) have a right to know what impact this development will have on our quality of life. This information should be provided by the City of Mandeville, not the developer.

Marvel B. Zehender
Resident of Old Mandeville since 1958

Mary B. Costa
Resident of Old Mandeville since 1960

Kristine Scherer

From: Joseph Joyner <josephejoyner@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, June 26, 2023 2:50 AM
To: Kristine Scherer
Subject: SUCETTE HARBOR

Dear City Council Members,

I am a **30 year resident of Tops'L Condominiums** and a **40 year resident of Mandeville**. I could make the argument that my wife and I will be the most negatively affected residents by the Sucette Harbor development, yet **we are two of the strongest supporters of it**. I was also an active supporter of the Al Copeland Sr. residential development many years ago and believe history has shown that it was a mistake by that City Council to cave into the vocal minority back then. Please do not make the same mistake that council did by blocking this development. **Sucette is a perfect use for this piece of property.**

There will always be the typical group of short-sighted, anti-development of anything, ignorant people that come out and make a lot of noise, even when it doesn't affect them. When I arrived in Mandeville in **1983**, there was one traffic light. Think of all the development and traffic that has been created since then. Many of those objecting to Sucette are the ones who were part of the rapid development and increased traffic that has been created in the past 20 years. Sucette is hardly a drop in the bucket compared to that period and will have virtually no impact on the overall traffic situation. Sure, I wish Mandeville was still like it was in 1983, but I never tried to close the door on anyone who arrived after me.

Sucette Harbor will be the crown jewel of the area and create an idyllic setting as you approach the Northshore. I have no financial interest in the property other than it will likely increase the value of my Tops'L condo, which is meaningless to me since I will never sell it. Most of the detractors of this long-anticipated development have probably never set foot on that piece of ground or have any clue on how much the area has deteriorated since Katrina destroyed the marina. That property has been my back yard for 30 years and I hope to be lucky enough to live there for another 30 years. Why would I be such a supporter of the Sucette development if I did not think it was going to substantially improve the area and my quality of life? **It will be devastating if Sucette is voted down by this City Council.**

We are so fortunate to have a developer with deep pockets, donated land and a vision of how to best develop that special piece of property. **I live at 709 Tops'L.** I have a sprawling view of the lake from every room in my condo, my deck and my patio. My end unit is only 50' from what was, and what will be the marina. The Sucette plan **will block about 40% of the view** that I have treasured and enjoyed for so many years. I was not immediately sure if I wanted to give that much up. After giving it substantial consideration, I am absolutely certain that the benefits of this project will far outweigh the sacrifice of losing my view. **Sucette will bring life back to the area and clean up the decay of the land surrounding the marina.** The current status of the property is about the worst I have seen. **We absolutely need this development** and I am very concerned about what will happen to the area if it is blocked.

The new marina will bring welcome activity back. The hotel, restaurant and event center will energize what has become a dead zone since Katrina. Life at Tops'L was so much nicer when we had an active marina and pool club. We use to feel like we were on vacation every day. As I approach retirement, I

want to have that lifestyle back along with all the amenities that Sucette will offer. I want to have my boat parked right out front my door again. I can't wait to walk the new boardwalk to the restaurant, hotel and beach. How anyone can object to all of this is just baffling to me. We are so lucky to have been given this **potential gift**.

I can appreciate a little skepticism and due diligence, but the objections I have been having to hear are so exaggerated and blown out of proportion. Many of those fighting this development won't even be impacted by it. Please have the foresight to see through all of that negativity the benefits of this development. They far outweigh the minor inconveniences. **Voting down this project will have a profound negative impact on the area and my quality of life during my retirement years. This is the development I always dreamed of** since the days I use to walk Tops'I during it's construction in **1983-84**. In **1992**, I acquired the rights to purchase 32 of the 37 units at Tops'I from the FDIC and formed Tops'I Partners. I spent so many years envisioning what improvements could be made to the Copeland property. Sucette has exceeded all of my ideas. If this project is voted down, there will never be another one during my lifetime. I came to Mandeville as a 24 year old stockbroker and am now 64. I split my time between Aspen, CO and Mandeville, flying back and forth twice a month for the past 11 years. As beautiful as Aspen is, my home will always be at [REDACTED] and I am looking so forward to the completion of Sucette Harbor.

The area around the location of the marina has become an eye sore and the erosion is threatening the integrity of Tops'I Condominiums, which has already incurred underground erosion damage related to the loss of the marina bulkhead. I don't want to even think about what will come of the area if this project is not approved. **WE NEED THIS DEVELOPMENT!** It would be a **travesty** if this project gets rejected because of the ignorance of an angry mob that **can't see the forest for the trees!**

I URGE YOU TO PLEASE VOTE TO APPROVE SUCETTE HARBOR.

Thank you!

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]