

**Planning Commission
Public Hearing
August 14, 2018**

The meeting was called to order by Planning Chairwoman Rebecca Bush and the secretary called the roll.

Present: Nixon Adams, Michael Blache, Ren Clark, Dennis Thomas, Bill Sones and Rebecca Bush

Absent: Simmie Fairley

Also Present: Louissette Scott, Director, Planning Department; Paul Harrison, City Attorney; Catherine Casanova, Landscape Inspector; Mayor Donald Villere; and Council Members David Ellis and Clay Madden, Laure' Sica, Mike Pulaski and John Keller

The Planning Case discussed was P18-06-08 Adoption of the 2018-2019 Short Term Work Program in Resolution 18-01 and Recommendation to the City Council regarding Ordinance 18-22, adoption of the Capital Improvements Budget for fiscal year 2018-2019, in relation to the Capital Improvements projects being consistent with the Comprehensive Plan

Ms. Scott said the commission's intent was to make sure there was a full commission present when making the recommendation. The commission had received a copy of the annual review with Resolution 18-01. The top priority items were the Open Space Master Plan, Comprehensive Drainage Master Plan, and an Economic Development Analysis of the Four Corners. These items were similar to the last few years' recommendations. Additionally, the City Council as part of Louisiana Revised Statute 33:109 referred the Capital Improvement projects and budget to the Commission for review for consistency with the Comprehensive Plan. Since there was an annual review of the Short Term Work Program, procedurally the budget would also be reviewed earlier in the year. Ms. Scott had added language to the resolution addressing the commission's review of the capital projects and recommendation of approval.

Mr. Adams said most of the items provided in the capital budget listings did not apply to the Planning Commission review and were in compliance with the Comprehensive Plan. Some of the items listed might be controversial, but they did not appear to violate the Comprehensive Plan. The City Council would not know until the final design was complete on some of the projects if they were compliant.

Mayor Villere asked if there were any projects that the commission felt needed additional information. Mr. Adams said there had much discussion about the lakefront restroom. His thoughts were if there was a playground there should be a restroom, and the question was where it should be placed. Mayor Villere said there was also a line item for the construction of a restroom at Sunset Point. Mr. Adams said the City needed a policy for restroom placement. He said at Pelican Park people walked 700' to 800' to access the restrooms. Mr. Adams said if the commission was forwarded the plans, they would review them.

Mr. Blache said there were many items not to be addressed like police cars. Mayor Villere asked if there were projects that needed additional information. Ms. Scott said in the future, the staff could break out the budget items. With future growth, water and sewer should be reviewed for capacity as well as street improvements with traffic and transportation, capacity on the streets and zoning. Also for review was public buildings and what type of playground was needed or was the use more passive. There was also a five year budget to look to the future.

Mr. Clark said linking the Short Term Work Program to the budget items was difficult because the commission should not comment on money, but the commission must approve

Planning Commission
Public Hearing
August 14, 2018
Page 2

uses in public spaces and determine if it was consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. Bernard de Marigny's plan was for passive uses on the lakefront. Without any drawings, the commission was being asked to approve a project. The review should not include police facilities, maintenance, wants or needs.

Mr. Thomas requested for additional information on the wetland evaluation and tree planting. Mr. Harrison said Mr. Clark had raised good points. The administration in this current fiscal year had provided the commission with all of the budget information to review certain items contemplated by Revised Statue 33:109. He directed the commission to the language in RS33:109 dealing with streets, squares, public ways around open spaces, public buildings and structures, public utilities that were being constructed so the commission was not dealing with road maintenance, tree planting or issues in public works. The commission had been reviewing the Short Term Work Program. The resolution to the City Council was recommendations.

There were good points if the commission requested to review project plans to analyze them in subsequent years as to whether they were in compliance. The commission could review the restroom locations and not weigh in on the value of the dollar. That was a City Council decision. Once the commission recommended the project, it did not move forward until the City Council appropriated the funds. Ms. Sica had articulated it well at the City Council meeting that it was about a balance of government. The City could opt out of the statute. The Comprehensive Plan was definitive and precise in the listings of zoning, roads, wetlands, private and public lands. It satisfied the qualifications of a Comprehensive Plan at outlined in RS33:106. A Comprehensive Plan and Maser Plan became the same thing. Mayor Villere was correct to send the commission the budget with the proposed projects. Mr. Clark was correct that the commission was not reviewing the costs. He suggested continuing to review the Short Term Work Program, tweak the language in the resolution recommending approval of the projects, and review the plans. The commission had also been provided the Historic District comments on the restroom project. Moveable restrooms were not permanent so it avoided an analysis of a permanent impact on the lakefront. Mayor Villere said the portable buildings would have to be moved in the case of an emergency or a storm. Mr. Harrison said the commission had the power to have the restroom permanently connected, but it could be self-contained in a storm. The Mayor created the budget, it was approved by the City Council, and the commission could make recommendations on the projects. This commission benefited from the state law. Every city in the area considered the statute.

Mr. Clark said the commission was asked to vote on the Short Term Work Program which the commission had worked on for months and now there was the integration of the capital budget. Mr. Harrison said it was an old law.

Mr. Adams said the commission had heard about the restroom issue. The Shoreline Protection sounded agreeable and was a project the City should spend money on, but the commission had not seen the final plans. He stated he did not see anything that was inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Thomas said the commission policy and procedure was not to vote on any issue that was not seen 72 hours in advance. It was stated that it was part of the meeting packet emailed the previous Friday. Mayor Villere said the commission did not have to be vote on a recommendation before the budget adoption. Mr. Thomas said the Critical and Sensitive Plan had been included on the Short Term Work Program for years and he considered the wetland evaluation a part of that plan. He asked what was the evaluation metric system used for critical and sensitive areas. Mayor Villere said the money would be spent on the west side for tree planting in the wetlands to eliminate any erosion and to further enhance the wetland area. Mr.

Clark said according to the law, the Mayor and City Council could opt out of the law. According to the law, the commission should be presented with the designs and the location of the tree planting to approve it. Mr. Thomas said his question was answered. Mayor Villere said the City Council had only seen the lakefront restroom design. The administration proposed to present a plan to the commission in May, 2019 before being presented to the City Council to provide information that the project was not violating the Comprehensive Plan. If further information was needed prior to starting the work, the administration would provide it.

Mr. Harrison said in previous years that had been joint meetings on the Short Term Work Program. Ms. Scott said the idea of the resolution was to include language and commission comments on projects with either an approval or disapproval in the resolution so it was handled once. It was not the intent to slide a section stating that the commission approved it, but to include a mechanism to address it. In the future, the Short Term Work Program and Capital Budget would be discussed together. The capital projects came to the commission later than the review of Short Term Work Program. The intent was to review that section of the resolution and if the commission had an issue with any of the projects to include those comments in the resolution. Mr. Clark said requesting the commission to vote on the capital budget at this meeting was not appropriate. Mayor Villere said the City Council wanted to know if any of the projects violated the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Clark said the restrooms were not a bad project, but the placement was a problem. Mr. Adams said the only way to know what was included in the budget was to attend the budget meetings and hear the discussion. Mr. Adams trusted the process and if there was some part of the project that was bad that it would be caught at the plan approval. Ms. Scott said the projects were identified and if the commission felt any were inconsistent those comments could be included or the two processes could be separated into two resolutions with another meeting addressing the capital budget.

