

The meeting was called to order at 6:00pm by Zoning Chairman Brian Rhinehart

The secretary called the roll.

Commissioners Present: Brian Rhinehart, Karen Gautreaux, Nixon Adams, Scott Quillin, and Claire Durio

Absent: Mike Pierce and Simmie Fairley

Also Present: Cara Bartholomew, Director Planning Department; Lauren Brinkman, Planner; Elizabeth Sconzert, City Attorney; David Parnell, City Attorney; Alex Weiner, Secretary; Keith LaGrange, Director Public Works; David LeBreton, City Consultant Engineer

**Z22-10-02** – LSU Health Foundation requests the rezoning of a Planned Residential District to Planned Combined Use District and to establish site development criteria and allowable uses within the district, Parcel D Section 46, Mariners Village Subdivision, PRD Planned Residential District, Mariners Blvd

&

**CU22-10-02** – LSU Health Foundation requests Conditional Use Approval to allow Administrative and Business Offices (6.4.1), Multi-Family Residential (6.2.7), Lodging (Transient) – Hotel/Motel (6.4.44), Restaurant-Sit Down with lounge (6.4.67), General Retail Sales (Conveniences) (6.4.38), Marine Services-Marina (6.4.53) and Marine Services – Retail (6.4.54) as defined in Article 6 - Land Use Classifications per the Table of Permitted Uses, CLURO Section 7.8, Parcel D Section 46, Mariners Village Subdivision, PCUD Planned Combined Use District, Mariners Blvd

Bill Hoffman, President of Woodward Interests: The Mariners Village property is located on the lakefront and will be an active adult community for people ages 55 and older with no kids. There would be a boutique hotel with an evening and breakfast style restaurant.

Alison Michel, Representative of Urban Systems: They coordinated with the City and the consultants to meet the CLURO requirements. They have done studies for many different developments and want success for everyone involved. They looked at peak times and historic traffic data for the study. They also spoke with the Regional Planning Commission to get the transportation model. Crash history was also looked at, which is not typical but Ms. Michel asked for it to be included. There was nothing alarming, there was some traffic in the morning which coincided with the schools in the neighborhood.

A trip generation was done for the different uses on the site. The restaurant is an amenity that caters to the people living there. The trips are based on operations, but everything is considered. There was no reduction done in trips from people living on site.

They do not design for an "A" rating during peak hours, that is the rating you would get on a Sunday afternoon. A "C" or "D" rating is the level they are looking for. They want to stay under a "1" for volume to capacity ratio. A 20 year life is standard for projects, and they used a 2025 estimated date for the opening. There was about a 2 second increase after the build on average along the East Causeway and Monroe intersection in 2025. In 2045 that increased to about 3 seconds in the same area. There was a potential improvement with a west bound left turn lane in that intersection.

Mr. Quillin asked if the west bound turn lane was on Monroe or north bound East Causeway. Ms. Michel said it was a west bound turn lane going to the south shore.

Winn Venable, 241 Wilkinson: Asked if the hatch marks on the presentation were the turn lane. Ms. Michel said that was not with the turn lane and was jumping ahead.

Ms. Michel said the west bound turns were part of the delay as they do not have their own lane. That would be an improvement and reduce the latency of this section even past what it would be without the development. It would be necessary in 2045 to meet CLURO requirements for service.

The queue map shows the existing vs the expected. The white hatches are the base conditions in 2025 with no development. The blue is with the development and increased queue. There was a similar output in the pm. They know they have to keep these intersections clear.

Mr. Rhinehart said traffic is a big concern so he is going to be a bit of a devils advocate. He knows that David LeBreton has worked with them and he wants to talk classifications vs math.

Mr. Rhinehart said the original trip generation that was presented to the public showed 12,000 sqft for the restaurant (high turnover sit down) generating 116 trips. The study showed that classification changing from high turnover sit down to fast casual and the quantity went from 9,200 to 5,500 so 1,000 sqft of restaurant facility was added but the number of trips was reduced by changing the classification.

Ms. Michel said she would look back to see where that came from. She said there were changes for what was originally planned vs what the study was done for.

Mr. Rhinehart said he realizes that there can be changes. If operating hours change then trips would increase.

Ms. Michel understands the concern, things can change and then the traffic is different. She would hope that if they decided to open more it would be to serve the people in the active adult community, which is part of the reason why an internal capture was not done.

