Planning Commission
Public Hearing
December 17, 2015

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

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

Absent: None

Also present: Louisette Kidd, Planning Director; Mayor Donald Villere; Acting City Attorney David Cressy; Consultants David Bailey and Frank Liang; Council Members Clay Madden, Ernest Burguieres, Rick Danielson, and Carla Buchholz

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

Ms. Scott presented that the applicant had submitted a final report and Digital Engineering had responded with final comments.

Frank Liang, Digital Engineering, discussed traffic models used by Rick Hall. There had been questions about how the traffic was being generated, the number of cars, hotel guest, and service vehicles. The traffic engineer's evaluation was based on the number of trips which included going for coffee in the morning, going to work, and coming home from work. He reviewed how the trips were generated in the traffic generation which was in the IT Traffic Generation manual. They compared the number of trips to the number of dwelling units. For a hotel, Saturdays and Sundays were the predominant days. Condominium/townhouse land uses had a number of average vehicle trips versus dwelling units during peak hours. There were 59 studies and the average dwelling unit of 215 was an average of .44 trips.

From the TIA report the marina rate was .08 trips per berth, the hotel was .53 trips per room during the am peak hours. Mr. Hall had separated the am and pm trips per land use. The two tables indicated what they used to generate the trips. Mr. Liang had reviewed the tables and found them acceptable. There was a discussion that this was the most credible tool to use in valuation. A standard deviation of .69 was used, but he did not know if there was any wiggle room.

Mr. Clark asked at full build out, how much traffic would be generated using Mr. Liang's number of 475 trips at peak hour. Mr. Liang said Mr. Hall's analysis was as total of 157 for single family uses by .75 for am peak hour would have 118 trips. Mr. Clark said to the end result at full development was what the board had to determine. The board was trying to determine the most probable number.

Mr. Liang summarized that Mr. Hall had presented his final draft report dated December 17, 2015. He had reviewed it using a 5% internal capture and traffic IT generations, and there were three improvements proposed for the local roadway network. The first improvement was at East Causeway and Monroe Street with the installation of a southbound left turn and a dedicated left and right turn lane. The second improvement would be the installation of s dedicated west turn lane on Monroe Street toward North Causeway. That improvement could be installed with some schematic design without disturbing the median. There could be a lineup of one other street with Lambert Street and would not be a main access, but there would be a need for another median cut. Preserving the median was important to the City. The threshold of implementation of levels of service change would determine when the improvements were implemented. Mr. Liang had also applied the Mariner's Boulevard connection which was included in the addendum.

Mr. Adams said the 5% internal capture did not greatly change the results. Mr. Liang agreed that the number could be slightly inflated, but felt 5% was a good representation. Mr. Blache said there was not much difference between a 0 and 5% capture and Mr. Liang was in agreement. The third recommendation was that Lambert Street should be widened. There might have right-of-way constraints. Ms. Scott said the right-of-way was 25'.

Mr. Clark said in hearing the summary at full implementation there would be 400-600 vehicles in motion, but not reduce the street rating below a critical level. Mr. Liang said East Causeway/Monroe Street would be an issue and that was why there were suggested improvements. Mr. Adams said the improvements must be in place before they can initiate any traffic. Ms. Scott said the development agreement would address that. Mr. Clark reiterated as the City's expert that Mr. Liang was saying the service would not degrade if certain measures were taken to street functions and Mr. Liang agreed with the models run and suggested improvements. Mr. Adams said Lambert Street would be 5% of the traffic, and could help an existing situation. Mr. Liang said it would create another north/south route. Mr. Fairley asked about Kleber Street. Mr. Adams said it was developed and may have more traffic down that street.

Mr. Muller reiterated that ITE trip generation was practiced nationally and internationally. The only two assumptions with the report was the distribution coming out of the subdivision and internally to the subdivision. The experts thought 30% was appropriate, but the City requested 5%. The local engineers were in a better position to dictate assumptions to distribution. The California Department of Transportation and Cal State Davis finalized a report in 2013 comparing it to smart growth. They found that it should generate less traffic than what ITE would predict. Using 5% was conservative, and the report said in some instances it could be off as much as 50%. The concern of the full build out was the purpose of TIA to project likely traffic.

Mr. Quillin recapped that the ITE was the worst case than could be expected. Mr. Muller said ITE projected 100 trips, and the report said in some cases it was 50. Clearly ITE demonstrated more traffic than probably was seen in reality. There was an article in the Advocate that focused development was not suburban sprawl. It concluded that future growth in St. Tammany in order to preserve amenities should

be done on a basis of Smart Growth, TND, and high density with green around it to have little neighborhoods within the 26,000 acres.