Mr. Adams said every jurisdiction had something that resembled RS33:109. Mr. Harrison said the summary was that all of the cities in his area were planning for development. Those jurisdictions had approved Comprehensive Plans, zoning regulations, and Master Plans. The commission could approve or disapprove a project on a case by case basis and the City Council could change it with ultimate oversight.

Mr. Adams said the catch phrase was to agree to review the plans. He could not see any plan to be inconsistent, but they may turn out to be later in the process and he asked how to deal with it. Mr. Blache said his understanding was that no project could be constructed until it was approved in the budget and review of the plan prior to construction. Mr. Harrison said the statute was designed to prevent unnecessary review of projects like a road was already on the ground that must be maintained. Mr. Blache gave an example of the proposed construction of a City skate park next to a residence needing to be reviewed for compliance. Mr. Harrison said the zoning and surrounding community would be required to be reviewed. Mr. Harrison agreed that the earlier the review, the better. Mayor Villere said if there were any listed projects that the commission requested more information, he would provide it when obtained. Mr. Blache asked if the commission could be provided enough information to be satisfied to state it met the Comprehensive Plan criteria. Ms. Scott said as an example, the plans for the restroom was complete and the commission could look at them. Mr. Harrison said the commission could review the information that the Historic District Commission had recommended on the restrooms to either agree or disagree with the findings. If there were other projects there would be plans and drawings that could be reviewed.

Ms. Bush asked if the commission could separate out paragraphs 5, 6, and 9 creating a separate document for the Short Term Work Program and hold a separate meeting to address the capital budget. Mr. Adams suggested sending a request to the administration for more information on specific projects. His request was for information on the wetland and flood

Planning Commission
Public Hearing
August 14, 2018
Page 4

protection projects. Mr. Clark asked about the veracity of the last "Be It Resolved" statement and Ms. Bush answered that would be amended for this resolution.

Ms. Bush moved to approve the resolution of paragraphs 1-8 removing paragraphs 5, 6 and 9, seconded by Mr. Adams.

Rebecca Rohrbough, 2525 Lakeshore Drive, stated she sympathized with the dilemma of what the commission was asked to review. She asked if the commission could consider an exception process. She found one project to be in violation of the Comprehensive Plan and she was prepared to present that. Ms. Bush said the commission was carving out the Short Term Work Program resolution and would consider the capital projects in another resolution at a future meeting.

Ms. Rohrbough said the project was labeled Jackson Avenue/lakefront bathroom line item in the budget. Mr. Adams said there was a similar line item at Sunset Point. Mr. Clark asked what did a playground on the west side of town mean. Mayor Villere stated the City would like to install a playground on the west side of the City, but the location had not been determined. Mr. Clark clarified that the resolution was being adopted specifically for the Short Term Work Program. The vote was unanimous.

It was suggested to discuss the capital budget at the August 28th regular meeting. Mr. Clark asked the commission to underline the budget items for discussion. Ms. Scott would email the items in the budget in a different format.

The subdivision case discussed was S18-08-02 Crosby Development Co., LLC requests preliminary subdivision approval for Phase 5 of the Sanctuary Subdivision, zoned R-1.

Ms. Scott presented the preliminary subdivision approval request for Phase 5 of the Sanctuary Subdivision proposing 29 lots being four parcels with parcels A and B being the green space and parcels C and D being the street parcels. The developer of The Sanctuary, Crosby Development Corp, was requesting Preliminary Subdivision approval for Phase 5, which consists of a total area of 39.82 acres in accordance with the Preliminary Plat prepared by Randall W. Brown & Associates, Inc. dated Aug 6, 2018. A revised plat was received. Additionally, preliminary subdivision approval was approval of the construction documents which were prepared by J. V. Burkes and Associates dated June 22, 2018. Sheets 1-12 had been submitted and revised through August 8, 2018.

The City Engineer provided comments in an e-mail dated August 14, 2018 as follows:

Recommend approval of the revised Drawing Set, dated August 8, 2018, by JV Burkes; with the provision that ditch side slopes as shown on the Typical Sections not be exceeded. The design appears to accomplish this--so the note is only for inadvertent omission by Applicant's engineer, and inadvertent oversight of defect in review by City.

The applicable waivers were submitted at final subdivision approval which would be to install some sidewalks, but not on every block. The variance request would be for the 12 lots in the cul de sacs on Henly Lane which was changed to Linette Lane. All of the lots exceeded the square area of 10,800 square feet.

John Crosby, applicant, stated there would be trails, and the plans were reviewed by the City Engineers. Mr. Thomas asked Ms. Casanova if there was only one live oak tree. Ms. Casanova said as far as she was aware with it being heavily wooded. Ms. Scott said the staff depended on the applicant for information.

Ms. Bush moved to approve the preliminary subdivision approval with the stipulation that all required live oak trees must be preserved, seconded by Mr. Adams and was unanimously approved.

Discussion - 1331 Madison Street

Ms. Scott presented that Brad del Rio had purchased the property at 1331 Madison Street which was previously reviewed in July, 2017. The previous owner had proposed to fill the property and the request was denied. The del Rio's had discussed their proposal with the staff who agreed it would be good to hold a discussion before spending money on plans.

Brad del Rio said he had read the previous request and agreed the request was excessive. His understanding of the meeting was that the commission requested to bring a plan for review. He had purchased the lot, and understood the elevation and the fill requirement. He presented two plans to construct a house to downsize for their retirement or build a long term rental containing 1,200 square feet. This area was a tidal property with pipes at the rear of the Prieto Marina. The road was 5.4' above sea level and he wanted to work with the coastal erosion and challenges in Mandeville. His request would be to raise the parking spaces to a reasonable level so no one was wading in ankle deep water for access several times a year. His idea was to build a bulkhead. His house at 222 Lafitte Street was 8' above sea level and the highest water was with Hurricane Isaac. The water came to 5.5' to 6', but not above 7'. That height was the basis for the proposal to raise the two parking spaces to above 7' leaving the front yard at the existing level, and build a bridge to the parking spaces. The bridge concept could be concrete with pipes or a wooden bridge. He did not think it was unreasonable to request raising the bridge and driveway for parking to 2' above the seawall.

Mr. Thomas asked about the elevation. Mr. del Rio said the southeast corner of the lot was 4.8' at the highest point on the land. Mr. Adams said it appeared to be a steep slope and the water would flow north. Mr. del Rio said there was an underground drainage pipe under Madison Street that was stopped up with concrete in it. The City placed a pipe under the street trying to drain to the south side onto this property. The elevation of 5.4' was located at the southwest edge. The north end of the swamp was the natural flow. Raising the parking would not block the flow to the north. Mr. del Rio said he was working with the neighbors to minimally raise the parking spaces. Mr. Clark asked about the parking location which would be located under the house. Mr. del Rio said he would request a variance similar to one approved for Mr. Gonzales for a reduced front yard setback. Mr. del Rio said he would like to live there, but he would not live there walking in the water. He showed pervious pave stones, drainage under the driveway to the parking spaces and the front yard would remain at the existing elevation. He would like the parking elevation to be 7.3'. Mr. Thomas asked if he had calculated the amount of fill that would be needed and Mr. del Rio said he had not done that calculation. Ms. Scott said the property was located in the Drainage Overlay District and he would be limited to 6" of fill under the building.

Mr. Adams said the question was if this was a reasonable request, and Mr. del Rio should show whatever water was to the rear of the lot would be the same amount at the same speed after construction. Mr. del Rio said there was 92' from the front southeast corner to the area that the Corps designated as the marsh. There was ample space for a smaller structure. He would use the hard land.

