CASE NUMBER: V23-11-40
DATE RECEIVED: October 27, 2023
DATE OF MEETING: November 14, 2023 and December 12, 2023
Address: $\mathbf{4 2 6}$ Lafitte
Subdivision: Old Town of Mandeville, Square 34 Lot D1-B
Zoning District: B-3 Old Mandeville Business District
Property Owner: Jason and Ashley Collier
REQUEST: $\quad$ V23-11-40/R23-11-02 - Jason and Ashley Collier request a variance to CLURO Section 7.5.10.3. B-3 Site Development Regulations and to resubdivide Lot D1-B into Lots D1-B-1 \& D1-B-2, Old Town of Mandeville, Square 34 Lot D1-B, B-3 Old Mandeville Business District, 426 Lafitte Street

## CASE SUMMARY:

The applicants own the property at 426 Lafitte St., located on the west side of Lafitte St., east of Carroll St., north of Madison St., and south of Monroe St. The property is irregular in shape, measuring 266.45' along the northern property line, $223.95^{\prime}$ along the western property line, $146.83^{\prime}$ along the southern property line, then north for $98.50^{\prime}$, east for $120^{\prime}$, and then $124.20^{\prime}$ along Lafitte St; containing a square footage of $47,717.7$ per a survey prepared by Land Surveying LLC dated 9.21.2020. The property is improved with two residences.

The property was administratively resubdivided in 2020 (ADM20-11-04) to create lots D1-A and D1-B. The applicant is requesting an exception to the minimum lot width to resubdivide Lot D1-B into Lots D1-B-1 \& D1-B-2. Lot D1-B-1 is a flag lot being $27.81^{\prime}$ wide at the street, the minimum lot width required is $60^{\prime}$. Should the resubdivision be approved the residences on both lots are compliant with setback requirements. The structure located on proposed Lot D1-B-2 is not compliant with the Based Flood Elevation.

| Lot D1-B-1 | Proposed | Required | Deficiency |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Width | $27.81^{\prime}$ | $60^{\prime}$ | -32.82 |
| Depth | $145.45^{\prime}$ | $120^{\prime}$ | $+25.45^{\prime}$ |
| Area | $36,117.98 \mathrm{sqft}$ | $7,200 \mathrm{sqft}$ | $+28,917.98 \mathrm{sqft}$ |


| Lot D1-B-2 | Proposed | Required | Deficiency |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Width | $97.01^{\prime}$ | $60^{\prime}$ | $+37.01^{\prime}$ |
| Depth | $120^{\prime}$ | $120^{\prime}$ | Compliant |
| Area | $11,599.71 \mathrm{sqft}$ | $7,200 \mathrm{sqft}$ | $+4,399.71$ |

Public Works reviewed the survey and had the following comments: Sewer and water services are already in place for the existing lots. No new services are required.

## CLURO SECTIONS:

### 7.5.10.3. B-3 Site Development Regulations

Each development site in the B-3 Old Mandeville Business District shall be subject to the site development regulations established in Exhibit 7.5.10., in addition to any other applicable regulations under the provisions of this CLURO or any other laws of the City, state or federal government. Section 8.1 establishes additional rules for application of lot and area requirements. The Planning Director may grant exceptions to the following standards pursuant to section 4.3.5.

| Site Development Factor | Standard | Comments |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Minimum Lot Area | 7,200 square feet |  |
| Gross Lot Area Per Multi-Family <br> Dwelling Unit | 5,500 square feet | No floor shall exceed this maximum <br> floor area unless the Zoning <br> Commission finds that the building <br> meets the criteria established in <br> section 7.5.10.2.3. |
| Minimum Building Floor Area | 800 square feet | The Planning Director may reduce <br> dimensions by up to 10 percent as an <br> exception if the minimum lot area <br> requirements are met. |
| Maximum Building Ground Floor Area | 5,000 square feet |  |
| Minimum Lot Width | 60 feet | 120 feet |
| Minimum Lot Depth | 25 feet |  |
| Minimum Front Setback along <br> Lakeshore Drive | The average of existing setbacks on <br> the nearest two lots, but not less than <br> 10 feet or more than 15 feet | Exceptions to maximum setbacks shall <br> be allowed for courtyards and <br> outdoor dining areas |
| Front Setback along all other Streets |  |  |