Mr. Muller also said the TIA presented assumed a connection with Mariner's Village, because the Comprehensive Plan provided for it. The addendum took into consideration an assumption of no connection. The report also took into consideration what happened if the proposed improvements were constructed at various times and that effect of the development. Surprisingly when the connection was accomplished would help with the revitalization of Mariner's Village; it had had little or no impact on the overall effect of the traffic situation.

Frank Hall, Hall and Associates, said he addressed expected trip activity at 100%. Mr. Quillin said with new urbanism having all of the capture of the land use was different from a planning standpoint. Mr. Hall said the first TND was in 1984 for Seaside Florida that was not yet built. It was designed for all motor vehicles and no pedestrian because it was cheaper. Mr. Clark said the California study was stating that ITE was twice what it should be. Mr. Hall said only for a mixed use.

Since the last meeting there were questions being answered regarding recommended improvements to get the traffic situation up to CLURO standards. They had looked at all intersections and the distribution pattern was highlighted at 35% West on Mariner's Boulevard. To be assured of how important that was, they removed it and that 35% went to Monroe Street and headed to New Orleans. That was the distribution change of the current version without including Mariner's Boulevard. The 2015 level of service versus 2025 as projected to be service level E going to an F. Service level E was existing and was below the CLURO standard at the Monroe Street/East Causeway signalization. This was a reason why the improvement on the north lane would provide more green to the east/west movement.

An extra left turn lane for Monroe Street would reach the 2025 levels. The CLURO said the developer was not responsible for fixing what was previously broken. Mr. Adams asked how the road could be brought to a service D. Mr. Hall said 10 to 11 lanes would solve the problem. Another recommendation would be a right and left turn on the north leg of the southbound movement. Their report suggested at Monroe Street either a left turn or southbound right and then a left. He felt this would work because it opened two new lanes south to the north side so cars were more balanced. Mr. Blache said if the City had the technology and Mr. Hall answered yes with an additional lane.

The feedback expressed this was a nice gateway and suggested to create a left turn and a new lane on the north side which could have some difficulty in paving the right-of-way plantings and a less optimal alignment.

Mr. Hall did want to resolve the frustration of the Mariner's Boulevard connection. Assuming it did not happen, there would be redistribution to Monroe Street which would be allowable up to 25% of the total development. The southbound right turn lane would be agreeable at 25 and 30% of the project. The southbound left turn lane would be agreeable at 25% of the project. The southbound right turn and left turn lanes were agreeable at 100%. The westbound left turn lane on Monroe Street was agreeable to 100%. This was calculated at the 5% correction factor. Mr. Thomas clarified just westbound was good to 100% and it was answered yes. Mr. Clark said however resolved if there was a left turn the traffic would be solved to 100%. Mr. Muller said the problem was with the southbound right turn already being a service level E. Mr. Clark said to be clear the left turn lane solved all of the problems in the development agreement about

staging. Mr. Hall was in agreement with the statement. Mr. Clark reiterated that 100% was the plan posted on the wall in the court room at this meeting. Mr. Hall said Mr. Liang was in agreement with the addendum. Mariner's Boulevard was included in the Comprehensive Plan which he agreed was wise. Mr. Hall presented a video of a roundabout and said his best vision was bank the money that would be used for the improvements and put it together with other sources to construct a roundabout.

Mr. Adams said the board wanted to make sure they had the needed information to move forward on a recommendation on traffic.

Allan Moore, 129 Dona Drive, said the simulation did not show the backup of westbound traffic. Between 7 to 7:30 a.m. there was a traffic rush for 30 minutes. The report showed 20% of the traffic coming westbound to West Causeway, and he thought it was a larger amount going westbound on Monroe Street to West Causeway for Mandeville High School. The traffic was backed up to Barbara Drive every morning. Mr. Adams asked what assumptions should be made. Mr. Moore said the peak 30 minutes at school time should be considered. Mr. Hall said they used traffic counts from the spring during school time.

Jamie Gephardt, 726 Hutchinson Street, asked about the 100% diagram of the southbound left turn to the Causeway. Mr. Hall moving west down Monroe Street with a left turn to the Causeway was one of the suggested improvements. Ms. Gephardt asked with a southbound left turn plus southbound right turn, where was the right lane. Mr. Quillin said there were two options, one being a left turn from Monroe Street south, and another creating four lanes with two lanes being a pass thru. The two options were an either/or. She also asked how to widen Lambert Street. A suggestion would be to take property along that street and the recommendation did not see a justification of preserving the Monroe Street median over residential property. Mr. Adams said that only helped 5% of the people so it would be an issue for discussion. It had been an idea from the public. Ms. Gephardt asked what would happen if the owners did not want to sell. Mr. Adams said it was a suggestion and it did not look like it was part of the plan. Ms. Gephardt wanted to know if there should be a worry for the property owners of losing their property. Mr. Adams said the board would weigh the pluses and minuses in making a decision. Mr. Blache said he did not see moving people off their property. Ms. Bush said it should be the least restrictive. Mr. Quillin said it would be 5-10' of the front of the property to make the road wider. Ms. Gephardt asked how he would feel if it was his property and he did not know if he would be losing it. Mr. Adams under the law the City could not take away property without just payment for it. It was a terrible solution and it would only be used as a last resort. Ms. Gephardt said the development was not relevant. Mr. Cressy said no one said it would happen, but it was part of that procedure of the whole project. The project would have to prove to a court that it was needed by the City and it was a big proof problem.

