

Kristine Scherer

From:
Sent: Monday, May 22, 2023 2:12 PM
To: Rick Danielson; Jason Zuckerman; Rebecca Bush; Skelly Kreller; Jill McGuire; Kristine Scherer
Subject: - thought on Sucette Harbor

To all of you, thank you very much for what you do as our council, and know you are very much appreciated! We've had the pleasure of working in this city, caring for it like you all do, and just wanted to give you a quick summary of our thoughts...

65' height needs to come down by at least one story. 45' is max height on the lakefront and is the height used as max for the rest of mariners village area and for mandeville overall. This project, when successful, is going to average more than 600 trips per day on on Monroe Street...100+ per day is just for the 50+ employees coming and going...my opinion...death by a thousand little cuts...this project is certainly one...to the traffic on Monroe, and to our low-rise skyline of Mandeville if the height doesn't come down.

That is it. Have a great day! Love you all!

Thanks,



Kristine Scherer

From: Jill McGuire
Sent: Monday, May 22, 2023 3:33 PM
To: Kristine Scherer
Subject: Fwd: Sucette Harbor Development

Kristine,

Mary wanted me to forward this to you. She accidentally misspelled your name in the first transmission.

Thank You,

Jill

Begin forwarded message:

From: < >
Date: May 22, 2023 at 2:25:14 PM CDT
To: Jason Zuckerman <jzuckerman@cityofmandeville.com>, Jill McGuire <jmcguire@cityofmandeville.com>, Clay Madden <cmadden@cityofmandeville.com>, ksherer@cityofmandeville.com, Rebecca Bush <rbush@cityofmandeville.com>, Rick Danielson <rdanielson@cityofmandeville.com>, Skelly Kreller <skreller@cityofmandeville.com>
Subject: Sucette Harbor Development

I am opposed to the Sucette Harbor Development plan as it currently stands.

I am 82 years old and have lived in the Mandeville area since 1973 when my husband and I arrived here with two babies. They grew up here, going through the Mandeville School system. I retired in 2006, just months after Katrina landed.

I love Mandeville, it's people, activities, trees and lake availability. I am saddened by the development of the Lake Pontchartrain shoreline and the continued destruction of our trees, wetlands, and habitats. Furthermore, the insufficient parking and lack of traffic mitigation associated with the Sucette plan need to be addressed, and the overall density needs to be considerably reduced, to make this proposal palatable to the citizens of Mandeville.

Please vote NO.



City of Mandeville
Council Woman McGuire

May 22, 2023
Re: Sucette Harbor

Dear Council Woman Jill and Citizens of Mandeville

I understand that the the Sucette Harbor development project is coming up for a vote soon. Since I have a perspective as an older citizen, a registered design professional and a college professor I would like to give you my thoughts in three voices. You will see these three voices are conservative, moderate and liberal. I hope the views expressed below help you make a decision as to which way is best to cast your vote for this project. My wife Bonnie agrees with these thoughts.

First speaking conservatively as a citizen I think the project does add value to the city in a couple of different ways. First it follows all of the rules expected of development as expressed in CLURO and set forth in the 2007 Comprehensive Plan. A project such as Sucette has been expected since the late 1970's. It is almost exactly what the Comprehensive Plan suggests. Like many other people I and my wife Bonnie want this project to blend in with the existing city, we want its architecture, its use and its population to be similar to and or slightly enlarge over what we presently have here. We think this project will bring people to the city who really want to be Mandevillians. Having new comers as well as some who used to live here when they were younger join us will add to the complexion of our people and culture. The people buying into this project will be well educated, mature citizens and most likely financially fit. They will add to the tax base of this community and will support our local shops and cultural institutions without adding to the burdens of our schools, drainage system or traffic. They might increase the demand for parks and city open spaces.