The consensus of the commission was that it was a reasonable request.

The adoption of the minutes was deferred until the next meeting.

Planning Commission
Public Hearing
August 14, 2018
Page 6

Ms. Bush moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Mr. Clark and was unanimously approved.

Lori Spranley, Secretary

Rebecca Bush, Chairwoman
Planning Commission

**Zoning Commission
Public Hearing
August 14, 2018**

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Nixon Adams and the secretary called the roll.

Present: Michael Blache, Nixon Adams, Ren Clark, Bill Sones, Dennis Thomas, and Rebecca Bush

Absent: Simmie Fairley

Also Present: Louissette Scott, Director, Planning Department; Paul Harrison, City Attorney

The next case discussed was V18-08-17 Crosby Development Co., LLC requests a variance to Section 7.5.1.3, R-1 Site Development Regulations and Section 8.1.1.4, Allowed Setback Encroachment, (4) Mechanical Equipment, lots 408, 415, 416, 418, 423, 424, 425, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440 and 441, Sanctuary Subdivision, zoned R-1

Ms. Scott presented a variance request for the building and mechanical equipment setbacks. Mr. Crosby was requesting a variance to lots 408, 415, 416, 418 (Oleander Ct), 423, 424, 425, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440 and 441 (Juniper Ct). Mr. Adams said the request was to allow these lots conform to the aesthetics of the subdivision. Mr. Crosby said when applying the Sanctuary Subdivision driveway restrictions as well as the new City restrictions, there was a narrow footprint. The subdivision regulations provided more green space. Ms. Scott said the request was to allow a 15' side yard setback on each side regardless of the lot width and to allow the mechanical equipment to be placed no less than 10' from the property line. The commission discussed that the request could be considered an exception. Mr. Crosby said the request would not meet the 30% rule.

Ms. Bush moved to grant an exception to allow the 15' side yard setbacks and the mechanical equipment to be located no closer than 10' from the property line, seconded by Mr. Adams. Ms. Scott said prior to the new regulation the Sanctuary Subdivision had greater setbacks and no driveway was allowed within the 15' side yard setback. The total area of the setback would be about the same because the Sanctuary's front and rear setbacks requirements were greater than the City requirements. The motion was unanimously approved.

Ms. Bush moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Mr. Clark and was unanimously approved.

Lori Spranley, Secretary

Rebecca Bush, Chairwoman
Planning Commission

**Planning Commission
Work Session
August 14, 2018**

The meeting was called to order by Planning Chairwoman Rebecca Bush and the secretary called the roll.

Present: Michael Blache, Ren Clark, Nixon Adams, Dennis Thomas, Bill Sones, and Rebecca Bush

Absent: Simmie Fairley

Also Present: Louissette Scott, Director, Planning Department; Paul Harrison, City Attorney; Catherine Casanova, Landscape Inspector

Ms. Bush announced that any additional information determined to be needed by the Commission in order to make a decision regarding a case shall be required to be submitted to the Planning Department by the end of business on the Friday following the meeting at which the additional information was requested or the case will automatically be tabled at the next meeting.

The only case also had an associated zoning case and both cases were discussed in conjunction. The planning case discussed was P18-08-09 Recommendation to the City Council regarding Ordinance 18-26, AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MANDEVILLE TO REZONE FROM B-1 NEIGHBORHOOD BUSINESS DISTRICT TO PCD-PLANNED COMMERCIAL DISTRICT A PARCEL OF LAND BEING A PORTION OF SQUARE 63 ON THE OFFICIAL PLAN OF THE CITY OF MANDEVILLE, WHICH PORTION MEASURES 233 FEET FRONT ON FLORIDA STREET, 282 FEET FRONT ON JACKSON AVENUE, 282 FEET ON THE SIDELINE NEAREST ATALIN STREET AND 233 FEET ON THE SIDELINE NEAREST MONTGOMERY STREET, MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED IN THE LEGAL DESCRIPTION AND SURVEY BY KELLY J. MCHUGH & ASSOCIATES, INC., ATTACHED AS EXHIBIT "A," HEREINAFTER REFERRED TO AS "SUBJECT PROPERTY," AND TO FURTHER GRANT A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT APPLICABLE TO THE SUBJECT PROPERTY PERMITTING THEREON AN INN AND/OR BOUTIQUE HOTEL AND ASSOCIATED USES AS DEFINED UNDER CLURO SECTION 6.4.44 LODGING (TRANSIENT) HOTEL/MOTEL, ALL AS SET FORTH ON THE PLANS PREPARED BY PIAZZA ARCHITECTURE PLANNING APAC, ATTACHED HERETO AS EXHIBIT "B"; AND OTHER MATTERS IN CONNECTION THEREWITH. The zoning case discussed was Z18-08-05 Recommendation to the City Council regarding Ordinance 18-26, AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MANDEVILLE TO REZONE FROM B-1 NEIGHBORHOOD BUSINESS DISTRICT TO PCD-PLANNED COMMERCIAL DISTRICT A PARCEL OF LAND BEING A PORTION OF SQUARE 63 ON THE OFFICIAL PLAN OF THE CITY OF MANDEVILLE, WHICH PORTION MEASURES 233 FEET FRONT ON FLORIDA STREET, 282 FEET FRONT ON JACKSON AVENUE, 282 FEET ON THE SIDELINE NEAREST ATALIN STREET AND 233 FEET ON THE SIDELINE NEAREST MONTGOMERY STREET, MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED IN THE LEGAL DESCRIPTION AND SURVEY BY KELLY J. MCHUGH & ASSOCIATES, INC., ATTACHED AS EXHIBIT "A," HEREINAFTER REFERRED TO AS "SUBJECT PROPERTY," AND TO FURTHER GRANT A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT APPLICABLE TO THE SUBJECT PROPERTY PERMITTING THEREON AN INN AND/OR BOUTIQUE HOTEL AND ASSOCIATED USES AS DEFINED UNDER CLURO SECTION 6.4.44 LODGING (TRANSIENT) HOTEL/MOTEL, ALL AS SET FORTH ON THE PLANS PREPARED BY PIAZZA ARCHITECTURE PLANNING APAC, ATTACHED HERETO AS EXHIBIT "B"; AND OTHER MATTERS IN CONNECTION THEREWITH.

Ms. Scott presented that the applicants had petitioned for a rezoning of a portion of Square 63 from B-1, Neighborhood Business District, to Planned Commercial District (PCD) and an application for approval of a Conditional Use Permit for a "boutique" hotel as defined under CLURO Section 6.4.44. Lodging (Transient) - Hotel/Motel. The City Council introduced Ordinance 18-26 at their meeting on August 9, 2018.

The property was located on the corner of US Hwy 190 and Jackson Ave, consisting of 1.509 acres of vacant land, as shown on the survey prepared by Kelly McHugh & Associates, Inc. dated June 2, 2009. The applicant was proposing to construct “Boutique Hotel” on the site, as described as “The Beacon Inn, Executive Summary” submitted with the application.

As per the “Beacon Inn Executive Summary”, the applicant was proposing *an independently owned mid-range hotel. The proposed hotel will offer free parking, a large swimming pool, continental style breakfast, room service, on-site front desk service a poolside grill, and access to The Beacon House: Our stunning open 2-story lobby with a comfortable sitting/reading loft.*

The CLURO defined the use classification of a hotel/motel as follows:

6.4.44. Lodging (Transient) - Hotel/Motel

A facility offering transient lodging accommodations on a daily or weekly rate to the general public with or without providing additional services, such as restaurants, meeting rooms, and recreational facilities available to guests of the facility or the general public. Typical uses include hotels, motels, and transient boarding houses.

