

**Planning Commission
Public Hearing
August 18, 2015**

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Nixon Adams and the secretary called the roll.

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

Absent: Rebecca Bush

Also present: Louise Scott, Planning Director; David Bailey, Consultant; David DeGeneres, Public Works Director; David Cressy, Acting City Attorney; Council Members Ernest Burguières, Carla Buchholz, and David Ellis, Mayor Donald Villere, Andre Monnot, Principal Engineers

The case discussed was P15-07-06 Recommendation to the City Council regarding Ordinance 15-17 with respect to Arpent Lots 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20 and 21, a portion of Arpent Lot 19, parcels A and B, and a portion of Kleber Street, City of Mandeville, St. Tammany Parish, Louisiana, more particularly described on the plat and survey prepared by Kelly J. McHugh and Associates, Inc., Civil Engineers & Land Surveyors, dated December 3, 2013, revised June 22, 2015, Dwg. No. 13-136-BS, containing 76.648 acres (The "PreStressed Concrete Site"); amending the official zoning map and Comprehensive Land Use Regulations Ordinance (CLURO) of the City to classify the former PreStressed Concrete Site to 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 provision, 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 and sewer servitude(s); 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 announced that Rick Hall, traffic consultant for Port Marigny, would make a presentation. Richard Muller, attorney for the Port Marigny project, would be the applicant's representative. Mr. Frank Liang, Digital Engineers, was the City's representative reviewing the Traffic Study.

Mr. Muller stated that the Traffic Impact Study was set forth in Section 8.4 of the CLURO and was designed to determine what the internal traffic would be as a result of the development of the site and the impact of that development to what the traffic flow was within the neighborhood within a confined study area. The defined study area was a quarter of a mile or an intersection that was impacted by 20% or more of the traffic. The reason Mr. Hall was selected for this assignment was because he had so much involvement with New Urbanism projects and Mr. Muller presented his resume. There was a lot of development in the area, but most of it was the typical type of suburban development as opposed to what was in a traditional neighborhood, which was more of a grid system and pedestrian friendly.

Mr. Muller presented Map 3 from the Comprehensive Plan, Functional Street Classification. The CLURO referenced arterial, collector, and local roads. The Functional Street Classification chose Monroe Street as a primary road, which meant a collector road or more than a local road. The purpose to the Traffic Analysis was to determine the impact and the levels of service. If there was not the ability to

maintain that level, then they would have to take some action to either eliminate the problem or come up with some alternative ways of doing it. They would have to identify additional rights-of-way needed to implement mitigation strategies, phasing of improvements and anticipated costs of the recommended improvements. He had said at the last meeting one of the recommended improvements for the development was to gain access through Mariner's Village to East Causeway. The owner had no control over that, but they were recommending that as a focal point for discussion in what came out of this meeting. The reason for that was in this neighborhood the road were principally north/south and that a service level would be maintained at a level C for the arterial or collector street. Where the existing level of service was below C or D, the developer was not required to bring the level of service up to the City requirement. The question was what was the capacity of Monroe Street and the adjoining streets and what traffic could it support in its present condition. The City had a 2005 Krebs LaSalle study that was before the Highway 190 improvements were made. It was a north/south analysis determining the level of C and D. They were dealing with the 2007 Comprehensive Plan adoption. The old town was on a grid that was New Urbanism which was being developed in this development, a grid system of streets. The study did not quantify the amount of additional traffic from infill or redevelopment of Old Mandeville. This was of particular concern in the redevelopment of the PreStressed Concrete site development which was currently limited to access from Monroe Street. The Mandeville Police Department did have mobile speed detectors and that information was provided to Mr. Hall and the developers. Mr. Hall's report was designed to comply with the requirements of the ordinance. But, it was not intended to establish a baseline for all of Mandeville. To the extent that the applicant could help, they would help.

Rick Hall stated because it was a complex series of calculations, they were within the regulations for performing a Traffic Impact study. The PowerPoint presentation indicated the green circles being the study site. Going four blocks east on Monroe Street, the trips were distributed out and compared to counts at that spot at this time then they would be responsible for extending the study area where it was substantial to a 20% area. The Comprehensive Plan was a good guide for developers and impact of the transportation system. He saluted Mandeville on the Comprehensive Plan and pushing developers in the right direction.

