

**Planning Commission  
Public Hearing  
January 20, 2016**

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Dennis Thomas and the secretary called the roll.

Present: Michael Blache, Ren Clark, Simmie Fairley, Nixon Adams, Dennis Thomas, Scott Quillin and Rebecca Bush

Absent: None

Also Present: Louise Kidd, Planning Director; Acting City Attorney David Cressy; Council Members Ernest Burguières, Carla Buchholz, and Clay Madden; Consultant David Bailey; and David DeGeneres, Public Works Director

The case discussed was P15-07-06 Recommendation to the City Council regarding Ordinance 15-17, an ordinance of the City Council of the City of Mandeville with respect to Arpent Lots 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, a portion of Arpent Lot 19, (not including the subdivided lots designated as lots 1-14, inclusive, forming the southwest corner of Kleber Street and Monroe Street), Parcels A and B, and a portion of Kleber Street, located in Sections 46 & 47-T8S-R11E, City of Mandeville, St. Tammany Parish, Louisiana, more particularly described on the plat and survey prepared by Kelly J. McHugh & Associates, Inc., Civil Engineers & Land Surveyors, dated 12/03/13, revised through June 30, 2015, Dwg. No. 13-136-bs, containing 76.648 acres (the "Prestressed Concrete Site"); amending the official zoning map and Comprehensive Land Use Regulation Ordinance (CLURO) of the City to classify the former PreStressed Concrete Site as a Planned Combined Use District ("PCUD"); approving the Site Plan, Master Plan and Guiding Principles prepared by Architects Southwest, Inc., dated June 25, 2015, entitled "Port Marigny TND" (collectively the "Master Plan"); requiring that the Master Plan and its provisions, together with the Restrictive Covenants, be covenants running with the land; approving the development of the PCUD in accordance with the Master Plan and accompanying submittals; revoking certain construction, drainage and sewerage servitude(s) and granting a servitude of passage and for utilities; granting variances as needed to give full effect to the master plan; establishing procedures for administering the master plan; and providing for other matters in connection therewith, and consideration of adoption of Development Agreement for Port Marigny.

Ms. Scott stated the discussion of the meeting would be on the Master Plan and Guiding Principles. She provided an overview that an ordinance was introduced by the City Council on July 9, 2015 and the Planning Commission had held public hearings since that time. At the completion of the public hearings, the Planning Commission would make a recommendation to the City Council. The City Council would then hold public hearings with the same process. Should there be an adoption of the ordinance, the conceptual plan would be approved. If the plan was adopted, the project would submit for tentative, preliminary and final subdivision approval. These reviews would be in conjunction with the approved Master Plan.

Steve Oubre, project architect, presented the market study indicated there was a market for 650 units and the CLURO because of the density could not fit that many units and reduced it to 429 units. The information was condensed into the lot type plan. A mansion condo was a condominium product put into a residence that followed the code of Port Marigny. They positioned along Monroe Street because that was where the condominiums were clustered. The townhomes were fee simple products. The single family residence lots were 50-55' x 110-115' which were analogous to a 60-65' frontage lot and did not have garages in the front yard. The 429 units were used in the Traffic Impact Analysis supported by the mix of uses.

He said David Bailey had spoken to the spirit of the Comprehensive Plan which was to recommend Port Marigny as a TND. The edges of the project should diminish in scale. Monroe Street had no activity at the property's frontage. Across the street was a commercial zoning that was a convenience store at one time. There were seven mansion condos located on Monroe Street and the market study showed a demand for this product. They had considered minimizing

the use and might consider all single family housing. The traffic study did not indicate a difference in the count.

There had been some confusion in the TNND and CLURO language that needed to be reconciled. In an effort to clean it up, they would write a supplement that would be a Development Agreement. Their Urban Regulating Document was the heart of the document. There was a conflict with a civic building. The TNND's civic building could be a piece of art. There were underlying problems since it did not have to meet the parking requirement which was not allowable. They would say it would follow their intent as long as it met the CLURO requirements. The plaza with the statue and the lighthouse were the two civic uses shown on the plan.