| Minimum Side Street Setback | 15 feet |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Minimum Interior Side Setback* | 20 feet if side abuts a lot with residential zoning | No setback is required for commercial buildings that extend across a property line or constructed with a firewall on the property line that complies with adopted building codes. The Planning Director may grant an exception for the elevation of existing primary structures where relocation of the building or mechanical equipment are impractical. |
| i. Frontage up to 50' | 8' each side |  |
| ii. Frontage between 51' - 60' | 10' each side |  |
| iii. Frontage between 61' - 75' | 12' each side |  |
| iv. Frontage between 76' - 80' | 13' each side |  |
| v. Frontage between 81' - 90' | 15' each side |  |
| vi. Frontage between 91' - 100' | 16' each side |  |
| vii. Frontage between 101' -110' | 18' each side |  |
| viii. Frontage between 111' - +' | 20' each side |  |
| Minimum Rear Setback | 20 feet |  |
| Mechanical Appurtenances | All mechanical appurtenances elevated more than 3 feet above grade shall comply with required building setbacks and shall be screened in accordance with Article 9 if located in the front or side yard, regardless of elevation. | The Planning Director may grant an exception for mechanical appurtenance setback encroachments when an existing primary structure is elevated and relocation of the building or mechanical equipment is impractical. |
| Maximum Structure Height | 35 feet | See section 8.1.1 for additional rules regarding Structure Height |
| Maximum Impervious Site Coverage | 75\% |  |

*The side yard setbacks of the site may be shifted into the opposite yard up to $30 \%$ so long as the area lost in one required side yard is provided in the opposite side yard and the total minimum setback of the site is provided.

### 8.1.1.2.-1 Setback Measurement

Setback distances shall be the shortest distance measured from the property line or street right-of-way line to a point on the Lot that is directly below the nearest extension of any part of the building that is substantially a part of the building itself and not a mere appendage to it (such as a flagpole, etc.)


| From: | Clifton Siverd |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Monday, October 30, 2023 1:25 PM |
| To: | Alex Weiner |
| Cc: | Cara Bartholomew |
| Subject: | RE: November P\&Z Cases |

## 245 Marigny

The maximum height allowed by CLURO Sec 5.2.3.2 for the ground level slab would be 6.52. The additional height is minimal and would not have impacts on neighboring properties. The proposed drainage plan would be acceptable if the height variance is granted.

426 Laffitte

Sewer and water services are already in place for the existing lots. No new services are required.

From: Alex Weiner [aweiner@cityofmandeville.com](mailto:aweiner@cityofmandeville.com)
Sent: Monday, October 30, 2023 9:55 AM
To: Clifton Siverd [csiverd@cityofmandeville.com](mailto:csiverd@cityofmandeville.com)
Cc: Cara Bartholomew [cbartholomew@cityofmandeville.com](mailto:cbartholomew@cityofmandeville.com)
Subject: November P\&Z Cases
Clif,
Good morning. There are two cases on the November Planning and Zoning agenda that we would like you to look over.

1. 245 Marigny - the applicant is requesting a fill variance to bring in $6^{\prime \prime}$ of additional fill to have their top of slab be at an elevation of 7 '
2. 426 Lafitte - the applicant is wanting to resubdivide their property.

I have attached the submitted documents for each case. Let me know if you have any comments or need any additional information.

Thanks,

## Alex Weiner, CFM

Planning Secretary
Department of Planning \& Development
City of Mandeville
3101 E. Causeway Approach
Mandeville, LA 70448
(985) 624-3132

## Legal Description:

Lot D1-B-1 Square 34
From the intersection formed by the Westerly Right-of-way of Lafitte Street and the Lautherly Right-of-way of Monroe Street run along the Westerly Right-of-way of
Lafite Street $S 31^{2} 20^{\prime} 38{ }^{\prime \prime}, 250.00$ feet to the Point of Beginning. From the Point of Beginning continue $531^{\circ} 20^{\prime} 38^{\prime \prime} W$, 24.20 feet; thence $N 59^{\circ} 54^{\circ} 01^{\prime \prime} W$, 120.00 feet;
thence, $531^{\circ} 20^{\prime} 38^{\prime \prime}$ W, 98.50 feet; thence N59 $5401^{\prime \prime}$ W, 146.83 feet; thence N31'26 06 100.223 .95 feet; thence $559^{\circ} 37^{\prime} 59^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{E}, 145.45$ feet; thence $531^{\circ} 20^{\prime} 38^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{W}$ 100.00 feet; thence $S^{\prime} 59^{\circ} 37^{\prime} 59^{\prime \prime E}, 120.00$ feet back to the Point of Beginning.
This tract contains $35,719.44 \mathrm{Sq}$. Ft.

Lot D1-B-2 Square 34:
From the intersection formed by the Westerly Right-of-way of Lafitte Street and the Southerly Right-of-way of Monroe Street run along the Westerly Right-of-way of Lafitte Street 531.2038 W, 250.00 feet to the Point of Beginning. From the Point of
 Beginning. This tract contains 11,098 $0^{6}$ CTIMMNTI

Note: There, is no portion of this property under the 5' Contour

A Resubdivision of Lot $D-1-B$, into Lots
D1-B-1 \& D1-B-2, Square 34, City of Mandeville St. Tammany Parish, Louisiana

FINAL APPROVAL

ITY ENGINEER OR PUBLIC WORKS DIR.
*This is a Preliminary Map and should not be uged for construction, bidding, recordation, conveyance, sales, or as the basis for issuance of a permit CHAIRMAN OF PLANNING COMMISSION