Most of the subdivisions did not allow for much walkability. The suburbs mostly had walkers or runners for personal fitness. There was the ASHTO green book that was a reference for standards. Map 5D in the Comprehensive Plan indicated this to be a mixed use area.

The Town Plan created with a map of the Master Plan. The market study indicated that marina slips would sell well, and a hotel was needed in downtown Mandeville. The grid system of streets was small blocks. There was a figure ground analysis, highlighting the streets to give an idea of how compact the project was. Phasing of the development was shown that could be flexible, but it was an indication of the market studies. There was an emblem proposed that was Marigny's shield, an urban regulating standard, a regulating plan with colors showing the intensity of land uses and types of buildings. The regulation plan could not be varied by another developer without board approval. A five minutes' walk radius was the rule of thumb for walkability. There were unique street types telling the engineers where to put trees, and how wide the lane and sidewalk should be. Motor vehicle speed next to the walker was very important. Economic return was 50-200% more when a development was laid out this way.

Traffic Growth history

The traffic growth between 1997 through 2012 was flat with the saturation of average number of vehicles per family. This was based on daily trips used from DOTD state counts. The information provided from the police measured what happened every 15 minutes for 2-3 week period. This was a complete spectrum including school time and Sundays. Mr. Clark asked if Mr. Hall had driven the area and he said the DOTD history was counterintuitive to his experience since 2005. Mr. Hall said he was trying to get a handle on the overall growth. The slide indicated an average daily count of 646 cars on Monroe Street and the 2005 traffic study indicated a level of 600 cars recorded at that location. Mr. Blache said the DOTD traffic count was Monday at 10 a.m. to 10:30 a.m. on Wednesday. This did not include any weekend traffic. Mr. Hall said he was looking at data from many locations to standardize what was the worst case situation. Mr. Blache said he felt the weekend was the peak time for traffic in Old Mandeville on Girod Street. He assumed many new residents would be working outside of Mandeville and the count would increase when they were home. Mr. Hall said seen the peak hour flows were in the pm because of people's movement from work to home or opposite in the morning. They felt the mornings were not as important because stores were closed until 10 a.m. The commercial side added to commuting activity in the evening. Mr. Clark said he was not taking into consideration the idiosyncrasy of Mandeville. Mr. Hall said he understood there were many schools, but he had looked at the 2005 study that considered school and noon peaks and analyzed it.

Proposed turn count locations

There had been a good discussion with the City's traffic engineer. They were willing to take additional counts north as well as to the west because of the concern of those intersecitons. Now that school was back in session, they would apply engineering analysis to the new counts. Mr. Quillin asked about the counts in Mariner's Village. Mr. Hall said they had included the numbers with Mariner's Boulevard as a connection to the site. On the other side, there were five connections to Massena Street. Mr. Muller reiterated that they would make every effort to make the Mariner's Village connection happen, but it was not within their control. Mr. Fairley said Kleber Street was in the original study, but not included in this study. Mr. Hall said he had driven all of the adjacent streets and noted a number of north/south streets were narrow and they did not want to triple the traffic on those streets. Mr. Quillin asked about a Mariner's Boulevard study being done secondarily if it was not available. The answer was no; that it would be too cumbersome to come in with those alternatives. Mr. Adams asked if Mariner's Boulevard was not included, would the project be reduced. Mr. Hall said the City and the owner would have to address it. Mr. Clark asked to what extent would the large east/west growth on Florida Street figure into the plant. Mr. Hall said tangible measurement by DOTD was flat for a long time and national trends showed the vmt was not bouncing back. Mr. Adams and Clark commented that there was a large tract of land north of Pelican Park with a bypass road for residential construction and traffic and would that be looked at. Mr. Hall said for a major development in the east, it might not be designed for walkability and there could be an expansion of commercial opportunities to satisfy them. Mr. Blache asked what no baseline information available means. Mr. Hall explained in the 2005 study, Massena Street was the most western area forecast, and the study gave it a clean bill of health for level of service. Mr. Adams said because of the grid system, except for school lines, getting around in Old Mandeville was easy. Entering onto or crossing Highway 190 was a problem. Mr. Blache said New Golden Shores was somewhat of a grid system and he was concerned about that. Mr. Hall said the Causeway was a point load from New Orleans and back in the evening. Volumes were being seen off the Causeway get up to 70 to 90,000 vehicles per day. Mr. Blache was concerned about the accuracy of the projects with no baseline. Mr. Hall said their traffic was able to dissipate into the

grid to an amount smaller than the regulations. Mr. Blache said the problem was not knowing. Mr. Adams said the City also had responsibility. Mr. Hall agreed to count other sites even though it was beyond their influence. Mr. Adams asked to include Camborne Street because most people would go that way to get to Winn Dixie and Rouses.

