

The meeting was called to order at 6:00pm by Commissioner Claire Durio

The secretary called the roll.

Commissioners Present: Karen Gautreaux, Brian Rhinehart, Scott Quillin, Nixon Adams, Simmie Fairley, Mike Pierce, and Claire Durio

Absent: None

Also Present: Cara Bartholomew, Director Planning Department; Lauren Brinkman, Planner; David Parnell, City Attorney; Alex Weiner, Secretary; Tina Myers, Secretary

Ms. Gautreaux said that this was Mr. Fairley's last meeting as a commissioner and wanted to thank him for all the work he has done.

Ms. Gautreaux said that case P23-04-02 would be heard last and moved into the Zoning Commission meeting.

New Business

P23-04-02 – A text amendment to CLURO Articles 2, 5, 6, 7, and 10 to amend regulations relative to the installation of signs City-wide including, but not limited to provisions to ensure that regulations are content-neutral, clear, and concise and to address issues such as abandoned signs, hazardous signs, temporary signs, free-standing signs, murals, materials used in sign construction, and related matters.

Ms. Bartholomew said that they added digital signs to the prohibited list. They talked about temporary signs, there was a proposal for 16 sqft everywhere. When looking at the old code there was a provision for only 8 sqft in residential areas that they wanted to extend to B-3 as well. The new proposed regulations for temporary signs would be 16 sqft in commercial districts and 8 sqft in residential and B-3 districts.

Ms. Durio asked if there could be multiple signs with a total maximum area.

Evelyn Campo, Desire Line Representative: There were some questions at the last meeting, she verified that there was currently one per site but if there was a second frontage then you could have a second sign.

Mr. Adams asked if the City could afford a new sign ordinance, was there enough money to enforce it? Ms. Bartholomew said they were clearing up questions or vagueness and that there was no issue with enforcement. Mr. Adams said that they should not do an ordinance if the City cannot enforce it. Ms. Bartholomew said she would love to know what is not being enforced. The City responds to all complaints and the code enforcement officer has logs that show his activities.

Ms. Durio said there is a sign code in place that needs to be reviewed for content neutrality.

Mr. Rhinehart said that was the primary driver of this. If the code is streamlined, then enforcement would be easier.

Mr. Adams said that Gilbert had four temporary signs which had to be taken down after the event. The City is going to get kickbacks on not allowing multiple signs. Ms. Bartholomew said only one temporary sign is allowed at the moment.

Ms. Durio suggested allowing multiple signs with a maximum total area of 8 sqft. Ms. Campo said that is an option they could do. Limiting the number is easier to enforce, but limiting the total area is not much harder. Ms. Durio said they could still have a maximum amount of signs like two or four.

Mr. Rhinehart asked if there were any slides that needed to be covered before they got too in depth with the discussion. Ms. Campo said that she added some slides based on questions at the last meeting. They can go through them or just discuss as the discussion so far was about the content on the new slides.

Mr. Rhinehart said that there were two issues that were emailed directly to him, before he got to them he was wondering if Ms. Campo had an answer to the shelf life question for political/garage signs.

Ms. Campo said she went back through the legal rulings and requiring removal after the event is unconstitutional. Mr. Rhinehart asked if they would just stay forever then, Ms. Campo said they would not stay forever you just have to have the same time period for all temporary signs. Ms. Bartholomew said the proposed time is 90 days for all temporary signs.

Mr. Adams said that they never enforce more than one temporary sign in the yards. Ms. Bartholomew said that leads to sign clutter. The commission can amend the draft to have a total maximum square footage and a total maximum number of signs.

Ms. Durio said she is not sure what the standard sign size is. She has seen signs that are 3'x2'. Mr. Adams said they are usually 18"x24". Ms. Durio suggested not more than four of those.

Mr. Quillin said he agreed with the total square footage and quantity and it would fix the problem Mr. Adams brought up with multiple signs.

Mr. Rhinehart asked if there was a consensus for a recommendation.

Ms. Durio suggested two signs for every 100' of frontage.

Mr. Adams said a 2'x2' sign would be large in a residential area.

Mr. Quillin suggested 3-4sqft as a maximum for an individual sign.

Mr. Rhinehart asked the time limit would be 90 days after the event. Ms. Durio said it was 90 days total.

Mr. Adams said that political signs on the street are out of hand. They are a traffic hazard.

Ms. Durio said they cannot regulate them if the signs are held, Ms. Campo said that was a free speech issue.

Ms. Campo said with a content neutral code language would be added to regulate things installed on private property or enforcing things like not being allowed in the right of way. A lot of times there is also language that says this does not infringe upon someone's free speech such as holding a sign.

Mr. Rhinehart said that makes sense.

Mr. Adams said the City can do whatever it wants on public property.

Ms. Durio said that can be regulated, just not in the sign code.

Mr. Parnell said that if someone is stepping into traffic the police would handle that.

Mr. Rhinehart said that EMC signs were banned, but he was concerned about loopholes. Ms. Campo said they added clarification that digital signs are treated the same as EMC and EVM signs.

Mr. Rhinehart brought up opaque signs that were attached to windows. Ms. Campo asked if there were complaints about too much coverage, Mr. Rhinehart said that was correct.

Ms. Campo said that they could put a limit on the percentage allowed to be covered on a single window and the total coverage on all the windows.

Mr. Adams said that they cannot have code enforcement look at percentages. The most clear-cut thing would be to not allow them.

