

The meeting was called to order at 6:00pm by Planning Chairwoman Karen Gautreaux

The secretary called the roll.

Commissioners Present: Nicholas Cressy, Claire Durio, Andrea Fulton, Karen Gautreaux, Mike Pierce, Scott Quillin, and Brian Rhinehart

Absent: None

Also Present: Cara Bartholomew, Director Planning Department; Rad Dickson, Planner; David Parnell, City Attorney; Tina Myers, Secretary

Old Business

Election of Planning Commission Chair

Ms. Gautreaux nominated Ms. Durio as the Planning Commission Chair. Mr. Rhinehart seconded the nomination, and the nomination passed unanimously.

With no new business on the agenda, Ms. Gautreaux moved to the Zoning Commission portion of the meeting.



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.

Old Business

Election of Zoning Commission Chair

Ms. Gautreaux nominated Mr. Rhinehart to continue as the Zoning Commission Chair. Mr. Quillin seconded, and the nomination passed unanimously.

New Business

SUP23-09-04 – Ozgur Duman requests a Special Use Permit to allow an exception to the B-3 Sign Design Standards per CLURO Section 10.8.2.4, Old Town of Mandeville, Square 50 Lot 38, B-3 Old Mandeville Business District, 821 Girod Street

Ms. Bartholomew noted that the applicant was allowed a hanging sign, wall sign, or canopy sign in addition to a monument sign. The regulations just do not allow for two of the same type of sign. Mr. Quillin added that there was not room for a monument sign.

Ms. Durio asked if the hanging sign was larger than what a monument sign would be. Ms. Bartholomew said it is not, a monument sign would be allowed 32 sqft so neither sign was larger than a monument sign. She added that hanging signs can be 25 sqft so both of the signs are smaller than what is allowed.

Mr. Rhinehart said that the sign ordinance is used to reduce sign clutter, but he would opt for the additional sign as opposed to cutting any tree limbs for visibility. Ms. Bartholomew added that the code allows for two signs, just not the two types being presented.

Jason Zuckerman, 1354 Villere: In the work session there were some questions about other conditions like this in Old Mandeville. He was driving around this weekend looking for this condition and it is common in Old Mandeville. There are a couple of examples on Girod Street such as Nuvolari's. The way the ordinance reads you can have an awning or wall mounted sign plus a monument sign per street façade. Nuvolari's has a wall sign and awning sign on the same façade, plus a monument sign. If you go to the Beach House it has three signs. This might be a case where the sign code that was just passed might need a clarification. There are a number of businesses around in the B-3 District that have more than one sign on a façade.

This might be something to address in the sign code. If you look at the ordinance the intent is to reduce sign clutter so there is one sign visible per elevation, but a lot of these cases like with Rusty Pelican you can see both signs. He thinks that the whole intent needs to be looked at and there might need to be some clarifications.

Ms. Durio asked if this was approved would they still be allowed a monument sign by right. Ms. Bartholomew said that was correct. They were entitled to an attached wall sign, a canopy sign, and a hanging sign and then also a monument or freestanding sign.

Ms. Durio asked if this could be a substitute for the monument sign, Ms. Bartholomew said that was a condition the commission could make.

Ms. Durio moved to approve the request with the condition that the second façade sign is a substitute for a monument sign. Ms. Gautreaux seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

V23-09-31 – Bradley Gaspard requests a variance to CLURO Section 8.1.1.4. Allowed Setbacks Encroachments, Old Town of Mandeville, Square 84 Lot 4G, R-1 Single Family Residential District, 619 Albert Street

Ms. Durio asked who the fence belonged to that was located on the other side of the A/C unit. Ms. Bartholomew said it belonged to the neighbor who sent in the letter.

Ms. Durio moved to approve the request as submitted. Ms. Gautreaux seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

V23-09-33 – Brian and Robyn Jackson request a variance to CLURO Section 7.5.1.3. R-1 Site Development Regulations, Old Town of Mandeville, Square 48 Lot 12-A-1, R-1 Single Family Residential District, 604 Maringy Avenue

Ms. Durio said it was interesting to see the shape as it is not an overbuilt sized house.

Vaughan Sollberger, 235 Girod: The objective was to remove as much as they could of the insensitive addition to the historic building and have the entire street frontage comply with everything. In the arrangement of how they had to separate the addition to keep it architecturally separate from the residence resulted in the rear encroachment. It is more compliant with the new configuration.

