CASE NUMBER: V23-02-03
DATE RECEIVED: January 12, 2023
DATE OF MEETING: February 14, 2023 and February 28, 2023
Address: 499 Devon Drive
Subdivision: Golden Glen, Sq. H Lot 99
Zoning District: R-1 Single Family Residential District
Property Owner: Juan Fonseca

REQUEST: V23-02-03 - Juan Fonseca requests a variance to CLURO Section 8.1.3. Supplemental Fence and Wall Regulations, Square H Lot 99A, R-1 Single Family Residential District, 499 Devon

## CASE SUMMARY:

The applicant owns the property located at 499 Devon Dr. The property is located on the northeast corner of Florida Extension and North Causeway Blvd. The property is irregular in shape, measuring 73.41' along Devon Dr., 180' along West Florida Extension, 104.83' along North Causeway Blvd, 100.91' along the north side of the lot, and 158.79' along the interior side containing approximately $22,279 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}$ according to the final plat of the Golden Glen subdivision, dated 12.19.1973. The property is improved with a single-family residence.

The applicant constructed a 7' privacy fence as a replacement for the subdivision fence which has fallen into disrepair. The existing subdivision fence is constructed of wood and measures 7'. The applicant's fence is parallel to the subdivision fence. The fence begins at the entrance stone columns at Devon Drive, runs along the Florida Extension, and continues along the rear property line stopping equal with the front façade of the house on the interior property line. The fence is constructed of metal and painted white.

CLURO Sec. 8.1.3(d) states that no fence wall exceeding four feet 4 ' 0 in height shall be erected or constructed within a required side or rear yard fronting a street. The applicant is requesting an exception to the height and location a fence within the street side setback.

Fences are not typically permitted to be located along the street side property line unless they are setback 15' or are a maximum of $4^{\prime}$ in height, an exception to this regulation is boundaries of a subdivision. When approving the subdivision the Planning Commission can approve the fencing along the boundary where the subdivision abuts hazardous condition. The lots located within Golden Glen Subdivision that are located along Florida Extension, N. Causeway and E. Causeway all have 7' fences along their property lines.

The fence is compliant with the required sight triangle per Sec. 8.1.1.8. Sight Triangles Required.
The applicant stated the fence provides privacy, security, acts as a sound barrier and will be more durable then the existing fence.

## CLURO SECTIONS:

8.1.3. Supplemental Fence and Wall Regulations

1. Fences in required setbacks.
a. Except as provided in paragraph 1.b of this section, no fence or wall shall exceed four (4) feet in height if located between the front of a structure and the front property line.
b. Decorative wrought iron fences may be allowed within required front setbacks and within required side and rear setbacks facing streets if they do not exceed five and one-half ( $51 / 2$ ) feet in height, supporting structure (columns) cannot exceed $6.5^{\prime}$ in height and are no more than fifteen (15) percent opaque when measuring all fence components higher than two ( 20 feet above grade excluding support columns. Fence height shall be measured from average grade to the tallest component of the fence, excluding gates and lighting on the top of support columns that do not exceed seven and one-half ( $71 / 2$ ) feet in height. The Planning Director may approve the use of other materials that have a substantially similar appearance to wrought iron and are at least as durable.
c. Fences or walls located in the rear or side yards shall not exceed seven feet ( $7^{\prime}$ ) in height.
d. No fence wall exceeding four feet (4'0) in height shall be erected or constructed within a required side or rear yard fronting a street, except as provided in paragraph 1.b of this section.
e. Any fence or wall located on a street intersection shall conform to sight triangle requirements.
2. Electrical fences in any form are prohibited.
3. Barb wire for fences shall be prohibited in all districts except $B-2, B-4, M-1$ or $M-2$ and when allowed shall only be used on fences in an area higher than six (6) feet above ground.
4. No fence or wall shall be constructed within a utility servitude without prior written approval of the affected utilities. Approval may be withheld by any utility upon its determination that the proper size or location of the fence or wall would adversely affect the operation, maintenance, or function of the servitude. Approval of the construction by a utility shall create no obligation to repair or replace a fence or wall damaged or removed by the utility in the course of its lawful use of the servitude.