Being a little more moderate my thoughts as a design professional ring slightly differently. I feel that the site plan developed for this site by my former student's firm heroically demonstrates some of the most current design thoughts associated with mixed use development. Blending very private land use (residential) with public land use, (hotel lodging, restaurant, retail, recreation), with activities for older adults with the use of ample open space, swimming and fitness centers for physical exercise builds urbanity into a small town setting as Mandeville has been for a long, long time. This development that way the site is planned as a blend of private and public land keeps the water front open to the citizens of Mandeville. More traditional developments such as a collection of wealthy high end gated residences will shut this part of the lakefront off to the general public. The marina invites the boating public, walkways invite the biking public and use of hotel and restaurant facilities invites relatives and overnight guests to also enjoy open water views and the fresh air and sunshine of Lake Pontchartrain. From a landscape architecture technical point of view the gardens and live oak plantings of this development will add canopy and flowers to our urban forest. Sucette adds a unique architectural beauty to our waterfront and our city's front door at the Causeway. These new buildings will honor modern architectural design but will offer a hint towards Mandeville's historic past. The sparkling white buildings against the green of the urban forest will become a land mark to those crossing the water. Shady walkways on Sucette's site will



will beckon residents to walk to places of interest along the lake front or on to the B-3 district centered on happy Girod street.

And of course college professors seem to run with some of the most liberal people in the nation. Therefore allow me to point out that Sucette offers a lifestyle to older citizens that can not be found elsewhere in Mandeville. Since it is an age restricted development, not quite like the Villages in Florida, Sun City Hilton Head or Sweetgrass in Texas or for active adults over 55 year of age this development offers something special for older adults. Old enough to be empty nesters but young enough to be actively social and inquisitive neighbors they are anxious to meet new friends on the streets and in the shops and restaurants in our city. This development will likely be a mix of older people wanting to give up their single family home and downsize to a more active lifestyle with other more active people. Some resident will come to be located in our wonderful town to share our resort type living and our salubrious environment. Others like me, might find living in well constructed steel frame buildings with 24 hour security a much safer place to live than living in a single family house in old Mandeville. The one dire feeling I and my wife will face about residing in Mandeville when we get in our 70s and 80's is living with hurricanes. In fact, Sucette offers a much more stronger place to live when winds approach 100mph. Mandeville will be better allowed older residents to downsize their housing or inviting former residents to retirement to lease a coastal living resort type apartment where they can see their former friends on a regular basis. This is a form of housing not found anywhere else in Louisiana. Another first for Mandeville.

In summary, I urge you to vote for this development. In a brief summation of the above Sucette Harbor meets all of our planning standards, will blend in well with the character of the city as well as bring new residents of an older stripe who will mix in well with the citizens of this town. They will be like us, young at heart, active, smart, well educated, and wealthy enough to add to the economy of this town. This project keeps the central part of the lake front open to the public, its smart design adds to the urban forest canopy of the city and the project as a whole will be an entry landmark of sort for the city. The design for Sucette is modern and a well planned community that adds to the city but is specially beneficial for older people who want to live the Mandeville lifestyle in their waning years while their children are growing as young adults raising their grand children in our community.

I see no reason why this project does not fit our beloved city.



From: -
Sent: Thursday, May 25, 2023 4:03 PM
To: 'rdanielson@cityofmandeville.com'; 'jzuckerman@cityofmandeville.com';
'rbush@cityofmandeville.com'; 'skreller@cityofmandeville.com';
'jmcguire@cityofmandeville.com'
Cc: 'kscher@cityofMandeville.com'
Subject: Comments of _____ for inclusion in minutes of Council Meeting May 25,
2023
Attachments: May 25 meeting Comments.docx

Honorable Members of the Council

Attached is my submission for the subject meeting item on Succette Harbor. The sentiments are not mine alone, but in principal have been addressed with a number of fellow Mandeville Residents. The main thrust is:

The Council should not be under the impression that a complete P&Z record is available to them;

Also, that the P&Z meetings throughout its approval were not adequately and widely publicized, maybe because the P&Z personnel misjudged its Citywide impact.

Secondly, the public's input was limited to mostly 3 minute inputs at the meeting which were only carried in a video review of the entire meeting or the abridged minutes, and the included questions were mostly not accompanied by studied answers and written submittals filed in accord with P&Z instructions were not readily available (much less answered).

