

The meeting was called to order at 6:01pm by Zoning Chairman Brian Rhinehart

The secretary called the roll.

Commissioners Present: Brian Rhinehart, Nixon Adams, Mike Pierce, and Claire Durio

Absent: Scott Quillin, Karen Gautreaux, and Simmie Fairley

Also Present: Cara Bartholomew, Director Planning Department; Lauren Brinkman, Planner; Elizabeth Sconzert, City Attorney; Alex Weiner, Secretary; 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

Ronald Bourgeois, 235 Beau Rivage: This is a great opportunity for outdoor entertainment opportunities in the community. He is for saving underutilized land and bringing it back into commerce. He thinks the City should work to find a way to develop underutilized properties.

Larry Beachler, 1756 Logan Lane: This has been underdeveloped for a long time, these are capable developers and he hopes it comes back into commerce.

Kevin Vogeltanz, 160 Cindy Lou: His purpose is to suggest an independent legal argument to deny the application with no conditions, based on a procedure issue. This property was rezoned to Planned Residential District (PRD) in 1998 and the site plan had no more than 10 single family residential units. A legislative finding of fact was made which states “Whereas, the City Council of the City of Mandeville finds that the requested zoning designation of the Property as a Planned Residential District and its development and use in accordance with the Site Plan attached hereto as, Sheet A-1 drawn by Alecha Architecture dated June 9, 1998, as revised, will serve the best interests of the City of Mandeville by protecting existing residential neighborhoods in the vicinity of the Property from the possible intrusion of commercial uses and other types of residential uses which, by their nature and/or size, may be deleterious to that neighborhood”.

There are also twelve criteria for the review and evaluation of a Conditional Use Permit or Planned District zoning listed in CLURO Section 4.3.3.8. and number twelve states that “That the proposed use, together with the conditions applicable thereto, will not be detrimental to the public health, safety, or welfare, or community aesthetics, or materially injurious to properties or improvements in the vicinity.” The city council found that 25 years ago. That binds everyone in the City until the authority overturns it. Everything has been correctly done so far, and the commission is bound on a recommendation to find the best interest and they cannot by matter of law until the city council overturns the legislative finding of fact. He challenges the developers and applicants to explain why he is wrong.

Paul Harrison, 532 Girod: The CLURO specifies an ordinance be drafted with an application. The project is consistent with the comprehensive plan. The argument made is a legal argument to kill any discussion. He disagrees on the law relevant to that particular project,

as it was never developed. The ordinance was conditioned on the project, they are dealing with semantics. Look at the project based on merit, Article 4 allows for concurrent applications. The issue of a best interest matter is based on who you ask.

Mr. Adams said there was some discussion on a previous Popeyes project. When the project did not go forward it fell back to the previous zoning. Is this an amendment to that plan? Ms. Sconzert said that this was a new project. It is semantics on the rezoning, but the conditional use has expired so it is a new project. The commission is looking at both the rezoning and conditional use in conjunction with each other.

Carlos Zelaya, 1188 Rue Chinon: He supports the proposal. It appropriately utilizes and develops Lake Pontchartrain and expands available housing for an underserved population. Replacing the five oaks with 35 trees is a wonderful suggestion.

Terri Lewis Stevens: 725 Dove Park Road: There is a rezoning before the commission. She went back and looked at the September 21st meeting and there were five items that were being asked for approval. She looked at the zoning prior to the Copeland request and thought it was a lower residential class. They could meet all of the CLURO if they redesigned. There was an event center in Mandeville that was under parked and needed buses and it ended up failing. There is not a great need for this type of housing. St. Anthony's has never been fully occupied and it was also age restricted. She encourages the developers to meet the CLURO requirements and if they do not like it, then they should ask the city council to change the CLURO.

Michele Avery, 766 Claire: There are four variances being asked for. Variances of this magnitude have never been done so this would set a big precedent. There is no hardship argument and no benefit to the community. The site already has commercial and multi family developments. The tax revenue would be negligible, only about \$74,000. It is important to point out what the original donation agreement called for which states "LSU Health Foundation agrees to use this generous and extraordinary donation, using a non-profit development partner to create an LSU independent living 55+ individuals supported by LSU driven assisted living and memory care". The land was originally for LSU alums and retired faculty and staff. The plan has radically changed. What if it fails? That is a relevant point as there has already been massive deviation from the original donor agreement. Need to think about the future.

Elizabeth Bourgeois, 235 Beau Rivage: She is a mom of three and supports the project. The main reason she supports the project is there are not enough community gathering places in Mandeville. People need to reconnect after COVID, and this would allow people to congregate and see other people.

Clave Gill, 806 Bocage Lane: He is totally retired and is one of the people who would live in a 55+ community. It seems like a wonderful project and a benefit to Mandeville and himself. He is looking for less upkeep with some amenities nearby as he ages. He thinks there are lots of people in a situation like his and he hopes for a positive recommendation.