Mr. Hoffman said that at first they were under the impression that a completely new traffic analysis would not be needed so there were some assumptions on the front end for trip generation. When a full study was requested they looked at the restaurants again for operating hours. One is a café with a bodega for breakfast and fast service lunch and open in the evenings. They broke out the two for the report to have realistic numbers for the report which is why the numbers change. Ms. Michel added that she asked a multitude of questions which probably caused them to dig a little deeper into their plans.

Mr. Adams asked how sensitive the numbers were to changes of use, Mr. Rhinehart said it would depend on the use classification that was selected. It could have a nominal effect or a significant effect.

Mr. Adams asked if any of the changes would alter the level of service under the CLURO.

Mr. Rhinehart said that his point was things change. At the beginning there would be 200 units of multi-family housing which would generate 79 trips. As things progressed and changed it would be senior adult housing and the trips changed again. He is concerned about the change as the idea of adult senior living needs to meet certain requirements. He thought that under the fair housing act you had to have at least 80% of tenants be 55 or older.

Mr. Hoffman said that was only if you were going with a federal funding type of program. Their active adult community is designed to be all 55 and older and no children. Mr. Rhinehart said that was important to know.

Mr. Hoffman said this was always going to be an active adult community. Multi-family was used in the beginning because it was easy. The numbers were ran as if it was residential and there was no huge difference.

Mr. Rhinehart asked if the difference between this and regular multi-family could be supplied.

Ms. Michel said the trips are the first step on that analysis. The first trip generation was based in the proposal stage.

Mr. Rhinehart said that this is something that would be needed to know at the next meeting. If there is an exemption if you are not taking federal money can you advertise something that restricts age. He understood that if you advertised as adult senior living you had to show 80% occupancy of 55 and older. There is also nothing that says they cannot change their mind later and become a normal apartment complex. That would make these numbers defunct.

Mr. Hoffman said that if something changed it would have an impact on the numbers. He brought up that the active adult component is a requirement of their lease with the foundation. They cannot change that without altering the lease. He also assumed if anything changed, he would have to come back before the commission. Mr. Rhinehart said that restaurants do not have to do that.

Ms. Bartholomew said the commission can condition approvals as part of the process, the same as music restrictions.

Mr. Rhinehart said that if the conditions are put on the development that if they want to change then they have to come before the council or commission, then the choice would be to deny the request and have the site sit barren, or just approve it so it stays in use.

Mr. Hoffman said that he wished he could guarantee that everything would go as planned, all he can say that is there are lots of consultants and developers behind this process and if they thought it would not be successful then they would not have spent the money they have already on the project. He does understand the question though. Mr. Rhinehart said that no one builds to fail, and he is not trying to be flippant. He just wants to be conservative and cautious. He is concerned about the business model changing to succeed and wants to make sure the structures match the success.

Mr. Adams said there is a sensitivity issue. Anything built on the property will generate traffic. The least intensive stuff on 23 acres would be single family residential. Any other uses would generate more and more traffic, is there a level of service change between the uses. Mr. Hoffman said if there were 350 – 400 mixed use residential units on the property, as opposed to what is being proposed, there would probably be a higher traffic pattern. They have selected the layout to fit with the area and traffic patterns. They are at the end by the Causeway and would have minimal impact on everything around it due to that. These numbers are not going to vary too much. If this development was twice as big it would go from a 2 second delay to 4 second delay on average, which is not much of an impact to the neighborhood.

Ms. Michel said that they do a lot of single family subdivisions and most have higher trip generation rates than this. There are lots of variables for 22 acres. A typical one gate entrance subdivision would blow this out of the water if built out with single family houses. This is more internal uses and the senior adult is a smaller trip generation.

Ms. Durio said it was mentioned that there will not be children, will they be prohibited or is the assumption that the residents will not have children. Mr. Hoffman said that the apartment regulations would dictate what kind of guest you can have, and how long they can be there. That would be written into the documents to create this environment. That is the reason for the hotel, if you are having your family come they can stay at the hotel, not in the units themselves.

Ms. Durio said the traffic count was done in a single day in October. Is that typical that it is only one day and not the average. Mr. Rhinehart agreed with that and added that some municipalities require 3-5 days but one day is frequently used.

Ms. Michel said they took turn counts over a seven day period and looked for variation and if the count moved. If it is high, does it change day to day. Green light times are what they are which is why field observations are done.