This Council must represent the Public's concerns and see that appropriately adequate answers are researched and answers answers given for the public to assess. When it does this, we believe that you will agree, approving this project is NOT in the best interests of Mandeville and is not the legacy you want to leave it.

Submitted by

Comments of

, for submittal at the City Council Meeting of May 25, 2023

The Council should not be under the impression that the Planning Commission record is complete. Because the public's written submissions were not included in the readily available public record. Worse than the absence of their questions is that there are no answers either. As a result, the available record is predominately the self-serving findings and conclusions of the Developer.

Prior to this project's approval at the Planning Commission, this project had received little notice or publicity and there are many elements of this project that were not evaluated and there remain many unanswered questions, including:

- 1) The issue of evaluating compatibility with the surrounding neighborhood that has developed almost exclusively as residential was not addressed (when a Commissioner asked a question on this CLURO based issue at the final PC approval hearing the Developers retorted that the issue was never raised). In reality the issue was raised by more than a few public statements and submittals, but never addressed and evaluated by the Commission
- 2) The contradiction the project's mixed use would make to the stated objectives set out and relied upon for decades by the public in Ordinance 98-40 were not vetted or evaluated
Ordinance 98-40 made some specific findings by noting in particular that: ... the requested zoning designation ... and its development ... will serve the best interests of the City of Mandeville **by protecting existing residential neighborhoods in the vicinity of the Property from the possible intrusion of commercial uses and other types of residential uses which, by their nature and/or size, may be deleterious to that neighborhood;** ... This may become a legal liability to the City if this change goes forward, especially if the enabling ordinance encompasses both Zoning and the Multi use application as one action as now drafted.
- 3) Planning never considered that if approved this has dire implications for the rest of Old Mandeville if the many "in-fill" Residential parcels there can so willy-nilly be rezoned to Commercial by this precedent. Mandeville has been known as a city that prides itself on its residential orientation and serenity. That should not be jeopardized
- 4) Planning never evaluated impacts on the more prevalent "mom and Pop" commercial entities (B&B's, restaurants, event venues, etc.) that exist and are essential to the fiber of Mandeville as a community.
- 5) Over the course of the PC review it became obvious that Senior element was mostly used as an excuse to circumvent City restrictions and regulations to accommodate its commercial elements that tested or superseded the limits in a number of areas. Ironically, the Developer eventually intimated that the Senior designation might not prevail for several reasons, including economic, and the rental would be open to all ages. That aspect and the consequences were never fully pursued at the PC.
- 6) There is no available record reflecting the public's questions, especially written ones since the public's participation was limited each to 3 minutes orally and were accessible only from reviewing the entire meeting videos or reading the minutes that are fairly abridged and mostly not quantitatively responsive. Without making available the complete oral and written submissions and detailed responses, a large portion of the public's comments are obscured. As a corollary to the absence of questions is the absence of answers, including, but not limited to:
 - Will there be environmental study to determine impacts on the annually returning Bald Eagles and Canadian Geese and flora and fauna
 - What are the impacts and cost on City utilities to accommodate that many concentrated residents and a large commercial undertaking represented by the hotel and events center

- How will traffic and policing be administered; developer stated it will all be private property, but safety and security will be a City policing responsibility; will it require additional personnel and equipment
- How will noise and light pollution be handled and controlled when night activities at the event center are ongoing
- How will the problems of a publicly accessible, "private beach" be managed and parking accommodated and safely and orderly managed (note Developer stated this was "Public Beach" but is not obvious on developer plans)
- What is the net economic benefit or cost to the City for having this facility versus the low-density residential alternative of the current zoning. Revenue generation is estimated but not costs.
- There is remaining concern about how emergency vehicles and fire-fighting equipment will "navigate" the tight configuration and singular way in and way out, and does the city even have fire-fighting equipment for the height buildings planned
- Other than the apparent Developer, the actual management of the various commercial aspects of the project, from planning to construction and ongoing management is an unknown; how will that be managed when the P&Z only looked at the developer plans
- What assurances are there that the developer will have the financial resources to do what the plans and his oral representations say he plans doing. (This becomes more important as the use is combined with the Zoning in a single ordinance).
- While the theoretical traffic studies say the impacts are measured in seconds; how do you convince the public whose waits at Monroe/East Causeway currently at times are measured in minutes that the project will improve his situation
- Despite developer's "experts" there is just general skepticism that the 1.5 cars per senior resident is valid. Most couples want to know which one of them, is going to get the "half-car"