The CLURO had a neighborhood general definition that differed from the Master Plan. Mr. Bailey thought "minimum" in their definitions this should be defined and they agreed to include that it must follow the CLURO regulations.

The CLURO allowed buildings on a single family lot as accessory uses to be used for rent. They intended to this as well and called them outbuildings. In 62 of the approved TNNDs very seldom was this engaged in rental. The City allowed this to be 1,000 square feet and their regulation only allowed it to be 450 square feet. The outbuilding was a separate or attached component. That was not used in the Traffic Analysis and they agreed it would be removed. In many cases it was used a bedroom for the children and may be connected to the main building. Mr. Quillin asked if it was also a garage and answered yes as well as the off street parking. Mr. Quillin said if it was an office then it would not be a garage and Mr. Oubre said the parking would still be needed. Mr. Clark asked if it was always above a garage and it was answered no. There would always be a garage. The general instructions notes would read that parking must comply with the CLURO requirements. They went above that and stated you would not have more than three parking spaces for the Village General or four parking spaces for the Village Edge.

In regard to street parking there was informal parking where cars may park in underutilized rights-of-way. They show where it occurred and how it will occur. There was a request for an estimated number of cars on the site. Parking will be provided as required in the CLURO. There was a question about calculating parking for all of the other uses. This was a conceptual plan but they did not know if it would be the same building type in two years. During the charrettes they calculated the total parking to be 959 spaces for the concept. There would be a request from the 36" fill allowance.

Open Space calculation was required to be 20% of the site with criteria outlined in the CLURO which would be 15.66 acres and they proposed 18.88 acres or 24%. The waterfront for the lighthouse that was 2 acres of state lease was included in this. Removing those 2 acres was still 2 acres above the requirement. Mr. Adams asked about the state lease. Mr. Muller said the parcel was still state owned subject to the City's lease which was a non-exclusive lease. The parcel between the lighthouse and hotel was owned by Dr. Pittman referenced back to the 1921 line. In the ordinance there was a request that the City work with the developer to amend the lease through a Cooperative Endeavor Agreement.

Connections to the existing roadways – and one of them was private. In accordance to establishing the connection to Mariner's Boulevard could not be overstated and it was recommended that reconsideration of the proposed density and uses follow any failure to make the connection before reaching a point in the development that exceeded the capacity of Monroe Street to accommodate the corresponding traffic load. Other improvements should be considered as contingencies. Establishing the timing of these connections in relation to phasing and building was critical. Agreements with private landowners and servitudes should be contingencies in any regulatory agreement. The language in the Comprehensive Plan did suggest an active City role in accomplishing these tasks. There was an agreement that the unit be controlled and regulated by the TIA and how it would be impacted in the future through

**Planning Commission  
Public Hearing  
January 20, 2016  
Page 3**

Mariner's Village. In their code there was a vehicular network drawing that was customary to show the grid of streets showing there was an achievement of the mandate. They have removed the document and did not want to create more confusion.

Phasing – it was recommended that a summary table be developed for each phase. More detail of timing of infrastructure should be included. They have removed the phasing portion of the document.

Design Review would be requested for review completion prior to the issuance of a building permit. This will help monitor development and traffic. They welcomed this review.

Detail for storm water systems would be developed. There were 16 streets types that were delineated.

Design Standards and Density – the CLURO outlined a calculation and would be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. The calculation was delineated in the drawing following the CLURO requirements. There would be some adjustments based on decisions on the mansion condos. The CLURO did not differentiate a townhome from an attached residential. The maximum units allowed would have been 554 and the proposal was for 429 units. There were 130 units less than allowed.

There were potential conflicts in definitions but the developer agreed to eliminate all of their definitions with the exception of design intent which was in line with the CLURO. The difference in alleys was that their development was not public and would hold that definition. Open porches difference was exceeding 32" and wanted 36" because of FEMA flood areas.

