

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

The secretary called the roll.

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

Absent: None

Also Present: Cara Bartholomew, Director Planning Department; Lauren Brinkman, Planner; Elizabeth Sconzert, City Attorney; David Parnell, 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

Ms. Bartholomew gave a recap of the project.

Bill Hoffman, President of Woodward Interests: This process started about six months ago. The streets that were highlighted in yellow were to show where the site was located during initial meetings with residents. Since this property is zoned Planned District, it works differently than other zoning districts. They kept issues like density and parking in mind during the development. CLURO Section 7.5.15.4 Flexible Site Planning allows for the departure of certain present codes for Planned Districts. There were five previous meetings about the development, and after those meetings they have proposed to amend their submittal. They are going to remove the café to allow for more parking. The traffic impact was the number one issue that they heard when talking to residents. This was designed as a low impact development. The traffic analysis showed a minimal impact. When looking at the development as active adult or multifamily the impact was only marginally different.

As the meetings progressed the future success of the active adult community became an issue. Their lease requires a senior living component. They did market research before signing the lease and it showed that it could be successful. The partners would not invest in something that would not be viable. It was not designed as multi-family living for a reason. The City does not have an active adult classification. Their research has led them to determine that 1 to 1 ½ parking spaces per unit is enough for an active adult community. It was suggested at the last meeting that the site was being overloaded. Mr. Hoffman believes that is due to the parking situation. They have added 89 parking spaces, 74 of which are going to be banked spaces. These banked spaces will remain greenspace until they are needed. They believe they have enough parking for the site. They did not lose any trees on the landscape plan when they added the banked parking spaces. Additionally, they will combine the two restaurant buildings into one building. They would be losing 18 of the required spaces, while adding 10 surface parking spaces. There would now be 589 parking spaces on the site vs the 607 required spaces. The 607 spaces required does not take into account the shared parking aspect. As was previously stated, they believe they only need 451 parking spots during peak hours of operation. They say the parking issue has been handled.

The 60' height is appropriate and not out of scale. You will not be able to see the top of the buildings from Monroe Street. It is also not out of scale from the Causeway. There are several differences between the house on Monroe that had to remove the top part of their home and this development. There is no height restriction in a Planned District and they are asking for a variance at the start. They say that it will not be out of scale with the continuous lot area.

Mr. Hoffman said they are asking for an 8,000 sqft departure for the hotel. The hotel also includes 26,000 sqft of parking. The 100,000 sqft limit does not account for a hotel constructed like theirs will be. The design is reasonable for the site.

They are proposing to remove five live oaks from the property and replace them with 36 trees. The trees being replaced are not currently visible to the neighbors. They do not have good canopies are not suitable for relocation as the survival chance is low. The report prepared by Buck Abbey supports their plan to remove and replace the oaks.

Mr. Hoffman said that Sucette would be a tremendous long-term asset to Mandeville. It is estimated that it will generate approximately \$500,000 in annual property taxes to the City, Parish and State. The City portion would be approximately \$34,000. Sucette will also generate approximately \$736,000 a year in direct sales tax. This does not include the revenue generated by residents and hotel guests who go out and shop in Mandeville. Additionally, there will be an estimated \$6,900,000 in sales tax generated for the construction of Sucette. There will be 80 full time jobs, and 60% of the lease payments will go towards cancer research. This project has the full support of the LSU Foundation in New Orleans, and Al Copeland and his foundation. This would allow residents of certain ages to stay close to their families. It fits the location and the departures requested are in the scope of a Planned District. Mr. Hoffman says he believes it complies with the CLURO and the spirit of the ordinance of regulation adopted by the City.

Mr. Rhinehart reiterated the three options for the commission, they could recommend approval, recommend denial, or recommend approval with conditions.

Mr. Quillin said that he would start with the CLURO definition of the height regulations, as looking at the drawings it shows a 60ft maximum height but there are things above that height. He wants to make sure that everyone understands that there is a calculation involved.