### 8.1.1.8. Sight Triangles Required

Visibility of and between pedestrians, bicyclists, and motorists shall be assured at all intersections in accordance with this section.
a. Measurement of Sight Triangles. The legs of sight triangles involving arterial streets shall be measured from the projected intersection of curb lines or edges of pavement.
b. Sight Triangles to be Free From Visual Obstructions. Sight visibility triangles shall be maintained free of visual obstructions to between the height of three (3) and seven (7) feet above street grade. No building, fence, wall, hedge or other structure or planting more than three (3) feet in height other than posts, columns or trees separated by not less than six (6) feet from each other, shall be erected, placed or maintained these areas.
c. Dimensions of Sight Triangles. Sight triangles shall be based on the dimensions shown in Table 8-1-1 unless the City Engineer or Public Works Director finds that greater sight distances are called for due to traffic speeds or other intersection characteristics at intersections involving arterials.

Exhibit 8-1-1: Sight Triangle Design


### 13.2. SUBDIVISION LAYOUT DESIGN

### 13.2.1.5. Special Requirements

1. Debris and Waste - No cut trees, timber, junk, rubbish or other waste materials of any kind shall be buried in any land, or left or deposited on any lot or street adjacent to a lot for which there is sought the issuance of a certificate of occupancy in the subdivision; nor shall any be left or deposited in any area of the subdivision at the time of expiration of the performance bond or dedication of public improvements, whichever is sooner.
2. Fencing Under Hazardous Conditions - Each subdivider and/or developer shall be required to furnish and install fences wherever the Planning Commission determines that a hazardous condition may exit. The fences shall be constructed according to the Mandeville Building Code. No certificate of occupancy shall be issued until said fence improvements have been duly installed or a performance bond covering such fencing has been submitted and accepted by the City Council in an amount recommended by the City Engineer or Public Works Director.
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CASE NUMBER: V23-02-04
DATE RECEIVED: January 18, 2023
DATE OF MEETING: February 14, 2023 and February 28, 2023
Address: 2640 Monroe St
Subdivision: Town of Mandeville, Sq. 87A Lot 15A
Zoning District: R-1 Single Family Residential District
Property Owner: Cayman Sinclair

REQUEST: V23-02-04 - Cayman Sinclair requests a variance to CLURO Section 8.1.3. Supplemental Fence and Wall Regulations, Square 87A Lot 15A, R-1 Single Family Residential District, 2640 Monroe

## CASE SUMMARY:

The applicant owns the property located at 2640 Monroe located on the south side of Monroe St., west of Wilkinson St., and east of Carondelet St. The property is a flag lot, measuring 260' along Monroe St., 204.17' along the eastern property line, $349.87^{\prime}$ along the southern property line, $80^{\prime}$ along Carondelet St., $90^{\prime}$ along the north west property line, and 120' along the western property line containing approximately $58,450 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}$ according to a survey prepared by Randall Brown \& Associates, Inc. and dated 7.29.2021. The property is improved with a single-family residence and is zoned R-1, Single Family Residential.

The applicant constructed a $6^{\prime}$ privacy fence that runs along Monroe St. for $260^{\prime}$. The fence is constructed of wood.

CLURO Sec. 8.1.3(a) states that no fence or wall shall exceed four (4) feet in height if located between the front of a structure and the front property line. The applicant is requesting an exception to the height and location a fence within the front setback.

## CLURO SECTIONS:

### 8.1.3. Supplemental Fence and Wall Regulations

1. Fences in required setbacks.
a. Except as provided in paragraph 1.b of this section, no fence or wall shall exceed four (4) feet in height if located between the front of a structure and the front property line.
b. Decorative wrought iron fences may be allowed within required front setbacks and within required side and rear setbacks facing streets if they do not exceed five and one-half ( $5 \frac{1 / 2}{}$ ) feet in height, supporting structure (columns) cannot exceed $6.5^{\prime}$ in height and are no more than fifteen (15) percent opaque when measuring all fence components higher than two ( 20 feet above grade excluding support columns. Fence height shall be measured from average grade to the tallest component of the fence, excluding gates and lighting on the top of support columns that do not exceed seven and one-half ( $71 / 2$ ) feet in height. The Planning Director may approve the use of other materials that have a substantially similar appearance to wrought iron and are at least as durable.
c. Fences or walls located in the rear or side yards shall not exceed seven feet (7') in height.
d. No fence wall exceeding four feet (4'0 in height shall be erected or constructed within a required side or rear yard fronting a street, except as provided in paragraph 1.b of this section.
e. Any fence or wall located on a street intersection shall conform to sight triangle requirements.
2. Electrical fences in any form are prohibited.
3. Barb wire for fences shall be prohibited in all districts except $B-2, B-4, M-1$ or $M-2$ and when allowed shall only be used on fences in an area higher than six (6) feet above ground.
4. No fence or wall shall be constructed within a utility servitude without prior written approval of the affected utilities. Approval may be withheld by any utility upon its determination that the proper size or location of the fence or wall would adversely affect the operation, maintenance, or function of the servitude. Approval of the construction by a utility shall create no obligation to repair or replace a fence or wall damaged or removed by the utility in the course of its lawful use of the servitude.