Mr. Rhinehart asked if the field observations were done more than once, Ms. Michel said they were.

Ms. Durio said that bad weather, such as fog, can increase traffic. Ms. Michel said they do not necessarily design for fog as it is abnormal and the police will deal with that on the causeway.

Mr. Rhinehart asked about the growth rate that was selected. It was from 1998 – 2005 and pre-Katrina, that bothers him.

Ms. Michel said she thought it was better to be before Katrina as that was a one time growth where that period was showing what the growth was like in the area without the event. They looked at the Regional Planning Model and at growth in the area around East Causeway approach and Monroe Street. There is only so much growth that is going to happen in this area as there is so much already built out. There is land in the surrounding areas which will have some growth. If a high growth rate was used, it would be double or triple counting as there is only so much growth that can happen. 1.5% is conservative and she does not see sustained 1.5% growth on Monroe Street for the next 20 years.

Mr. Rhinehart agreed that Mandeville has had a pretty steady population but what is happening is people living in other areas and then coming to Mandeville. The growth rate may look like 1.5% but he wonders how well the surrounding corridors coming into Mandeville was captured. This has become a destination community.

Ms. Michel said the 1.5% growth rate over 20 years is higher than they think, most of the growth is on Causeway and 190. Mr. Rhinehart said that could be but people are coming into Mandeville.

Ms. Durio added that they are coming through to the causeway bridge, which is adjacent to the development.

Mr. Hoffman said the area is off the causeway and can be reached without waiting at the light by Monroe Street.

Ms. Durio said that few people who live in the development will be coming off the Causeway on a daily basis. They will have to come out at Monroe, few people are going to be able to enter at Mariners. Mr. Hoffman said that most people coming off the causeway are not related or coming to the development. Constraints would be hit as they grow, limited supply of restaurants as they fill up which would limit people coming in as they cannot get seats. This is the same as limiting people in other places such as the lakefront if there is no parking.

Mr. Quillin said there are 78 acres next door that can be developed, Mr. Adams said it was not their job to provide for them. He asked if the City had commissioned the Monroe corridor study yet.

David LeBreton, City Engineer: That was just put under contract to look at that corridor.

Mr. Hoffman said that all permitted projects were included in the study and then the growth was built in, however the area next door was not a permitted project yet and he assumed it would have to go through this same process as them.

Ms. Michel said that a 1.5% increase over 20 years would be a 35% increase in traffic. You take a third of what you have and add it to what you currently have. This is only talking about am and pm peaks but does not include dinner or lunch, it is mainly commuting traffic.

Mr. Rhinehart said that it was mentioned that the marina would not be open to the public and asked if there would be a boat launch. Mr. Hoffman said that you do not have to be a resident to have a slip but there would not be a boat launch to launch a boat.

Mr. Rhinehart asked if the restaurant would be for the tenants, Mr. Hoffman said he anticipates people coming to the restaurant. He thinks that it will serve people in the community as there is no food service in the active adult community. It will also serve people who come to the hotel and other parts of Mandeville. Ms. Michel said they took into account restaurant trips and the marina will bring people in as well, but they will be coming in on a boat which is not counted as a vehicle trip.

Mr. Rhinehart asked if they included vehicles with the marina, Ms. Michel said they did but that it would be different if there was a boat launch which this does not have. Mr. Hoffman added that they would have temporary docks to allow people to tie up and use the restaurant but this would not count as a vehicle trip.

Mr. Rhinehart said that Mandeville has a "C" status and asked if there was a definition, Ms. Michel said it was in the report. Mr. LeBreton read the definition which is as follows: Level of Service (LOS) C is considered to have a stable traffic flow but is becoming susceptible to congestion with general levels of comfort and convenience declining noticeably. He added that the CLURO requires a "C" on local and a "D" on collector streets.

Ms. Durio asked what additional things were recommended along with the turn lane and when those would be added. Ms. Michel said that at Cambrone and Antibes intersection they recommended some type of median or widening to allow for a two phase left turn movement.

Ms. Durio asked if a turn lane would be added on Causeway and Monroe, Ms. Michel said that for that location a crosswalk improvement was suggested.