Ms. Bartholomew said the height requirement is done by a calculation. She said that the height is measured up to the mid-point between the highest ridge and eave and then divided by two.

Mr. Adams said you could have a 70' A-Frame house with this formula.

Mr. Quillin said that Mr. Hoffman had stated that the parking for the hotel was roughly 25% of the square footage. He is not used to parking being calculated as building square footage so he is curious as to why it is being done here.

Mr. Hoffman said that their understanding was retail square footage was calculated by everything under roof. When looking at the hotel, everything under the roof measures 108,000 sqft, with the bottom floor being parking. Mr. Quillin asked if the parking was located below BFE, Mr. Hoffman said it was.

Mr. Quillin said the tree line was spoken about, he wanted to know where it was and who owns it. Mr. Hoffman said there are two tree lines, one on the western side of the property and one on the northern side. The tree line along the west runs along the drainage canal that the City has, and the tree line along the north separates the subdivision from the structures on the property. They would own all the trees. Mr. Quillin said that it would be easier to maintain since it would be under their control, and would cover the view.

Ms. Gautreaux said she had a similar question. There was a picture of what would be seen once the trees were mature, would there be any trees along the northern border that would be saved? Mr. Hoffman said they have not gotten that granular on the tree saving yet, but they hope to save some trees along the northern border. There will be no issues along the western side of the property as it is staying as is.

Mr. Quillin said that with the revised application being presented, the café is being removed. Would the restaurant stay? Mr. Hoffman said it would. The café had the marina office in it as well, which is being moved to the restaurant. It would probably have to be shifted north a bit. 10 usable parking spots will be added with the removal of the café, the rest will be banked. They will make sure they can keep the trees if the spaces are converted.

Mr. Quillin asked if the banked parking would be taken into account for the pervious/impervious calculations. He also asked if those calculations took into account the water in the marina or just the land. Ms. Bartholomew said the calculations are looked at as the whole site so it would include the marina. She added they are more than compliant.

Mr. Fairley said he had some concerns about the height which were addressed. He asked how many jobs were lost with the removal of the café? Mr. Hoffman said that none were lost. The café would have only operated in the morning, and the restaurant in the afternoon and evenings. The restaurant will now be open for all three times. This was not done initially as it is easier to find quality operators for lunch and dinner times, than for all three. There would be no loss of fulltime jobs and they would be serving the same amount of meals.

Ms. Durio said that they are being asked to change this from a Planned Residential District to a Planned Development that is commercial. They are looking at the R-3 and B-2 based on the proposed uses. In Article 7 under commercial uses it says that B-2 Highway Business District, provided, however, that commercial uses designated on a site plan providing for a mix of commercial uses and residential uses shall comply with the requirements of the B-1 Neighborhood Business District. The B-2 that they are using is for highway access. Ms. Bartholomew said the reason for that is when it comes to permitting and development the R-3 district is not considered strictly residential, it is a more commercial operation. If this was proposed to be strictly single family residential and commercial then the B-1 guidelines would have been used as B-1 is used for low density and commercial.

Ms. Durio said that this was not on a highway, it was accessed through a residential area. There is no access from a major road. She likes the idea of a hotel, but it seems incompatible with the multi family use. She does not see the connection. There seems to be an issue with the large event space for the neighborhood community. There would be around 200 people arriving and leaving at around the same time. The hotel would be better for an area that could buffer it with more green space and parking. She thinks that the use is appropriate, but the question is if the mixture of a hotel and apartment complex are appropriate together.

Mr. Adams said that there has been lots of discussion at the previous meetings. There is a plan in front of the commission. It seems like the City has been waiting for a plan for this place since the 1960s. The last use permitted was as a dry boat storage yard. The property has always been mixed use not single family residential. There are not any variances in the true sense. They have to look at the whole development and if it will be an asset to the town.