CASE NUMBER: V23-02-05
DATE RECEIVED: January 18, 2023
DATE OF MEETING: February 14, 2023 and February 28, 2023

Address: 2646 Monroe Street
Subdivision: Old Town of Mandeville, Sq. 87A Lot 21A
Zoning District: R-1 Single Family Residential District
Property Owner: Cayman Sinclair

REQUEST: V23-02-05 - Cayman Sinclair requests a variance to CLURO Section 8.1.3. Supplemental Fence and Wall Regulations, Square 87A Lot 21A, R-1 Single Family Residential District, 2646 Monroe

## CASE SUMMARY:

The applicant owns the property located at 2646 Monroe located on the corner of Monroe St. and Carondelet St. The property measures $90^{\prime} \times 120^{\prime}$ containing $10,800 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}$ according to a survey prepared by Surveys Incorporated. The property is improved with a single-family residence and is zoned R-1, Single Family Residential.

The applicant constructed a 4' fence running along Monroe St. The fence along Monroe St, is currently compliant, however the applicant would like to construct a $6^{\prime}$ fence for $40^{\prime}$ from the neighboring property. The fence along Carondelet St. is compliant for $44^{\prime}$ from the corner of Monroe St. running south. A 6' fence has been constructed for 75' along Carondelet St. The fence is constructed of wood.

CLURO Section 8.1.3(a) states that no fence or wall shall exceed four (4) feet in height if located between the front of a structure and the front property line and Section 8.1.3(e) states that any fence or wall located on a street intersection shall conform to sight triangle requirements. The fence is compliant with the sigh triangle regulations. The applicant is requesting an exception to the height and location a fence within the street side setback.

## CLURO SECTIONS:

### 8.1.3. Supplemental Fence and Wall Regulations

1. Fences in required setbacks.
a. Except as provided in paragraph 1.b of this section, no fence or wall shall exceed four (4) feet in height if located between the front of a structure and the front property line.
b. Decorative wrought iron fences may be allowed within required front setbacks and within required side and rear setbacks facing streets if they do not exceed five and one-half ( $51 / 2$ ) feet in height, supporting structure (columns) cannot exceed 6.5 ' in height and are no more than fifteen (15) percent opaque when measuring all fence components higher than two ( 20 feet above grade excluding support columns. Fence height shall be measured from average grade to the tallest component of the fence, excluding gates and lighting on the top of support columns that do not exceed seven and one-half ( $71 / 2$ ) feet in height. The Planning Director may approve the use of other materials that have a substantially similar appearance to wrought iron and are at least as durable.
c. Fences or walls located in the rear or side yards shall not exceed seven feet (7') in height.
d. No fence wall exceeding four feet (4'0 in height shall be erected or constructed within a required side or rear yard fronting a street, except as provided in paragraph 1.b of this section.
e. Any fence or wall located on a street intersection shall conform to sight triangle requirements.
2. Electrical fences in any form are prohibited.
3. Barb wire for fences shall be prohibited in all districts except $\mathrm{B}-2, \mathrm{~B}-4, \mathrm{M}-1$ or $\mathrm{M}-2$ and when allowed shall only be used on fences in an area higher than six (6) feet above ground.
4. No fence or wall shall be constructed within a utility servitude without prior written approval of the affected utilities. Approval may be withheld by any utility upon its determination that the proper size or location of the fence or wall would adversely affect the operation, maintenance, or function of the servitude. Approval of the construction by a utility shall create no obligation to repair or replace a fence or wall damaged or removed by the utility in the course of
its lawful use of the servitude.