Andrew Baird, 160 Beau Rivage: It would be a great opportunity to gather at the Lakefront. Things get repetitive and he would like more stuff to do.

Lawrence Grundmann, 301 Mariners Island: Virtually all of the variances from the 1998 Ordinance designating this as Planned Residential parcel are driven by enhancing the economics of the developer. Thus his reluctance to reduce or eliminate the hotel and event center or amend parking assumptions to be more realistic. The Commission should perform studies to determine if the perceived (advertised) economic benefits justify the substitution of the very commercial neighbors that many of those who brought the residential growth to this neighborhood over the last 40 years were seeking to leave behind -exactly what this current zoning change is proposing- are not harmed by permitting this change. We have seen no such evaluation and justification

It is interesting to note that Ordinance 98-40 made some specific findings by noting in particular that "The requested zoning designation and its development will serve the best interests of the City of Mandeville by protecting existing residential neighborhoods in the vicinity of the Property from the possible intrusion of commercial uses and other types of residential uses which, by their nature and/or size, may be deleterious to that neighborhood". He came at 84 years old and bought a condo nearby. He asks that the commission look at the assumptions being made.

Todd Whalley, 19109 Sandy Lane: The Director of Existing Business and Industry for the St. Tammany Corporation. He wanted to voice their support of the project as it would bring new assets into the region. It would be a low impact development and would enhance the quality of life and bring in jobs. The developers are long time residents of the area and the land owner, LSU Health Foundation, has dedicated 50% of lease payments to cancer research. This project fits well within the community and would make a positive impact. The hotel also looks remarkably like the Hotel St. Tammany which would have been located a few hundred yards away historically.

Ernest Burguieres, 241 Wilkinson: *Passed out some handouts to the commission* There is a lot that gives pause if you live in Mandeville. Is it worth it? The application suggests a one-time tax revenue of \$375,000 with a yearly revenue of \$40,000. Ordinance 98-40 establishes a factual basis for no more commercial in the area. The ordinance has not been overturned so the commission is bound to follow it. If they do not agree they need to find a specific reason. It is also not fair. Everyone else has to follow the rules, why not the developers. It is a beautiful property and it was not enough. The City has to live with the consequences if it is a bust. This is an excessive development with special breaks.

Winn Venable, 241 Wilkinson: The existing zoning of PRD is the best use with minimal impact. She did not understand that a Planned Development category was exempt from the CLURO guidelines. She wishes Sucette Harbor success, but the proposal does not fit with the town, it would be a travesty to the guidelines. The commission does not have to approve the conditional use requests, she implores them to reject the requests as written and have the developers resubmit with conformance to the CLURO.

Terri Hamilton, 1111 Villere: Is there a benefit? She does not know. The live oak variance is a slap in the face to people who cannot get a live oak tree trimmed without begging the City. She knows someone who could not build on their property because the City would not let them trim a live oak. She does not care if they replace the trees with 100 live oaks. There will be 201 units with only about 700 sqft, that is not very big. The 82 room hotel sounds great but there are already three competing event centers. The PM-1 district needs to be rewritten, it is not strong enough. She lives by a disaster marina and the City can do nothing to stop them. There needs to be insurance that this does not become another JSBB. It is critical that cannot happen. The City would be Metairie if this is allowed to happen. It would lose trees and greenspace for profit.

Mr. Rhinehart said the commission would discuss the matter amongst themselves to get things in order so they can vote at the next meeting. There would not be any more public comment. Mr. Adams wondered if they should wait for a full commission.

Nicole Stanley asked if she could speak as she arrived late and did not fill out a card. Mr. Rhinehart asked if anyone else wanted to speak, as no one else did, Mr. Rhinehart allowed Ms. Stanley to speak.

Nicole Stanley, 154 Cindy Lou: Has children in school off of Monroe Street and at the last meeting requested that the traffic study be directed to that school traffic. She is not looking for residents to be walking around the school grounds. She did not move here to be Metairie. She has been here for 13 years and moved from uptown New Orleans. She wasn't living in the 9th ward, no offense, but she moved here because she was looking for a better place to

raise her kids. To be in public and be social and around people, and not be next door to an environment like Sucette Harbor. She could live in the Quarter if she wanted to live next to a hundred hotels, or a retirement community. She could stay uptown.

Ms. Durio asked if the first picture of the presentation was only the development site. Ms. Bartholomew said it was.

Mr. Rhinehart said there was a quorum so they can start the framework and talk again at the next meeting.