## MAYor OPRRLIMHAKARY DOCUMENT



ERMTUDES OF RECORD AS SHOWN ON TITE OPINION OR TITE POUICY WLL BE ADDED HERETO UPON REQUEST AS THE UNDERSIGNED HAS PERFORMED NO ABSTRACT OR TTTLE SEARCH. THE UNDERSIGNED HAS MADE NO ATTEMPT TO LOCATE ANY BURIED UTILITIES OR ASSOCIATED PEDESTALS.
THIS MAP IS IN ACCORDANCE WTH THE STANDARD DETAILED
REQUIREMENTS PURSUANT TO THE ACCURACY STANDARDS OF A C SURVEY
AND THE APPUCABLE STANDARDS OF PRACTICE CITED IN LAC 46:LXI.
(Must verify prior to Construction) Building Setbacks
Front: $25^{\circ}$
Side: Combined 15', Minimum each $5^{\prime}$ Rear: 30

## map pafeared for JASON COLLIER

Shown a survey made of property located in lot D1-B, SQuare 34, CITY of mandeville LOT D1-B, SQUARE 34, CITY OF
ST. TAMMANY PARISH, LOUISIANA

THIS MAP IS IN ACCORDANCE WITH A PHYSICAL SURVEY MADE ON THE GROUND UNDER THE SUPERVISION OF THE UNDERSIGNED: SIGNATURE AND STAMPED SEAL MUST BE IN RED OR THIS PLAT IS NOT A TRUE COPY

certified correct
PRELIMINARY

| SCALE: $1^{\prime \prime}=60^{\prime}$ | DATE: $05-31-2023$ | NUMBER: 21264 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

CASE NUMBER: SUP23-11-05
DATE RECEIVED: October 4, 2023
DATE OF MEETING: November 14, 2023 and December 12, 2023
Address: 2020 Woodrow
Subdivision: Old Town of Mandeville, Square 47 Lot 12A
Zoning District: TC Town Center District
Property Owner: Steve Lee

REQUEST: SUP23-11-05 - Richelle Bannon requests Special Use Approval to allow Animal Sales and Services (Limited) per the Table of Permitted Uses, CLURO Section 7.8, Old Town of Mandeville, Square 47 Lot 12A, TC Town Center District, 2020 Woodrow Street

## PREVIOUS CASES: SUP19-05-02 - Special Use Permit for Medical Services (Suite B) <br> SUP19-07-03 - Special Use Permit for a Sit-Down Restaurant (Suite A)

## CASE SUMMARY:

The property is located at 2020 Woodrow St., on the south side of Woodrow St., north of Livingston St., west of Girod St., and east of Lafitte St. The property measures $96.45^{\prime} \times 105.79^{\prime}$ containing 10,203 square feet per a survey prepared by John Bonneau \& Associates, Inc. and dated 10.06.1995. The lot is currently improved with a commercial building. The existing building is split into two suites. Suite A is currently occupied by a sit-down restaurant, Suite B is vacant. The applicant is requesting to locate a dog spa in Suite B. The use requires special use approval in the Town Center District.

### 6.4.7. Animal Sales and Services (Limited)

Retail sales, veterinary services, outdoor kennels, grooming, and boarding when totally within a building, of dogs, cats, birds, fish, and similar small animals customarily used as household pets. Typical uses include pet stores, small animal clinics, dog bathing and clipping salons, and pet grooming shops but excluding outdoor kennels and uses for livestock and large animals.

The applicant states that this will be a luxury DIY dog spa. There will not be any kennels or boarding at this location. A floor plan has been submitted showing that there will be 6 existing offices that will be converted into spa rooms. There will be a total of 1,690 sq. ft. for the proposed use. The Town Center District follows the B-3 Site Development Criteria.

## Landscape:

Variances for landscaping were approved with case SUP19-05-02.

## Parking:

The Commission approved an exception to parking for the entire building, shown as 3,502 sqft, with the approval of case SUP19-05-02. An exception for an additional parking space required for outdoor dining was approved with SUP19-07-03.

Animal Sales \& Services (Limited) requires 1 parking space per 200 sqft of gross floor area. However, parking requirements in the Town Center District require the calculation for Shopping Center - Neighborhood be used for all commercial uses. Shopping Center - Neighborhood requires 4 spaces per 1,000 sqft of gross floor area.

## CLURO SECTIONS:

### 6.4.7. Animal Sales and Services (Limited)

Retail sales, veterinary services, outdoor kennels, grooming, and boarding when totally within a building, of dogs, cats, birds, fish, and similar small animals customarily used as household pets. Typical uses include pet stores, small animal clinics, dog bathing and clipping salons, and pet grooming shops but excluding outdoor kennels and uses for livestock and large animals.