### 8.1.1.8. Sight Triangles Required

Visibility of and between pedestrians, bicyclists, and motorists shall be assured at all intersections in accordance with this section.
a. Measurement of Sight Triangles. The legs of sight triangles involving arterial streets shall be measured from the projected intersection of curb lines or edges of pavement.
b. Sight Triangles to be Free From Visual Obstructions. Sight visibility triangles shall be maintained free of visual obstructions to between the height of three (3) and seven (7) feet above street grade. No building, fence, wall, hedge or other structure or planting more than three (3) feet in height other than posts, columns or trees separated by not less than six (6) feet from each other, shall be erected, placed or maintained these areas.
c. Dimensions of Sight Triangles. Sight triangles shall be based on the dimensions shown in Table 8-1-1 unless the City Engineer or Public Works Director finds that greater sight distances are called for due to traffic speeds or other intersection characteristics at intersections involving arterials.

| Intersection Type | Dimensions | Diagrams |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Two Arterials | At least 25 feet along each arterial street |  |
| Arterial and Collector or Local Street | At least 25 feet along the arterial street and 20 feet along the local or collector (minor) street |  |
| All Other Street Intersections, including all intersections in the B-3 and T-C districts | Two overlapping triangles measuring 15 feet by 25 feet |  |
| Intersection of Alleys or Driveways with Streets | 25 feet along the minor street and 15 feet along the alley or driveway | Minor Street <br> curb line   <br> property line   |
| Intersections of streets with driveways from multi-occupancy centers | To be determined by the Public Works loads and intersection design | rector based on projected traffic |



MONROE ST


Totals $=139: 3:$ Gothic Picket Cedar fence. $w /$ metal Post
82'. 6'. Dog Eared Picket Cedar w/ $4 \times 4 \times 8$ A. CQ. Post
2. 3' Walk Gates

1- 2' Access Walk Gate

ArcGIS Web Map









CASE NUMBER: V23-02-06
DATE RECEIVED: January 20, 2023
DATE OF MEETING: February 14, 2023 and February 28, 2023
Address: 2032 Woodrow Street
Subdivision: Town of Mandeville, Sq. 47 Lot 47C-1A
Zoning District: TC Town Center District
Property Owner: Layton Fernandez

REQUEST: V23-02-06 - Layton Fernandez requests a variance to CLURO Section 5.2.3.2. Drainage Overlay District and Fill Sub-Area A \& B-3 Site Development Criteria - Maximum Impervious Calculation, Square 47 Lot 47C1A, TC Town Center District, 2032 Woodrow St

## CASE SUMMARY:

The property at 2032 Woodrow St. is located on the south side Woodrow St., west of Girod St., east of Lafitte St., and south of General Pershing St. The property measures 64.81'x105.79' having a square footage of 6,856 per a survey prepared by Lowe Engineers and dated 4.19.2022. The lot is currently undeveloped and a permit for new mixed use structure has been applied for.

The applicant submitted a letter from Howard Engineering, LLC by Ashley Austin, PE states that more than 6" of fill would be required within the parking area to achieve proper drainage. A grading and drainage plan was submitted, the plan includes the explanation of requests. The plan was prepared by Howard Engineering, LLC.

The applicant is requesting more then 6 " of fill for the courtyard, rear parking and the southeast corner of driveway. The drainage plan highlights the north east corner of the development in orange. This area is the courtyard and is not considered under the roof shed, therefore no more 6 " of fill is permitted. The applicant states the additional fill is requested in order to have the court yard and the required sidewalk be at the same elevation.

The applicant is requesting $1.6^{\prime}$ of fill for the required on-site parking area (highlighted in green). The rear access drive is proposing $1.5^{\prime}$ of fill. The drainage plan explanation states this area is a low spot and requires more fill to bring it up to the grade of the rest of the lot.

The site plan submitted by Piazza Architecture dated 2.16.22 Sheet A02.2, states the maximum impervious coverage is $93 \%, 21 \%$ over the maximum allowable $75 \%$. The Commission previously approved site plan by KVS Architecture dated 2.5.21 Sheet A1.0 depicted a $29 \%$ pervious calculation, this calculation did include permeable paving within the vehicle use area.

## CLURO SECTIONS:

### 5.2.3.2. Drainage Overlay District and Fill Sub-Area A

The following standards shall apply to all development falling within the mapped boundaries of the drainage overlay district as established in section 7.6 .1 of this CLURO and fill sub-area A, which includes the areas located between Monroe Street, Bayou Castain, Lakeshore Drive and Galvez Street. Where the DO district overlaps with other areas described in this section 5.2.3, the provisions of the DO district shall apply.