Mr. Adams said that a summary from the legal council as to what they are doing would be helpful. There are policies and goals in the CLURO. The comprehensive plan came out in 2007 and was the consensus of the community. The CLURO reflects the comprehensive plan. Ms. Bartholomew said that the comprehensive plan calls the parcel a mixed use planned district.

Ms. Sconzert recommended going through the specific variances one by one. Mr. Adams said that variance was used, but they have nothing to do with this, it is a whole new zoning. If they look through the comprehensive plan it would not disagree much. There are 15 policies at the end which are used to give counsel to the city council. The commission is not acting as the Board of Adjustments at the moment, they are in a counseling role.

Ms. Sconzert said the word choice of "variance" was poor on her part. They could discuss the four criteria that depart from the regulations in place.

Mr. Rhinehart said there were four criteria listed in the case summary, they could go through them and expand on any that piqued a commissioner's interest.

Ms. Durio said that if the building height was adjusted then there would need to be adjustments to the other requirements as well. They can look at the criteria independently, but it should be kept in mind that they do affect each other. She said that there is a lot of stuff situated on the site. She does not see the relationship between the hotel and the multi family housing. If there was no hotel, then the parking shortage would be solved for the multi family housing. Each element adds to the parking shortage, they can take each item individually but should look at the project as a whole.

Ms. Durio also asked if there were the pictures of the live oaks being removed. Ms. Bartholomew said they were in the tree report which is posted online, Ms. Durio said she would look for it.

Ms. Durio said that the hotel and event venue seem to be two different things, but there is a single parking calculation. There are a number of event venues in the area, and with the overlap of the hotel guests, apartment residents, and event center people it seems like there is no provision for event parking. The event center is a local attraction as well and she is not sure how much overlap from the hotel it would get. Ms. Bartholomew said the parking regulation for the hotel considers the number of guestrooms along with the congregate space that is there. Both of the uses are counted under one calculation.

Ms. Durio said for 82 rooms there are 129 spaces. Unless the occupancy is low or the event is small she does not see how it is adequate. For most situations there is on street parking available, this has no overflow.

Ms. Durio asked if the parking bank would affect the landscape plan being proposed. Ms. Bartholomew said it was just a quick draft to show the potential spaces so another look would have to be done.

Mr. Adams asked if the parking bank would take care of the total deficiency, Ms. Bartholomew said it would still be short about 20 spaces. Ms. Durio said you would lose

landscaping, Ms. Bartholomew said some of the parking spaces are moving from parallel to perpendicular.

Ms. Durio said the pervious calculations and landscape plans would have to be looked at to see the impact of the additional parking. She understands that there is parking underneath the structures but if the commission is not willing to consider the additional height she does not know if that would reduce the unit size or if parking would be removed. There is a lot being put on one space and is requiring a lot of departures that may not be necessary or beneficial to the community.

Mr. Rhinehart asked if Mr. Pierce had any comments on one of the four departures listed, Mr. Pierce said he had some comments on the big picture not the individual items.

Mr. Rhinehart said this basically an empty lot, or a blank canvas. There is no significant obstacles for this site. When it is an empty lot you should have to paint within the lines. That would address all the issues, and he does not see a reason why you would depart from the footprint you have. Mr. Rhinehart said they required someone to cut off the top of his house to meet the height requirement nearby and would have a problem with not requiring this developer to do the same.

Mr. Rhinehart said that he had some reservations as the comprehensive plan is 15 years old. With policy 3-4 and 3-5 they state that... South of 190 and Monroe there is nothing comparable to the development. It is out of character to his view. He is not sure how to proceed.

Mr. Pierce said his comments were fairly aligned. He thinks of this as a blank canvass and does not see why they should not be built to the same guidelines. He gets that it is a Planned Development, but he thinks they missed the spirit of the CLURO. It is overblown for Mandeville. There is no reason to go into a blank canvass and be above and beyond for square footage and height along with a parking reduction. He does not see a reason to deviate for what they ask everyone else to do.

Mr. Rhinehart said the commission can make a recommendation to approve the application, to deny the application, or to approve with conditions. He thinks the drift is to make a recommendation that would require the applicants to paint within the lines. That the recommendation would be that there not be any variances or departures and everything comply with the CLURO. Mr. Adams said that when changes are recommended to be made they should be the minimum possible to achieve the health, safety, and welfare reasons were given. Mr. Adams said he is unsure what that magnitude would be.

Mr. Adams said there might be something related to the trees, as that is the most likely place for a problem he thinks. The concern is not necessarily that they are specimen trees, but the overall canopy. They should look at the canopy in 10 years. Regardless, whatever they recommend by law has to be the minimum possible to achieve the health, safety, and welfare concerns and they need to be spelled out.