CASE NUMBER: V23-11-37
DATE RECEIVED: September 18, 2023
DATE OF MEETING: November 14, 2023 and December 12, 2023

Address: 245 Marigny
Subdivision: Old Town of Mandeville, Square 8 Lot 14
Zoning District: R-1 Single Family Residential District
Property Owner: Jim and Marison Tucker

REQUEST: V23-11-37 - Jim and Marisol Tucker request a variance to CLURO Section 5.2.3.2. Drainage Overlay District and Fill Sub-Area A, Old Town of Mandeville, Square 8 Lot 14, R-1 Single Family Residential District, 245 Marigny Avenue

## CASE SUMMARY:

The applicant owns the property at 245 Marigny, located on the corner of Marigny Avenue and Jefferson Street. The property measures 63.95' x 202.42' and has a square footage of 12,948 per a survey prepared by John G. Cummings \& Associates dated 7.17.23. The lot is currently undeveloped.

The applicant is requesting to elevate the slab to a height of $7^{\prime}$ from the existing grade of 6' shown at the center of the build site. A drainage plan prepared by Arrow Engineering \& Consulting has been submitted by the applicant. The plan indicates that the property would drain along the east and west sides into an existing culvert located along Jefferson St.

Public works has reviewed the submitted drainage plan and had the following comments. The maximum height allowed by CLURO Sec 5.2.3.2 for the ground level slab would be 6.52. The additional height is minimal and would not have impacts on neighboring properties. The proposed drainage plan would be acceptable if the height variance is granted.

The following statement was provided on the application: "We are requesting a six inch (6") variance over the standard six inches above ground level on the height of our slab. Thus moving from ground level at six feet to a finish floor height of seven feet. This parcel is the lower portion, or originally what was part of the larger parcel now associated with the next door neighbor. Their finished slab floor is at seven feet. The center of the street is at $6^{\prime \prime} 8^{\prime \prime}$.

The property to the south has a finished top of slab at $6.65^{\prime}$, with a beginning grade elevation of 6.4'.
At the November $14^{\text {th }}$ meeting the applicant stated that they thought the finished floor elevation of the property to the south was at 7 ' which is why they requested to be at a height of 7 ' but stated that he was fine with adjusting the request to be at the same height as the neighboring structure. The as-built for the neighboring property was submitted showing the highest point of the foundation to be at 6.7'. This information was sent to the applicant who agreed to revising the request to be at $6.7^{\prime}$ rather than 7 '.

The applicant updated their request for a variance to CLURO section 5.2.3.2 to add additional fill to bring the height of the slab to an elevation of 6.7 ft MSL.

## 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.



| From: | Clifton Siverd |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Monday, October 30, 2023 1:25 PM |
| To: | Alex Weiner |
| Cc: | Cara Bartholomew |
| Subject: | RE: November P\&Z Cases |

## 245 Marigny

The maximum height allowed by CLURO Sec 5.2.3.2 for the ground level slab would be 6.52. The additional height is minimal and would not have impacts on neighboring properties. The proposed drainage plan would be acceptable if the height variance is granted.

426 Laffitte

Sewer and water services are already in place for the existing lots. No new services are required.

From: Alex Weiner [aweiner@cityofmandeville.com](mailto:aweiner@cityofmandeville.com)
Sent: Monday, October 30, 2023 9:55 AM
To: Clifton Siverd [csiverd@cityofmandeville.com](mailto:csiverd@cityofmandeville.com)
Cc: Cara Bartholomew [cbartholomew@cityofmandeville.com](mailto:cbartholomew@cityofmandeville.com)
Subject: November P\&Z Cases
Clif,
Good morning. There are two cases on the November Planning and Zoning agenda that we would like you to look over.

1. 245 Marigny - the applicant is requesting a fill variance to bring in $6^{\prime \prime}$ of additional fill to have their top of slab be at an elevation of 7 '
2. 426 Lafitte - the applicant is wanting to resubdivide their property.

I have attached the submitted documents for each case. Let me know if you have any comments or need any additional information.

Thanks,

## Alex Weiner, CFM

Planning Secretary
Department of Planning \& Development
City of Mandeville
3101 E. Causeway Approach
Mandeville, LA 70448
(985) 624-3132

| From: | Jim Tucker [jimtucker2015@gmail.com](mailto:jimtucker2015@gmail.com) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Wednesday, November 15, 2023 4:55 PM |
| To: | Radford Dickson |
| Cc: | Cara Bartholomew; Alex Weiner |
| Subject: | Re: 245 Marigny fill variance |

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Yes, that would be fine. Thanks for letting me know.

## Jim Tucker

On Wed, Nov 15, 2023 at 2:25 PM Radford Dickson [rdickson@cityofmandeville.com](mailto:rdickson@cityofmandeville.com) wrote:

Good afternoon Mr. Tucker,

We have received the As Built from 233 Marigny and I have attached it. It appears that the highest point on the foundation is 6.7'. Please let us know if you approve changing your application to 6.7' rather than 7'.