There has been a lot of talk about traffic, there is going to be traffic no matter what gets built there. This project complies with the quality of service level in the CLURO. For parking there is no need for the developer to add any more or less than what is needed. There is nowhere else to go if there is no parking available, it is too far to walk and would not push parking anywhere else. They have added parking banks, so the parking is not a big issue. The height is not out of scale to the surrounding area and buildings already there. It would fit in or look even better. The commission has to look at the potential problems and benefits. Due to the status of the people living there, they would not add to the school system.

There are no hotels in-between the Tchefuncta and East of Fontainebleau State Park. There are an estimated 40,000 voters in the area so there are about 60,000 people with not one hotel. There is need for one in the area. He added that this is a different type of retirement home.

Mr. Adams said that this would open up the Lakefront to the people in New Golden Shores and Old Golden Shores. The development would be a big amenity to the town. However, there is no pedestrian walking path for access. There should be something added to the plan. He loves the landscape plan, but he would like to see a guarantee on the trees for the length of the project.

Mr. Pierce said this is a terrific piece of property and he is not opposed to the multi residential and the hotel/event center in theory. His issue is with the scale. He appreciates the parking bank and tree plan. The conflict is a matter of opinion. The developers say that it is low impact and not out of scale, he thinks that it is high impact and out of scale. He is not sure if it fits with the intent of the CLURO. The benefits are not about the money the City would make, it is about having a nice place to live. He is not opposed to the planning, just the scale.

Mr. Rhinehart said that he has similar thoughts. He has gone back and forth at previous meetings. He has looked at the policies and goals of the comprehensive plan and two of them jumped out. Policy 3.4 states "Continue to develop and implement strategies that preserve the scale and historical and architectural character of the City's older neighborhoods and business areas." and Policy 3.5 "states Require Old Mandeville development to be designed to standards that preserve and enhance the historic character of the area." They have to ask if the size and scale fit with the neighborhood and enhance the character.

Mr. Rhinehart says they fail in section two of the review and evaluation criteria which says: Compatibility with existing or permitted uses on abutting sites, in terms of building height, bulk and scale, setbacks and open spaces, landscaping and site development, and access and circulation features. He asked if the size and scale fit with the architecture of the surrounding neighborhood. He does not think it does and the development would be an anomaly. He does not want to open the door for similar sized buildings next door.

Mr. Pierce agreed and said he would double down and say that there are roughly zero six story building in Mandeville. Again, he does not object to the use, just the size.

Ms. Durio said that the hotel space would be 8,000 sqft over and that is for a highway zoning. Would you add in the retail and restaurant or would they be separate. Ms. Bartholomew said it was per building. She also reiterated that these were not prescriptive regulations. Ms. Durio said for comparison it exceeds the size for highway commercial. Ms. Bartholomew said it did as that was the district it was based on.

Ms. Durio said that it the district being used, but she is not sure that it is the one they have to base it on. When they look at the size and what is in the vicinity, what Mr. Adams said was previously on the property were more of a compatible size. They were services to a residential community or to a hotel community.

Ms. Bartholomew said that because B-1 was brought up, the maximum lot area is 40,000 sqft which is not even an acre. This is a 15-acre parcel so just keep that in mind when looking at comparisons.

Mr. Quillin said there was a comment about fire services, has anyone spoken to the District Four Fire Department to see if they can service the buildings. Ms. Bartholomew said that is usually done during the permitting process, the plans would be reviewed by the State Fire Marshal. The Planning Department is in close contact with the Fire Chief and Fire Department and they have not reached out and made any comments.

Mr. Adams asked if Design Review has looked at the project yet? Ms. Bartholomew said they will review the architectural elements. Ms. Durio asked if they would look at the overall size and density or just the architectural elements. Ms. Bartholomew said they would look at those elements as architects, but typically they just look at architectural elements.

Ms. Durio said at some point they have to have a consensus for basing the best use of the property from PRD to PCUD. The question is do they have any provisions to provide. Mr. Rhinehart said that they can make a motion to recommend with things to include or exclude.