Ms. Durio asked if the window coverings would be less than 25%, Mr. Adams said that there should be nothing on the windows.

Ms. Campo said that there would be no first amendment issues, but people use them a lot.

Ms. Durio said that she sees lost cats and signs at the trailhead. They seem local and not a problem.

Ms. Bartholomew said that adhesive stickers are still window signs.

Ms. Campo said that window signs and temporary signs are in different categories. There is no time limit for window signs.

Ms. Durio asked if signs taped onto a window for an event would be considered temporary signage. Ms. Bartholomew said those would be considered incidental signage.

Mr. Quillin said that the signs on the windows were not opaque, you can see out when you are inside of the building. There should be some care used with the wording as they are not opaque. Ms. Durio asked how they should be described.

Ms. Campo said that the word opaque is not in the code, it just refers to window signs.

Mr. Adams said that there was a monument sign case in the past with trouble on the final ground elevation and suggested it be measured from the center of the street. Ms. Bartholomew said that measuring from grade is the easiest solution, the center of the street in some places is 1 ½ feet higher than the building grade.

Mr. Adams asked if the entire base had to be on the ground, Ms. Bartholomew said it did. Mr. Adams said that they use to require landscaping, Ms. Bartholomew said she was unsure about that, but the entire base has to be on the ground.

Mr. Quillin said that he agreed with Mr. Adams on the thoughts about measuring from the center of the street. If there is a steep slope, then the sign would not be very visible. Ms. Bartholomew said that there are not many drastic changes of grade in the City, Mr. Quillin said that Liz's has a big change of grade vs the center of the street.

Ms. Bartholomew said an option could be to do the center of the street or at grade, whichever is higher. That could lead to having sign bases that are 5' in height. If the commission wants to keep the scale low then the measurement should be from grade.

Ms. Campo added that not everyone builds to the max height, if the grade is lower then they could take advantage of the height limit. Ms. Durio added that is why the commission is here for the unusual circumstances.

Mr. Adams asked what the difference would be for a mural vs a sign. Ms. Campo said that they cannot say anything on the content. It could be based on the method of construction/application.

Mr. Adams asked if Liz's could have what they have. Mr. Quillin said that you can find it by describing the look, but he is not sure if it is signage or not.

Mr. Rhinehart asked if there was a Pepsi logo painted on a wall if it would be a mural. Ms. Campo said a mural is defined as being painted or applied. There is a limit in the Historic District for the lettering or text. Some cities use that limit throughout.

Mr. Quillin asked if an outside wall was torn down revealing a coca cola logo from the 1930s would that be allowed? Mr. Adams said that was tough to call.

Ms. Bartholomew said that if it is tough to call it will go before the commission. She added that when a sign is on a significant or contributing building it will go before the Historic District Commission to look for compatibility.

Janet Smith, 1164 Rue Chinon: She wanted to remind the commission that a lot of people care about this even if they are not here in person. She appreciated the confirmation of digital signs on the prohibited list and would like to see that before the approval Ms. Bartholomew said it is posted on the website.

Ms. Smith said that she added the word "opaque" when talking about the window coverings. She said that there are different aesthetics with clear glass covering vs 100% covering. She suggested possibly changing the definition to a different thing. The current recommendation is to reduce the coverage from 50% - 25% but she encourages them to eliminate the cling film for the multitude of issues that surround it.

Mr. Rhinehart said the cling film limit could be limited to 25%. Ms. Durio said it does not look particularly attractive and she typically sees it at gas stations.

Mr. Adams asked why they needed to have signs showing what their products are, people know what they have.

Ms. Smith said that she does not want to restrict it to cling, it looks like something painted on the windows.

Mr. Adams asked if there was a limit on lettering.

Ms. Campo said that one way to regulate aesthetics was to regulate the method of application like with murals. They could only allow window signs that are hand etched or painted. It may not be the best way but it is an option.

Ms. Durio asked if there were a lot of places with the cling film that were not gas stations.

Skelly Kreller, 280 Dona: He agrees that window signs should be eliminated, no questions. There is one code enforcement officer and one police officer. This is impossible to enforce. It would be easier to enforce if it was not allowed. Gas stations do not need them. He disagrees with the size for temporary signs. The recommendation is to have 8 sqft in residential and 16 sqft in commercial. The old regulation was 32 sqft. That should not be changed. Window signs should be eliminated, and the commercial size should be 32 sqft.

Mr. Adams thought that for "For Lease" signs they were supposed to use the space on the monument sign.

Mr. Rhinehart asked what would happen if after the 90 days and it was still for lease? Ms. Bartholomew said that if it was an active listing, they would allow it.

Ms. Campo wanted to make sure that she understood what type of sign they were talking about. If they were talking about an attached cabinet sign that they changed to say "For Lease" then that sounds like a permanent sign which would be allowed.

Mr. Adams said that they do not rent property to people passing by and the signs are not needed. Every tenant thinks they need their name on the road, but that is not how they advertise. There are still signs showing lots for sale in the Sanctuary. Ms. Bartholomew asked what the solution would be.

Mr. Quillin said that if it is temporary then at least they could reduce the square footage. He is against what Mr. Kreller recommended. Ms. Bartholomew said that the draft is recommending 16 sqft.

Ms. Durio asked if the 16 sqft would be for temporary only, Ms. Bartholomew said that was correct.

Ms. Durio asked if there was a consensus on glass/window signs. Ms. Bartholomew said the current draft recommends reducing the coverage to 25% but the commission could change that.