Ms. Durio said the commission is looking at this as a multi-family and mixed-use development. She understands that the developers intend for this to be an age restricted community but she has come to understand that is not a use they can incorporate into the recommendation. From her research of the Fair Housing Act, you cannot discriminate on age. Certain exceptions can be made, and if they meet those they can advertise for the community. Federal Law says if they can have that exception, the City does not. They have to look at the parking and traffic study as multi family. The project has morphed from the original proposal. The commission can only plan for mixed use with a multi-family residential. They cannot require something that Federal Law does not permit if they do not meet the requirements.

Ms. Bartholomew wanted to point out that the application has not changed since it was submitted. Ms. Durio said the original donation had something different, Ms. Bartholomew said that was not an application before the commission.

Mr. Rhinehart said that plans can change and have an impact downstream. As there were some commissioners absent from the meeting tonight the next meeting might be more of a work session at the beginning and then have a recommendation at the end. Ms. Bartholomew said she would like to advertise the next meeting as a voting meeting as it has to be advertised for three weeks prior to the meeting.

Mr. Rhinehart wanted to make sure there was nothing stopping them from having a similar discussion. Ms. Bartholomew said there was not, it would just allow them to vote at the end.

Mr. Rhinehart said they have taken the temperature of the four members here, but have not taken the temperature of Mr. Fairley or Mr. Quillin. Ms. Durio said that he is listening in and agrees with Mr. Pierce. She added that it is not official.

Mr. Rhinehart asked when the next meeting would be, Ms. Bartholomew said it would be April 17th.

Ms. Durio asked to check for each commissioner's availability beforehand. Ms. Bartholomew said she would, it was just that the advertisement was due on Thursday.

Ms. Sconzert asked if the commission wanted any information before the adjournment.

Ms. Durio asked if the developers had considered any revisions or changes, they were willing to make having heard from the public.

Bill Hoffman, President of Woodward Interests: We will take the comments under advisement. They have a different opinion on a number of the statements. This is a Planned Development, if everything in Mandeville was going to be the same height it would have been established all the way across. This is part of a bigger planned development area. The tree variance is based on the condition and age of the trees. Sometimes you need to plan for the future, not what is current. When it comes to the height, he does not think it is unreasonable or out of scale to the surrounding areas.

For the parking they, and their legal counsel, think a conditional use can be done for the age restriction. Developers constantly fight the battle of paving vs green. They do not want to add more paving to the site. They also know they have to provide enough parking or people will not come. They have done studies and they believe there is enough research to show there is enough parking. They disagree with the comment that they did not paint within the lines, they think they have. They believe it would be an added benefit to the City and would benefit the entire community, not just the people around the area. They will certainly take everything they heard into consideration.

Ms. Durio asked if the day and night renders from the causeway included the landscaping. Mr. Hoffman said they did.

Mr. Rhinehart said there was nothing more required for the next meeting which would be April 17th. It would be a continuation of this meeting which would culminate in a recommendation to the city council.

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

Planning and Zoning Commission
Special Meeting about proposed LSU Health Foundation Project
March 20, 2023
Page 7 of 7



Alex Weiner, Secretary



Karen Gautreaux, Chairwoman
Planning Commission



Brian Rhinehart, Chairman
Zoning Commission

Alex Weiner

From: Ellen O'Connell [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, March 6, 2023 4:43 PM
To: Alex Weiner
Cc: Skelly Kreller; Cara Bartholomew; Clay Madden
Subject: LSU HEALTH FOUNDATION PROJECT

Hello,

- 1.) If the city of Mandeville gives a height variance to the Woodward Developers, what new height restriction for them would be in place?
 - 2.) If the bricked Mariners Blvd is damaged by construction vehicles, must the developer repair with the same bricks?
 - 3.) Has the city 1st checked to make sure his old bricks can be purchased, if damaged?
 - 4.) Will the Woodward Developers be charged an impact fee upfront?
 - 5.) If an impact fee will be charged, what is the cost that will be collected?
 - 6.) If after construction, the cost of the impact of said development goes over the presumed impact fee, will the overage be charged to the developers and would this condition be in the contract with the city?
 - 7.) Since, I heard that Mandeville is considered to be a "dark city", how if any will lighting on this project be restricted?
 - 8.) If the current calculated # of parking spots is not enough, what measures will the developers take to keep the parking spaces the same? I.e: restrict the # of vehicles allowed by renters of the 55+ residence, etc.
* For example: I have 6 parking spaces for a 4-plex in Mariners Village. I only allow each tenant to own 1 vehicle. Then I make 2 exceptions when necessary.
Very simple.
* In the other 4-plex which I own 3/4 of, there are 5 designated parking spaces. The other owner had 2 vehicles before I purchased the 3.
Therefore, the 3 units that I own, can only be allowed to own one vehicle.
* In Harbor Oaks in Mariners Village, I have 4 rental units. I tell each prospective tenant that they ONLY have 1 designated parking space.
 - One 8-plex there has only 3 guest parking spaces.
 - In the 6-plex there are ONLY 2 guest parking spaces.
- A lot of landlords don't do as I do.
Thus, I see vehicles parked in the grass in front of plexes, which creates ruts of mud AND problems for vehicles trying to exit shared driveways.
- Again, what restrictions will the development have in place concerning limited parking spaces?
- 8.) Concerning the Marina: What plan do the developers have in place for scheduled dredging of the Marina?
 - 9.) Do they have knowledge of how often the Marina must be dredged?