Paul Harrison on Behalf of the Applicant: The legal background for a comprehensive plan is found in Title 33 Section 47.3. A comprehensive plan zones, a master plan plans. This property is zoned mixed use and part of Planned Development. It is not residential only in nature. There are no single-family homes in Mariners Village, they are condominiums. There was a previous use as a marina, which is consistent with the existing harbor. The marina is not natural, you could probably reclaim it all.

Parcel D is zoned Planned District. It was zoned PRD in 1998 on a planned residential development that failed and was never built. The commission cannot make a personal opinion on density, the project complies with density. It is located by the Causeway which is a highway with no stoplights. This is located next to condominiums and historically had a marina and was mixed use. It is not located in downtown or in New Golden Shores. The commission has not given one moment of clarity on what is required. The developers do not have to paint within the lines, a Planned District allows for the consideration of the merit of a project.

The traffic analysis fully complies with the density, there are apartments on Monroe that are more dense than this. The architecture is award winning and compatible with the condominiums in place and what is being proposed. The commission should not fear the lack of success. Compatibility was brought up after about six months and never was before. It is compatible. There is no reason to say no. The commission can create requirements like a bike path or going to Design Review. The staff has said that a Planned District should stand on its own merit and should not be compared to a single family use.

If the commission forces them to comply what would happen is that all the balconies would be removed, reduce the hotel, chop off the roof and make it ugly. When a developer asks for a deviation, it is for a reason. Mr. Harrison said they have provided extensive reasons for deviation from the height, because of aesthetics and because you would not be able to tell the difference. This commission has not said why it should be lower it has just opined that with no fact or study. The zoning component is a bit different and there is not much that can be done there.

Mr. Rhinehart said they are aware of that and are looking at this development as a Planned District. The commission has not focused on density but rather size and scale. The CLURO specifically says to look at compatibility. In addition, section 4.3.3.1 says: "Conditional Use and Planned District Zoning Procedure. The purpose of this procedure is to provide for review and discretionary approval of uses or development sites typically having unusual site development features or unique operating characteristics requiring special consideration" and so forth. They are looking at this and applying the CLURO and the Comprehensive Plan to the best of their ability.

Ms. Durio said that no one has compared it to single family residential. The commission is looking at the existing local community. She added that it was her understanding that there was a finding that the residential was the best use, does the commission need to make a finding that this mixed use is the best use.

Ms. Bartholomew said it was a 1998 ordinance and at that point the developer and property owner put together the request and that is part of the where as clause. The commission needs to find their own justification for the way they vote. Ms. Bartholomew said she would not

consider the 1998 ordinance, that was an application that came before them that they felt was appropriate at that time.

Mr. Adams asked if anyone remembered that project. Anyone who calls that a single-family development is nuts. It had a helicopter pad and horse stables, along with speedboat parking. It was not a single-family residence use; it was a planned family compound.

Ms. Bartholomew wanted to remind everyone that the applicant did submit a revision. If the commission decides to accept it, then the parking would be compliant.

Mr. Adams made a motion to recommend approval of the revised plan for the reasons he stated in his findings, with the conditions of a walking and bicycle path be added, and there be regular landscape checks. Mr. Fairley seconded the motion.

Mr. Quillin proposed an amendment to include review by the Design Review Committee, Mr. Fairley seconded the amendment. The amendment passed with a vote of 4-3 with commissioners Pierce, Rhinehart, and Durio voting against.

Ms. Durio proposed an amendment to the motion to reduce the density of the hotel/retail space to the B-2 requirements. Ms. Gautreaux seconded the amendment.

Mr. Adams asked how the commission would do that.

Ms. Durio said it was her understanding that they could make amendments to the request.

Mr. Harrison asked for the reasoning behind the amendment.

Ms. Bartholomew said that would not be the density, it would be the square footage.

Mr. Adams said he was not sure a general recommendation like that could be done.