Ms. Durio suggested prohibiting cling film while keeping the 25% coverage.

Mr. Quillin brought up only hand painted or etched signs, Ms. Durio said she was unsure about going that far as hand painted was a big expense.

Trilby Lenfant, 16 Preserve Lane: The window signs are not limited to cling film, there are some made of chloroplast. Ms. Durio said they cover the entire window area and is not sure how to define them. Ms. Lenfant is in support of eliminating them. She added that the sign reference by Mr. Adams for the lots for sale has been there for the past 17 years and asked what could be done to enforce that. Ms. Durio said that with the new regulations you could call to say the sign has been up longer than 90 days.

Mr. Rhinehart said they could make it a permanent sign. Mr. Adams brought up that they were not parcels, they were selling lots.

Ms. Lenfant also wanted the rest of the town the protections being provided to the Historic District. Ms. Durio asked specifically what protections she was wanting, Ms. Lenfant said she would like to see any protections in the Historic District given to the rest of the town.

Ms. Durio said that there would be different signage on the highway than the rest of the neighborhood. There would be a different zoning designation for that, but the neighborhoods should be the same.

Mr. Parnell said that one of the code enforcement issues brought up at the last meeting was someone had shades to block the sun with a message of some sort on the other side. It was not attached to the window and not a decal, he was not sure how that would be covered. Mr. Rhinehart said the 25% coverage should cover everything.

Mr. Parnell added that an important thing to remember is why they needed certain signs, and the City could not restrict them from advertising. Safety reasons and needing to see in the building are reasons they could use.

Mr. Adams said they could use aesthetics as well, Mr. Parnell said that someone's aesthetics could be different than another.

Mr. Kreller said that shades should not be counted if they were neutral colored. He agreed that the City should be treated the same. The Historic District and West Side should be treated the same. There are some specific things in the Historic District but they can be addressed individually. He does not see how the 25% coverage could be enforced without 12-15 officers. There is not much enforcement here. He is not saying that is wrong, just wondering how it would be enforced.

Ms. Bartholomew wanted to add that several emails were received and every email had the same example. Unless there is another example that is missing then she believes they can handle it. She also said that the code enforcement has been to several gas stations and measured.

Mr. Rhinehart said that enforcement has to start with someone saying that they have a problem.

Mr. Kreller said that there are multiple stores with them in use.

Ms. Bartholomew said that the commission can recommend not having them, or enforce them at the 25% coverage.

Mr. Rhinehart said this was coming to the council as well. Mr. Kreller said that this is just a discussion and thanked the commission and everyone for working on it and this was needed.

Mr. Adams said it seems like there were two issues.

Ms. Durio said that if they moved to eliminating then there should be a compliance period. Mr. Rhinehart said that it was not reasonable to have zero signage.

Mr. Adams said he thinks it will be an enforcement impossibility and would be more effective if they went to none.

Mr. Parnell said that the material would be the harder issue, not the math. The material has been clarified.

Mr. Rhinehart said the only main comment was the square footage and number of signs if someone wanted to make a motion for that.

Ms. Durio asked what the consensus was for the square footage, Ms. Bartholomew said it was 8 sqft with a maximum of two signs.

Mr. Parnell brought up that Mr. Adams thought a 4'x4' sign was too big and suggested a 2'x3' sign if they wanted one sign.

Ms. Durio said they should not specify a size as that is determined by the manufacturer, it should just be no more than two.

Mr. Quillin would like to change that to a maximum of one sign at 4 or 3 square feet so it keeps the individual sign small.

Mr. Parnell asked if they would allow different topics on the face? Mr. Quillin said he could not read them.

Ms. Durio said that if the maximum would be 3 sqft per sign, if that is the case then there would be no more than 6 sqft total, she does not see why they could have one 8 sqft sign if they could only have two 3 sqft signs. Mr. Quillin said they could do two 3 sqft signs, and then a smaller sign.

Ms. Durio said the maximum of 8 sqft and the two signs are good for her. The maximum of an individual sign takes care of itself.

Ms. Durio made a motion to propose a maximum of 8 sqft with a total of two signs.

Mr. Quillin proposed an amendment to the motion of each individual sign being no more than 3 sqft. Mr. Adams seconded the amendment.

Ms. Gautreaux asked for some clarification.

Ms. Durio asked how they would get the 8 sqft. Mr. Quillin said not to worry about the 8 sqft. They could do other sizes.

Ms. Durio asked what the amendment was, Mr. Quillin wanted to limit the square footage of an individual sign to 3 sqft.

The secretary called the roll and the amendment failed with a vote of 4-3 with commissioners Gautreaux, Pierce, Rhinehart, and Durio voting against.

Ms. Bartholomew said they were back to 8 total square feet with a maximum of two signs per site.

The Secretary called the roll and it passed unanimously.


Mr. Rhinehart said there were no further additions or amendments to the language and asked if there was a motion to recommend the council to accept.

Ms. Durio made a motion to recommend to the council to accept. Mr. Adams seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Fairley motioned to adjourn the meeting, Mr. Rhinehart seconded, and all were in favor. The meeting was adjourned at 7:33pm.



Alex Weiner, Secretary



Karen Gautreaux, Chairwoman
Planning Commission

Brian Rhinehart commenced the Zoning Commission Meeting.

Announcement that written notice of decisions regarding zoning variances will be filed in the Commission's office the following day of this meeting at which time applicable appeal time will begin to run.