Currently, this property was zoned B-1 Neighborhood Business District. The applicant was requesting the property be rezoned to Planned Commercial District for the use of a hotel, which was a commercial use and required a Conditional Use Permit in a PCD zoning. CLURO Section 7.5.15.5 *Review of Plan Based on Existing Regulations* stated the site plans shall be based upon the requirements for the proposed use, in this case, to follow the B-2, Hwy Business District site development criteria.

Included in the submittal for the Planned District zoning and Conditional Use Permit were the following documents included in the Ord. as Exhibit B:
Sheet A02.2 and A02.1 Site Plan (including color rendering)
Sheet A02.3 Conceptual Drainage Plan,
Sheet A02.4 Conceptual Landscape Plan
Tree Survey

The site plan, prepared by Piazza Architecture Planning dated 7.24.18 and revised through 8.07.18 proposed the following:

- A “Boutique” hotel consisting of 40 guest rooms including amenities of a swimming pool and large lobby available to patrons with sitting area and loft.
- The proposed building was situated on the lot as an “L shaped hotel”.
- The wing facing Florida Street was 3 stories tall.
- The center common core and the wing facing Jackson Ave were 2 stories tall.
- The proposed building was approximately 20,726 Square feet of enclosed area.

Under the Planned District, commercial uses shall follow the B-2, Hwy Business District criteria. The proposed site plan complied with the B-2 site development criteria as outlined below.

7.5.9.3. B-2 Site Development Regulations PROPOSED SITE PLAN

1. Minimum lot area	15,000 Square feet 59,210sf
---------------------	---------------------------------------

2. Unit Size		
a. Minimum	800 Square feet <i>n/a</i>	
b. Maximum	65,000 Square feet	
3. Maximum Building Size	100,000 Square feet 20,726 sf	
4. Minimum lot width	150' 233'	
5. Minimum lot depth	100' 282'	
6. Minimum Yard Setback Requirements		
a. Front Yard	25' or Required depth 5 '*	27' -
	of greenbelt, whichever is greater	
b. Street Side or Rear Yard	15' or Required depth, of greenbelt, whichever is greater	15'
c. Interior Side or Rear Yard		
(1) Adjacent to Residential Districts	20' 22.5"	
	<i>O/R Zoning adjacent rear</i>	
	<i>yard**</i>	
(2) Adjacent to Other Districts	5' or	16.5'
	<i>B-1 Zoning adjacent interior</i>	
	<i>yard</i>	
(3) With firewall at property line	0'	
	<i>n/a</i>	
7. Maximum Height of Structures	35'	34'
8. Maximum Impervious Site Coverage	75% 65.5%	
9. Minimum District Size	40,000 Square feet 59,210sf	

Landscaping:

Greenbelt: Jackson Ave and US Hwy 190:

Jackson Ave:

The site plan proposed a 15’ greenbelt on Jackson Ave, and was compliant with the minimum requirement.

Hwy 190:

The proposed site plan complied with CLURO Section 7.6.2.6 (a) G-O Site Development Regulations

- a. The greenbelt throughout the Highway 190 Widening Project Corridor, (Highway 190 right-of-way from its intersection with Highway 22 to its intersection with the Mandeville City Limits at Bayou Castain), shall be defined as the area from the existing DOTD right-of-way line a distance of twenty-five (25') feet **or** from the existing DOTD right-of-way line to the new DOTD right-of-way line, whichever is greater; and

Based on this regulation, the new DOTD row line was greater (~39' - ~27'). The site plan proposed not only the future DOTD row line, but also added an additional 5' greenbelt along US Hwy 190. This regulation was adopted during the active development of phase one for the DOTD row expansion – where the limits of construction ended at the west side of Jackson Ave on Hwy 190. To date, there were no addition plans on the schedule for future expansion.

Buffer: The proposed zoning for the hotel site was PCD, and follows the B-2 zoning district requirements for buffer requirements.

- **East side:** Adjacent property to the east was zoned B-1, Neighborhood Commercial and no buffer was required.

9.2.5.5.4. Buffer Zone Requirements

(6) The required depth of a buffer zone on a development site 200 feet in depth or greater, measured at right angles from the property line along which the buffer is required to be located, shall be expanded by an additional one (1) foot for each additional twenty (20) feet of site depth up to a maximum additional buffer of ten (10) feet.

- **South side:** The zoning for the adjacent property on the south side is zoned O/R Office Residential. These lots were developed with single family dwellings and requires a landscape buffer. The site plan proposes a 22' 6" buffer calculated on the future DOTD row, and was compliant. Additionally, the site plan proposed a 5' greenbelt, beyond the future DOTD row.

Site Interior Landscaping:

Site Interior Planting Regulations – conceptual landscape plan revised through 8.10.18 indicates that the site interior landscaped area consisted of 8.09%, compliant with the minimum 8% required.

PARKING

6.4.44 Lodging (Transient) – Hotel/Motel	1 per each lodging units plus 1 per 200 s.f. of gross floor area including restaurant, Lobby & meeting rooms excluding guest rooms and access halls
--	---

This building was proposed with 40 guest rooms requiring 40 parking spaces. Additionally, the gross floor area including restaurant, lobby and meeting rooms was 3,200 square feet, (1:200 sf) which required an additional 16 parking spaces (3,200/200=16). The development required a total of 56 parking spaces and the site plan proposed 58 parking spaces which were in compliance with CLURO 6.4.44 Lodging (Transient) – Hotel/Motel.

Currently, the property was zoned B-1, Neighborhood Commercial and the CLURO stated that a Planned Commercial District followed the B-2, Site Development Criteria. Ordinance 18-26 contained the language indicating how the proposed development departed from the existing requirements of the CLURO, using the B-2, Site development criteria.

Ordinance 18-26 stated the following:

- (i) the PCD limits the use of the Subject Property to an Inn and/or Boutique Hotel as opposed to more intense office, retail and service establishments, including multi-tenant shopping centers;
- (ii) allows for more creativity and design of the buildings to be constructed on the Subject Property as well as the placement of such buildings;
- (iii) the flexibility with regards to the design of the buildings allows for the inclusion of additional green space, which allows for the preservation of certain mature trees on the Subject Property and the reduction of the impervious area within the Subject

- (iv) Property to 64% under the PCD as opposed to the 75% allowed; and
- (v) allows for a reduction in overall building size from 100,000 square feet allowed to 20,726 square feet proposed pursuant to the Site Plan.

Included was language addressing the proposed use of a hotel and that it improved what otherwise would be required under the CLURO. This was referenced in item (i).

The B-1, Neighbor Business District zoning and the B-2, Hwy Business District zoning were similar in much of the site development criteria, with the exception of the following:

	<u>B-1</u>	<u>B-2</u>
Maximum lot area:	40,000 sf	N/A
Maximum unit size	N/A	65,000 sf
Maximum building size	15,000 sf	100,000 sf

With the proposed rezoning to PCD, the entire development site could be regulated to provide for a more improved level of aesthetic (approving architectural elevations and specific site plan). Additionally, approval of a Conditional Use Permit would limit the land use on the site and the specific site plan (and accompanying plans) to that specifically approved under the Planned District Zoning and Conditional Use Permit.