Mr. Hall stated there was a trip generation calculation for every unit from the charrette, market study, and size of the site. It was shown for peak hours and 250 trips without Mariner's Village and included 5-6 points on Massena or Monroe Streets. Mr. Clark asked Mr. Hall if he had seen the school's car line. Mr. Hall said the total was 287 entering and 209 existing on the site for 500 totals which included all nine streets in the development.

Mr. Thomas asked how to account for the hotel. Mr. Hall said they used national statistics. The proposal was for 120 rooms and 140 slips. For a mixed use site, they used the logics how of many people from the hotel to a restaurant in peak time. They assumed 30% of the total trips generated were on a single use measurement and were interactive between the uses or mode other than car. Mr. Adams said the board would request the City consultant to comment.

Frank Liang, Digital Engineering, the City consultant, said he had received the August 14th letter to Andre Monnot for comments.

Traffic Impact Analysis

The deficiency of the study did not look at critical intersections. The access points in the original analysis made it difficult to tell how many trips generated were loading into the existing grid systems. He would need further information to know if met the CLURO requirements.

1. Mr. Liang did not see the exhibit showing existing peak hour analysis before the development, and the generation for local roadway network to determine traffic loading.
2. Under the assumption of using Mariner's Boulevard, a U-turn would be allowed under the Causeway. It was presently used for official use and would not change. If the connection was not made, a new report would be needed. Mr. Adams asked at what point would the owner decide to look at some other direction.

4. Mr. Liang had reviewed the analysis of how to get to the development, which streets to use, and what was the use shortest route depending on the access point. In discussing this with Mr. Hall, he proposed a turn count location be developed. It appeared that Massena Street had five and Monroe Street had four. Mr. Liang assumed a same capture of 496 trips on vmt with a 30% capture rate. Mr. Hall said they based it on ITE collected information. Mr. Clark asked how many cars would be lined up on Massena Street to get onto Monroe Street. It was a good idea to calm the traffic, but Massena Street was a short street. Mr. Hall said he found the drivers would adjust to the supply or streets given. If there was a long queue of traffic, people would find an alternate route. Mr. Clark asked what would if Mariner's Boulevard was not available. Mr. Hall said drivers would adjust to the conditions and optimize their travel. Mr. Liang suggested a pre-development plan and assumed the number of trips at each access point and then develop a post development level of service. If the road was below level C, improvements needed to be installed. Mr. Adams said he would like to see a visual model. Mr. Hall said the model needed signal control to give a viable model. The computer program gave it a level service F. If there were only a dozen cars, it did not justify a level F. Mr. Liang said theoretically Monroe Street would not be slowed down.

**Planning Commission
Public Hearing
August 18, 2015
Page 5**

5. Pre and post development levels of service were discussed.
6. Mr. Liang did not recommend using the FDOT tables, and suggested using the Highway Capacity Manual with an appropriate module to determine the level of service. It could not reflect a volume at an intersection, and you could not create a model with the table at Monroe Street and North Causeway. Mr. Hall agreed to run that software and predicted same outcome.
7. The 30% rate assumed seemed high, and suggested using 5%. Mr. Adams said there would be another consultant with experience in New Urbanism leading the next meeting.
8. The trip distribution split was skewed and suggested a reduction in the percentages.
9. The final comment was that the development would be constructed in phases, and it was suggested to phase in the roadway improvements.

Mr. Liang summarized there should be a level of service analysis at additional intersections.

Mr. Adams announced that the next meeting would be held on September 1st. Ms. Scott stated the Master Plan and Guiding Principles would be discussed. In order to collect more information and have the City Engineer review it, the next traffic analysis meeting would be held on September 29th. Mr. Clark said he had a problem with the flat line on the DODT traffic report.

Brian Rhinehart, 712 Carondelet Street, said two sources of data were cited, DOTD and the traffic warning signs. The DOTD website estimated the annual average daily traffic counts. The report was run every three years and 2012 was last time it was run and it was at the other end of Monroe Street rather than at the PreStressed site. There were no traffic baseline for this site and the count was randomly placed around the town. The Mandeville Police Department was not measuring an impact but just telling us to slow down. He also pointed out a math error and the analysis was ignoring the retail space. Mr. Liang stated that he found the same thing.