Ms. Durio asked if this had to be done before going to the Historic District Commission? Mr. Sollberger said that was correct. He added that they have gone before the Historic District Commission, but their decision is predicated on the decision of the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Ms. Durio asked if the porch was existing, and if by making it 8ft causes it to encroach. Mr. Sollberger said that the existing porch currently encroaches into the setback. They are removing it and replacing it with a front porch that properly follows the front. He added that they did a similar job across the street, and this makes a lot of difference for the presence of the building.

Ms. Durio said when you are working with a historic building, removing an addition and trying to make it more consistent these things happen. The porch vs the stoop is much better.

Mr. Pierce said he does not have a problem with the stoop but is curious why the need to encroach into the rear. Mr. Sollberger said it was based on the area needed for the master suite because there is not one in the existing building now. The existing addition is very utilitarian.

Mr. Pierce asked why not shift everything forward to the setback already being requested, that way you are not encroaching on both sides. Mr. Sollberger said he understands what he was saying, they thought it was worthy to ask for it as it worked well with the overall revitalization of the property. There were also some floorplan decisions that went into it as well. Ms. Bartholomew added that since the garage is attached it currently encroaches into the rear setback as well.

Ms. Durio asked if it encroaches less than the garage, Ms. Bartholomew said it did.

Mr. Cressy said that it already appears that the building is stepping over everything, and having an improved building that steps over some lines would be a net improvement.

Ms. Fulton asked if there were any comments received from the neighbor directly across Maringy? Mr. Sollberger said he came to the first meeting in support.

Mr. Cressy asked if the digital rendering of the front porch would be accurate in terms of

scale with respect to the distance from the steps to the street. Mr. Sollberger said it was.

Mr. Sollberger said that all the trees would remain as well.

Mr. Cressy moved to approve the request as submitted. Ms. Durio seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

V23-09-34 – Elisa and Jason Bragg request a variance to CLURO Section 7.5.9.3 B-2 Site Development Regulations & Section 9.2.5.5. Landscape Requirements in Districts Other than Low-Density Residential, Poitevent Tract, Lots 13-C & 13-D, B-2 Highway Business District, 3940 Florida Street

Mr. Rhinehart asked if the City Engineer was in agreement with the four points submitted by Mr. Horchoff. Ms. Bartholomew said that the ADA requirement was something that the Fire Marshal would look over and is typically for new construction. She added that there appears to be spaces in the front of the building that could be ADA accessible.

Mr. Rhinehart asked if the applicant had looked at the comments, Ms. Bartholomew said she spoke with them.

Ms. Gautreaux wanted to know the outcome of that discussion, Ms. Bartholomew said that the applicant was here, but seemed agreeable to the comments.

Ms. Durio asked if any comments had been received from the neighborhood across the street. Ms. Bartholomew said there was just the one public comment.

Mr. Rhinehart said that if the applicant and City Engineer are in agreement then they should be good, as far as addressing the questions that were raised.

Ms. Durio said she is just surprised that they have not heard more from the neighborhood.

Ms. Durio asked if there was going to be any landscaping in the area, or if that would be an issue for CLECO. Ms. Bartholomew said that would be a CLECO issue. There are some shrubs that could be planted, and she believes that the plastic surgery center down the road planted outside of the lines, but they would have to get CLECO approval. Ms. Bartholomew said she had reached out and has not heard anything back and would try again.

Ms. Durio asked what the area was now, Ms. Bartholomew said they were just parking on the grass. She added that no trees were being requested for removal, except for some smaller dead ones.

Ms. Durio said that there are a lot of cars in that area without a buffer to the street. Mr. Rhinehart agreed. Ms. Durio understood that it was difficult with the CLECO servitude, but there is no screening.

Mr. Quillin asked what the zoning was, Ms. Bartholomew said it was B-2.

Mr. Rhinehart said that it was adjacent to the next door residential. Ms. Bartholomew said that basically from the Rouses driveway to St. Tammany Linnen was B-2. Then the plastic surgery center was Planned Commercial District, which uses B-2.

Mr. Rhinehart asked what it was going the other way towards the Whitney building, Ms. Bartholomew said it was Office/Residential.

Ms. Durio asked if there was any way to include pervious parking, even though it was not counted? Mr. Quillin asked what Ms. Durio was trying to say.

Ms. Durio said to reduce the amount of concrete that was truly impervious. Mr. Quillin said there was some of this that he was thinking about, he would rather have a structured parking area instead of parking on the grass. He did think that adding some shrubbery would be good, he is not crazy about planters, but if it were garden plantings or low shrubbery.