Respectfully,

## Rad Dickson

Planner

City of Mandeville

3101 East Causeway Approach

Mandeville, LA 70448

CLURO
985.626.3144


CASE NUMBER: V23-11-38
DATE RECEIVED: September 28, 2023
DATE OF MEETING: November 14, 2023 and December 12, 2023

Address: 4520 Hwy 22
Subdivision: Hwy 22 Gateway, Section 54 Lot B
Zoning District: B-2 Highway Business District
Property Owner: Scott Ballard

REQUEST: V23-11-38 - Scott Ballard request a variance to CLURO Section 10.8.2.6. Land Uses located in B-1, B-2, B-4, O/R, PM-1, PM-2, M-1, and M-2 Districts, Hwy 22 Gateway, Section 54 Lot B, B-2 Highway Business District, 4520 Hwy 22

## CASE SUMMARY:

The applicant owns the property at 4520 Hwy 22, located on the south side of Hwy 22, north of W Causeway Approach, and west of Moores Road. The property is irregularly shaped, measuring 211.25' along Hwy 22, 267' along the west property line, then east for $139.66^{\prime}$, south for $239.35^{\prime}$, then $25^{\prime}$ along W Causeway Approach and then 557.76' along the east property line, containing approximately 71,000 square feet. The site is currently improved with a commercial business, PJs Coffee.

The applicant is requesting to locate an additional monument sign on the West Causeway Approach entrance to the business. The monument sign will be double sided, measuring 16.84 sq . ft . on each side for a total square footage of 33.68 . The sign will be located on an existing base and will be $6^{\prime}$ in height. The regulations allow for 1 monument sign per lot.

The existing monument sign is located $12^{\prime}$ from the property line. Current sign regulations require a setback of $15^{\prime}$ from the closest abutting right of way. The base of the sign is non-conforming and shown on the survey from 1996. When the prior business closed the sign face was removed, but the base was left alone.

There is an existing double sided monument sign on the Hwy 22 side of the business measuring 36.49 sqft on each side.

## CLURO SECTIONS:

10.8.2.6. Land Uses located in B-1, B-2, B-4, O/R, PM-1, PM-2, M-1, and M-2 Districts.

| Permitted Signs Allow |  | . |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Land Use | Attached (wall or blade) Signs, Canopy (or awning) Signs, and Hanging Signs | Monument Signs or Free-Standing Signs with Wooden Posts |
| All land uses not occupying complex sites | One (1) wall, canopy, hanging, or blade sign is permitted per street façade, subject to all the following: <br> - Maximum area for a wall or blade sign is one (1) square foot per linear foot of building façade. <br> - If a building façade has a linear footage of thirty-five (35) feet or less, the wall or blade sign may have a maximum area of 35 feet. <br> - The blade sign must have a minimum clearance height of eight (8) feet above the ground. <br> - If a building façade has a linear footage exceeding one-hundred-twenty (120) feet, the maximum area of the wall or blade sign is one-hundredtwenty (120) square feet. <br> - Maximum sign area for a canopy sign is twelve (12) square feet. <br> - Maximum sign area for a hanging sign is six (6) square feet. The hanging sign must have a minimum clearance height of eight (8) feet above the ground. | One (1) monument or free-standing sign is allowed per lot, subject to all the following: <br> - The maximum sign area allowed is one hundred (100) square feet. <br> - The maximum height is seven (7) feet from grade with a maximum height of two (2) feet for the base of the sign. <br> - The Zoning Commission may approve an exception allowing a height increase if natural grade is four (4) or more feet below the crown of the abutting street. <br> - The minimum setback is fifteen (15) feet from the closest abutting right-of-way and 100 feet from the nearest residential property line. <br> - Sign may be externally or internally illuminated but may not cause any uplight or glare <br> - If a free-standing sign is used, two-posts measuring four inches by four inches or larger must be used. Posts must be composed of wood and must be incorporated as a visual design element of the sign. |


|  | Sign may be externally or <br> internally illuminated but may <br> not cause any uplight or glare. |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |



## SIGNAGE SPECIFICATIONS

for
PJ's Coffee of New Orleans
Mandeville, LA (BK Conversion)


## A44 SIGNS

www.aaasigns.com


## Specifications

$50.52^{\prime \prime} \times 48^{\prime \prime} \times 10^{\prime \prime}$ deep, internally illuminated, D/F, sign cabinet with White acrylic faces
Cabinet and 1 " retainers to be painted Black
Faces to be White acrylic
Faces to be White acrylic



CASE NUMBER: V23-11-39
DATE RECEIVED: October 17, 2023
DATE OF MEETING: November 14, 2023 and December 12, 2023
Address: 1225 Montgomery
Subdivision: Old Town of Mandeville, Square 82 Lot 19-A
Zoning District: R-1 Single Family Residential
Property Owner: Michael and Grace McIntosh
REQUEST: V23-11-39 - Michael McIntosh requests a variance to CLURO Section 8.1.1.4. Allowed Setbacks Encroachments, Old Town of Mandeville, Square 82 Lot 19-A, R-1 Single Family Residential District, 1225 Montgomery Street

## CASE SUMMARY:

The applicant owns the property at 1225 Montgomery St., located on the north side of Montgomery St., east of Albert St., west of Colbert St., and south of Florida St. The property measures $86.87^{\prime} \times 145.42^{\prime}$ and has a square footage of $12,632.23$ per a survey prepared by RJ Fuselier \& Associates, LLC dated 11.09.22. Construction was recently completed for a singlefamily residence.