1. Grading and Fill. No change in elevation from natural grades shall be allowed except follows:
a. Up to six (6) inches of fill may be placed under the perimeter of the soffit or roof line of structures to achieve positive drainage from under the structure.
b. Existing sites may be graded, or surface or subsurface conveyances may be established to meet the City's requirement to convey water to the City's stormwater management system.
c. Grading changes shall not have an adverse impact on adjacent properties in accordance with State law.
d. Fill shall not be allowed within the dripline of existing trees required to remain or any vegetative protection area.
2. Driveways.
a. Driveways shall be built at existing grade except that driveways may be elevated no more than six (6) inches if necessary to access a garage or parking areas beneath the building and to help convey water to the City's stormwater conveyance system.




1 SITE PLAN


2 VICINITY MAP

TOWN CENTER DISTRICT ZONING REGULATIONS:
CLASS\# TENANT SPACE AREA (SF) USE CLASSIFICATION TC-PERMITTED USES



## PARKING FIGURES:



EXCEPTION REQUESTED FOR $15-11=4$ PARKING SPACES
PARKING SPACES IN SURROUNDING AREA $=244$ PARKIIG SPACES

PROJECT DATA:


CONST. TYPE: vB
FIRE PROTECTION:
BULINIGSRPINKER SYSTEM PER NFPA 13
FIRE LLARM SYSTEM PER NSPA FIRE ALARM SYTEM PER NFPAT2
1-HOUR RIRE SEPARATOSS BETWEN EACH UNIT
$\frac{\text { REOUIRED }}{25.0 \%} \quad \frac{\text { PROPOSED }}{29.111 \%}$

DENSITY CALCULATOR: 6856 SF/ $2000 \mathrm{SF}=3.4$ UNITS PERMITTED SITE DVEEOPMEN REGLATIONS TO BE IN COMPLIANCE WITH

## Howard Engineering, LLC

## Engineering Consultants

Commercial * Industrial *Residential

708 Perrilloux Trace Avenue
Madisonville, LA 70447
504-289-5268
LA Firm License \# 6340

January 26, 2023

Mr. Layton Fernandez
RE: Trailhead Live Work Building - Non-Adverse Fill Impact
2032 Woodrow St
Mandeville, LA
Dear Mr. Fernandez,
Pursuant to your request we have provided the civil engineering services for the referenced project. The project consists of a building and parking area at the rear of the site. The building has a first floor area of approximately 3000 square feet and extends to the property lines on each side. The parking lot in the rear of the site consist of paving.

Our design for the parking in the rear consist of a drain line and two drain inlets. Paving will be sloped to provide a positive flow to the inlets. CLURO Section 5.2.3.3 indicates that no more than 6 inches of fill can be used to elevate the area. In order to provide proper drainage of this area more than 6 inches of fill will be required. Based on our calculations the water on the site should drain properly with the additional fill and not adversely affect the property or surrounding properties.

If you have any questions or comments do not hesitate to contact us.
Sincerely, Howard Engineering, LLC


CASE NUMBER: V23-02-07
DATE RECEIVED: January 25, 2023
DATE OF MEETING: February 14, 2023 and February 28, 2023
Address: 2711 Monroe Street
Subdivision: Pine Place, Sq. B Lot 23A
Zoning District: R-1 Single Family Residential District
Property Owner: Nicholas and Jessika Cressy

REQUEST: V23-02-07 - Nicholas and Jessika Cressy request a variance to CLURO Section 9.2.5.2. Vegetation Protection Zones, Square B Lot 23A, R-1 Single Family Residential District, 2711 Monroe St

## CASE SUMMARY:

The applicants own the property at 2711 Monroe St., located on the corner of Monroe St. and Carondelet St. The property measures 150 'x176.6' having a square footage of 26,490 per a survey prepared by John E. Bonneau \& Associates, Inc. and dated 6.18.2009, revised on 7.23.2009. The property is improved with a single-family residence.

The applicants poured footings for an exterior porch and stair addition. The deck and stair addition is $8^{\prime} \times 22^{\prime} 11^{\prime \prime}$. The existing rear porch and addition are proposed to be enclosed. The new deck and stairs are compliant with the setback regulations; however the location is inside the $82 \%$ dripline of an 84 " live oak. The new deck foundation encroaches approximately 66 sq ft into the $82 \%$ drip line. The existing foundation encroaches approximately 53 sq ft into the $82 \%$ drip line. The plans submitted are by KVS Architecture, Sheets A1.0, A2.2, S1.0, S1.1 dated 1.23.2023.

The City Consulting arborist, Malcolm Guidry, submitted a report dated January 28, 2023. The report concluded that he construction within the $82 \%$ drip line will not adversely affect the condition of the Live Oak tree as the tree is in exceptional health.