New Business

V23-04-12 – Allison and Brian Froeba request a variance to CLURO Section 9.2.5.2. Vegetation Protection Zones, Square 5 Lot 6A, R-1 Single Family Residential District, 1617 Lakeshore Drive

Mr. Quillin said he made a statement at the last meeting that limestone is not usually put down directly onto the soil and that usually some type of fabric mesh is placed down, which should be suggested for this as well. Ms. Bartholomew said the applicants agreed to the placement of the fabric mesh.

Ms. Durio asked if the arborist weighed in on the removal of the sidewalk. Ms. Bartholomew said that she looked at the entire site and any removal of concrete underneath a live oak is always encouraged.

Mr. Adams said that this was less than 1% of the canopy. Mr. Rhinehart agreed that this was a very small amount.

Mr. Quillin made a motion to approve the case as submitted, Ms. Durio seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

V23-04-14 – John Keller requests a variance to CLURO Section 8.1.1.4. Allowed Setbacks Encroachments, Square 1 Lots 13 & 14, R-1 Single Family Residential District, 2816 South Street

Mr. Adams said this case was discussed in detail at the last meeting and it was a reasonable request.

Kylie Rogers, 2818 South: Would this be over the property line? Ms. Bartholomew said no, it would be 3ft from the property line. Mr. Quillin asked if Ms. Rogers objected, Ms. Rogers replied she did not.

Mr. Adams made a motion to approve the case as submitted, Ms. Gautreaux seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

V23-04-15 – Lynn Brayton requests a variance to CLURO Section 7.5.10.3 B-3 Site Development Criteria – Setback Encroachment, Square 34 Lot D1-A, B-3 Old Mandeville Business District, 418 Lafitte Street

Mr. Pierce asked if there was a 14' limit for accessory structures? Ms. Bartholomew said that was only for accessory structures, accessory dwellings can be higher than that.

Mr. Adams said it was 14' by measurement not height. Mr. Pierce said he does not think they have that either.

Mr. Adams said they were not asking for a height variance, Mr. Pierce said that is why he brought it up, the plans seem to contradict that.

Ms. Bartholomew said that the accessory dwelling has to meet what the regular structure would meet. She said that an accessory building, like a shed, could not exceed 14' in height by formula.

Mr. Pierce asked why the 14' limit was in the packet. If it does not apply that is fine.

Mr. Quillin asked where the 10' measured from in the original layout.

Vaughan Sollberger, 235 Girod, Architect: It may be an issue of the placement of the 10' on the plan to keep it away from other graphics. The layout is 10' from the existing building. The balcony is habitable area, so they are considering that area as 10' from the building due to caution. He added that in an earlier iteration they were asking for the 30% administrative flex, but it was not allowed due to the existing building already utilizing the flex.

Ms. Bartholomew said that technically it would meet the 30% but when looking at the flex they look at all the buildings as a whole.

Mr. Adams asked how tall it was.

Mr. Sollberger said that accessory structures can be located 3' from any property line but are limited to a maximum of 14'. This is different as it is a accessory dwelling so it meets the requirements of the regular building.

Mr. Adams asked if that was right, he thought an accessory structure was an accessory structure. Ms. Bartholomew added that it has to meet the BFE so that changes the height.

Mr. Sollberger said that if a second dwelling is built it has to meet the requirements of the primary structure, height included. Mr. Adams said they were not asking for height anyway.

Mr. Pierce asked if what they were saying was that it has to meet BFE and be elevated? Ms. Bartholomew said it did as it was a dwelling. She added that there is a provision for accessory dwellings that are required to be elevated.

Mr. Pierce asked if the primary structure was elevated, Ms. Bartholomew said it was not, the primary structure does not meet BFE.

Mr. Rhinehart said it was already built though.

Mr. Pierce said he was wondering if it needed to meet BFE when he drove by as the old one does not. Ms. Bartholomew said they are two different situations. Mr. Pierce asked if the property needed to meet BFE. Ms. Bartholomew said that any new structures would need to meet BFE.

Mr. Sollberger thanked Mr. Fairley for his years on the commission.

Mr. Adams said he was sorry to hear about the passing of Mr. Sollberger's father.

Ms. Gautreaux made a motion to approve the case as submitted, Mr. Quillin seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

V23-04-16 – Brad and Dawn del Rio request a variance to CLURO Section 5.2.3.2. Drainage Overlay District and Fill Sub-Area A, Square 77 Lot 1B, R-1 Single Family Residential District, 1331 Madison Street

Mr. Rhinehart asked if the City Engineer had looked this over. Ms. Bartholomew said they did, along with public works and they both said it would have no adverse impact and would help the property with the wash out issues it was facing.

Mr. Adams made a motion to approve the case as submitted, Ms. Durio seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

V23-04-17 – East Approach LLC requests a variance to CLURO Section 9.2.5.7. Live Oak Protection Requirements, Square A80 Lot 80A, B-2 Highway Business District, 2810 East Causeway Approach

Mr. Adams asked what the number of trees they would get in replacement. Ms. Bartholomew said it would be 4.

Mr. Adams said he thought they should require what it would take to get a decent planting.

Ms. Bartholomew said that the City is going to have their landscape architect draw up some plans to mimic the wildflower garden in between East Causeway and Florida and move it further down. There are trees in that which are mostly magnolias with some live oaks.

Mr. Quillin asked if only the southern tree was removed would there be issues with the insurance company.