Ms. Bartholomew said for B-1 the maximum building size is 15,000 sqft. Ms. Durio said B-2 is 100,000 sqft. Ms. Bartholomew thought that Ms. Durio wanted the B-1 requirements. Ms. Bartholomew said the Ms. Durio should go through and say what she wants.

Ms. Durio said she would suggest an amendment to the motion to reduce the maximum building size to 100,000 sqft for the hotel/retail space which is currently at 108,000 sqft for the reason that you are putting commercial use in an area that is surrounded by residential neighborhoods and to make the overall size of the commercial use more compatible. Ms. Bartholomew wanted to make it clear that Mariners Village is multi family not R-1 Single Family Residential.

Mr. Adams said that Ms. Durio said the development was surrounded by residential but it is not. Ms. Durio said that Mariners Village, while not R-1, is primarily residential. Ms. Bartholomew said it was multi family residential. She added that consistent terms needed to be used and the development was surrounded by multifamily residential.

The roll was called on the motion to reduce the size of the hotel. The amendment failed with a vote of 2-5 with commissioners Adams, Quillin, Pierce, Rhinehart, and Fairley voting against.

Ms. Bartholomew restated the motion which was: To accept the revised plans submitted and to include a walking and bike path for access, landscape checks, and review and approval by Design Review.


The roll was called for the motion and it passed 4-3 with commissioners Pierce, Rhinehart, and Durio voting against.

Ms. Bartholomew said the next step of the process is that the recommendation, along with all the approved plans would be sent to the city council. She said she would let everyone know when it will be placed on the council agenda. Ms. Bartholomew added that the memo and findings would be sent to the council within ten days.

Mr. Quillin motioned to adjourn the meeting, Mr. Rhinehart seconded, and all were in favor. The meeting was adjourned at 7:28pm



Alex Weiner, Secretary



Karen Gautreaux, Chairwoman
Planning Commission



Brian Rhinehart, Chairman
Zoning Commission

Alex Weiner

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, March 20, 2023 12:36 PM
To: Alex Weiner
Subject: FW: LSU Mariners Village Property Plans Comments of Lawrence Grundmann, 301 Mariners Is. 70448, for inclusion in Planning Committee Zoning Change Application Record
Attachments: DISCUSSION POINTS FOR ZONING COMMITTEE MEETING 2022.9.21.DOCX

Good Morning Alex

As follow on to my earlier email for the upcoming meeting wherein I noted elements not clearly addressed, I reviewed our first submittal comments (on Sept. 21, 2022) which were to be read into the record of the meeting but were not. Several of the items contained therein also were not fully vetted by the Commission.

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;** ...

It is our plea that careful consideration be given to the impacts on existing residents who came here relying on the expressed intents and aspirations of the City leaders to preserve the residential nature of their neighborhood.

Respectfully submitted
Larry Grundmann
301 Mariners Island
Mandeville, LA
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, September 21, 2022 1:51 PM
To: aweiner@cityofmandeville.com
Subject: LSU Mariners Village Property Plans Comments of Lawrence Grundmann, 301 Mariners Is. 70448, for inclusion in Planning Committee Zoning Change Application Record

Dear Mr. Weiner;

Thank you for the opportunity to place concerns of the neighboring public before the Planning Commission on this extremely important issue. After discussions with several of our neighbors here in Mariners Island, I am submitting the

attached comments for inclusion in the Zoning Change proceeding records. I am also prepared to read these at the Zoning Committee Meeting tonight if permitted.

Lawrence Grundmann,



Alex Weiner

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, March 20, 2023 1:57 PM
To: Alex Weiner
Subject: RE: 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-

A neighbor and fellow boater asked me to add this to my submissions for this next meeting tonight:

As a boater, I have been in Marinas all over the area including Mariners Village Marina. Boating is inherently a social activity. 18 parking places for 102 slips is totally inadequate. The Pelican Yacht Club and the Park across the street disproves the adequacy of this ratio. You have only to go there on a weekend or holiday and see all lots totally full and people parked everywhere. People will park everywhere around the new marina, if built. They will fill up the construction company lot as they do now on weekends and park everywhere in the adjacent facilities. There will be constant complaints to the police. Everyone will say what was the P&Z thinking.