10.) Will the developers maintain ownership and responsibility for the maintenance of the Marina?

11.) Will Woodward be able to sell any part of this LSU Health development in the future and therefore will contracts containing agreements be forced to be passed on to any prospective owner?

Thank you for taking questions.

Sincerely,
Ellen O'Connell
Caymen Cove Homes LLC
Mariners Village Condominium LLC
Treasurer & Secretary
Harbor Oaks Condominium Inc
HOA President



The P & Z meeting on Tuesday, 3/7/23, was disturbing in the following areas:

1. The discussion of the traffic report at the meeting projected between 28 and 32 additional cars daily with little impact on traffic as a result of this development. These numbers, as presented, were related to the housing units only. Where was the data for the hotel, restaurants, the event venue, marina, and ancillary services such as grounds maintenance vehicles? According to Sucette Harbor's stated estimated economic impact, it is expected that 80 new jobs will be created. Add to that the patrons of these facilities that will also come and go. This amounts to many more than 28-32 cars daily. If these numbers were included in the report, why were they not included in the traffic engineer's statement Tuesday night?
2. It is clear that most new traffic will come to this area on Monroe Street, West Antibes to Mariners Blvd. Monroe Street is already overloaded with traffic. In light of #1 above, it is impossible to know exact numbers. It was stated in the meeting that total additional autos would be 600-650, however, I read in the paper that the total was near 900. Was this 600-650 vehicles for the residential housing only? This is all very unclear.
3. The residential was changed to include multi-family as well as +55. Did we not know in the beginning that Mandeville doesn't have an ordinance for all +55? This should have been revealed and explained at the beginning of the discussion, not later. Either way, there are Fair Housing considerations that are very real which need to be clearly addressed.
4. At the end of the meeting, we learned that variances are not needed to go forward with this project. At earlier meetings, the impression was clearly given that variances would be needed. It appears that if variances are not needed, then this was known all along. Why was this not stated earlier?

While I do believe that the P&Z Commissioners and the City Council strive to best serve the people of the City of Mandeville, based on what I heard Tuesday night compared to earlier meetings, particularly the first meeting, it seems, not only me but to others in the room, that this is a bait and switch. Whether intended or not, when things change and last minute statements conflict with earlier statements, lack of confidence is the result.

As well, folks have little confidence in the traffic engineer's report, as she was not prepared, did not have answers to basic questions asked, and did not seem to be able to find the answers in her own report.

The Fair Housing issues need to be addressed and solved before going forward.

A traffic study performed by an independent engineer not connected to the developer or to anyone on the Commission needs to be conducted so we can have reliable and accurate numbers.

This matter is not ready to go forward as is and any vote should be postponed until the
aforementioned questions are answered to the public's satisfaction.

Phoebe Williamson
2621 Rebecca Lane
Mandeville, LA 70448
[REDACTED]

Alex Weiner

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, March 16, 2023 3:57 PM
To: Alex Weiner
Subject: LSU Mariners Village Property Plans Additional (#6) Comments of Lawrence Grundmann, 301 Mariners Is. 70448, for inclusion in Planning Committee Zoning Change Application Record

Hi Alex-

I mentioned at the last meeting I was hoping for a tabulation of all questions by all participants and Developer and Commission answers and we were told that all questions to date had been addressed. That is difficult to assess because there is no summary tabulation. However one obvious omission is the following item from my Oct 24 submittal to you:

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.

Also, there has been no discussion or public review of the Construction phase details, including: planned or likely timing and duration of construction period. Construction traffic studies, including routing of heavy construction equipment and the myriad of construction materials, much of it utilizing large or even oversized vehicles to effect same, parking accommodations for construction workers and many other details of the undertaking that will seriously impact the neighborhood for the duration. In addition, and related to that and addressable will be construction environmental impacts, including but not limited to, dust control, lighting for any night operations and noise abatement.

I would like to suggest including these and any other omissions (that may only likely be identified by the suggested summary listing) on the March 20 meeting agenda.