Mr. Clark said he looked at Terra Bella and asked if the street sizes would be similar. Mr. Oubre said there were more street types in Terra Bella. Mr. Clark encountered the informal parking having some streets that was impassable. That would be troublesome. Mr. Oubre said if people park incorrectly then there would be a blockage. It was a grid system so there was the ability to go around. Mr. Clark asked if the same architectural control would be in control at Port Marigny as it was in Terra Bella and it was answered yes. Mr. Adams asked about price ranges for the units. Mr. Oubre said the mansion condo was profiled as it was an entry level product and would be \$235-400,000 per unit. There would be condos at the \$165,000 range. These prices were intended at opening and would escalate with development.

Mr. Quillin asked about minimum density of 4 units per acre. He asked if that would be 312 units as a minimum. Mr. Oubre said if allowing a net density of 2 units per acre there would not be the same walkability as to make it a viable TND.

David Bailey, City Consultant, said the request for removal of conflicts was to assure that the consideration was clear and have as much certainty of proposal to construction. Mr. Oubre had been responsive to the concerns. Several of his comments had to do with the addition of as required in the CLURO. With the consideration of a PCUD approval of a complex document could codify certain exceptions.

In his review, it was important to note there was a goal dedicated to the entire site and reflected it was an important parcel. The density was outlined in the goal and the south portion of the site be developed more densely and the northern low to medium density. There were discussions about how to make the Monroe Street frontage compatible with the surrounding area. Another concern was the 35' width of many of the lot frontages on Monroe Street and amending them to closer to a 50' lot which was discussed the day of the meeting.

Mandeville had a certain degree of elbow room and it was important that a portion of the northern part of the site had that feel.

Mr. Oubre said when they met to discuss downscaling the frontage on Monroe Street, he thought in order to great a more textural assembly of lots they could divide the frontage by 19 and would get 50' lots. He would suggested continuing with the mansion condos but bringing it down to three buildings at 70' frontage to allow for rear parking. He would like to mix up the size of the lots for a variegated degree of housing on Monroe Street that would be behind a 50' green buffer.

Mr. Thomas asked about the 35' lots. Mr. Oubre said they were in the market study, but he was not a fan because it was costly to build on that small of a lot. Mr. Bailey said a goal was a buffer to the surrounding neighborhood which was about compatibility. The R-1X zoning was a specific modification of R-1 with narrower lot dimensions. The goal in this area was to get away from excessively narrow lots. Mr. Bailey said the lots on Monroe Street were rear loaded parking. There was an agreement that the lots would be in the 45' plus range. Mr. Muller said the reason for the discussion was because Mr. Bailey was reading the provisions of the Comprehensive Plan for density to be applied.

Claudia Seligman, 44 Tradewinds Court East, said there was a detailed conceptual plan and there would be no reversal in the future. Mr. Adams said subdivision approval would also be required. Ms. Scott said the conceptual plan was the guidance. The location of the uses was approved and then site plan approval for location of the site and parking. Ms. Seligman said she did not know how the City could require a reduction. Ms. Scott said the developer would be doing the reduction. Mr. Adams said the board would make a recommendation to the Council and they were following the CLURO criteria. She asked what plan could remedy the future traffic problems. Mr. Cressy said whatever density at the start of construction would take up "x" trips and if they did not match future construction would not be allowed. There would be required improvements to the streets as required before build out and would be included in the development agreement. Ms. Seligman was concerned about unanticipated consequences. Ms. Scott said during the subdivision process if there was a proposed use generating more traffic there would be an opportunity for review. Mr. Adams said the board was trying to get the best information possible and he agreed that everyone was concerned about the traffic. Ms. Seligman asked what happened with an "oops" in traffic and it was answered that the City would have to deal with it. Mr. Clark said the board must look at this project as it related to the body of law and encapsulate it with what was being provided to the board for review. All of the traffic consultants agree there would be more traffic but would not degrade it for this project. Mr. Adams said Monroe Street was already a service level F and would need to be fixed. Mr. Cressy said the traffic study was based on analysis from around the work and had narrowed down the unknowns as much as possible.

Karen Breaux, St. Croix resident, asked who wrote the CLURO. Mr. Adams explained that it began with the Comprehensive Plan many years ago. The property had been stated in the CLURO for almost 25 years and had been through many public hearings.

