

**Planning Commission
Public Hearing
September 1, 2015**

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

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

Absent: None

Also Present: Louise Scott, Planning Director; David Bailey, Consultant; Mayor Donald Villere; and Council Members Carla Buchholz, Rick Danielson and Ernest Burguieres

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

Ms. Scott presented David Bailey, City Consultant, who had familiarity with Traditional Neighborhood Districts and he had reviewed the Master Plan and Guiding Principles.

David Bailey gave a presentation with examples and detailed illustrations. The intent was not to be a detailed review, but to establish some topics and subjects for more examination.

1. Background: There may be a single variance for fill and grading on the site. This area was different than Old Mandeville and the general patterns of development would be appropriate to Old Mandeville. The question was density and details of a good fit. Mr. Bailey's role in the process was to assist the staff, Commission and Council in evaluating the project.
2. Observations of the Comprehensive Plan: In general it was intended to guide the development. The project included 9 policies, of which 5 were relevant.
3. Policies: The general guide was a window of the Comprehensive Plan to promote the site. One end was a premier waterfront development, and the other end was a desire to avoid an overburdening of the transportation infrastructure which could be accomplished through traffic improvement.

The first comment was that New Urbanism was focused on the form of development, size, scale, material, placement on site, parking, and landscaping and less focused on uses. Ultimately he thought the best communities were with a focus on form. This was a form based project.

4. It was important to understand this was a conceptual review level at this time. A Planned Combined Use District established a conceptual Master Plan and concept of a maximum number of units for the site. Once reviewed and forwarded to the City Council there would be subsequent processes of subdivision and site plan review. There were many questions that had to do with the elements determined through that process.
5. A substantial portion of the review was to establish terminology. Terms outbuilding and back building were used as structures on certain lot types. They were not defined in the definitions and did not match existing CLURO definitions. Much of focus was graphic images describing the site plan. Page 21 of plan showed four types of zoning with residential lots and civic space in the center of the project. General: there was a set of descriptions on page 34 describing the form of the areas. It would define where the buildings could be placed on the lots, the aspects of the fronts of the buildings, and to build to the lines instead of setbacks.
6. Density: Page 25 described density on Monroe Street as being 6.8 lots per acre. The CLURO defined units per acre. New Urbanism allowed more than one unit per lot. The Monroe Street frontage would be seven lots were mansion/condo with 4 to 8 units on a less than one acre lot. He was concerned that this density was to be contrary to what was described in the Comprehensive Plan.
7. Phasing: This was discussed by the staff and the question was what infrastructure and various entitlements would be deployed to the site. He recommended a development similar for phasing to understand the different elements of the site. Phase 1 was Massena Street with a low density mixed residential use. This would be a reasonable phase 1 with limited infrastructure on the rest of the property. Phase 2 would go deeper in the site and there should be a discussion on more infrastructure to Mariner's Boulevard. Phase 3 would be the hotel, mixed use and a connection to Mariner's Boulevard would be critical. Through market forces, phasing would evolve.
8. Connections: Goal 12 and the policies gave excellent guidance and stressed improvements were considered as a way to meet the spirit of the Comprehensive Plan. He thought there should be a development agreement to establish contingencies.
The Mariner's Boulevard connection was clarified in a memo as being private. The boulevard was public, but it did not touch the edge of PreStressed with a City servitude separating it. The Comprehensive Plan described an active City role in making the connection. This was such an important piece of the project that the sooner it was resolved, the better.
9. Road Network: Streets, sidewalks, parking, and types of landscaping were greatly detailed. There were two types of parking, formal parking spaces which would be striped and substantial informal parking being parking of one car and these could become one way streets. It could work many positives by reducing the land dedicated to paving, and it could be used for play and enjoyment.
10. Urban Regulations: This related to three of the zoning classifications. Data for building to lines were included. The center was denser, the general area was less dense but a significant portion of each lot was covered, and the edge had more space between the structures. There were questions of definition, and minimum used in general. The civic uses were exempt from regulations; however, there should be the establishment of basic regulations and how they relate to special events needed to be defined. Outbuildings had limited office use and may change.
11. General Instructions: Parking was accommodated but nothing beyond that. He was concerned about language setting up potential issues of parking

12. management on the site. There should be clarification of terminology and examining the maximum of parking regulations.
13. The fill and grading plan must be examined closely. The covenants and other documents were cursorily reviewed and several required elements in the CLURO but appeared to be in place.
14. Special Events: New Urbanism was about outdoor spaces, and stage for events. When managed well they were fantastic. However, there was the potential to become issues. Identifying how events would be handled should be reviewed.
15. Some document had too much information and Mr. Bailey had discussed this with the staff how to match the detail in the appropriate documents with the level of detail necessary for approval. A development agreement should be tailored with them. He advised being careful not to approve more than intended.

There was a discussion with Mr. Bailey about insuring that the developer had enough information of entitlements to more to the next step. If the review and approval was too vague then it would not be clear what was available to work on. The City needed to be careful not to approve more than comfortable approving. On page 24, there were colored squares representing different types of buildings. There was an example of seven lots on Monroe Street and understanding how that related to phasing was important because the board could understand the infrastructure going in at that time.

Mr. Blache asked how to reserve the City rights. Mr. Bailey said a development agreement to verbalize what was being approved and what was needed additional review. There would be a discussion about the number of units or square footage and where approval would stop without infrastructure improvements. Mr. Blache asked if there was flexibility for the developer to switch the type of project due to market conditions. Mr. Bailey said it was critical for the project not be hamstrung. If a document can be created that matched the CLURO, it would be easier. If not, a small restaurant on the site with a porch did not have a matching definition of a porch there would be issues. Ms. Scott said traffic would be the critical path.