The applicant is requesting an exception to encroach into the east side yard setback to locate a generator and $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{C}$ condenser. The lot has a frontage of $86.87^{\prime}$ requiring side yard setbacks of 15 feet. Two decks have been constructed for the location of the mechanical equipment in the southeast side setback. One deck encroaches $7^{\prime}$ into the setback, and the other encroaches $2.5^{\prime}$. The $7^{\prime}$ encroachment would leave a remaining setback of $11.2^{\prime}$ feet. The side yard is adjacent to the driveway for the flag lot to the east of the property.

|  | Existing | Proposed | Change | Deficiency |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| East Side Setback | $15.2^{\prime}$ | $8.2^{\prime}$ | $7^{\prime}$ | $-6.8^{\prime}$ |
| West Side Setback | $15^{\prime}$ | $15^{\prime}$ | $0^{\prime}$ | Compliant |

A letter was submitted from the applicant explaining the reasons for the request.
At the November $14^{\text {th }}$ meeting the Commission requested the following additional information: The height and dimensions of the equipment decks, the distance that the equipment is from the house, and pictures of the rear of the house, and the side that the equipment is located showing the location of any windows.

The applicant has submitted a letter and updated sketch of the property showing that both equipment decks are $43^{\prime \prime}$ above grade. The equipment deck located outside of the laundry room and master bathroom measures $15^{\prime} \times 7^{\prime}$ and the equipment deck located outside the garage measures $30^{\prime \prime} \times 51^{\prime \prime}$. The generator is located $2^{\prime}-4^{\prime \prime}$ from the from the exterior wall of the house, and the $A / C$ condenser is located $2^{\prime}$ from the house.

## CLURO SECTIONS:

### 8.1.1.4. Allowed Setbacks Encroachments

Every part of a required setback shall be open to the sky and unobstructed by accessory structures except:
4. Mechanical Equipment. Except as authorized for the elevation of existing structures, or where there is existing mechanical equipment located within the side setback, heating, ventilation, air conditioning, generator, or pool equipment shall not encroach into any required front or side setback.

### 7.5.1.3. R-1 Site Development Regulations

Each development site in the R-1 Single-Family Residential Zoning District shall be subject to the following site development regulations in addition to any regulations applicable under the provisions of Article 8. The Planning Director may grant exceptions to the following standards pursuant to section 4.3.5

| 1. Minimum lot area | 10,800 Square feet (except for legal non-conforming lots <br> as provided) |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2. Minimum building area (Square feet per unit) | 1,200 Square feet |
| 3. Minimum lot width | $90^{\prime}$ |
| 4. Minimum lot depth | $120^{\prime}$ |
| 5. Minimum Yard Setback Requirements | $25^{\prime}$ |
| a. Front yard | $8^{\prime}$ each side |
| b. Interior side yard* | $10^{\prime}$ each side |
| i. Frontage up to $50^{\prime}$ | $12^{\prime}$ each side |
| ii. Frontage between $51^{\prime}-60^{\prime}$ | $13^{\prime}$ each side |
| iii. Frontage between $61^{\prime}-75^{\prime}$ | $15^{\prime}$ each side |
| iv. Frontage between $76^{\prime}-80^{\prime}$ | $16^{\prime}$ each side |
| v. Frontage between $81^{\prime}-90^{\prime}$ | $100^{\prime}$ |
| vi. Frontage between $91^{\prime}-100^{\prime}$ |  |


| vii. Frontage between 101' $-110^{\prime}$ | $18^{\prime}$ each side |
| :---: | :---: |
| viii. Frontage between 111' $+^{\prime}$ | $20^{\prime}$ each side |
| c. Street side yard | $15^{\prime}$ |
| d. Rear yard | $30^{\prime}$ |
| $6 . ~ M a x i m u m ~ H e i g h t ~ o f ~ S t r u c t u r e s ~$ | $35^{\prime}$ |
| 7. Maximum Impervious Site Coverage | $45 \%$ |

*The side yard setbacks of the site may be shifted into the opposite yard up to $30 \%$ so long as the area lost in one required side yard is provided in the opposite side yard and the total minimum setback of the site is provided.