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

Alex Weiner

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, April 12, 2023 4:03 PM
To: Cara Bartholomew
Cc: Alex Weiner
Subject: LSU Mariners Village Property Plans: Additional Comments of Lawrence Grundmann, 301 Mariners Is. 70448, for inclusion in Planning Committee Zoning Change Application Record

It is requested that this correspondence be included in the application records and distributed to the Planning Commission Members before its April 17, 2023 Meeting

Dear Ms. Bartholomew:

Hopefully you recall my various written submittals and oral comments on the proposed LSU Health Foundation Lessee's (Woodward's) Proposal throughout the process since its first hearing on September 21 of last year. I and my 6 neighbors in the Mariners Island Condo building directly across the "lollypop stick" from the proposed project parcel are probably the closest homeowners to this proposed project.

Unfortunately, I will be unable to attend the April 17, meeting where the Commission is scheduled to render its final decision. Particularly disturbing is that there is no published listing of the public's questions with them collated by categories and the developer/Commission responses, mitigation plans or reason for rejection of those issues as stated there would be. I have submitted to Mr. Weiner several examples of unanswered issues but the expected listing would better capture any missed ones.

A major driver of the proposed project's impact on immediate area residential neighbors is that virtually all of the variances from the County CLURO and the 1998 Ordinance designating this as Planned Residential parcel are driven by enhancing the economics for the developer. This may explain (but not justify) his reluctance to reduce the size of the hotel and eliminate the event center and moderate most other commercial aspects or amend parking assumptions to be more realistic. The Commission should perform studies to determine if the perceived (advertised) public's 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 irrevocably harmed by permitting this change. We have seen no such evaluation and justification by the Planning Commission.

It is interesting to note that the property's existing zoning 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;** ...". Many, if not most of the proposed project's neighbors made the surrounding area their home based on this principle.

It is our plea that careful consideration be given to the impacts on existing residents who came here relying on the expressed intents and aspirations of the City leaders to preserve the residential nature of their neighborhood. Most importantly, given recent economic shifts which are most certainly increasing costs of the project, the developer will be seeking to further exploit the site to reestablish economics he envisioned at the time of the originally proposal submittal. One avenue seemingly already being explored is to allow all age group rentals of the apartments rather than the senior, 55+ restriction that underpins almost every "code variance" request by the developer. If the Commission does not unequivocally tie-down that restriction for all time to any authorization of this proposed, it could not do a greater disservice to our community and its residents.

A subset hurdle of memorializing this age restriction is that the Property owner, LSU Health Foundation of New Orleans, is not the developer applicant, but rather a Developer Lessee of 99 years duration, Woodward. Further complicating the efficacy and permanence of such a restriction is the proposal that the apartment management will likely be a concession operator under contract to the Developer. Any restriction must be able to reach through all of these layers to be permanently

effective. It is hoped, if any permitting ordinance for any zoning variance and the age restriction is written, it will be confectioned to effectively reach through all these layers for all time.

We appreciate the hard work the P&Z Staff is putting into this review, but we are concerned that the negative impacts on existing residential neighbors is being unjustifiably minimized or even ignored.

Thank you for your indulgence in reading this I hope you and your staff will explore the suggestions that have been submitted on behalf of many of my neighbors who have indicated the same sentiments and concerns about unanswered questions.

Sincerely,

L.C. Grundmann, Jr.

301 Mariners Island

Mandeville



DID YOU KNOW? The 29 acres donated by the Al Copeland family for this project is valued at over \$7 million, making it the largest gift ever received in the LSU Health Foundation's 31-years of operation..



LSU Health Foundation announced the development of a state-of-the-art retirement community in Mandeville last August. The project will also include a marina, hotel and health care services.

THE NORTHSHORE IS TOPS FOR RETIREMENT

Ranked Louisiana's top spots to retire, Covington and Mandeville continue to work to meet demand for retirement communities.