Mr. Adams asked about the zoning for the nursing home across the street, and it was stated it was zoned Institutional. Mr. Clark asked if the property was built as a hotel, could it be converted to an elder care facility in the future. Ms. Scott said the use would have to be amended by the City Council. A hotel was not a permitted use in the B-1 zoning district and as a Planned District the tradeoff was to approve specific plans for the site. Mr. Clark said it was limited to construction and use. Mr. Blache said it would be applying the site development of the B-2 district. Ms. Scott said the plan was reviewed based on the B-2 Site Development Regulations, but the use was specific to only a hotel as presented. The commission would approve the architectural elevations and a specific set of plans.

Mr. Adams said since the demise of the Ozone Hotel there was a need for a hotel use. From his experience at Pelican Park there were times of year where no one could not find a room on the Northshore. The Comprehensive Plan called for a mix of uses. Mr. Blache asked if there was a description of the Gateway Overlay District in the Comprehensive Plan and Ms. Scott answered no. The Gateway Overlay District was created to address additional landscape requirements and at a later time the Design Guidelines were approved for review. This project would be presented to the Design Consultants for review and there would be comments before the next meeting.

Mr. Blache asked about the requirement for a Traffic Impact Study and his concern was ingress/egress safety. Most people had difficulty getting on Highway 190 heading west at certain times of the day.

Thad Ridgley, 113 Meribo Place, stated he was the applicant. Ms. Scott said the commission could request Traffic Study information, if needed. Mr. Adams said he did not think the project would add much more traffic, but turning west would be difficult but that was not created by this project. Mr. Ridgley said they felt the project was an upgrade of uses from a convenience store, restaurant or gas station. There would be more difficulty accessing those uses than a hotel. Mr. Clark said the hotel parking could become a convenient way to get to Florida Street as a cut through. Mr. Ridgley proposed a pork chop to restrict that cut through. Until there would be a highway improvement the roadway reduced from four lanes to three lanes. Mr. Clark said traffic was getting worse. Mr. Adams said most people use Montgomery

and Atalin Streets to get around it. People living on Atalin Street did not want to drive more traffic that way. Mr. Blache said this would also create problems for the hotel guest. Mr. Ridgeley said they would be in support of a stop light.

Mr. Blache asked about lighting in the rear parking lot. Mr. Ridgley said they were working with the City, but they not developed the full scope. He assured the commission that they would move forward for the best interest of the City and their neighbors. Ms. Scott said the regulations required full cut off lighting and height restrictions. Mr. Blache asked for more information. Mr. Thomas said Mandeville was a Dark Skies community. Ms. Scott said the commission could request the applicant to prepare a lighting plan for review for compliance and approve that as part of the package.

Mr. Blache asked about the rear buffer with the residential uses. Ms. Scott said most of the adjacent properties had installed solid wood fencing. Mr. Ridgeley said the first 20-30' would be fenced with bamboo. The south side would be a wood fence for the entire length of the property. Mr. Adams asked if there was a marketing study showing the need of hotel rooms. Mr. Ridgley said they had not completed their market analysis. Mr. Adams asked if they knew what level of hotel would be proposed in terms of rates. Mr. Ridgley said it would be mid-ranged and felt they could command a decent rate with the location. He said currently the zoning allowed for a 5' buffer for the property south of this property. Ms. Scott stated it would require a 20' buffer with an additional 2' for the depth of the property. Ms. Scott said the question was the 22.5' buffer to the rear, but the staff had not checked the plant material with this being a conceptual plan. There appeared to be a solid wood fence along the rear property line. There was an existing large stand of bamboo. The City allowed a maximum fence height of 7' that would be placed on the property. Mr. Thomas asked about the east side. Mr. Ridgeley said there would be nothing placed because it was heavily wooded. Ms. Scott said there was no buffer requirement between the two properties.

Mr. Ridgeley said with the current zoning, the building setback on the south side would be closer to the neighbors. Ms. Scott said the property would still require a 20' buffer. The project was proposing parking adjacent to the buffer and it could also be the location of a building. This would be consistent with either zoning district.

Louis Funck, 1441 Montgomery Street, said he previously owned the property from Atalin Street to Jackson Avenue and he felt responsible for his buyers. This appeared to be a request for an upzone. He spoke to the original owner who stated that the City told him that his project would take up so much area for retention that he could not do the project. Ms. Scott said the City typically did not require a retention pond. There was a conceptual drainage plan that was being reviewed by the City Engineers. Mr. Funck has several concerns that included the south side lighting, the drainage, how the bamboo would affect the drainage and the lighting disturbing the homeowners. He stated he would fight the zoning change. Mr. Adams asked Mr. Funck what he would prefer to be constructed on the property. Mr. Funck said he would prefer a shopping center, but not a gas station. Mr. Adams said a specific plan must be approved in a planned district. By right, the B-1 zoning could allow more intensive uses. At this time, the neighbors could have input on the plan. Mr. Clark said this was an issue when a homeowner purchased property next to a commercial use. Mr. Funck said the middle lot was zoned a B-1 zoning, but a variance was granted for the construction of a double. Mr. Adams said the zoning was originally B-2 and with the CLURO adoption the zoning became B-1. He suggested reviewing the zoning for the area from Girod Street east as to how the area was developing. Mr. Funck said he would like to see the existing bed and breakfast uses filled. Mr. Clark said gas stations and quick stops were light and noise invasive. Mr. Funck said if he was a developer, he would speak to the neighbors.

**Planning Commission
Work Session
August 14, 2018
Page 7**

Michelle Omes, 1421 Montgomery Street, asked about the traffic. If no improvements were added at the Jackson Avenue/Florida Street intersection people would go through the neighborhood and there were a lot of children. Another issue was the noise regulations. How late could people be in the pool? Mr. Clark said the pool was located next to a swamp at a busy Highway 190 intersection.

Paula Fontana, 809 Jackson Avenue, was located at the corner of Jackson Avenue and Montgomery Street. She was concerned about the Jackson Avenue driveway with a lot of traffic coming from the lakefront. Young kids were at the lakefront and zoomed up the street late at night. She suggested placing the driveway only on Florida Street so there would not be any Jackson Avenue traffic and the kids would be safer on the side streets. Her second concern was her neighbor's bedroom being adjacent to the buffer and parking. If the building was placed to the rear, it would not be cool. The third issue was safety. She often found trash, beer and drugs in the front yard. She was concerned without a gate that people might congregate. She was also concerned about drainage. Ms. Scott said the City Engineer was in the process of reviewing the plan.

Mr. Ridgley said he canvassed the area and had met with 2 of the 3 immediate neighbors. In reference to security, this was a high end establishment that would probably charge between \$150-\$200 per night. He would be the resident general manager on the site. The concerns were important to the neighbors and they wanted an upgrade to the community and neighborhood. With the current zoning, construction could take place without neighbor input. His business partner lived on Lakeshore Drive; he owned Mandeville property and they cared about the community. They were working with the City to construct a respectable business plan and hotel.

Mr. Adams asked if the gates would be locked. Mr. Ridgley said they would be all RFID, but they would not have security gates and thought it was not in the best interest of the City. He would prefer low level lighting. The property was situated with a large greenbelt so it would be subtle and have a coastal residential feel. Ms. Scott asked about traffic engineer information regarding access. Mr. Blache said Ms. Fontana had a good point regarding the entrances. Mr. Ridgeley would prefer the main entrance on Highway 190 and no access to Jackson Avenue. Currently the way the road was situated, they had limited access to the property on Highway 190 with the road changing from two lanes into three way lane so it would become more risky in that location. Ms. Scott suggested meeting with DOTD.