Ms. Durio asked if the median and turn lanes were only for if the development moved forward, Ms. Michel said those were based on the no build condition in 2045 due to growth in the background. Ms. Durio asked if the Cambrone and Antibes suggestions were based on the build condition. Mr. LeBreton said that both were based on no build. Delays increase more as traffic backs up on Monroe.

Winn Venable, 241 Wilkinson: It was said that the restaurant was not intended to attract patrons from the surrounding area which conflicts with its design as an amenity for the guests at the hotel which is a discrepancy that she would like clarified at some point. It also says there would be 84 total traffic going in and out for the timeframe of the restaurant itself which seems like a lot of cars. The marina has 22 cars in addition to the restaurant and regular traffic. The left turn on Monroe and Causeway, the issue is not the people going to the south shore. The issue is with the right lane going straight. She also hopes that the design aesthetic is paid attention to if this is approved.

Robert Fabacher, 10600 Baham Road: Said that 80% being 55 or older has nothing to do with federal funding but rather with the fair housing administration. He mentioned that Mr. Hoffman made reference to 350 residential units on 22 acres, it is actually 15 acres and if you tried to put 350 residential units on 15 acres the lots would be about 1700 sqft lots. Noticed that there was a pool for the apartment complex with no fence around it, would guests of the hotel have access to the swimming pool.

Mr. Hoffman said there were two pools, one is within the confines of the courtyard with a fence that restricts access to that for the active adult community. There is another pool down by the lake with a fence around it to restrict it from hotel guests.

Mr. Fabacher said that there is no bailout, if something happens there is an apartment complex without sufficient parking and a restaurant without sufficient parking. The worst case scenario needs to be taken into account if the senior adult living does not work out and they need to attract a larger crowd, is there parking for that. He is urging everyone to look at the worst-case scenario not the best.

Rachel Vogeltanz, 160 Cindy Lou: Need to think about Port Marigny, this does not take into account the combined affect of that. What would happen to the model if the numbers were off even a small amount. She is wondering how much was paid to the traffic experts and if they would be willing to share their communications with the traffic experts with the commission. The left turn lane at Monroe and Causeway, there is already a left turn lane there and she is unclear if they are proposing a second turn lane. The report mentions getting rid of some medians and she would appreciate more details on that.

Terri Lewis Stevens, 725 Dove Park Road: The restaurants look problematic as they changed from one version to another. The restaurant business is very volatile, so it would be wise to consider the spaces as fully occupied for all hours as possible. She suggested asking for a deed restriction in perpetuity for any problematic issues such as parking or restaurants. There was a number to reach per the CLURO and it seems to her the numbers conveniently met them. She is an architect by trade and has reviewed traffic studies in the past and does not believe she ever came across one that did not meet the criteria. There are residential areas around the development that have side streets that connect with the one way in and one way out streets of the development.

Ernest Burguieres, 241 Wilkinson: has a bunch of questions on the traffic study, will there be an opportunity to come back and ask more questions about different issues pertaining to the study.

Mr. Rhinehart said there would be at least one more meeting to discuss things and there could be as many meetings as necessary. Ms. Bartholomew said they would discuss scheduling at the end of the meeting.

Mr. Burguieres said there has already been an hour of presentations and questions back and forth, but the written report spawns a dozen more questions on different things, who gets the opportunity to ask those questions. Ms. Bartholomew said that you could email questions to be passed on to the developers.

Mr. Burguieres said that in the opening sentence of the report it states that Monroe is a 4 lane road but it is not, only the first 400 feet is a 4 lane road then 2 ½ miles of it is a 2 lane road. He finds it offensive that it says that. If you are putting your cards on the table, then you have to say what it is.

Mr. Burguieres said that Massena Street was included in the study and it has no connection to the development as it is four blocks away. Why would that be included as the only connection is Port Marigny which makes people ask if the development will be connected in the future.

Ms. Michel said the study area was based on collaboration with the City and there is a school there which is a significant traffic generator. That was her understanding as to why the City wanted it included. Mr. LeBreton added that they were looking at streets in a ¼ mile radius.

Mr. Burguieres said that streets like Cambronne would have more of an affect, Massena seems very far away from this. Mr. LeBreton said that Cambronne was included as well. He said that there were four or five streets between East Causeway before you get to Massena which would have an effect. West Causeway was a Madisonville problem and East Causeway was an Abita Springs problem which is not taken into account by this study. Has the Port Marigny traffic study been looked at to see if this matches up with it.