The applicant is requesting a variance to CLURO Section 9.2.5.2. Vegetation Protection Zones in order to construct a new deck with concrete slab within the $82 \%$ dripline of a live oak.

## CLURO SECTIONS:

### 9.2.5.2. Vegetation Protection Zones

An area extending at least fifteen (15) feet in all directions from the trunk of any tree required or proposed to be preserved to meet the requirements of this or encompassing a minimum of two-thirds (2/3) of the entire canopy area of the tree, whichever is greater, shall be required to be maintained undisturbed under the provisions of this Article. This area is defined as the Vegetation Protection Zone. Exception: The Vegetation Protection Zone for live oaks will be a circle with a radius which is eighty-two (82) percent of the canopy of the tree, measured from the trunk to the drip line. A barrier shall be erected and maintained around this area at all times during construction. No soil deposits, construction materials, equipment, or other materials shall be temporarily or permanently stored in locations within or immediately adjacent to the Vegetation Protection Zone which would cause suffocation of root systems of trees required or proposed to be preserved. No paving with concrete, asphalt, or other impervious material shall be allowed within the Vegetation Protection Zone. No structure shall be placed or constructed at any time within the Vegetation Protection Zone.
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# Malcollm Guidry <br> Professional Consullting Arborist, LLC <br> P.O. Box 503 <br> Covington, LA 70434 

January 28, 2023
Catherine Casanova, Inspector
Landscape and Urban Forestry
Department of Planning and Development
City of Mandeville
3101 East Causeway Approach
Mandeville, LA 70448

Re: The distance of the live oak tree located on adjacent property west of new construction of a stairway of residence 2711 Monroe St, Mandeville, Louisiana

Dear Ms. Casanova:
Regarding the matter as referenced above, as I understand, there exists concern that the new construction is within the regulated $82 \%$ of the branch radius of the tree's canopy. Within the past two weeks I have visited the site, observed the new construction of the stairway, additionally, inspected the tree, its canopy spread and the distance of the tree from the new construction.

## Discovery

My observations regarding this matter are noted as follows:

- Tree at issue------------------------Live oak
- Size --------------------------------Mature/fully grown
- Health -----------------------------Excellent condition
- Structural integrity-------------Excellent condition
- Location of tree-------------------Due west of new construction
- Distance of trunk to corner of residence ------------38 $3^{\prime} 8^{\prime \prime}$ (KVS Architects)
- Dripline of tree to canopy------57'5" (KVS Architects)
- New construction, foundation of stairway is located within the regulated $82 \%$ branch radius of the tree----------(KVS Architects)

Note: KVS Architectural sheet A1.0 which shows measurements, is attached to this report. With respect to KVS Architecture measurements I agree the distance from tree to residence and that of the new construction are correct.

## Catherine Casanova

City of Mandeville
January 28, 2023
Page 2

## Discussion/Conclusion

My recent inspection of the tree included its state of health, branched architecture, soil conditions within the area of root spread of the tree and the distance of newly constructed stairway foundation to the trunk of the tree. Based upon my observations, it is my opinion that the construction of the foundation of the stairway caused no harm to the root system of the tree. The health condition of the tree is exceptionally good, the tree is strong, its root system is exceptionally good, the chemical, physical and biological components of the soil I found to be very good.

Finally, it is my opinion, the construction at issue, although located within the area of $82 \%$ of the dripline of the tree has not caused any harm to the tree. It is also my opinion, no treatments and or after care are not needed for all is well with the soil, the tree and its root system.

Sincerely,

Malcolm Guidry
Consulting Arborist


Catherine Casanova
City of Mandeville
January 28, 2023
Page 3


THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT THIS SURVEY WAS DONE UNDER MY DIRECT SUPERVISION AND CONTROL; AND THAT THE SURVEY WAS DONE ON THE GROUND AND IS IN accordance with the "minimum standards for property boundary surveys" as adopted by the state of louisiana, board of registration for PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS FOR A CLASS "C" SURVEY.
REEERENCE SURVEY: A Survey of Lots 23, 24, 25 and a portion of Lot R6, Square B, Pine Place by WILSON POPE, INC. job no. 9788 dated June 17. 2003
NÖTE: All interior property angles are $90^{\circ}$.
BASIS FOR_ANGLES: The Reference Survey.
NOTE; City water \& sewer is ovailable to these Lots,
per dept. public works.
FLOODZONR NOTE: This is to certify that I have consulted the Federal Insurance Administration Flood Hazord Boundary Maps and found th
property described is located in Flood Zone(s) A10" with a property described is located in Flood Zone(s) "A10"
Base Flood Elevation of $12^{\prime}+1^{\prime}=13$, in accordance with © Ponel No. 220202 0002 C : Revised: APRIL 4, 1983