Mr. Bailey was reviewing the fully formed project with some understanding of what came first must be decided. Mr. Clark asked to expand on what entitlement meant. Mr. Bailey said at the conceptual level there was a summary table of the units. As the project was being built as an example, 100 units were drawn down and there was a running track of them for a balance of what was allowed. This would leave 92 units available for future construction. Mr. Bailey said this was assuming meeting it met the regulatory criteria. Mr. Adams said the City code was entitlements by use. If there was no infrastructure, the developer was not entitled to build it. Mr. Thomas said the streets were designed as two-way, but they could be one way assuming peak traffic. Steve Oubre, architect, said all of the streets were designed to be two-way streets, and there was an option of the City to convert to one way streets during certain times.

Mr. Muller said the different with the form based code was being two dimensional as opposed to three dimensions. Mr. Bailey's points of definitions were well taken, and they were committed to the process and working with the staff to reconcile any difference.

Ray Baas, President of New Golden Shores Homeowner Association, said he appreciated the comments from Mr. Bailey and the extensive planning of the suitability of the project. He thought it was, well planned, would be well financed,

but the density must be reduced for both residential and commercial uses. The density was not compatible with all of Mandeville. He requested not to allow a new city within a city and having spillover problems. He asked to focus and get more answers on the traffic impact, especially on Monroe Street.

Pat Rosenow, Chase Court resident, lived adjacent to the project. He realized the property was not being put to optimal use, but this project was not to the well-being of the citizens. He was hoping to find a middle ground for both sides. He felt to this point the process had allowed the proponents to put forth an unfettered presentation and no questions from the citizens. He recognized that the board needed a complete record of information. He also recognized the due process that everyone had an equal opportunity to know that would be done moving forward. He and Mr. Bailey discussed that the City retained some of the traffic as well and which components of the phasing had greater traffic infrastructure needs. This parcel had a whole goal and nine important policies dedicated to it in the Comprehensive Plan. The staff, he as a consultant, the board, and the Council wanted to make sure the issues were not overburdening. Mr. Rosenow said he would wait to hear from with the traffic review. Mr. Bailey said along the eastern boundary, phase 1 was in keeping with the intention of the Comprehensive Plan. There were areas that were too dense. Mr. Rosenow said he was concerned about commercial viability.

Michael Greer, Monroe Street resident in Magnolia Ridge subdivision and also homeowner's president said he echoed the previous speakers. The board was focused on a positive ways and wanted success, but there were concerns about school infrastructure, speed bumps, and traffic. There were other infrastructure issues besides traffic. He said New Urbanism had a checkered history so he asked to see a comparison of similar developments. The tenant of New Urbanism was to reduce the number of cars, but the concern was about going to the grocery outside of the development.

Claudia Jaubert, Coffee Street resident for 15 years, asked about a guest house, outbuilding and back building being another dwelling on one lot. She asked if those were counted in the total density and the answer was no. Ms. Jaubert said it created more density. Mr. Oubre said definitions should be reviewed for compatibility. Ms. Aubert asked if the outbuildings could be reviewed for compatibility. Ms. Oubre answering that they were now allowed. Ms. Scott said a homeowner could lease rooms in their house, but in the single family residential areas would not be allowed another unit. The Traditional Neighborhood District would allow for the separate unit. Ms. Jaubert said this would allow more people living in the area than just the number of units stated. She was concerned about the potential for vacation and short term rentals that would not be desirable for the area. She said it did not take an expert to see that traffic would be a huge problem.

Mr. Oubre said they were willing to remove it from the project since so few became rental units. They could have housed a mother-in-law or child in a separate unit.

Debbie Sachs, Jefferson Street resident, was concerned about school overcrowding, lower test scoring and losing local tax dollars if they school was taken over by charter operators. Mr. Muller said the School Board participated in the charrettes and would work with them in any way possible. He also stated that all of the service providers had attending and participated in the charrettes.

Natalie Alland, Magnolia Ridge Subdivision, said she was in favor of the development. She felt in the end there would be some compromise. She had visited

**Planning Commission
Public Hearing
September 1, 2015
Page 5**

River Ranch and loved the development. Her question was if the City was setting a precedent. Ms. Scott said the Chenier development was similar with a Planned Unit Development to the front of the property and residential to the rear. Ms. Alland said with two lane highways, it did not look so appealing from Monroe Street with street flooding in this area. She was interested in grading and draining away from Monroe Street. She was in agreement with Mr. Baas about reducing the development by 25%.

Leonard Rohrbough, 2525 Lakeshore drive, asked about the number of inventory of unbuild empty lots in this area, which was answered to be 150-300 lots. Mr. Rohrbough was concerned about a condensed area of density.

Tess Dennie, 536 Lafitte Street, said for the most part she was happy with the project. The OMBA board asked her to convey their concerns and question the density. Their biggest question was how much would be commercial and to create some connectivity. They were open to particularly single family or townhomes and not so much apartments.

Dawn Hunter, 52 Barbados Court, said her concern was traffic with the construction. She asked where the crew would come through, what it would do to the streets, trees, and foundations where she lived. She moved 8 years ago to be convenient to the Causeway, and she did not want cars behind her.

Greg Mulvaney, 420 Chase Court, thought it could add a lot of value and was looking forward to another neighborhood, but he was confused by a lot of the small lots. Mr. Oubre said the market study was completed before the first drawing. The market study indicated the market of 629 units of varying types, and they were proposing 429 units.

Mr. Adams stated the next meeting was scheduled for September 29th.

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



Lori Spradley, Secretary



Dennis Thomas, Chairman