Mr. Rhinehart asked if Port Marigny needed to be addressed at all, Mr. Parnell said that there was not an application for that property at the moment. There is a traffic study from 2015 that they could look at, but it is outdated and would have to be updated for any permit.

Mr. Burguieres asked if the previous studies made the same assumptions as this study.

Mr. LeBreton said that previous studies were considered. Trip generation and distribution are the biggest factors in traffic studies. They looked at different distribution percentages from different directions and existing traffic flows. They also went a step further and made it all internal to the north shore. There were existing traffic patterns that matched the Port Marigny report, and they went beyond and included where it was all north shore traffic distribution as well.

Ms. Michel addressed the comment about the restaurant not being for the general public, that was specifically limited to the fast casual restaurant not the sit down. The sit down is meant to bring people in, more likely in the evenings or the summer. For the marina, the trips with the regular marina land use were included. They were not discounted due to the fact that there would not be a public boat launch, they were just pointing out it was a conservative approach to keep all the trips that were estimated if it would have a boat launch.

Ms. Venable asked how many boats were going to be in the marina, Mr. Hoffman said there were 103 slips. Ms. Venable asked if the 22 trips a day was a lot. Mr. Hoffman said that based on marina consultants that is what is expected of a marina of this size at this location.

Judith Bonneau: Owns a lot on Monroe close to the development. With regards to the left hand turn lane what is being proposed, would they lose the median or part of their property? Mr. Hoffman said the left hand turn lane was projecting the growth in vehicular traffic in 2045, no matter if this site gets developed or not. It would be up to the City on how to proceed. One of the recommendations that their consultants came up with was a left turn lane could alleviate some of that growth. That would not be impacted by if the development is there or not.

Ms. Venable asked if they were anticipating a second left hand turn lane, Mr. Hoffman said they were not anticipating anything. This is just one of the solutions for the 35% more traffic in 2045.

Mr. LeBreton said that the left-hand turn lane would be shifted over to allow for an additional lane for the problem of the through-right movement. Ms. Michel said this would be a third lane so it would be left turn, through, and through-right.

Mr. Burguieres asked who would pay for this, Mr. Rhinehart said the City would.

Mr. Rhinehart said the question about the adult living requirements being 55 and older he would like a clarification as he was under the impression that anyone who advertises 55 and older would have to maintain 80% occupancy. What is the requirement to change that, he thought it was just no longer advertising the age restriction. He would also like to see the difference between adult living and multifamily in the math. The average number of trips per day on Monroe, what it is today and what it would be when the facility was completed is something he would also like to see.

Ms. Bartholomew said it was in there and Mr. LeBreton was looking for it.

Mr. Quillin said he would like to see how the trip generation would compare to the parking that was stated previously.

Mr. Hoffman said they would address all the questions at one point.

Ms. Bartholomew said there have been several topic driven meetings and have covered all the main topics. Additional wrap up meetings were discussed for each topic to address any lingering comments. Mr. Rhinehart said it was looking like 1-2 more meetings.

Ms. Durio asked if there would be a separate work session meeting or would it be part of the wrap up meeting. Ms. Bartholomew said there would be a wrap up meeting and then a work session meeting to put together the thoughts.

Mr. Rhinehart said they would have to put together their findings to make a recommendation to the city council.

Ms. Durio said her understanding was that would occur in a work meeting with the public.

Ms. Bartholomew said there would be one more meeting to go over the topics and make sure the big questions were answered, then move into a work session and voting meeting format. She added that anyone in the public should not hesitate to send in questions so they can get answered for the next meeting.

Mr. Quillin asked if the next meeting date needed to be decided on, Ms. Bartholomew said she would talk to the developers to see their schedule and then come to the commission with some dates.

Mr. Quillin motioned to adjourn the meeting, Ms. Durio seconded, and all were in favor. The meeting was adjourned at 7:36pm

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Alex Weiner, Secretary

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Karen Gautreaux, Chairwoman  
Planning Commission

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Brian Rhinehart, Chairman  
Zoning Commission



## **Mariners' Village Questions**

**10/12/2022**

### ***Existing Trees***

- The tree report states that 5 existing Live Oaks are to be removed...this violates Mandeville's local development code. Also, only these 5 trees are mentioned, while the site survey shows numerous other trees of significant size that would need to be removed to achieve the proposed site plan. What is the explanation of this, are these trees of no value, how will their benefits be mitigated?
- Tree mitigation plan states that "the project landscape is built around a structure of Live Oaks" but is requesting a pass in order to cut down 5 existing, wild Live Oaks. This seems contradictory

### ***Site Conditions***

- The shoreline of this site is one of the few natural embankments of Lake Pontchartrain that remain in the entire City of Mandeville.
  - What analysis was done to determine that the proposed treatment at the water's edge is the best option and that it will not have a negative affect on the fragile, existing character of the shoreline?