A RESUBDIVISION MAP OF
LOTS 23, 24, 25 AND A PORTION OF 26, SQ. B, PINE PLACE LOTS 23A \& 25A, SQ. B, PINE PLACE situated in
CITY OF MANDEVILLE

BARRETT C. McGUIRE

| Survey No. 2009188 | Drawn by: SPH | Scale: $1^{\prime \prime}=40^{\prime}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Date: JUNE 18, 2009 | Revised: 7/23/09(OFFICE) |  |

CASE NUMBER: V23-02-08
DATE RECEIVED: January 26, 2023
DATE OF MEETING: February 14, 2023 and February 28, 2023

Address: 216 Lamarque St
Subdivision: Old Town of Mandeville, Sq. 8 Lot 6
Zoning District: R-1 Single Family Residential District
Property Owner: Allison and Heath Moss

REQUEST: V23-02-08 - Allison and Heath Moss request a variance to CLURO Section 5.2.3.2. Drainage Overlay District and Fill Sub-Area A, Square 8 Lot 6, R-1 Single Family Residential District, 216 Lamarque

## CASE SUMMARY:

The property at 216 Lamarque St. is located on the west side of Lamarque St., north of Claiborne St., and south of Jefferson St. The property measures approximately $63.5 \times 202$ ' The lot is currently improved with a single-family residence.

The residence is located $20^{\prime}$ from the front property line, $90^{\prime}$ from the rear, $5^{\prime}$ from the north side property line, and 25' from the south side property line. A pool is proposed to be located in the rear of the property. The pool will be 54' from the rear property line, $6^{\prime}$ from the north side, and $25^{\prime}$ from the south side property line. The setbacks for the pool comply with the minimum accessory setback of $3^{\prime}$ from the property line.

The pool equipment is proposed to be located with the north side setback. There is existing mechanical equipment located within the same setback therefore the equipment can be located there without a variance.

The application states "The customer wants to raise the pool wall elevation by 14 " to avoid being flooded by the lake water during big storm events. The deck will be a ground level slab. One side of the pool will have a raised wooden deck".

The request is to allow the construction of a pool 14 " from existing grade. The following request for elevated pools have been approved by the Commission based on proposed elevations and no adverse effects to drainage:
V22-02-06 - 130 Lamarque - 24 " from grade
V22-08-25-1709 Lakeshore - 30" from grade
V22-03-05-2239 Lakeshore - 18" from grade
V22-06-20-2047 Lakeshore - 24" from grade

The applicant is requesting an exception to the CLURO Section 5.2.3.2 Drainage Overlay District and Fill Sub-Area A, in order to construct an elevated pool. CLURO allows for a maximum of $6^{\prime \prime}$ of fill within Fill Sub Area A. The pool is proposed to be elevated 2 ' from grade.

## CLURO SECTIONS:

### 5.2.3.2. Drainage Overlay District and Fill Sub-Area A

The following standards shall apply to all development falling within the mapped boundaries of the drainage overlay district as established in section 7.6 .1 of this CLURO and fill sub-area $A$, which includes the areas located between Monroe Street, Bayou Castain, Lakeshore Drive and Galvez Street. Where the DO district overlaps with other areas described in this section 5.2.3, the provisions of the DO district shall apply.

1. Grading and Fill. No change in elevation from natural grades shall be allowed except follows:
a. Up to six (6) inches of fill may be placed under the perimeter of the soffit or roof line of structures to achieve positive drainage from under the structure.
b. Existing sites may be graded, or surface or subsurface conveyances may be established to meet the City's requirement to convey water to the City's stormwater management system.
c. Grading changes shall not have an adverse impact on adjacent properties in accordance with State law.
d. Fill shall not be allowed within the dripline of existing trees required to remain or any vegetative protection area.
2. Driveways.
a. Driveways shall be built at existing grade except that driveways may be elevated no more than six (6) inches if necessary to access a garage or parking areas beneath the building and to help convey water to the City's stormwater conveyance system.
3. Impervious Cover. Impervious coverage of a site shall include the total horizontal area of all buildings, roofed or covered spaces, paved surface areas, walkways and driveways. Pools of water including but not limited to swimming pools, reflecting ponds and fountains are excluded from this calculation.