BY DREW HAWKINS

Orothy Gale wasn't lying when she said, "There's no place like home." Having a comfortable and safe place to lie your head at night is a basic human need, but all too often, affordable retirement communities that can provide residents with both a good quality of life and attend to their medical needs, all without breaking the bank, are difficult to access for those in South Louisiana.

The need is especially being felt on the Northshore of Lake Pontchartrain, where The LSU Health Foundation estimates more than 10,000 people are retiring every day.

In a 2021 study by SmartAsset, Covington and Mandeville grabbed the top two spots in a ranking of "Best Places to Retire in Louisiana." The study ranked cities by tax burden; medical offices, recreation centers

and retirement centers per 1,000 people; and the percentage of the city's population that are seniors (18.6% for Covington and 18.3% for Mandeville).

Patrick Descant, partner and vice president of preconstruction services at DonahueFavret, a contractor that's built multiple retirement communities on the Northshore, said the good news is that the supply of communities is starting to move to meet demand.

"Over the last 12 years, there's been somewhat of a boom of retirement communities on the Northshore that serve independent living, assisted living and memory care, along with skilled nursing facilities as well," said Descant. "And what these new facilities, the new models and designs that we've seen have really honed in on is trying to make the residents feel at home and extremely comfortable, which that lends to a real high quality product."

Among those working to meet demand is the LSU Health Foundation, which last summer announced one of the largest economic development projects to happen on the Northshore: a \$150 million private partner investment that aims to bring a state-of-the-art retirement community to Mandeville. The Al Copeland family gifted 29 acres of land to the LSU Health Foundation to build the project.

"This partnership with LSU Health Foundation is a long-standing one, and it is my honor to donate this land in our father's name," said Al Copeland Jr. at the announcement.

The need for this specialized type of housing has also increased as society has become more transient. Many families no longer remain in close proximity to one another across multiple generations. "The oldest of our population find themselves losing their independence at home and needing some help," said Kerry Milton, chief nursing officer at St. Tammany Health System. "That is where the affordable retirement community is truly needed."

Milton said socialization is really the key for residents of a retirement community, which needs to offer safety, structured schedules, social interactions, healthy activities, exercise, nutritional support, convenient access to healthy food and assisted food preparation, plus staff-hosted events and outings for the residents to stay engaged in daily life activities.

To facilitate socialization and create a more homelike environment, Descant said the

What we really need to see in the future is truly affordable retirement and long-term care options. Much education is needed for people who do not yet need these living arrangements to understand their cost and to plan for future needs.

Paula Day, assistant vice president of care coordination at St. Tammany Health System

design of modern retirement communities has shifted. Gone are the days of "institutional" style, dull buildings. Today's facilities are structured with wings that have different colors and decor, so residents feel almost as if they live in different "neighborhoods."

"These communities, these neighborhoods have central communal areas, with furniture and rugs and TVs that meet the needs. They really make these residents feel like home when they're not in their rooms. And we want to incorporate skylights and dormers to bring in natural light to the middle part of the building where the communal areas are. One of the biggest amenities is one of the simplest amenities that you can possibly think of, and that's natural light, sunlight," said Descant.

While the Northshore does have a wide variety of care settings — from centers for rehabilitation to skilled nursing, long-term acute care and custodial care — there remains a deep need that's not being filled.

"What we really need to see in the future is truly affordable retirement and long-term care options," said Paula Day, assistant vice president of care coordination at St. Tammany Health System. "Much education is needed for people who do not yet need these living arrangements to understand their cost and to plan for future needs."

According to Caring.com's 2022 Senior Living Report, the average cost for assisted living in Louisiana is \$3,748 per month. A cost that's lower than the national average can still be well outside of the budget of many families in the state.

What's more is that many Americans do not have enough saved for retirement. A 2021 report from the Federal Reserve found that nearly one in every four adult Americans has no retirement savings at all — and this was before the pandemic hit.