Ladson Poole, Arborist for the Applicant: They tried to get in contact with the insurance company to get some specifics on what they were wanting but they heard nothing so far. He met with Ms. Fuselier on site last week and going off of previous experience with insurance requirements, what would need to be removed would be well over what would maintain the health of the tree. Too many large branches would need to be removed. The applicant is willing to plant in the greenspace in front of the building.

Ms. Durio asked if he was talking about the northern or southern tree, Mr. Poole said he was referring to the southern tree.

Mr. Quillin asked if the northern tree was an issue with the insurance. Mr. Poole said the northern tree is not an issue as there is nothing overhanging. Mr. Quillin said his main concern was if they only allowed removal of one if they would be in the same spot with the insurance company.

Mr. Poole said his only concern was down the road when the tree gets bigger it becoming an issue. As of today it is not a concern.

Ms. Durio said the email said to simply cut back the overhanging limbs, if there are no overhanging limbs they would probably be fine.

Mr. Quillin asked if this would be a hardship if he could not get insurance. Mr. Rhinehart said if he was denied coverage maybe.

Mr. Rhinehart said to be contrary there are pine trees 10 – 12 feet away that could as easily fall down on the structure.

Mr. Adams said it would be a tradeoff with one tree in the back corner that is not as visible with getting a healthier urban forest.

Ms. Durio said the southern tree is close to the building as there are roots right by the sidewalk and was probably planted either too close or before the structure was built.

Mr. Quillin made a motion to approve the request with the condition that only the southern live oak be removed and replaced with the four 2 inch caliper trees as recommended by the city arborist. Mr. Fairley seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

With all new business for the Zoning Commission finished, Mr. Rhinehart adjourned the Zoning Commission to move back to the Planning Commission to hear case P23-04-02.



Alex Weiner, Secretary



Brian Rhinehart, Chairman
Zoning Commission

Alex Weiner

From: Yvette [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, April 24, 2023 8:21 AM
To: Alex Weiner
Subject: SIGNAGE

Please do something about the signs on these businesses that insist on covering every square inch with flashing lights and cheap paper window coverings, it's disgusting and tacky. These businesses don't want anyone looking in the windows after closing so they take the cheap out.

It looks like Veterans Blvd. in Metairie, you don't see this in Madisonville.

Thank you.

Yvette Accardo

Alex Weiner

From: Wayne Schmidt <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, April 24, 2023 10:57 AM
To: Alex Weiner
Subject: Signage letter

Dear P&Z Commissioner:

Thank you for working to update our city's signage code. Protecting the aesthetics of Mandeville is so important. Please prohibit (for now and the future) all electronic message centers, electronic variable message signs and digital signs. Also, please amend the regulations to completely prohibit opaque "attached signs" for windows as those cannot be easily enforced.

These items were discussed at the last meeting, but need to be confirmed in the revised amendment recommendation before you vote.

Included here is an example of the blight caused by illegal, non-conforming window signage that currently exists in Mandeville today.

I appreciate the work you do for the city. Thank you for protecting it.

Sincerely,

Wayne Schmidt
1070 Rue Chino
MANDEVILLE , La 70471

Illegal signage that exists today in

Sent from my iPhone

Alex Weiner

From: Tanya Everett [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, April 23, 2023 6:45 PM
To: Alex Weiner
Subject: Signs

Thank you for working to protect our signage laws in Mandeville and keep our aesthetics pleasing to the eye. Please continue to keep ALL electronic signs prohibited including electronic message centers, electronic variable message signs and digital signage. Also please vote to amend the regulations to ban all opaque window fronts.

These items were discussed at last meeting.

I appreciate the work that you do.

Thank you ,

Tanya Everett
1493 Rue Bayonne
Mandeville, LA 70471

Sent from my iPad

Alex Weiner

From: SHELLEY Rainey [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, April 24, 2023 9:32 AM
To: Alex Weiner
Subject: Request

I have lived in Mandeville for the past 21 years and plan on retiring here. There's both good and bad that comes with the substantial growth that we have experience in our city. I believe we very much need to protect our aesthetics and ask that all electronic signs, message centers, etc. be prohibited now and in the future. Also, please amend the regulations to completely prohibit opaque "attached signs" for windows as those cannot be easily enforced.

Thank you for you for your work and dedication. I know it's a challenging job.

Sincerely,
Shelley Rainey

Alex Weiner

From: Sam Smalley <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Sunday, April 23, 2023 7:58 AM
To: Alex Weiner
Subject: Sign ordinance

I'm opposed to change the ordinance on electronic signage.

Alex Weiner

From: ROBERT SANTOPADRE [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, April 23, 2023 5:28 PM
To: Alex Weiner
Subject: P&Z signage

Please do not allow the lighted signs in our town. Also, please amend the rule that allows the opaque signs that are as equally distracting and not a good look for our town.

Robert Santopadre
1270 Rue Beauvais
Mandeville La, 70471

Sent from my iPhone

Alex Weiner

From: Pat Iserman [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, April 24, 2023 9:39 AM
To: Alex Weiner
Subject: Signs,let's keep mandeville MANDEVILLE

Not Metairie 😊

Alex Weiner

From: Michelle Boze <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, April 24, 2023 10:20 AM
To: Alex Weiner
Subject: Signage

Dear P&Z Commissioner:

Thank you for working to update our city's signage code. Please, please, please protect our beautiful city by prohibiting (for now and the future) all electronic message centers, electronic variable message signs and digital signs. Also, please amend the regulations to completely prohibit opaque "attached signs" for windows as those cannot be easily enforced.