City Council of Mandeville:

The practical difficulties applicable to this variance request were (and are) primarily budgetary and secondarily architectural. Practically this meant keeping the under beam square footage to a minimum and within a compact footprint.

The resulting floor plan required utilizing $56^{\prime}$ of allowable building width to fit, side by side, a 2 car garage, entry, living rm, and bedroom.

As the attached survey/site plan illustrates, the living area and garage conform to the setback requirements. The variance is requested to allow placement, as is, for the whole house generator and A/C condenser along the easterly exterior wall of the house.

Distance to neighboring homes was the primary consideration for placing these units. The two neighboring homes to the east and west of 1225 Montgomery St. are 1211 and 1237 Montgomery St., respectively. The neighboring lot to the north is undeveloped. 1211 Montgomery St is $70^{\prime}$ from 1225 Montgomery St and 1237 is $30^{\prime}$ from 1225 Montgomery St.
The east side yard location offered the most distance between residences and therefore the best noise buffer.

A rear yard location would increase noise exposure to both neighbors and future neighbors to the north.



- BEARING BASIS/REFERENCE PLAT: - FLOOD ZONE CLASSIFICATION:

BEARINGS BASED ON GRID NORTH AS PER THE LOUISIANA STATE PLANE COORDINATE SYSTEM OF 1983, SOUTH ZONE (1702). COORDINATES IN US SURVEY FEET. REFERENCE: RESUBDIVSION OF LOTS 19, 20 21, 22, AND 23 SQUARE 82 BY RANDALL W. BROWN, DATED SEPTEMBER $22,2003$.

ACCORDING TO THE FEMA FLOOD
INSURANCE RATE MAP, FIRM PANEL ID: 2202020431D HAVING AN EFFECTIVE DATE OF 9/30/2016 THIS PROPERTY IS LOCATED IN AN "X" FLOOD ZONE. "X" BASE FLOOD - ELEVATION (BFE) IS N/A.

CENTERLINE OF STREET ELEVATION IS 10.60' NAVD88.

## Map of Survey Made For Michael Mcintosh

Being a certain portion of ground situated in Square 82 of the Town of Mandeville, more specifically described as Lots 19-A and bounded by Montgomery Street, Albert Street, Colbert Street, and U.S. HWY 190, St. Tammany Parish, Louisiana
 150 BELLE TERRE DR. EUNICE, LA. 70535 (337)654-6403
SURVEYING + MAPPING
RIFUSELIER E ASSOCIATES LLC
FIRM REG. H: UA (VF 790), TX (10194363)

| PROJ. No. | $22 N O 12$ |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DETAILED: | BPJ | $8 / 04 / 23$ | FINAL SURVEY - IMPROVEMENTS | CDR |
| DATE: | II/9/2022 | $7 / 15 / 22$ |  |  |
| SHEET: | 01 | DATE | REVISION DESCRIPTION | BY |

To:

Alex Weiner,CFM
Planning Secretary
Department of Planning \& Development
City of Mandeville
3101 E. Causeway Approach
Mandeville, LA 70448
Re: Variance request for Generator and A/C condensers in setback at 1225 Montgomery St, Mandeville, LA 70448

Owners: Michael and Grace McIntosh


Laundry room window upper left, master bath window upper right. The electrician placed the generator at a distance greater than the minimum required by code.


Pictures of the rear of the house. From left to right are 1) a master bedroom window, 2) kitchen window and exterior door, 3) a covered deck, and 4) at the far right is another bedroom window.

Height and dimensions of the equipment decks are as follows: $A / C$ condenser and Generator on deck measuring $43^{\prime \prime}$ above grade to top of deck/bottom of equipment and overall $15^{\prime}$ long $\times 7$ ' from house to furthest edge.

There is a small platform adjacent the east exterior wall of the garage measuring $30^{\prime \prime} \times 51^{\prime \prime}$ and is also $43^{\prime \prime}$ above grade.

Distance that the equipment is from the house: The Generator is $2^{\prime} 4^{\prime \prime}$ and the $A / C$ condenser is $2^{\prime}$ from the east exterior wall of the house.

Sketch of house footprint and location of Generator and A/C condenser.


Very Truly Yours,
Michael McIntosh


CASE NUMBER: V23-12-41
DATE RECEIVED: November 17, 2023
DATE OF MEETING: December 12, 2023 and January 9, 2024

Address: W Causeway Approach
Subdivision: Hwy 22 Gateway, Section 54 Lot C
Zoning District: B-2 Highway Business District
Property Owner: Scott Ballard

REQUEST: V23-12-41 - Mike Saucier requests a variance to CLURO Section 9.2.5.7. Live Oak Protection Requirements and Section 9.2.5.5. Landscape Requirements in Districts Other than Low-Density Residential, Hwy 22 Gateway, Section 54 Lot C, B-2 Highway Business District, W Causeway Approach

## CASE SUMMARY:

The property at W Causeway is located on the north side of W Causeway Approach, west of Moores Road, and south of Hwy 22. The property is irregular in shape, measuring 158' along the northern property line, 127' along the western property line, $237^{\prime}$ along the east property line, and $193^{\prime}$ along W. Causeway Approach; containing a square footage of 25,300 . The property is currently unimproved.