Estimates say that a 65-year-old resident in Louisiana whose life expectancy aligns with the state average would need to save \$914,400 to live out retirement in relative comfort. That's why industry experts say planning and saving for retirement is key.

"It's important for people to understand how much planning and saving is needed to be ready for retirement, aging and the health conditions that come with it," said Day. ■

Alex Weiner

From: Matt Taylor <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, April 12, 2023 9:00 AM
To: Alex Weiner
Subject: Sucette Harbor

Hi, Alex. I'm writing to inform you of my support of the Sucette Harbor development on the Mandeville lakefront. I'm a resident of Mandeville (Beau Chene). As owner of Property One, a regional commercial real estate firm with offices across the state, I've had a lot of experience with real estate development, and my experience leads me to conclude that Sucette Harbor would be a great benefit to Mandeville.

Here are the key points for me:

- It's the right developer. Paul Flower has a great track record and has the resources and experience to get this project done the right way. He's been around long enough to understand how to make a project work and not gouge the surrounding community. That's not an insignificant point - a lot of developers are completely self-centered and don't see the bigger picture. Paul is not that. He's experienced and reasoned. He's the right guy to be respectful of the existing culture.
- The proposed development is the right use for the site. Having a high end, first class development like this on our waterfront will only add to the Mandeville vibes that attract people here. I can think of other projects that would be successful here and benefit developers, but I can't think of any that would benefit Mandeville as much as this one would.

Again, as a resident and expert in commercial real estate/development, I'm in support of this project from Woodward happening in our backyard. I'm very excited to see this come to fruition.

If you have any questions, I'd be happy to speak to you about it.

Matt Taylor

President
Property One, Inc.
Licensed in Louisiana

[REDACTED]
3500 N. Causeway Blvd., Suite 600
Metairie, LA 70002
Property One, Inc. is licensed in LA, MS, TX, and
GA

Alex Weiner

From: Allen Churchill [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, April 14, 2023 7:13 AM
To: Alex Weiner
Subject: Sucette Harbor

Dear Sir,

I am writing in support of the Sucette Harbor development which i understand is under consideration by the Mandeville zoning and planning commission.

Like many North Shore residents I am perhaps reflexively suspicious of big development projects that could degrade our quality of life, increase traffic, etc.. However, I think the Sucette Harbor project is of high quality and realistic. It is also my understanding that the developers have an attractive track record with multiple projects. Additionally, I feel like that some day someone is going to develop that land so It might as well be a well conceived project like this one.

My take on this project may be a little different from others as I am in the business of assisting retirees and pre-retirees with planning for their old age and help them manage long term care issues and insurance. I think it would be a boon to the Mandeville area to have a new first class facility to serve our population.

On a more personal note my father is currently a resident of Poydras Home on Magazine street in New Orleans. I can assure you that families who currently travel 45 minutes there and back to visit their elderly loved ones would have rather had options in the Mandeville area. South Shore travel times there and back can be a considerable strain. This reality leads me to think this project has every chance of working.

It is with these thoughts in mind that I urge your positive consideration of this project.

Allen Churchill

1925 America st.

Mandeville La. 70448



Alex Weiner

From: Andrew Ellender <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Saturday, April 15, 2023 11:04 AM
To: Alex Weiner
Subject: Sucette Harbor

Hello Alex,

The building height should be allowed as it is part of the comprehensive plan for Mandeville. The CLURO and the plan do not match up and this should be an exception until the CLURO can be updated.

Parking should not overflow into the neighboring streets. Please raise this issue and help us understand how this will be prevented. Can you recommend any enforcement verbiage that forces the owners to increase parking space if it becomes a problem in the future?

I am fine with cutting down 3 oak trees if they are unhealthy and replacing them with the proposed amount of new trees. Can enforcement language be recommended that forces them to replace any trees that die or are damaged on their property?

--

Best Regards,

Andrew Ellender
780 Lambert st
Mandeville, LA 70448
[REDACTED]