Margaux Rhinehart, 712 Carondelet Street, was concerned about stating they were using PM data. Those who lived in Old Mandeville were more concerned with the morning traffic.

Claudia Seigleman, 44 Tradewinds Court East, commented that she was concerned that the project would follow what was required in the Comprehensive Plan. She felt the January 2005 report was not a good baseline since there was a large influx of people and cars after Hurricane Katrina. She did not agree with the DOTD numbers, and if the board decided further studies were needed to please do it for the citizens.

Ross Linerd, Digital Engineering, said their comments were located on the City of Mandeville's website.

Jamie Gephardt, 726 Hutchinson Street, said she lived across Monroe Street from the development and she was concerned with traffic. She felt the only way to control the traffic was to lower the numbers of the development with less density. She agreed that the morning traffic was the problem. Many of the cars were going to the Causeway to get to work and there were many directions of people going home.

In most households there were cars, and this would be almost 700 more cars on the road in the morning. People would not be confined to that one area. She felt the question was in order to lower the traffic and impact, could they lower the number of units.

Greg Mulvaney, 420 Chase Court, asked if the assumptions were based on U.S. standards, specifically 50% of the households being single occupants being realistic. He felt the analysis was underestimating the number of cars.

Darla Moore, 129 Dona Drive, spoke representing Ray Baas, asked where were the statistics on the number of vehicles per family. The other question was on page 10 of the analysis; it stated that it was refined with local knowledge. It was vague about where was the local knowledge.

Mike Pulaski, 305 Mariner's Island, President of the Master Association, asked if he was hearing that Mariner's Boulevard was not in play. Mr. Adams said that determination was not made. Mr. Pulaski said there were a lot of cobblestones, which made a lot of noise which presented another concern. He stated between 4:30 and 6:30 p.m. along Mariner's Boulevard and the Service Road you were "taking your life in your hands".

Mr. Adams said the 2005 traffic study and levels of service given did not seem realistic at certain points of the day. It was still a problem and how to make it better.

Mr. Thomas said there were some discrepancies in the reports. He requested a clarification and correction of the math errors and questionable data. Mr. Hall said there was a math error in one column, but the traffic summary and formulas were correct. Mr. Adams said the distribution pattern must be worked out. Mr. Muller said agreed to do the actual counts for correct baseline information. Mr. Muller said the 2005 study identified two issues of the north/south traffic connecting to Florida and Monroe Streets and East Causeway. East Causeway was a problem identified for more than 10 years and nothing had been done.

Mayor Villere said the City was working with the Parish, Causeway, and State on a traffic study encompassing the area from I-12 to the lake, the Tchefuncte River to Big Branch, the Highway 1088 interchange, and Highways 59 and 190. They were working the Regional Planning Commission to consider major developments. Unfortunately it did not meet the timetable for this project.

There was a discussion about Mr. Burguieres list of questions. One of them was how many cars, visitors, hotel guests, and uses of the center were projected at any time of the day. Mr. Burguieres said Mr. Hall's standards were geared to the residents, but not people outside of the development. He understood there were no answers at this meeting, but he wanted to see the assumptions of traffic for uses and special events. This would be two suburb types of development in the Old Mandeville area and would be a city within a city. The grid streets were designed to weave into the community, but everyone needed to know how the residents would be affected. Mr. Adams said the board was looking particularly at traffic. All of the questions needed to be resolved in a public hearing. Mr. Burguieres suggested having GNOEC also attend the meetings. Ms. Scott said she would forward GNOEC all of Digital Engineering's comments. Mr. Hall requested a copy of question number 9 and Mr. Clark requested a formal answer for the board.

Mr. Rhinehart asked if there was a greater leeway for parking in a Planned District. Ms. Scott said if the applicant requested variances, they would be

**Planning Commission
Public Hearing
August 18, 2015
Page 7**

considered in the subdivision process, but at this time they were not proposing to reduce the parking requirements. There would have to be a hardship or demonstrate why it was an advantage or improved situation.

Mr. Clark moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Mr. Fairley and was unanimously approved.


Lori Spranley, Secretary


Dennis Thomas, Chairman