Mr. Clark said he was confused with two traffic consultants having a matrix to 100%, and one change would pave the way to have the project move forward with Lambert or any other street. What the consultants said was by adding a left turn on Monroe Street it would be feasible to 100% so the issues about expropriation were off the table. Mr. Cressy said it was not on the table.

Darla Moore, 120 Dona Drive, asked about the traffic study on Cambronne Street and Barbara Drive. The traffic would back up to Barbara Drive on Monroe Street and people would cut through New Golden Shores. Mr. Hall said the existing traffic was low and they did their best to distribute the traffic in a consensus manner and it was 2.5% on three streets going north/south. Ms. Moore said Cambronne

Street had more traffic than normal at this time. Mr. Adams said with a turn lane there might be no extra traffic. Mr. Adams said with the growth in the town we should expect more traffic on a public street. Mr. Quillin said northbound on Cambronne Street showed a decrease in the am on the addendum.

Mr. Thomas said Monroe Street north was not the easiest intersection to go through. Ms. Moore said it was used quite a bit as a cutoff. Mr. Clark said in the last meeting there was a discussion about driver motivations and attitudes of the path of least resistance. Ms. Moore said she hoped there was a plan b in case there was a more serious traffic issue. Mr. Blache explained that this was not a blanket approval. The project would be phased and the board would assess each phase. The developer would be required to present a plan and make necessary changes for it to work.

Mr. Adams said the board's job was to evaluate the project under the ordinances and the Comprehensive Plan and make a recommendation to the City Council from their fact gathering.

Brian Rhinehart, 712 Carondelet Street, asked if the board felt the project met the California study criteria. The California study included bus and train stops which were not available in Mandeville. Mr. Rhinehart said he felt 5% was the correct amount and there was no wiggle room.

Daniel Burrell, 540 Lambert Street, asked about the size at 100% build out. Mr. Oubre said there would be a marina, 157 single homes, 193 condo/townhomes, a 120 rooms, and retain of 60,000 square feet.

Mayor Villere said he had met with Regional Planning Commission to look at a wider traffic study. They were obtaining information, and had been provided the Port Marigny information. Results were expected by August, 2016 for a short/long term look.

Mr. Blache said with the assistance of Mr. Cressy there was a resolution prepared and it would become part of the record. Mr. Quillin moved to adopt the resolution, seconded by Mr. Thomas. Mr. Burguieres asked if this was on the agenda. Mr. Adams said there should be a board discussion. Mr. Blache said he was concerned about the attacks on the board from the Council. Bob Becker had recently provided an educational presentation explaining the planning process was to be a separate issue from politics. The board had made fair decisions on the information presented. Mr. Cressy said the board could open the agenda with a unanimous vote. Mr. Adams said the process was clear and he had read the original 1920s model ordinance which indicated that the board was to stay out of politics. The main goal of the board was to protect the CLURO and Comprehensive Plan while keeping the integrity in the process. The board was asking the Council to let the process be finished and they would send a recommendation. Mr. Quillin moved to open the agenda, seconded by Mr. Blache and was unanimously approved.

There was a lengthy discussion between the board and Mr. Burguieres regarding Mr. Burguieres having submitted questions and him feeling they were not being answered. He had received questions from his constituents because they were feeling left out of the process. The board was concerned that the request was not being handled in the appropriate manner and that the process should be devoid

of politics. The board understood that the process was their review with a recommendation to the City Council for their final action. The intent of the resolution was for the Council to take no further action until the board finished their public hearings.

Mr. Clark moved to amend the resolution with a change in the verbiage asking the Council to "refrain", seconded by Mr. Blache. Mr. Burguieres said at this time the issue of the questions was already past. He suggested asking the Attorney General for an opinion. Messrs. Quillin and Thomas accepted the change and the vote was unanimous on the change. The vote was taken on the resolution and was unanimously approved.

Ms. Scott announced a tentative meeting date of January 20th.

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

Lori Spranley, Secretary

Dennis Thomas, Chairman