I appreciate the work you do for the city. Thank you for protecting it.

Sincerely,

Michelle Boze- Toomey
2420 Mathis Street
Mandeville, Louisiana 70448

AND

1446 Rue Bayonne
Mandeville, Louisiana 70471

Alex Weiner

From: Brian Rhinehart [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, April 24, 2023 3:31 PM
To: Alex Weiner
Cc: Cara Bartholomew
Subject: FW: Signage Code

From: Michael McGoey [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, April 24, 2023 1:39 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Signage Code

Dear Commissioner::

We are residents of Fontainebleau.

Thank you for working to update our city's signage code. Protecting the aesthetics of Mandeville is so important. Please prohibit (for now and the future) all electronic message centers, electronic variable message signs and digital signs. Also, please amend the regulations to completely prohibit opaque "attached signs" for windows as those cannot be easily enforced.

These items were discussed at the last meeting, but need to be confirmed in the revised amendment recommendation before you vote.

Included here is an example of the blight caused by illegal, non-conforming window signage that currently exists in Mandeville today.

We appreciate the work you do for the city. Thank you for protecting it.

Sincerely,

Michael and Suzette McGoey
1442 Rue Bayonne
Mandeville, LA 70471

Where is Code Enforcement ??



Alex Weiner

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, April 22, 2023 8:25 PM
To: Alex Weiner
Subject: Signage

We are in support of prohibiting electric message/digital signs, as well as window coverings in Mandeville businesses.
Thank you. Mary Beth and Kent Lambert

Sent from my iPhone

Alex Weiner

From: Mark Wolfe [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, April 23, 2023 8:13 PM
To: Alex Weiner
Subject: Signage vote

Dear Mr. Weiner:

It is my understanding that there will soon be a Planning and Zoning meeting and vote on updating our city's signage code. I have been a resident on Mandeville for almost 30 years. It is where I chose to purchase my last home. A huge reason for my choice was the rural, homey feel I got from the City. I raised my three children here. Although we have seen an explosion of growth since I bought my home, especially since Katrina. I look at the trip to Covington from my house and am sadly reminded of Metairie. A Cement highway, treeless, no more Pretty Acres, big box stores, traffic, etc. yet, to date, somehow, Mandeville has done a decent job in controlling the cement city landscape.

Maintaining Mandeville's ambiance and charm is vital to its residents as it makes Mandeville a great place to call home and protects our land and property values, which should be important to us all, especially our leadership.

I am urging you to vote to prohibit all electronic message centers, electronic variable message signs and digital signs indefinitely as it cheapens the appearance and charm of our roadways and City.

Additionally, please amend the regulations to completely prohibit opaque "attached signs" for windows as they are a safety hazard and invite crime (in addition to being terribly unsightly).

When a store front has opaque signage, criminals are more likely to target such store for robbery or worse and putting employees and customers in those establishments in eminent danger. When law enforcement is prevented from seeing what is happening within a store because their vision is obscured, it makes their job much more difficult in adequately assessing a potentially dangerous situation. This in turn places the lives of first responders in danger as well. I know this because I had a client, working in just such a store, murdered and the criminals exited the store successfully. When called, police were unable to enter the store until it was too late for my client because law enforcement could not put eyes on the unfolding situation.

Some of these items were discussed at the last meeting, however the aforementioned safety issue was not raised. I am raising it as it is a vital consideration. All of these issues should be confirmed in the revised amendment recommendation before you vote.

The work you do does not go unnoticed and is greatly appreciated. Please make our home, Mandeville, the winner in this vote by protecting its integrity, desirability, its value, its safety and its beauty.

Of course with time comes growth, but growth should never be at "any" cost. Especially at the cost of the citizens of Mandeville. Thank you for your consideration. I remain,

Very truly yours,

MARK R WOLFE

Sent from my iPhone

Alex Weiner

From: Brian Rhinehart <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, April 24, 2023 3:33 PM
To: Alex Weiner
Cc: Cara Bartholomew
Subject: FW: We Oppose Electronic and Digital Signs in Mandeville

From: Leo Matthews <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, April 24, 2023 9:16 AM
To: Karen Gautreaux <[REDACTED]>; Brian Rhinehart <[REDACTED]>; Simmie Fairley <[REDACTED]>; Scott Quillin <[REDACTED]>; Mike Pierce <[REDACTED]>; Nixon Adams <[REDACTED]>
Subject: We Oppose Electronic and Digital Signs in Mandeville

Dear P&Z Commissioner:

Thank you for working to update our city's signage code. Protecting the aesthetics of Mandeville is very important. Please prohibit (for now and the future) all electronic message centers, electronic variable message signs and digital signs. Also, please amend the regulations to eliminate opaque "attached signs" for windows as those cannot be easily enforced.

These items were discussed at the last meeting, but need to be confirmed in the revised amendment recommendation before you vote.

We appreciate the work you do for the city. Thank you for protecting it.

Sincerely,

Leo Matthews and Janet Neidermeier
1121 Rue Chinon
Mandeville, La, 70471

Alex Weiner

From: Leila Haydel [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, April 24, 2023 1:48 PM
To: Alex Weiner
Subject: signage consideration please

Dear Mr. Weiner,

Thanks so much for paying attention to our fair city & all the work ya'll do for it. Updating our city's signage code, thereby protecting the aesthetics of Mandeville, is of utmost importance to us homeowners & all its citizens. Said rules need to be enforced.