Thank you,
LARRY GHRUNDMANN
301 Mariners Island , 70448
[REDACTED]

Alex Weiner

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, March 7, 2023 4:04 PM
To: Alex Weiner
Subject: LSU Mariners Village Property Plans Additional (#5) Comments of Lawrence Grundmann, 301 Mariners Is. 70448, for inclusion in Planning Committee Zoning Change Application Record

Dear Alex;

As mentioned in previous submittal (#4) I did not get adequate notice of the Feb 13 meeting on this subject and could not attend. But I have reviewed the videoed session in full and have some additional comments/concerns that should be addressed.

- 1) There seems to be "creeping flexibility" into the plans that are not documented; among them are the possibility of changing to a family living if things don't work out with just 55+ occupancy, flexibility of restaurant hours and a few others casually referred to. All of these impact the decisions the PC will make based on the application submitted how are these "flexibilities" abated or how are impacts on decision assumptions accommodated to reflect the resultant impacts?
- 2) Assumptions that were made in the original submittal about situations that are still unaccepted to try to reduce code restrictions and limitations become the basis of follow on studies such as traffic. For instance, the parking for 1.5 vehicles/housing unit variance is not an accepted assumption, but the number of vehicles affects traffic (as does the nature of the rental units).
- 3) There is constant references to no children/young children, but some of the discussions undermine that precondition, including the fact that the developer has stated his intent to rebuild the beach that is most likely to become (whether intended or not) the most attractive in Mandeville. This issue has yet to be addressed in parking capacity, traffic or in the questions it opens about the ongoing responsibility for all of these public facilities on private property. When I say "responsible" I mean it in all senses of the word: maintenance, compliance with restrictions, security, etc.
- 4) In closing the last meeting, the Chairman noted there may be only a few more meetings. I, along with many others, are hoping the questions asked over all the meetings will be correlated and answered because few have been.

Thank you for your assistance in making these and my previous comments made known to the Planning Staff Director and the Commissioners.

LARRY GRUNDMANN
301 Mariners Island, Mandeville
[REDACTED]

Alex Weiner

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, March 7, 2023 8:31 PM
To: Alex Weiner
Subject: RE: LSU Mariners Village Property Plans Additional (#5) Comments of Lawrence Grundmann, 301 Mariners Is. 70448, for inclusion in Planning Committee Zoning Change Application Record

Hi Alex

One question I don't recall being addressed and answered is the construction period impacts and mitigation; what is the expected construction period, when is it expected to start, what is the heavy equipment routing and major material deliveries routing to the site, what are the traffic impacts, dust controls in residential neighborhood to name a few. Would you please point me to the responses if these have been addressed.

Thanks

Larry Grundmann

From: Alex Weiner <aweiner@cityofmandeville.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 7, 2023 5:04 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: LSU Mariners Village Property Plans Additional (#5) Comments of Lawrence Grundmann, 301 Mariners Is. 70448, for inclusion in Planning Committee Zoning Change Application Record

Lawrence,

Thank you for your comments. They will be distributed to the commission.

Alex Weiner, CFM

Planning Secretary
Department of Planning & Development
City of Mandeville
3101 E. Causeway Approach
Mandeville, LA 70448
(985) 624-3103

Permit applications and other applications are available on the website under the Planning Department page and can be emailed to permits@cityofmandeville.com.

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, March 7, 2023 4:04 PM
To: Alex Weiner <aweiner@cityofmandeville.com>
Subject: LSU Mariners Village Property Plans Additional (#5) Comments of Lawrence Grundmann, 301 Mariners Is. 70448, for inclusion in Planning Committee Zoning Change Application Record

Dear Alex;

As mentioned in previous submittal (#4) I did not get adequate notice of the Feb 13 meeting on this subject and could not attend. But I have reviewed the videoed session in full and have some additional comments/concerns that should be addressed.

- 1) There seems to be "creeping flexibility" into the plans that are not documented; among them are the possibility of changing to a family living if things don't work out with just 55+ occupancy, flexibility of restaurant hours and a few others casually referred to. All of these impact the decisions the PC will make based on the application

submitted how are these "flexibilities" abated or how are impacts on decision assumptions accommodated to reflect the resultant impacts?

- 2) Assumptions that were made in the original submittal about situations that are still unaccepted to try to reduce code restrictions and limitations become the basis of follow on studies such as traffic. For instance, the parking for 1.5 vehicles/housing unit variance is not an accepted assumption, but the number of vehicles affects traffic (as does the nature of the rental units).
- 3) There is constant references to no children/young children, but some of the discussions undermine that precondition, including the fact that the developer has stated his intent to rebuild the beach that is most likely to become (whether intended or not) the most attractive in Mandeville. This issue has yet to be addressed in parking capacity, traffic or in the questions it opens about the ongoing responsibility for all of these public facilities on private property. When I say "responsible" I mean it in all senses of the word: maintenance, compliance with restrictions , security, etc.
- 4) In closing the last meeting, the Chairman noted there may be only a few more meetings. I, along with many others, are hoping the questions asked over all the meetings will be correlated and answered because few have been.

