

Kristine Scherer

From: [redacted]@lsuhealth.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 7, 2023 5:38 PM
To: Clay Madden; Rick Danielson; Jason Zuckerman; Rebecca Bush; Skelly Kreller; Jill McGuire
Cc: Kristine Scherer
Subject: Proposed Sucette Harbor Development / June 7, 2023

To All.

I am writing to express my profound opposition to the Sucette Harbor plans as proposed by the LSU Health Foundation, the owner of the land, and Woodward Interests, the developer.

While I have deep concerns, which are outlined below, I want to be clear that my objection is not to the development of the property, but rather what is currently proposed.

My husband and I moved here in 2003, we live in Old Mandeville in the Historic District. We love living here for its many qualities of life, the charming neighborhoods, each with their own character, the low crime, and most especially, the small-town almost rural feel, a feel that that is eroding by virtue of developments, both residential and commercial, that are out of scale and out of character with the existing community. *It is incumbent upon you to protect what we have.*

Rezoning. It seems to me that the City has put the proverbial cart before the horse. This property has a Residential Zoning Classification and was acquired with that zoning classification. That the Master Plan color codes it as Planned Development does not make a zoning change mandatory. Zoning changes should be extraordinarily rare and only for the most compelling of hardship reasons. Profit is not a hardship reason.

Further, as the City never contemplated an age restricted development/multifamily we should not now approve one. The CLURO (and Master Plan) for our beautiful city should first be examined, revised where necessary, and if acceptable to the citizenry, then approved. If, and only if, such a development is included should the developers return to the City with their proposal. Generally speaking, if a development's criteria is not allowed, then it is presumed prohibited. Thus, this development should not be allowed. To vote yes will alter forever the rural, small-town charm that attracted so many of our City's residents.

2015 Cluro, rev. 2021, and 2007 Master Plan. As we all know, our CLURO dates to 2015, last revised in 2021 and establishes, among much else, the size, density, parking, and tree protections, et al. that our citizens have determined are appropriate and desirable for Mandeville. Rules if you will, by which everyone should abide.

The 2007 Master Plan, which is a guide only and not binding, began in 2005 and was adopted in January 2007, during a time when many of us were still reeling from Katrina, and bears the imprint of national planning desires. Nonetheless, it does clearly state: *Mandeville on the Lake. Mandeville is a wooded coastal community that exists in harmony with its abundant environmental resources, celebrates its rich cultural history and endeavors to enhance the quality of life for future generations.*

The Master Plan may help determine which, if any, departures (that new word for variances) might be deemed permissible for a given project in a given area. **Nonetheless, simply because you MAY choose to allow a departure (variance) does not mean that you MUST choose to allow a departure (variance).** Further, **granting any departure (variance) establishes** an undesirable precedent, one which we cannot "walk back."

I honestly do not see where Sucette, as currently proposed, will enhance our quality of life. Nor, due to its financial structure (not for profit fee owner, leasehold developer interest), will it strengthen the City's fiscal health in any significant manner commensurate with the impact it will have on our quality of life. Further, neither our CLURO nor our Master Plan envisioned this sort of age-restricted multi-family development.

Environmental Concerns. Mandeville's lakefront is part of a fragile, interconnected system that is repeatedly under assault by, at best, "low impact" endeavors (playgrounds, benches, etc). Sucette's very size and density should render it moot.

Parking. If multi-family developments require 2 spaces per unit, why should Sucette, or any developer, receive a departure to a lesser number? How and where will visitors park? Employees? Special events guests? How does this add to the health, safety, and welfare of our citizens?

Traffic. I take issue with the developer's traffic study and many of its underlying presumptions, especially the 55 & older with many tenants having one or no car. I am 63, my husband 71. We both still work fulltime & cross the Lake in separate vehicles to get to our respective offices. This is not abnormal or unusual. This is not an area where Uber or Lyft are prevalent, even cabs are difficult to come by. There is no public transportation, nor likely to be any. The impact of any event at the proposed hotel/event center will be almost as unfathomable as any future storm/hurricane evacuation (and we know they are coming). All this will be funneled through uncharacteristically narrow streets, Antibes W. and Antibes E.