In the interest of your vote tomo night, please note my 'vote' to prohibit (for now AND future) all electronic message centers, electronic variable message signs & digital signs. Amending the regulations to completely prohibit the opaque "attached signs" for windows would be a code that's really hard to enforce, therefore, a vote to prohibit them as well is my request.

PLEASE confirm all these items (discussed at last meeting) b4 voting on the revised amendment on Tues.

Thank you for protecting our cities ambiance.

Sincerely,

Leila Haydel
72 Tranquility
Sanctuary

Alex Weiner

From: Kathy williams <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Sunday, April 23, 2023 7:59 PM
To: Alex Weiner
Subject: No electronic signs

Dear P&Z Commissioner:

Thank you for working to update our city's signage code. Protecting the aesthetics of Mandeville is so important. Please prohibit (for now and the future) all electronic message centers, electronic variable message signs and digital signs. Also, please amend the regulations to completely prohibit opaque "attached signs" for windows as those cannot be easily enforced.

These items were discussed at the last meeting, but need to be confirmed in the revised amendment recommendation before you vote.

Included here is an example of the blight caused by illegal, non-conforming window signage that currently exists in Mandeville today.

I appreciate the work you do for the city. Thank you for protecting it.

Sincerely,

Kathy Williams
774 Rue Calais

Where is Code Enforcement ??



Sent from my iPhone

Alex Weiner

From: Jonathan Maurin [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, April 24, 2023 8:35 AM
To: Alex Weiner
Subject: Mandeville Signage Code Request - Maurin

Dear P&Z Commissioner:

Thank you for your time spent working to update our city's signage code. Protecting the aesthetics of Mandeville is so important. Please prohibit (for now and the future) all electronic message centers, electronic variable message signs and digital signs. Also, please amend the regulations to **eliminate** opaque "attached signs" for windows as those cannot be easily enforced.

These items were discussed at the last meeting, but need to be confirmed in the revised amendment recommendation before you vote.

Included here is an example of the blight caused by unconfirming signage that exists in Mandeville today. I appreciate the work you do for the city. Thank you for protecting it.

Sincerely,

Jonathan Maurin
21 Rue Reims, Mandeville LA 70471



Illegal signage that exists today in Mandeville

All the best,

Jonathan Maurin

C: [REDACTED]

E: [REDACTED]

Alex Weiner

From: Greenville [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, April 23, 2023 7:31 PM
To: Alex Weiner
Subject: Sign Code for upcoming meeting

Dear P&Z Commissioner:

Please protecting the aesthetics of Mandeville by prohibiting (for now and the future) all electronic message centers, electronic variable message signs and digital signs. Also, please amend the regulations to completely prohibit opaque "attached signs" for windows as those cannot be easily enforced.

These items were discussed at the last meeting, but need to be confirmed in the revised amendment recommendation before you vote.

Included here is an example of the blight caused by **illegal, non-conforming window signage** that currently exists in Mandeville today.

I appreciate the work you do for the city. Thank you for protecting it.

Sincerely,
John Overton
988 Rue Chinon
Mandeville



Alex Weiner

From: Heather Watkins [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, April 24, 2023 7:00 AM
Subject: Signage Code

Good morning P&Z Commissioners:

Thank you for working to update our city's signage code. Protecting the aesthetics of Mandeville is so important. Please prohibit (for now and the future) all electronic message centers, electronic variable message signs and digital signs. Also, please amend the regulations to completely prohibit opaque "attached signs" for windows, as those cannot be easily enforced.

These items were discussed at the last meeting, but need to be confirmed in the revised amendment recommendation before you vote.

We appreciate the work each of you do for the city. Thank you for protecting it.

Sincerely,

Jeff and Heather Watkins
1476 Rue Bayonne
Fontainebleau Subdivision, Mandeville

Alex Weiner

From: Janet Fabre Smith <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, April 24, 2023 11:04 AM
To: Alex Weiner
Subject: Comments on amendments to Mandeville Signage Regulations

Alex, thank you for forwarding these comments to the commissioners.

To: The Mandeville Planning Commission
From: Janet Smith
Date: April 24, 2023
Re: Comment on the proposed amendments to the CLURO Articles 2,5,6,7 and 10 and related sign regulation

NOTE: The draft of amendments posted on the website and in the packets to be used for the April 25th meeting is dated March 13th and has not been edited since then. An updated draft should be available before a vote is taken.

I applaud the effort to update the City's sign regulations and agree with most of the recommendations. But as you proceed, please consider two changes:

1. Request amendment be edited to include "Digital Signs" as a type of prohibited sign.

At the last P&Z meeting, I pointed out that there was a typo in # 6 of the Prohibited Sign Types. The term "Digital Signs" is included in the "definitions" of electronic signs, but not in the list of "prohibited signs". Please correct that omission. This is an important distinction.

DEFINITIONS

22. *Electronic Message Centers (EMC), Electronic Variable Message (EVM) Signs, or Digital Signs.* An electrically activated, changeable copy or message sign with a variable message and/or graphic presentation capability that can be electronically programmed by computer from a remote location or at the sign. Also known as an EMC or digital sign, these signs typically use arrays of LED lights to create an illuminated message.