Scale: $1 / 8 \mathrm{in}$. per ft.



CASE NUMBER: Z23-02-01
DATE RECEIVED: January 20, 2023
DATE OF MEETING: February 14, 2023 and February 28, 2023
Address: Square 76 Lots 76-C-1 and 76-C-2
Subdivision: Magnolia Ridge, Sq. 76A Lots 76-C-1 and 76-C-2
Zoning District: B-1 Neighborhood Business District
Property Owner: Allen and Selene Tingle

REQUEST: Z23-02-01 - Allen and Selene Tingle requests the rezoning of two lots designated B-1 Neighborhood Business District to R-3 Multi-Family Residential District, Square 76 Lots 76-C-1 and 76-C-2, B-1 Neighborhood Business District, Square 76 Lots 76-C-1 and 76-C-2

## CASE SUMMARY:

The applicant owns the property being Lots $76-\mathrm{C}-1$ and $76-\mathrm{C}-2$, located on the corner of Magnolia Ridge Dr. and East Causeway Approach. Lot 76-C-1 is irregular in shape, measuring 109.09' along the southern property line, 154.70' along the eastern property line, $85.72^{\prime}$ along the northern property line and the western property line measures $85.80^{\prime}$ and $72.62^{\prime}$ along the diagonal line, with a square footage measuring 16,846. Lot 76-C-2 measures 109.09'x145.29' with a square footage of 15,878 . These measurements are per a survey prepared by Randall Brown \& Associates, Inc. and dated 9.16.2020. A administrative resubdivision was approved in October 2020 creating the 2 lots. The two lots are currently unimproved.

The property to the east and west is zoned B-1 Neighborhood Business District, the property to the south is zoned R1-X.

The applicant is requesting to rezone the property to R-3 to construct townhomes. Residential uses are not permitted in the B-1 District. The R-3 Site development criteria allows for $75^{\prime}$ lot frontage, 120 in depth and a minimum of lot area of 9,000 square feet. Lot 76-C-1 is a corner lot with $85.75^{\prime}$ of frontage on E. Causeway Approach and 154.7 ' in depth. The R3 District requires 3000 sq ft of land area per unit, allowing for a maximum of 5 units. Lot 76-C-2 is 145' along Magnolia Ridge Blvd and 109.47' in depth. The Lot meets the frontage and area not the depth. The lot area is $15,878 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}$ allowing for a maximum of 5 units.

The R-2 District requires the same lot size as the R-3 District however, the R-1 district requires 5,000 sq ft of land area per unit and allows a maximum of 2 units per lot. The use table allows for townhomes in the R-3 District not the R-2 Districts.

CLURO SECTIONS:

| Use Classification | R.1 | R.1X | R.2 | R.3 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6.2 Residential Use Classification |  |  |  |  |
| 6.2.1 Single Family | P | P | P | P |
| 6.2.2 Cluster Resid.* |  |  | C | C |
| 6.2.3 Duplex Resid. |  |  | P | P |
| 6.2.4 Two Family * |  |  | S | S |
| 6.2.5 Townhouse * |  |  |  | S |
| 6.2.6 Condo. Res. |  |  | P | P |
| 6.2.7 Multi-Family |  |  |  | P |

### 7.5.4.1. Purpose of the R-3 Multi-Family Residential District

The purpose of the R-3 Multi-Family Residential district shall be to provide moderate to high density residential neighborhoods for individual buildings on individual lots or for more than one building on one lot. The R-3 district shall accommodate single-family attached dwellings that have common walls, including town houses, condominiums, congregate and cluster developments as well as multi-family structures ranging in type from tri-plexes to apartment buildings.

### 6.2.5. Townhouse Residential

The use of a site for two or more townhouse dwelling units, constructed with common or abutting walls and with each unit located on a separate subdivided parcel of ground within the total development site, providing for the individual ownership of each unit and the parcel of ground upon which it rests, as well as the direct or indirect ownership by all the unit owners on a proportional, undivided basis the common areas and facilities serving all dwelling units within the townhouse group.

### 6.2.6. Condominium Residential

The use of a site for a building or group of buildings forming a series of attached dwelling units constructed with common or abutting walls and located on a commonly owned site, where the units are owned individually and the land, structure(s), common areas and facilities are owned directly or indirectly by all the unit owners on a proportional, undivided basis.