Density/Height/Area. Despite the developer's touting of green space, this project is shoehorned into too small of an area. The height exceeds by approximately 10 feet. The hotel/event space is asking for 8,000 more square feet than allowed. Again, how will consenting to any departure (variance) from the current permissible parameters **enhance our quality of life?** Further, the developers state that, with mature trees, the buildings will be "invisible" from the City. It emphatically, however, will be extraordinarily and massively visible as one crosses the Causeway into Mandeville, and this out of scale project has the unfortunate potential to become Mandeville's gateway image.

Marina/Harbor. While I appreciate that Mariner's Village owners are definitely in favor of this project because it includes shoring up their harbor, this is not a valid reason to approve Sucette.

LSU Cancer Research. With respect, any LSU cancer research mention is a 100% irrelevant consideration; it is an emotional marketing tactic. And I say this as someone who lost my Daddy to cancer, and my husband also lost his father to cancer.

In Conclusion. I would ask you this: If the development plan as currently proposed requires square footage, height, tree removal, and/or any other departures (variances) to meet their profit objectives, then the design in and of itself is not right or suitable for the area and, therefore, should be rejected. It is not the City's job to ensure that any project is profitable. **I believe it is your job to protect the health, safety, and welfare of your constituents, the residents of Mandeville.**

While I wish the Sucette Harbor concept success, as proposed it simply does not fit into the scale and character of our town. For any developer, not just this one, to make a design proposal so at odds with our CLURO standards makes a travesty of the guidelines, nay protections, which our citizens believed we had.

Please remember: Just because any applicant of a Planned Development project **MAY** request departures (variances) that **COULD BE** approved by ordinance **does not mean** that our City Council **MUST** approve the requests.

So I now implore each of you, as the guardians of our small town, to reject these proposed Sucutte Harbor plans as currently written and request that the developers resubmit a plan that conforms to the spirit of our CLURO.

Thank you each for taking the time to read this.

Kristine Scherer

From:
Sent: Thursday, June 8, 2023 3:24 PM
To: Kristine Scherer
Subject: Suscette harbor

I am writing in support of the Suscette harbor project. I feel like it is tasteful and backed by high quality institutions. Also, as a 61 year old I can tell you that there is a demand for that kind of housing- especially as the security situation on the south shore deteriorates. I am personally interested in that kind of housing and think it would be a boon to the area and probably has less negatives associated with it than most competing ideas. I am also struck by the approval of the Old Mariners board.

Full disclosure, live just outside the city limits but worship, shop, eat and have an office in Mandeville. Should this project get built I would be interested in looking at the apts.

Sincerity,

Sent from my iPhone

Kristine Scherer

From:
Sent: Thursday, June 8, 2023 11:09 AM
To: Kristine Scherer
Subject: FW: Matter for discussion of and inclusion in the record of Mandeville City Council Meeting of the June 8, 2023 relating to Ordinance 23-16 (Sucette Harbor)
Attachments: MICA SIGNATURES AGAINST PROJECT.pdf; Examples of cooperation.docx

Dear Ms Kscherer:

I am resending your copy with the corrected email. Sorry about that. And thank you for letting me know as it is important that this is included in the Council Records. Please confirm receipt.

From:
Sent: Tuesday, June 6, 2023 9:06 AM
To: 'rdanielson@cityofmandeville.com' <rdanielson@cityofmandeville.com>; 'jzuckerman@cityofmandeville.com' <jzuckerman@cityofmandeville.com>; 'rbush@cityofmandeville.com' <rbush@cityofmandeville.com>; 'skreller@cityofmandeville.com' <skreller@cityofmandeville.com>; 'jmcguire@cityofmandeville.com' <jmcguire@cityofmandeville.com>
Cc: 'kscher@cityofMandeville.com' <kscher@cityofMandeville.com>
Subject: Matter for discussion of and inclusion in the record of Mandeville City Council Meeting of the June 8, 2023 relating to Ordinance 23-16 (Sucette Harbor)

Dear Council Members:

At the May 25, 2023 Council meeting, Bill Hoffman from Woodward indicated that the 5-member Board of The Mariners Village Master Association had voted “unanimously” to endorse the Sucette high-density residential and commercial-use development. The residents of Mariners Village were surprised and puzzled by this announcement as they were not polled or given any notice of any such support proposal.

It is not clear who the board members of the “Association” are, when they took office or if they took office in accordance with the Articles of Incorporation and By-laws. Accordingly, we have collected from the 23 Condo Property Owners in Mariners Island disavowal notices from a super-majority and zero project support votes. I have attached them to this email.