It is my position that the Planning Commission did not adequately represent the expressed concerns of the City's residents in conducting and reporting its review and it is incumbent on this Council to represent their concerns and see that appropriately adequate answers are researched and answers given for the public to access. When you do this, I believe that approving this project is NOT in the best interests of Mandeville and is not the legacy you want to leave it.

Submitted by

For Immediate Release

5-25-2023

Contact:

Mariners Village Master Association Votes to Endorse Sucette Harbor Project

The Mariners Village Master Association board of directors voted Tuesday to endorse the proposed Sucette Harbor development located within Mariners Village. The vote was unanimous, 5-0.

The Mariners Village Master Association, MVMA, hails the plan as a step forward for the neighborhood to put this vacant piece of property back into use.

The proposal includes an age-restricted, high-end apartment complex, a boutique hotel, a restaurant, and redeveloped marina.

MVMA board members and residents have widely expressed concern over the eroding marina applaud Woodward's plans to address it.

Board President Eric McVicker stated "Both Woodward and the LSU Health Foundation have been good neighbors and have presented a plan that will benefit the neighborhood and community for many years to come. These folks have gone out of their way to meet with members of the community and address concerns residents have and I have no doubt that will not change."

The Mariners Village Master Association Board of Directors requests the city council approve the proposal.

#####

Kristine Scherer

From: Alex Weiner
Sent: Friday, May 26, 2023 10:22 AM
To: Kristine Scherer
Subject: FW: LSU Health Foundation Property

Kristine,
See the below email about the proposed LSU Health Foundation development.

Alex Weiner, CFM
Planning Secretary
Department of Planning & Development
City of Mandeville
3101 E. Causeway Approach
Mandeville, LA 70448
(985) 624-3132



From: Alex Weiner <aweiner@cityofmandeville.com>
Sent: Friday, May 26, 2023 10:20 AM
To: Alex Weiner <aweiner@cityofmandeville.com>
Subject: LSU Health Foundation Property

Good Morning,

Please forward this information to the entire City Council.

I have attended all of the Planning and Zoning meetings as well as the two Council meetings concerning the LSU Foundation property proposed development.

It is unfortunate that the Mandeville residents that are in favor of the project are outnumbered and outspoken by the opposition. Admittedly, I have not stood at the podium either.

I reside on Barbados Court, if you are not familiar, the street entrance is off of Antibes East, the street that will be directly impacted with an increase in traffic. Knowing this has not swayed me from my support of the project.

The same residents that spoke last night, spoke at the planning and zoning meetings saying the same thing. Other than the owners in Mariners Island, they were all "Old Mandeville" residents that will object to any proposed changes to Mandeville.

It was completely offensive to imply the 80 full time workers will be minimum wage employees and will not be able to afford to live in Mandeville. Maybe not on the Lakeshore, but affordable housing is available in our city. (sorry for the sidebar rant).

The fact is that this property is privately owned by a foundation that exists on donations. If the project is dismissed, another will follow and may not have the benefits to the community as this one does. Age restricted living is on the rise as Baby Boomers enter into retirement and senior living. This will be a very viable complex at a high end price tag. Perfect for the residence of Mandeville and/or their family members.

The property is privately owned. Anyone accessing the property is trespassing; therefore, it is benefiting no one. The development will allow the residents of Mandeville to enjoy the restaurants, the walking path, the marina and the beach.

Anyone looking for overnight stays in Mandeville are restricted to Bed and Breakfast establishments or have to go to Covington. Why would we not want a boutique hotel for our families and for the tax income?

This is a beautiful project and should be welcomed,

thank you,

[click here](#)