Ms. Durio said a smaller driveway with a planting area, and some greenery by the fence would make a difference.

Ms. Fulton suggested increasing the gravel parking to the rear, away from Florida Street. Ms. Bartholomew asked if it would be pulled more towards the building, Ms. Fulton said it would be. Ms. Bartholomew said that there were existing pine trees located there.

Ms. Fulton said she was referring to the gravel parking lot to the rear of the lot, if that could be expanded to reduce what is necessary in the front. Ms. Bartholomew said that was an existing condition. Ms. Fulton asked if it was possible to expand that area so less would be needed along Florida Street.

Mr. Quillin said that the only challenge with that would be most of the lot and buildings are fenced in. Ms. Durio said those buildings may have vehicle bays which need access.

Mr. Quillin asked if the material for the parking area was known, if it would be gravel or blacktop or concrete? Ms. Bartholomew said it would be concrete.

Mr. Rhinehart asked if reducing the parking space area would affect the compliance in anyway. Ms. Bartholomew said they are currently in compliance; this is additional overflow parking.

Mr. Cressy agreed that parking on the grass is not optimal. If there were trees planted in front of the vehicles to mask the building it would look nice, and then you would not have to worry about the CLECO servitude. Without the building the cars are fine, with the combination of cars, and the building, and concrete put people off.

Ms. Durio agreed, planting in front of the fence and then doing something like a garden that would not interfere with CLECO would make a difference. Ms. Fulton added that shrinking the driveway to 12 feet and putting plantings in the space as well.

Ms. Durio said she wanted to know if the applicant was willing to do the landscaping and driveway reduction.

Jason Bragg, 3940 Florida: He was willing to do those conditions.

Ms. Bartholomew said that if the driveway was reduced to 12 feet be sure to include angular parking.

Ms. Durio moved to approve the request with the conditions that the driveway be reduced to 12 feet, the parking spaces be angled, and an acknowledgement and agreement that the applicant would plant some greenery to camouflage that area between the new parking area and the building behind it, as well as plant some non-intrusive greenery along the new driveway for aesthetic purposes. Mr. Quillin seconded the motion.

Mr. Quillin added that he had a small addendum to the motion if Ms. Durio would accept it, which is to receive approval from CLECO. Ms. Gautreaux seconded, and the addendum passed unanimously.

Ms. Myers called the roll for the updated motion which passed unanimously.

Public Comment

Ms. Bartholomew reminded the commission about their yearly continued education requirement, along with their ethics, and sexual harassment prevention training requirement. She also reminded everyone that the first October meeting was moved to the 3rd instead of the 10th.

Mr. Quillin motioned to adjourn the meeting, Ms. Gautreaux seconded, and all were in favor. The meeting was adjourned at 6:45pm.



Alex Weiner, Secretary



Brian Rhinehart, Chairman
Zoning Commission

September 25, 2023

Planning and Zoning Commission
City of Mandeville
3101 East Causeway Approach
Mandeville, LA 70448

Re: Case Number: V23-09-34
3940 Florida Street
Requested Variance from CLURO Section 7.5.9.3 & Section 9.2.5.5

Dear Commission Members:

I am writing to point out four issues related to this Appeal that are not mentioned in the Case Summary Sheet and that did not seem to be discussed at your previous meeting on 9/12/2023, as follows:

1. A van-accessible parking space and access aisle has not been provided as required by both CLURO Div. 2, Article 9, Sec. 9.1.2.2.b and the ADA Standards for Accessible Design.
2. The parking lot drive aisle that provides access to the parking stalls is extremely narrow (only 12'); per CLURO Div. 2, Article 9, Table 9.1.2 the minimum permitted width of a parking lot drive aisle is 26'. Vehicles will not be able to use parking spaces 1, 2 or 3 without driving across unpaved portions of the site.
3. The parking stalls are only 18' deep; per CLURO Div. 2, Article 9, Sec. 9.1.2.2.a the minimum depth of a parking stall is 18'-6".
4. There is an existing area drain (not shown on the survey) within the footprint of the proposed new driveway, and the inlet grate for that drain is more than 12" lower than the shoulder of Florida Street. Constructing the new driveway will require re-grading of the drainage ditch and modifications to that area drain.

Sincerely,



Dennis Horchoff
455 Devon Drive
Mandeville, LA