Thank you for your assistance in making these and my previous comments made known to the Planning Staff Director and the Commissioners.

LARRY GRUNDMANN

301 Mariners Island, Mandeville


✓

**CITY OF MANDEVILLE PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
SPEAKER CARD**

CASE NUMBER: _____ DATE: _____
CASE NAME: _____
SPEAKER NAME: Elizabeth Bourgeois
MAILING ADDRESS: 233 Beau Rivage Drive, Mandeville, La
PHYSICAL ADDRESS (if different): same
CITY: Mandeville STATE: La
ZIP CODE: 70411 PHONE: [REDACTED]
COMMENTS: I am in favor of Sucette Harbor
would be great much needed community
gathering place
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: 3/20/2023
CASE NAME: Sucette Harbor
SPEAKER NAME: Ronald G. Bourgeois, Jr.
MAILING ADDRESS: 235 Beau Rivage Dr
PHYSICAL ADDRESS (if different): _____
CITY: Mandeville STATE: LA
ZIP CODE: 70471 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: LARRY BEATHLER JR
MAILING ADDRESS: 1756 LOGAN LANE, MANDEVILLE
PHYSICAL ADDRESS (if different): _____
CITY: MANDEVILLE LA STATE: LA
ZIP CODE: 70448 PHONE: [REDACTED]
COMMENTS: HERE IN SUPPORT OF SUCKETTE HARBOR PROJECT

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: 3/20/23
CASE NAME: Sucette Harbor
SPEAKER NAME: Kevin Voeg Hanz
MAILING ADDRESS: _____
PHYSICAL ADDRESS (if different): (Joycelyn Lowe has agreed to
CITY: _____ Donate her STATE: _____
ZIP CODE: _____ time to me) PHONE: _____
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: 3/20/23

CASE NAME: _____

SPEAKER NAME: Carlos Zelaya

MAILING ADDRESS: 1188 Rue Chinon

PHYSICAL ADDRESS (if different): _____

CITY: Mandeville

STATE: LA

ZIP CODE: 70471

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: 3/20/23

CASE NAME: _____

SPEAKER NAME: TERRI LEWIS STEVENS

MAILING ADDRESS: 725 DOVE PK RD.

PHYSICAL ADDRESS (if different): _____

CITY: BUNNINGTON

STATE: LA

ZIP CODE: 70433

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: 3/20/23
CASE NAME: Surcette
SPEAKER NAME: Michele Avery
MAILING ADDRESS: 766 CLAVE DR
PHYSICAL ADDRESS (if different): _____
CITY: MANDEVILLE STATE: LA
ZIP CODE: 70471 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: 3/30/23
CASE NAME: _____
SPEAKER NAME: CLAVE GILL
MAILING ADDRESS: 806 BOGAGE LN MANDEVILLE
PHYSICAL ADDRESS (if different): SAM
CITY: MANDEVILLE STATE: LA
ZIP CODE: 70471 PHONE: [REDACTED]
COMMENTS: _____

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

V

**CITY OF MANDEVILLE PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
SPEAKER CARD**

CASE NUMBER: _____

DATE: 3.20.23

CASE NAME: _____

SPEAKER NAME: Andrew Baird

MAILING ADDRESS: 160 Beau Rivage Drive

PHYSICAL ADDRESS (if different): _____

CITY: Mandeville STATE: LA

ZIP CODE: 70471 PHONE: [REDACTED]

COMMENTS: As a teenager in Mandeville, I would like for more opportunities for fun activities on the North Shore in Mandeville as opposed to having to go

I AM: FOR AGAINST OTHER across the bke.
 I WISH TO SPEAK I DO NOT WISH TO SPEAK

✓

**CITY OF MANDEVILLE PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
SPEAKER CARD**

CASE NUMBER: _____

DATE: 3/20/23

CASE NAME: _____

SPEAKER NAME: Todd Whelan

MAILING ADDRESS: 19104 Sandy Lane

PHYSICAL ADDRESS (if different): _____

CITY: Mandeville STATE: LA

ZIP CODE: 70471 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: 3-20-23
CASE NAME: SUCETTE
SPEAKER NAME: ERNEST BURGUIERES
MAILING ADDRESS: _____
PHYSICAL ADDRESS (if different): 241 WILKINSON
CITY: _____ STATE: _____
ZIP CODE: _____ PHONE: 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: 3/20/2023
CASE NAME: Sucette Harbor
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 AGAINST () OTHER
 () I WISH TO SPEAK () I DO NOT WISH TO SPEAK