The applicant is requesting to remove two live oaks from the property for the construction of a new Citizens National Bank. One live oak measures $18^{\prime \prime}$ in diameter and the other measures $24^{\prime \prime}$ in diameter. There are a total of five live oaks on the property, two measuring $24^{\prime \prime}$, one measuring $18^{\prime \prime}$, one measuring $16^{\prime \prime}$, and one measuring $12^{\prime \prime}$ in diameter. The remaining three live oaks will be preserved on site.

A report of the live oaks was prepared by Bill Reich, ASLA, and submitted by the applicant. The report states that the-18" Live Oak observed is not a specimen tree but is an understory tree that has been shaded out and full shape and growth habit have been stunted due to its location as such. Removal of adjacent trees during construction would limit its survivability. 24 " Live Oak has also been growing in an understory environment and has growth mostly on one side towards the road.

The applicant is requesting to underbrush in the W Causeway greenbelt area. There are 23 trees identified in the W Causeway greenbelt, including three live oaks. No trees are being removed.

## CLURO SECTIONS:

### 9.2.5.7. Live Oak Protection Requirements

In all zoning districts, including the R-1, R-1X and R-2 districts, all live oak trees 6 " dbh shall be protected as follows:

1. A tree removal permit shall be obtained from the Building Inspector prior to cutting, clearing or removing any live oak tree.
2. The applicant wishing to remove a live oak tree must state in writing that such activity will enhance the health, safety and welfare of the public, or otherwise benefit the public interest and the applicant must offer evidence to that effect. The Building Inspector is empowered to issue or deny the permit based on the application and the evidence. Prior to the issuance of a tree removal permit the applicant must submit a plan or written statement offering evidence of compliance with the tree replacement provisions of this Article.
3. It shall be unlawful for any person to place soil in such a way that would cause live oaks to become diseased or die. If filling with soil is necessary to properly drain the land, all efforts should be made to protect the area within the drip line of a live oak from the impact of such activity. Should all efforts fail and a tree removal permit be issued for the removal of the live oak the provisions of these regulations regarding replacement of trees shall be required to be met.
4. A tree removal permit will be required to prune the primary and secondary branches of any live oak tree 12 "dbh or greater. Such pruning shall be required to be recommended in writing and supervised by a licensed arborist or a state forester.

### 9.2.5.5. Landscape Requirements in Districts Other than Low-Density Residential

The requirements of this Article shall apply to all zoning districts other than $\mathrm{R}-1, \mathrm{R}-1 \mathrm{X}$ and $\mathrm{R}-2$ residential districts, with the exception of the Live Oak Protection requirements in section 9.2.5.7, which apply in all zoning districts. In all zoning districts other than R-1, R-1X and R-2, development sites shall be required to meet the minimum requirements as specified by this Article for Landscaping within the periphery landscape areas, interior planting areas and buffer areas. All required plant materials shall be installed or preserved in accordance with this Article and the landscape inspector shall inspect the required landscaping to verify adherence to code and the landscape plan approved in conjunction with the permit prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.
e. Preservation of Trees in Greenbelts - Except in accessways as described above, all trees and shrubs shall be preserved or replaced if diseased or dead. In addition, if the number of trees six (6) inches or more dbh which are in the front periphery do not equal the required number of Class A and Class B trees (one (1) per twenty-five (25) linear feet), then Class $A$ and Class $B$ trees must be planted to the extent necessary to comply with the requirements of this Article. In addition to the above, the following requirements will apply:
(1) Dead trees and shrubs may be removed and shall be replaced from the list of native plants that has been approved by the Zoning Commission and is available from the City of Mandeville Department of Planning and Development.
(2) Invasive species may be removed subject to the approval from the Landscape Inspector.


## Field Report - Live Oaks- Evaluation

| Date Issued | $12 / 05 / 2023$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Project Name | Citizens Bank- Mandeville |
| Project Number | NA |
| Attendees | Bill Reich (Reich) and Matt Saucier |
| Subject | Existing Live Oak Observation |
| Site Visit Date | $11 / 28 / 2023$ |

## OBSERVATIONS / COMMENTS

1- 18" Live Oak observed is not a specimen tree but is an understory tree that has been shaded out and full shape and growth habit have been stunted due to its location as such. Removal of adjacent trees during construction would limit its survivability.
2- 24" Live Oak has also been growing in an understory environment and has growth mostly on one side towards the road. Possible pervious pavers may help soften the impact of development on that side.


1-18" Live Oak


2-24" Live Oak

PREPARED BY: Bill Reich, ASLA, CLARB

END OF REPORT