### ***Site Design***

- Why is a landscape architect from North Carolina engaged with the project team rather than one with local expertise that understands our local ecology and context of the site?
- Planting Design
  -
- Rain gardens and other forms of GI are mentioned in the narratives provided. This is a good start to managing the site's runoff, however, what other forms of GI are being proposed. What portions of the first flush (1" of rain) will be routed to these facilities, particularly the parking areas and roofs of the proposed buildings?
  - This development will significantly increase the % of impervious surface on this parcel on land, which is located immediately on the lakefront. What design storm is the proposed site plan designed to handle?
  - Where is the proposed site outfall for stormwater runoff? Will these locations be fitted with any kind of sediment or filtration device in the event of treatment bypass?
- How will site utilities be handled? Will new drainage, sewer, and water mains be required to serve a development of this size?

## Alex Weiner

---

**From:** Cara Bartholomew  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 13, 2022 9:05 AM  
**To:** Alex Weiner  
**Subject:** FW: Oct. 12/ P & Z Meeting

*Cara Bartholomew, AICP*

Director, Dept. of Planning & Development  
City of Mandeville  
3101 East Causeway Approach  
Mandeville, LA 70448  
985.624.3103



---

**From:** Ellen O'Connell <ellenoconnell328@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 12, 2022 5:28 PM  
**To:** Cara Bartholomew [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Oct. 12/ P & Z Meeting

Cara,

I hope you can express my concerns in my stead this evening. I'm dealing with a health issue.

- 1.) Why not stick with the original plan of an Assisted Living Center?
- 2.) How will the current plan affect the Army Corps calculation of flood risk for Mariners Village Residents?
- 3.) How many light poles will be installed?
- 4.) How many lumens of light/ bulb for the lightening?
- 5.) Will the city drainage ditch be changed in any way.
- 6.) Which road will enter the development?
- 7.) What will the property tax rate be?
- 8.) Since funds will go to a non- profit, what is left toward sales tax?
- 9.) If entry roads with the very unique rounded brick are damaged by construction equipment, have you looked for a supplier ahead of time, so that these unique roads look the same?

## Alex Weiner

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, October 24, 2022 5:12 PM  
**To:** Alex Weiner  
**Subject:** LSU Mariners Village Property Plans Additional (#4) Comments of Lawrence Grundmann, 301 Mariners Is. 70448, for inclusion in Planning Committee Zoning Change Application Record

Dear Alex

The following comments arise from responses by the developers during the last public meeting on the subject held on Oct. 21, 2022 and it is requested that these be added to the record for official response:

Reference is made to this meeting when the Woodward representative was at the podium to answer a question I raised (the last permitted in the session) regarding the fact that there were no parking places allocated to accommodating members of the public who came to use the beach since it was unlikely they would park off premises and walk in. The sponsors at the first meeting stated there would be no prohibition on such access.

On this night the Woodward representative's response stated it was a private beach primarily for hotel guests and apartment occupants but reiterated there would be no barrier to outsiders. His response seemed to infer that its private property status would negate the need for accommodating public beach visitors to the property. I find that to be less than comforting (or realistic) in that the beach as depicted is likely to be the most attractive one in the Mandeville area and there are inherently other public access needs and activities for the site. The "public/private" response by the developer only adds confusion and does not address the parking issue.

Additionally, it raises the questions of site security and public safety responsibility. Are the property's "public-areas" (those spaces not occupied by structures) going to remain privately owned (and by what entity) or are they going to be somehow passed to the Township or other government ownership and therefore the accompanying responsibility for maintenance and security? Regardless it would seem unless there are enacted and enforced prohibitions against public access, then parking accommodations for the beach must be added.

Also, account must be taken for the public servitude running along the east side of the marina entrance canal that would allow for the public to have a right to access the lake.