Mr. Clark asked about the drainage and Ms. Scott said the City Engineer was reviewing the plan. Mr. Clark said there should be more than three elevation points. Mr. Blache asked for more information on lighting. Ms. Bush said for a balance between security and subtlety. Mr. Adams asked Mayor Villere about reconstructing Highway 190 with a median. Mayor Villere said information should be obtained in January or February from the engineering consultants. He would call them for any input on this area. Mr. Clark asked if Mandeville was a Dark Sky community. Ms. Scott said Mandeville was not a certified community, but the City regulations included many of the principles. The City required full cut off shielding to reduce glare, must be faced downward, and the height of lumens. The City was working with LED lighting as plans were submitted. Lower level lighting must be reviewed so there was no light over wash to the adjacent property owners.

In summary additional information needed was a lighting plan, the City Engineer to review ingress/egress with the ability to allow Highway 190 access only, and the applicant would contact DOTD to obtain in writing about limiting the access.

**Planning Commission
Work Session
August 14, 2018
Page 8**

Ms. Bush moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Mr. Clark and was unanimously approved.

Lori Spranley, Secretary

Rebecca Bush, Chairwoman
Planning Commission

**Zoning Commission
Work Session
August 14, 2018**

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Nixon Adams and the secretary called the roll.

Present: Michael Blache, Ren Clark, Nixon Adams, Dennis Thomas, Bill Sones and Rebecca Bush

Absent: Simmie Fairley

Also Present: Louissette Scott, Director, Planning Department; Paul Harrison, City Attorney; Catherine Casanova, Landscape Inspector

The only case also had an associated zoning case and both cases were discussed in conjunction. The planning case discussed was P18-08-09 Recommendation to the City Council regarding Ordinance 18-26, AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MANDEVILLE TO REZONE FROM B-1 NEIGHBORHOOD BUSINESS DISTRICT TO PCD-PLANNED COMMERCIAL DISTRICT A PARCEL OF LAND BEING A PORTION OF SQUARE 63 ON THE OFFICIAL PLAN OF THE CITY OF MANDEVILLE, WHICH PORTION MEASURES 233 FEET FRONT ON FLORIDA STREET, 282 FEET FRONT ON JACKSON AVENUE, 282 FEET ON THE SIDELINE NEAREST ATALIN STREET AND 233 FEET ON THE SIDELINE NEAREST MONTGOMERY STREET, MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED IN THE LEGAL DESCRIPTION AND SURVEY BY KELLY J. MCHUGH & ASSOCIATES, INC., ATTACHED AS EXHIBIT "A," HEREINAFTER REFERRED TO AS "SUBJECT PROPERTY," AND TO FURTHER GRANT A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT APPLICABLE TO THE SUBJECT PROPERTY PERMITTING THEREON AN INN AND/OR BOUTIQUE HOTEL AND ASSOCIATED USES AS DEFINED UNDER CLURO SECTION 6.4.44 LODGING (TRANSIENT) HOTEL/MOTEL, ALL AS SET FORTH ON THE PLANS PREPARED BY PIAZZA ARCHITECTURE PLANNING APAC, ATTACHED HERETO AS EXHIBIT "B"; AND OTHER MATTERS IN CONNECTION THEREWITH. The zoning case discussed was Z18-08-05 Recommendation to the City Council regarding Ordinance 18-26, AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MANDEVILLE TO REZONE FROM B-1 NEIGHBORHOOD BUSINESS DISTRICT TO PCD-PLANNED COMMERCIAL DISTRICT A PARCEL OF LAND BEING A PORTION OF SQUARE 63 ON THE OFFICIAL PLAN OF THE CITY OF MANDEVILLE, WHICH PORTION MEASURES 233 FEET FRONT ON FLORIDA STREET, 282 FEET FRONT ON JACKSON AVENUE, 282 FEET ON THE SIDELINE NEAREST ATALIN STREET AND 233 FEET ON THE SIDELINE NEAREST MONTGOMERY STREET, MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED IN THE LEGAL DESCRIPTION AND SURVEY BY KELLY J. MCHUGH & ASSOCIATES, INC., ATTACHED AS EXHIBIT "A," HEREINAFTER REFERRED TO AS "SUBJECT PROPERTY," AND TO FURTHER GRANT A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT APPLICABLE TO THE SUBJECT PROPERTY PERMITTING THEREON AN INN AND/OR BOUTIQUE HOTEL AND ASSOCIATED USES AS DEFINED UNDER CLURO SECTION 6.4.44 LODGING (TRANSIENT) HOTEL/MOTEL, ALL AS SET FORTH ON THE PLANS PREPARED BY PIAZZA ARCHITECTURE PLANNING APAC, ATTACHED HERETO AS EXHIBIT "B"; AND OTHER MATTERS IN CONNECTION THEREWITH.

Ms. Scott presented that the applicants had petitioned for a rezoning of a portion of Square 63 from B-1, Neighborhood Business District, to Planned Commercial District (PCD) and an application for approval of a Conditional Use Permit for a "boutique" hotel as defined under CLURO Section 6.4.44. Lodging (Transient) - Hotel/Motel. The City Council introduced Ordinance 18-26 at their meeting on August 9, 2018.

The property was located on the corner of US Hwy 190 and Jackson Ave, consisting of 1.509 acres of vacant land, as shown on the survey prepared by Kelly McHugh & Associates, Inc. dated June 2, 2009. The applicant was proposing to construct "Boutique Hotel" on the site, as described as "The Beacon Inn, Executive Summary" submitted with the application.

As per the “Beacon Inn Executive Summary”, the applicant was proposing *an independently owned mid-range hotel. The proposed hotel will offer free parking, a large swimming pool, continental style breakfast, room service, on-site front desk service a poolside grill, and access to The Beacon House: Our stunning open 2-story lobby with a comfortable sitting/reading loft.*

The CLURO defined the use classification of a hotel/motel as follows:

6.4.44. Lodging (Transient) - Hotel/Motel

A facility offering transient lodging accommodations on a daily or weekly rate to the general public with or without providing additional services, such as restaurants, meeting rooms, and recreational facilities available to guests of the facility or the general public. Typical uses include hotels, motels, and transient boarding houses.

Currently, this property was zoned B-1 Neighborhood Business District. The applicant was requesting the property be rezoned to Planned Commercial District for the use of a hotel, which was a commercial use and required a Conditional Use Permit in a PCD zoning. CLURO Section 7.5.15.5 *Review of Plan Based on Existing Regulations* stated the site plans shall be based upon the requirements for the proposed use, in this case, to follow the B-2, Hwy Business District site development criteria.

Included in the submittal for the Planned District zoning and Conditional Use Permit, were the following documents included in the Ord. as Exhibit B:
Sheet A02.2 and A02.1 Site Plan (including color rendering)
Sheet A02.3 Conceptual Drainage Plan,
Sheet A02.4 Conceptual Landscape Plan
Tree Survey

The site plan, prepared by Piazza Architecture Planning dated 7.24.18 and revised through 8.07.18 proposed the following:

- A “Boutique” hotel consisting of 40 guest rooms including amenities of a swimming pool and large lobby available to patrons with sitting area and loft.
- The proposed building was situated on the lot as an “L shaped hotel”.
- The wing facing Florida Street was 3 stories tall.
- The center common core and the wing facing Jackson Ave were 2 stories tall.
- The proposed building was approximately 20,726 Square feet of enclosed area.