✓

**CITY OF MANDEVILLE PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
SPEAKER CARD**

CASE NUMBER: I DON'T KNOW DATE: 3.20.23
CASE NAME: SUCETTE
SPEAKER NAME: TERRI HAMILTON
MAILING ADDRESS: 1111 VILLERE
PHYSICAL ADDRESS (if different): _____
CITY: THEVILLE 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: _____
CASE NAME: Soucette Development
SPEAKER NAME: Lawrence Grandmoun
MAILING ADDRESS: 301 Maruzne Island
PHYSICAL ADDRESS (if different): _____
CITY: Mandeville STATE: LA
ZIP CODE: 70448 PHONE: [REDACTED]
COMMENTS: _____

I AM: () FOR (V) AGAINST () OTHER
 (X) 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: Elizabeth Bourgeois

MAILING ADDRESS: 235 Beau Rivage Dr.

PHYSICAL ADDRESS (if different): 235 Beau Rivage Drive

CITY: Mandeville

STATE: LA

ZIP CODE: LA

PHONE: [REDACTED]

COMMENTS: Want the development

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

The land in the state
it is now is deliterious.

=

health welfare of society

ma

IS IT REALLY WORTH IT?

The Sucette application on file on the City's website suggests that the economic benefit from their project is as follows:

- **A one time tax revenue of \$375,000. to the City of Mandeville** for construction based on a \$75,000,000 construction cost.
 - The State of Louisiana would receive \$3,338,000.
 - The Parish of St. Tammany would receive \$3,188,000.

- **A yearly recurring revenue of \$40,000. to the City.**
 - The State of Louisiana would receive \$356,000.
 - The Parish of St. Tammany would receive \$340,000.

A nominal sum compared to the density burden that our citizens will be exposed to.

Sucette Harbor – Estimated Economic Impact

Estimated Annual Property Tax:

Combined between all outlets: \$500,000

	Millage	Percentage	Tax Proceeds
School District	62.00	47.4%	\$ 237,000
Fire District 4	25.38	19.4%	\$ 97,000
St. Tammany Law Enforcement	11.14	8.5%	\$ 42,000
City of Mandeville	8.86	6.8%	\$ 34,000
Recreation District 1	6.75	5.2%	\$ 26,000
Library	5.78	4.4%	\$ 22,000
Other public services	11.01	8.4%	\$ 42,000
Total Estimated	130.92	100.0%	\$ 500,000

Total Employment:

- Approximately 80 new full-time employee equivalents

Ongoing Operations Sales Tax:

Sales tax rate: 9.2% on estimated \$8 million in revenue

State	4.45%	\$ 356,000
Parish	4.25%	\$ 340,000
City	0.50%	\$ 40,000
Total Estimated	9.20%	\$ 736,000

One-Time Construction Materials Sales Tax:

Sales tax rate: 9.2% on estimated \$75 million in material cost

State	4.45%	\$ 3,338,000
Parish	4.25%	\$ 3,188,000
City	0.50%	\$ 375,000
Total Estimated	9.20%	\$ 6,900,000

Sucette Harbor – Estimated Economic Impact on the City of Mandeville

Total Employment:

- Approximately 80 new employees
- Between Active Adult, Hotel, Food & Beverage Program, Marina

One-Time Construction Materials Sales Tax:

Sales tax rate: 9.2% (0.5% of that the City)

Estimated \$75 million in material cost = \$375,000 in sales tax paid to the City of Mandeville

Ongoing Operations Sales Tax (for the City of Mandeville):

F&B, Retail, Marina Sales Tax: \$40,000

Estimated Annual Property Tax (for City of Mandeville):

Combined between all outlets: \$27,000-\$34,000

September 19, 2022

**The 1998 Zoning Ordinance (98-40)
that established the Planned Residential Development
for Al Copeland, Sr. for Parcel D**

1. With the passage of Ordinance 98-40 the Council established that *it served the best interests of the City of Mandeville by protecting existing residential neighborhoods in the vicinity of the Property from the possible intrusion of commercial uses and other types of residential uses which, by their nature and/or size, may be deleterious to that neighborhood.*
2. The Council has not overturned or revised Zoning Ordinance 98-40 and it is therefore the current directive from the City Council on this property, Parcel D.
3. Planning and Zoning should follow this directive until it is changed or overruled.
4. If you do not agree with this, show me the specific authority that renders Ordinance 98-40 null and without effect.

NOT FAIR!

The community we live in reflects our shared view. We decided on limits to structure height, parking requirements and live oak trees. It established a recognizable scale to this small town. **Anyone who wants permission to depart from these rules must demonstrate a hardship.** Except when it comes to a Planned Development. Why should an applicant, that is not even part of the community, be allowed to avoid the rules we all agreed to follow? The Sucette property is valuable for all kinds of uses as it sits, but that's not enough?

P&Z should not give a free pass to this applicant that is not available to the rest of the town just because the rule allows you to.