Charles Goodwin, 2075 Lakeshore Drive, asked about a hotel attracting a transient clientele. He asked if the project was viable if the hotel was converted to office condos. Mr. Oubre said the market study indicated a need for a hotel in the historic part of Old Mandeville but they needed visibility. It was viable because of the visibility from the Causeway. There were 350 people that participated in the charrettes and many people asked for a hotel. Many guests have to go to the interstate to have a place to stay. The developer owned the real estate and could not let it run down.

Mike Pulaski, 305 Mariner's Island, said he heard at a traffic meeting about not having a connection to Mariner's Boulevard. Mr. Hall had commented that if there was no

**Planning Commission  
Public Hearing  
January 20, 2016  
Page 5**

connection there would be a reduction by 35%. Mr. Muller said the 35% was a distribution pattern suggested by the engineers. The question was if it was a necessity to go through Mariner's Village. The study determined that going through Mariner's Village did very little. Mr. Adams said it would be checked at every phase. Mr. Muller said there was a table in the Development Agreement that would have trips assignable to each land use. There was a total number of permitted trips and when it reached that maximum there would be no additional construction.

Greta Perry, 408 Chase Court East, said she could not take a left on Monroe Street and must go around the school. She asked if considered to start at the bottom number of units allowed. The commercial space must also be addressed because 60,000 square feet seemed like a lot.

Kurt Frosch, 1359 Clauselet Street, asked about a turn lane on the south side of Monroe Street into the project. The amount of traffic on Monroe Street was high without the development. The turn lane would allow the Monroe Street traffic to continue. Mr. Oubre said a turn lane was not intended. Turn lanes widened the roadway and traffic would tend to speed more. Mr. Frosch said he would rather see a turn lane and he thought the size of the project should be reduced. He also asked if the architecture facing Monroe Street simulates a French Quarter style. Mr. Oubre said the style was predicated on the Mandeville style.

Brian Rhinehart, 712 Carondelet Street, asked if the City would budget and take ownership of the traffic study. Mr. Adams said the City would have to review the figures. This would be included in the development agreement with a table to be maintained. There was a formal administrative procedure that would be delegated to the Planning Director to annually review the trips and land uses and that they were being met. Mr. Rhinehart asked about the measurement of the trips being counted and Mr. Muller answered yes. Mr. Cressy said the trip rates were attributable to each use. Mr. Rhinehart said build the first part of the subdivision and someone will be responsible for matching it to the table. Mr. Adams said there would be a subdivision plan which would include what would be built. Then they would construct other houses and that would be added to the table and determined if it met the process or not. Mr. Clark asked if there was any empirical support and Mr. Muller said under the agreement the City was authorized to do a review to monitor the development.

Ernest Burguieres, Councilman District 3, said the projections were estimates and there was a mechanism to verify the projections. If the actuality came in too high, have a verification process of the actual traffic counts as more comfort for the citizens.

Margaux Rhinehart, 712 Carondelet Street, asked as the CLURO was written for this type of development at a time that was not envisioned for this type of project. Ms. Scott said the PreStressed site was zoned Planned District since 1993 and in 2007 was identified as a TND. Ms. Rhinehart thought a TND was Old Mandeville, Old Golden Shores and did not image condos and multi-story apartment buildings. She said most residents do not comprehend what was coming. She was seeing a construction boom and increasing in the school population. She was concerned about allowing 407 units when there was a construction explosion. Mr. Quillin said there was culpability for their product as part of the development agreement for roadway improvements. The board could not make them responsible for any other development in the City. Ms. Scott said the City recognized the issues and was participating in a larger traffic plan. Mr. Clark said this board could only make a recommendation from their fact finding meetings.

Mr. Adams announced that the next meeting was scheduled for February 23<sup>rd</sup>. There were proposed dates of March 5 and March 30, 2016. It was requested to have the board reply about availability.

Mr. Quillin moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Ms. Bush and was  
unanimously approved.

  
Lori Spranley, Secretary

  
Dennis Thomas, Chairman