Under the Planned District, commercial uses shall follow the B-2, Hwy Business District criteria. The proposed site plan complied with the B-2 site development criteria as outlined below.

7.5.9.3. B-2 Site Development Regulations PROPOSED SITE PLAN

1. Minimum lot area	15,000 Square feet 59,210sf
2. Unit Size	
a. Minimum	800 Square feet n/a
b. Maximum	65,000 Square feet
3. Maximum Building Size	100,000 Square feet 20,726 sf

4. Minimum lot width	150'	233'
5. Minimum lot depth	100'	282'
6. Minimum Yard Setback Requirements		
a. Front Yard	25' or Required depth	27' - 5'*
	of greenbelt, whichever is greater	
b. Street Side or Rear Yard	15' or Required depth,	15'
	of greenbelt, whichever is greater	
c. Interior Side or Rear Yard		
(1) Adjacent to Residential Districts	20'	22.5"
		O/R Zoning adjacent rear
	yard**	
(2) Adjacent to Other Districts	5' or	16.5'
		B-1 Zoning adjacent interior
	yard	
(3) With firewall at property line	0'	
	n/a	
7. Maximum Height of Structures	35'	34'
8. Maximum Impervious Site Coverage	75%	
	65.5%	
9. Minimum District Size	40,000 Square feet	
	59,210sf	

Landscaping:

Greenbelt: Jackson Ave and US Hwy 190:

Jackson Ave:

The site plan proposed a 15’ greenbelt on Jackson Ave, and was compliant with the minimum requirement.

Hwy 190:

The proposed site plan complied with CLURO Section 7.6.2.6 (a) G-O Site Development Regulations

- b. The greenbelt throughout the Highway 190 Widening Project Corridor, (Highway 190 right-of-way from its intersection with Highway 22 to its intersection with the Mandeville City Limits at Bayou Castain), shall be defined as the area from the existing DOTD right-of-way line a distance of twenty-five (25') feet **or** from the existing DOTD right-of-way line to the new DOTD right-of-way line, whichever is greater; and

Based on this regulation, the new DOTD row line was greater (~39’ - ~27’). The site plan proposed not only the future DOTD row line, but also added an additional 5’ greenbelt along US Hwy 190. This regulation was adopted during the active development of phase one for the DOTD row expansion – where the limits of construction ended at the west side of Jackson Ave on Hwy 190. To date, there were no addition plans on the schedule for future expansion.

Buffer: The proposed zoning for the hotel site was PCD, and follows the B-2 zoning district requirements for buffer requirements.

- **East side:** Adjacent property to the east was zoned B-1, Neighborhood Commercial and no buffer was required.

9.2.5.5.4. Buffer Zone Requirements

(6) The required depth of a buffer zone on a development site 200 feet in depth or greater, measured at right angles from the property line along which the buffer is required to be located, shall be expanded by an additional one (1) foot for each additional twenty (20) feet of site depth up to a maximum additional buffer of ten (10) feet.

- **South side:** The zoning for the adjacent property on the south side is zoned O/R Office Residential. These lots were developed with single family dwellings and required a landscape buffer. The site plan proposes a 22' 6" buffer calculated on the future DOTD row, and was compliant. Additionally, the site plan proposed a 5' greenbelt, beyond the future DOTD row.

Site Interior Landscaping:

Site Interior Planting Regulations – conceptual landscape plan revised through 8.10.18 indicates that the site interior landscaped area consisted of 8.09%, compliant with the minimum 8% required.

PARKING

6.4.44 Lodging (Transient) – Hotel/Motel

1 per each lodging units plus 1 per 200 s.f. of gross floor area including restaurant, Lobby & meeting rooms excluding guest rooms and access halls

This building was proposed with 40 guest rooms requiring 40 parking spaces. Additionally, the gross floor area including restaurant, lobby and meeting rooms was 3,200 square feet, (1:200 sf) which required an additional 16 parking spaces (3,200/200=16). The development required a total of 56 parking spaces and the site plan proposed 58 parking spaces which were in compliance with CLURO 6.4.44 Lodging (Transient) – Hotel/Motel.

Currently, the property was zoned B-1, Neighborhood Commercial and the CLURO stated that a Planned Commercial District followed the B-2, Site Development Criteria. Ordinance 18-26 contained the language indicating how the proposed development departed from the existing requirements of the CLURO, using the B-2, Site development criteria.

Ordinance 18-26 stated the following:

- (vi) the PCD limits the use of the Subject Property to an Inn and/or Boutique Hotel as opposed to more intense office, retail and service establishments, including multi-tenant shopping centers;
- (vii) allows for more creativity and design of the buildings to be constructed on the Subject Property as well as the placement of such buildings;
- (viii) the flexibility with regards to the design of the buildings allows for the inclusion of additional green space, which allows for the preservation of certain mature trees on the Subject Property and the reduction of the impervious area within the Subject Property to 64% under the PCD as opposed to the 75% allowed; and
- (ix) allows for a reduction in overall building size from 100,000 square feet allowed to 20,726 square feet proposed pursuant to the Site Plan.

Included was language addressing the proposed use of a hotel and that it improved what otherwise would be required under the CLURO. This was referenced in item (i).

The B-1, Neighbor Business District zoning and the B-2, Hwy Business District zoning were similar in much of the site development criteria, with the exception of the following:

	<u>B-1</u>	<u>B-2</u>
Maximum lot area:	40,000 sf	N/A
Maximum unit size	N/A	65,000 sf
Maximum building size	15,000 sf	100,000 sf

With the proposed rezoning to PCD, the entire development site could be regulated to provide for a more improved level of aesthetic (approving architectural elevations and specific site plan). Additionally, approval of a Conditional Use Permit would limit the land use on the site and the specific site plan (and accompanying plans) to that specifically approved under the Planned District Zoning and Conditional Use Permit.

Mr. Adams asked about the zoning for the nursing home across the street, and it was stated it was zoned Institutional. Mr. Clark asked if the property was built as a hotel, could it be converted to an elder care facility in the future. Ms. Scott said the use would have to be amended by the City Council. A hotel was not a permitted use in the B-1 zoning district and as a Planned District the tradeoff was to approve specific plans for the site. Mr. Clark said it was limited to construction and use. Mr. Blache said it would be applying the site development of the B-2 district. Ms. Scott said the plan was reviewed based on the B-2 Site Development Regulations, but the use was specific to only a hotel as presented. The commission would approve the architectural elevations and a specific set of plans.

Mr. Adams said since the demise of the Ozone Hotel there was a need for a hotel use. From his experience at Pelican Park there were times of year where no one could not find a room on the Northshore. The Comprehensive Plan called for a mix of uses. Mr. Blache asked if there was a description of the Gateway Overlay District in the Comprehensive Plan and Ms. Scott answered no. The Gateway Overlay District was created to address additional landscape requirements and at a later time the Design Guidelines were approved for review. This project would be presented to the Design Consultants for review and there would be comments before the next meeting.

Mr. Blache asked about the requirement for a Traffic Impact Study and his concern was ingress/egress safety. Most people had difficulty getting on Highway 190 heading west at certain times of the day.