PROHIBITED SIGNS

10.4.2. Prohibited Sign Types.

Prohibited signs are subject to removal (except legal nonconforming signs as defined by this Article) by the City at the sign owner's or user's expense. The following types of signs are prohibited within the City of Mandeville:

1. Abandoned or unsafe signs.
2. Audible signs.
3. Beacons.
4. Bench signs.
5. Billboards.
6. Electronic Message Centers (EMC) and electronic variable message (EVM) signs. No new or existing signs may be converted to EMC or EVM signs.

2. Recommend eliminating opaque window signage, addressed under “Attached Window Signs.”

Under Summary of Recommendations:

Item 13 under the recommendations states “Reduce allowable window signage area and add clearly enforceable standards for window sign placement and methods.” (See graphic from consultant’s slides below)

There is a huge difference between the type of window sign on the left (Cocoa & Sweet) with lettering that does not obscure sight through the window and the opaque “covering” of the (Buddy’s) signage on the right. I believe these should be addressed separately.

The current recommendation is to reduce the amount of coverage, which is an improvement, however that will be almost impossible to enforce. In fact, code enforcement has not dealt with situations exactly like this that currently exist.

The best solution is to outlaw this type of opaque window signage altogether.

ATTACHED SIGNS

- Currently: Can not exceed 50% of the area of any window or 25% of all windows.
- Proposed: Can not exceed 25% of the area of any window or 10% of all window areas.

Window Signs

April 2023

Thank you for the work you do and for

considering these requests.

Janet Smith
1164 Rue Chinon
Mandeville



Alex Weiner

From: Darlene DeVillier <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Sunday, April 23, 2023 5:07 PM
To: Alex Weiner
Subject: Signage

I support a prohibition of all electronic message centers/digital signs and window coverings in the City of Mandeville.

Sincerely,
Darlene

Alex Weiner

From: Claudia Riegel <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Sunday, April 23, 2023 6:01 PM
To: [REDACTED] Alex Weiner;
Subject: Signage

Dear P&Z Commissioner:

Thank you for working to update our city's signage code. Protecting the aesthetics of Mandeville is extremely important. Please **prohibit** (for now and the future) all electronic message centers, electronic variable message signs and digital signs. Also, please amend the regulations to eliminate opaque "attached signs" for windows as those cannot be easily enforced.

Thank you for working hard to maintain our community as a great place to live.

Sincerely,

Claudia Riegel
1161 Rue Chinon, Mandeville, LA 70471

Alex Weiner

From: Chip Wagar III <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Sunday, April 23, 2023 6:38 PM
To: Alex Weiner
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Sign Ordinance discussion coming up

Importance: High

Gentlemen and Ladies:

Thanks for your time in keeping Mandeville's sign ordinance up to date and maintaining the aesthetics of our city.

As a Mandeville resident and business owner, I would like to encourage you to continue to prohibit any and all electronic message centers, electronic variable message signs and digital signs. In fact, I would support buying the existing billboards that remain or were "grandfathered" to remove them as well, although I realize that's outside your scope. Our sign ordinance has made Mandeville a unique community in Louisiana and something toward which other communities aspire. Let's keep it going.

Also, the ugly opaque window signs and advertising need to go too. This is the subject of some conversation in our community lately as these seem to proliferate. They should be prohibited. They are ugly and violate the spirit of our community, adding little to the attraction of the store in any event.

Again, thanks for your time and all you do for our community.

With best regards,



*Partner
Wagar Hickman, LLC
1401 West Causeway Approach*

Mandeville, Louisiana 70471



Alex Weiner

From: Chadwick Wall <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, April 24, 2023 2:40 PM
To: Alex Weiner
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: From a Concerned Mandeville Citizen

All,

Regarding Mandeville's Sign Code, please do NOT allow any electronic message centers, electronic variable message signs, and digital signs in Mandeville. Also, please ensure that any opaque "attached signs" for windows become prohibited, going forward.

Thanks!

Sincerely,

Chad Wall
91 Longwood Drive
Mandeville, LA 70471

Sent from my iPhone

Alex Weiner

From: B Bennett [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, April 24, 2023 2:26 PM
To: Alex Weiner; Scott Quillen
Subject: Signage code

Dear P&Z Commissioners:

Thank you for working to update our city's signage code to protect the aesthetics of Mandeville. Please prohibit (for now and the future) all electronic message centers, electronic variable message signs and digital signs. Also, please amend the regulations to completely prohibit opaque "attached signs" for windows as those cannot be easily enforced.

These items were discussed at the last meeting, but need to be confirmed in the revised amendment recommendation before you vote.

Thank you for the work you do for the city.

Sincerely,
Bryan Bennett
1405 Rue Avignon

Alex Weiner

From: Brian Marcotte [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, April 24, 2023 2:49 PM
To: Alex Weiner
Subject: Mandeville Sign Code

Dear P&Z Commissioner:

Thank you for working to update our city's signage code. Traveling from New Orleans/Metairie to Mandeville is a daily reminder that the aesthetics of Mandeville are important. I don't want to see Mandeville resemble cities across the lake. Please prohibit (for now and the future) all electronic message centers, electronic variable message signs and digital signs. Also, please amend the regulations to completely prohibit opaque "attached signs" for windows as those cannot be easily enforced.

These items were discussed at the last meeting, but need to be confirmed in the revised amendment recommendation before you vote. I appreciate the work you do for the city. Thank you for protecting it.

Sincerely,

Brian Marcotte
919 Rue Chantilly
Mandeville, LA 70471