We ask that you investigate the source and validity of this endorsement to determine if the Council was not misinformed, or worse misused, and by whom. Some areas you might question are: who are the 5 Board members who voted unanimously? The Secretary of State only lists two (2) Directors as of June 4, 2022, not five (5) although 5 are required and July 21, 2018 is the last State filed report of 5 members. Why was the Master Association State of LA Corporate fees allowed to lapse for several years and suddenly brought up to date in May of 2022 when this project was first publicly announced? Ask the Master Association’s Agent, Eric McVicker, to produce the elements of the endorsement: the date, place and time of the meeting, the meeting announcement, the polling format and execution methodology and individual Parcel Association results on which the Board

of Directors might have made any decision even if it had been its charter. Finally, ask Mr. McVicker if he even owns property in Mariners Village. The recorded land records reflect another owner of his condo.

Additionally, to demonstrate that this “timely” endorsement was likely part of a planned effort by the parties we note in a second attachment the many times in announcements, some even before any formal public applications, that Mr. McVicker’s “personal” endorsement as a resident of Mariners Village was included. How were those arranged if, as Mr. Hoffman claimed at the May 25 Council Meeting (minute 2.15 of the record), he did not know the identity of any of the Mariners Village Master Association Board members? And the Councilman in whose district the project is located certainly knows his campaign consultant’s association, but he did not say so either. Finally, we understand that one of the board members is an employee of LSU Health Foundation. This fact was also left out of the presentation of the endorsement.

To let this disingenuous at best and possibly illegal endorsement stand without verification by the Council would be unfair to the citizens of Mariners Village whose position on this project has been misrepresented by the developer at the Council Meeting and Eric McVicker in his numerous media interviews.

Respectfully,

Kristine Scherer

From: Kristine Scherer <kristine.scherer@marinersvillage.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 8, 2023 9:54 AM
To: Rick Danielson; Skelly Kreller; Rebecca Bush; Jill McGuire; Jason Zuckerman; Kristine Scherer
Cc: Clay Madden
Subject: DENIAL OF ENDORCEMENT BY MARINERS VILLAGE MASTER ASSOC./WOODWARD INTERESTS STATEMENT
Attachments: Tops'l disavow letters.pdf;
Mariners_Residents_Disavowal_of_Sucette_Harbor_Endorsement.pdf

Dear Council Members,

Please find attached 33 additional signed petitions disavowing the “Endorsement” by Mariners Village Master Association (MVMA) and rejecting the proposed Woodward Interests project.

Please add these to the petitions that _____ already submitted.

The MVMA has not held its required yearly membership meeting, as per their Bylaws, since December 2019.

Despite Covid, no effort was made to hold a yearly membership meeting by ZOOM or any method. As a result the current board members were never elected by the membership.

The Board of Directors was never replaced by a yearly membership meeting vote. It is not known how this current “board” was put into place.

The MVMA "board" never surveyed its members about the “Sucette Harbor” project. Therefore, their *endorsement is irrelevant*, and does not represent the views of the majority of Mariners Village residents as evidenced by these petitions. The public record should be immediately corrected concerning this false representation.

Sincerely,

Examples where the development team used the Mariners Village Master Association Board/President (Eric McVicker) in their push for this project:

<https://fb.watch/kXpB54hCo7/> (may 25th City Council meeting (@1:23) Hoffman mentions the endorsement)

<https://www.lsuhealthfoundation.org/lsu-health-foundation-new-orleans-and-the-al-copeland-family-announce-senior-living-development-plans-for-northshore/> -This is the tweet from one of the Master Association Board members) (Summer 2021)

https://www.nola.com/news/northshore/developers-make-pitch-for-retirement-complex-hotel-on-former-copeland-land-at-mandeville-lakefront/article_43518cda-3a94-11ed-9f24-93211beb9a29.html (Sep 23, 2022)

<https://neworleanscitybusiness.com/blog/2021/11/04/studies-underway-for-proposed-150m-mandeville-retirement-community/> (Nov 4, 2021)

https://www.nola.com/news/northshore/lsu-nonprofit-has-big-plans-for-al-copeland-lakefront-property-how-will-mandeville-react/article_0934c58e-f149-11eb-9790-cf831f439dd8.html (August 2, 2021)

The City Council Meeting of May 25, 2023.