Thad Ridgley, 113 Meribo Place, stated he was the applicant. Ms. Scott said the commission could request Traffic Study information, if needed. Mr. Adams said he did not think the project would add much more traffic, but turning west would be difficult but that was not created by this project. Mr. Ridgley said they felt the project was an upgrade of uses from a convenience store, restaurant or gas station. There would be more difficulty accessing those uses than a hotel. Mr. Clark said the hotel parking could become a convenient way to get to Florida Street as a cut through. Mr. Ridgley proposed a pork chop to restrict that cut through. Until there would be a highway improvement the roadway reduced from four lanes to three lanes. Mr. Clark said traffic was getting worse. Mr. Adams said most people use Montgomery and Atalin Streets to get around it. People living on Atalin Street did not want to drive more traffic that way. Mr. Blache said this would also create problems for the hotel guest. Mr. Ridgeley said they would be in support of a stop light.

Mr. Blache asked about lighting in the rear parking lot. Mr. Ridgley said they were working with the City, but they not developed the full scope. He assured the commission that they would move forward for the best interest of the City and their neighbors. Ms. Scott said the regulations required full cut off lighting and height restrictions. Mr. Blache asked for more information. Mr. Thomas said Mandeville was a Dark Skies community. Ms. Scott said the

**Zoning Commission
Work Session
August 14, 2018
Page 6**

commission could request the applicant to prepare a lighting plan for review for compliance and approve that as part of the package.

Mr. Blache asked about the rear buffer with the residential uses. Ms. Scott said most of the adjacent properties had installed solid wood fencing. Mr. Ridgeley said the first 20-30' would be fenced with bamboo. The south side would be a wood fence for the entire length of the property. Mr. Adams asked if there was a marketing study showing the need of hotel rooms. Mr. Ridgeley said they had not completed their market analysis. Mr. Adams asked if they knew what level of hotel would be proposed in terms of rates. Mr. Ridgeley said it would be mid-ranged and felt they could command a decent rate with the location. He said currently the zoning allowed for a 5' buffer for the property south of this property. Ms. Scott stated it would require a 20' buffer with an additional 2' for the depth of the property. Ms. Scott said the question was the 22.5' buffer to the rear, but the staff had not checked the plant material with this being a conceptual plan. There appeared to be a solid wood fence along the rear property line. There was an existing large stand of bamboo. The City allowed a maximum fence height of 7' that would be placed on the property. Mr. Thomas asked about the east side. Mr. Ridgeley said there would be nothing placed because it was heavily wooded. Ms. Scott said there was no buffer requirement between the two properties.

Mr. Ridgeley said with the current zoning, the building setback on the south side would be closer to the neighbors. Ms. Scott said the property would still require a 20' buffer. The project was proposing parking adjacent to the buffer and it could also be the location of a building. This would be consistent with either zoning district.

Louis Funck, 1441 Montgomery Street, said he previously owned the property from Atalin Street to Jackson Avenue and he felt responsible for his buyers. This appeared to be a request for an up zone. He spoke to the original owner who stated that the City told him that his project would take up so much area for retention that he could not do the project. Ms. Scott said the City typically did not require a retention pond. There was a conceptual drainage plan that was being reviewed by the City Engineers. Mr. Funck has several concerns that included the south side lighting, the drainage, how the bamboo would affect the drainage and the lighting disturbing the homeowners. He stated he would fight the zoning change. Mr. Adams asked Mr. Funck what he would prefer to be constructed on the property. Mr. Funck said he would prefer a shopping center, but not a gas station. Mr. Adams said a specific plan must be approved in a planned district. By right, the B-1 zoning could allow more intensive uses. At this time, the neighbors could have input on the plan. Mr. Clark said this was an issue when a homeowner purchased property next to a commercial use. Mr. Funck said the middle lot was zoned a B-1 zoning, but a variance was granted for the construction of a double. Mr. Adams said the zoning was originally B-2 and with the CLURO adoption the zoning became B-1. He suggested reviewing the zoning for the area from Girod Street east as to how the area was developing. Mr. Funck said he would like to see the existing bed and breakfast uses filled. Mr. Clark said gas stations and quick stops were light and noise invasive. Mr. Funck said if he was a developer, he would speak to the neighbors.

Michelle Omes, 1421 Montgomery Street, asked about the traffic. If no improvements were added at the Jackson Avenue/Florida Street intersection people would go through the neighborhood and there were a lot of children. Another issue was the noise regulations. How late could people be in the pool? Mr. Clark said the pool was located next to a swamp at a busy Highway 190 intersection.

Paula Fontana, 809 Jackson Avenue, was located at the corner of Jackson Avenue and Montgomery Street. She was concerned about the Jackson Avenue driveway with a lot of traffic coming from the lakefront. Young kids were at the lakefront and zoomed up the street late at night. She suggested placing the driveway only on Florida Street so there would not be

**Zoning Commission
Work Session
August 14, 2018
Page 7**

any Jackson Avenue traffic and the kids would be safer on the side streets. Her second concern was her neighbor's bedroom being adjacent to the buffer and parking. If the building was placed to the rear, it would not be cool. The third issue was safety. She often found trash, beer and drugs in the front yard. She was concerned without a gate that people might congregate. She was also concerned about drainage. Ms. Scott said the City Engineer was in the process of reviewing the plan.

Mr. Ridgley said he canvassed the area and had met with 2 of the 3 immediate neighbors. In reference to security, this was a high end establishment that would probably charge between \$150-\$200 per night. He would be the resident general manager on the site. The concerns were important to the neighbors and they wanted an upgrade to the community and neighborhood. With the current zoning, construction could take place without neighbor input. His business partner lived on Lakeshore Drive; he owned Mandeville property and they cared about the community. They were working with the City to construct a respectable business plan and hotel.

Mr. Adams asked if the gates would be locked. Mr. Ridgley said they would be all RFID, but they would not have security gates and thought it was not in the best interest of the City. He would prefer low level lighting. The property was situated with a large greenbelt so it would be subtle and have a coastal residential feel. Ms. Scott asked about traffic engineer information regarding access. Mr. Blache said Ms. Fontana had a good point regarding the entrances. Mr. Ridgley would prefer the main entrance on Highway 190 and no access to Jackson Avenue. Currently the way the road was situated, they had limited access to the property on Highway 190 with the road changing from two lanes into three way lane so it would become more risky in that location. Ms. Scott suggested meeting with DOTD.

Mr. Clark asked about the drainage and Ms. Scott said the City Engineer was reviewing the plan. Mr. Clark said there should be more than three elevation points. Mr. Blache asked for more information on lighting. Ms. Bush said for a balance between security and subtlety. Mr. Adams asked Mayor Villere about reconstructing Highway 190 with a median. Mayor Villere said information should be obtained in January or February from the engineering consultants. He would call them for any input on this area. Mr. Clark asked if Mandeville was a Dark Sky community. Ms. Scott said Mandeville was not a certified community, but the City regulations included many of the principles. The City required full cut off shielding to reduce glare, must be faced downward, and the height of lumens. The City was working with LED lighting as plans were submitted. Lower level lighting must be reviewed so there was no light over wash to the adjacent property owners.

In summary additional information needed was a lighting plan, the City Engineer to review ingress/egress with the ability to allow Highway 190 access only, and the applicant would contact DOTD to obtain in writing about limiting the access.

Ms. Bush moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Mr. Clark and was unanimously approved.

Lori Spranley, Secretary

Nixon Adams, Chairman
Zoning Commission