The question of the "attractive nuisance" of the beach and related parking does also beg the answer to the broader question of ongoing ownership and responsibility for the "public-areas" noted above.

When another questioner inquired about steps to protect the periodic Bald Eagles nesting in the on-site cypress trees, the developer spokesman dismissed any concern citing it was not a nesting site. It is hard to believe that the LSU ornithologists who expressed concern in the Sunday (10/23/22) Picayune/Advocate article about the impacts on birds that periodically flock in the LSU lakes that are proposed to be dredged would be as blasé about the birds' disturbance on the Sucette site because of the development without some study and specific mitigation. The developer should undertake such impact and mitigation studies not only for the eagles but all the varieties, including the annually returning Canadian Geese to the property and marina area.

Thank you for your kind attention to this request.

Lawrence Grundmann  
301 Mariners Island  
Mandeville, LA 70448

A

CITY OF MANDEVILLE PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION  
SPEAKER CARD

CASE NUMBER: \_\_\_\_\_

DATE: 2-13-23

CASE NAME: SUCLETTE

SPEAKER NAME: ERNEST BURGUIERES

MAILING ADDRESS: 241 WILKINSON ST

PHYSICAL ADDRESS (if different): \_\_\_\_\_

CITY: \_\_\_\_\_

STATE: \_\_\_\_\_

ZIP CODE: 70448

PHONE: 

COMMENTS: \_\_\_\_\_

I AM:        ( ) FOR                            ( ) AGAINST            ( ) OTHER  
              (✓) I WISH TO SPEAK            ( ) I DO NOT WISH TO SPEAK

A

CITY OF MANDEVILLE PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION  
SPEAKER CARD

CASE NUMBER: \_\_\_\_\_

DATE: FEB 13, 2023

CASE NAME: Suclette

SPEAKER NAME: D. Winn Venable

MAILING ADDRESS: 241 Wilkinson St Mandeville LA 70448

PHYSICAL ADDRESS (if different): \_\_\_\_\_

CITY: Mandeville

STATE: LA

ZIP CODE: 70448

PHONE: \_\_\_\_\_

COMMENTS: \_\_\_\_\_

I AM:        ( ) FOR                            (X) AGAINST            ( ) OTHER  
              (✓) I WISH TO SPEAK            ( ) I DO NOT WISH TO SPEAK

CITY OF MANDEVILLE PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION  
SPEAKER CARD

CASE NUMBER: \_\_\_\_\_ DATE: 2-13-23  
CASE NAME: Success Project  
SPEAKER NAME: Robert Falachis  
MAILING ADDRESS: 10600 Boham Rd  
PHYSICAL ADDRESS (if different): \_\_\_\_\_  
CITY: Folsom STATE: GA  
ZIP CODE: 70437 PHONE: [REDACTED]  
COMMENTS: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

I AM: ( ) FOR (  ) AGAINST ( ) OTHER  
(  ) I WISH TO SPEAK ( ) I DO NOT WISH TO SPEAK

CITY OF MANDEVILLE PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION  
SPEAKER CARD

CASE NUMBER: \_\_\_\_\_ DATE: \_\_\_\_\_  
CASE NAME: \_\_\_\_\_  
SPEAKER NAME: Rachel Vegetanz  
MAILING ADDRESS: 160 Cindy Lou Pl  
PHYSICAL ADDRESS (if different): \_\_\_\_\_  
CITY: Mandeville STATE: LA  
ZIP CODE: \_\_\_\_\_ PHONE: \_\_\_\_\_  
COMMENTS: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

I AM: ( ) FOR (  ) AGAINST ( ) OTHER  
(  ) I WISH TO SPEAK ( ) I DO NOT WISH TO SPEAK

K

CITY OF MANDEVILLE PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION  
SPEAKER CARD

CASE NUMBER: \_\_\_\_\_

DATE: Feb 13 2023

CASE NAME: Sucette Harbor

SPEAKER NAME: Terri Lewis Stevens

MAILING ADDRESS: \_\_\_\_\_

PHYSICAL ADDRESS (if different): 725 Dove Park Rd

CITY: Corington

STATE: LA

ZIP CODE: 70433

PHONE: 

COMMENTS: \_\_\_\_\_

Worst case scenario should always be  
the condition of approval.

I AM:

FOR

AGAINST

OTHER

I WISH TO SPEAK

I DO NOT WISH TO SPEAK