

The meeting was called to order at 6:00pm by Planning Chairwoman Karen Gautreaux

The secretary called the roll.

Commissioners Present: Karen Gautreaux, Nixon Adams, Scott Quillin, Mike Pierce, Brian Rhinehart, and Simmie Fairley

Absent: Claire Durio

Also Present: Cara Bartholomew, Director Planning Department; David Parnell, City Attorney; Alex Weiner, Secretary

Mr. Quillin made a motion to adopt the minutes from the March 8 and March 29 meetings, Mr. Rhinehart seconded, and all were in favor.

**R22-04-01/V22-04-10** – John Crane requests a variance to CLURO Section 7.5.1.3 R-1 Site Development Regulations and to resubdivide into lots 6 and 7, Sq. 13, R-1 Single Family Residential District, 320 & 324 Lamarque

Ms. Bartholomew said that this case had a corresponding variance request, as such they would be heard at the same time.

John Crane, Applicant, 311 Lamarque: Clarified that lot 7 has two units on it

Mr. Rhinehart said that both lots are now legal non-conforming lots, but were legal when they were built on, and asked if the properties had taken on any water.

Mr. Crane replied they had taken on water at least three times to his knowledge and were substantially damaged.

Mr. Rhinehart asked when the structures would be rebuilt would they be single family homes and at base flood elevation (BFE), Ms. Bartholomew replied they would.

Mr. Adams noted that the smaller lots would be in character with the surrounding properties, Mr. Rhinehart also mentioned that if the two properties were sold, pride of ownership would also help keep the sites looking nice.

Mr. Pierce asked why the lots were combined if they were under one ownership, Ms. Bartholomew replied that it was done this way to try and accommodate the lower frontage of the lots. If there were two lots next to each other under one ownership, they were combined to try and get closer to the minimum frontage requirement. Mr. Pierce said that the language seems legally fishy because if one lot was under a husband's name and the other under a wife's name, then they would not be combined.

Ms. Gautreaux said that this is something they could look at for the next CLURO rewrite

Mr. Crane said that his intention with the lots is to keep the Historic District consistent.

**R22-04-02/V22-04-14** – Gateway Property Investments requests a variance to CLURO Section 7.5.3.3 R-2 Site Development Regulations and to resubdivide into lots 99D and 99E, Sq. 99, R-2 Two-Family Residential District, 700 Montgomery

Ms. Bartholomew said this case, like the last case, has a corresponding variance request and both would be heard at the same time.

Mr. Quillin noticed that a portion of the building seemed to be outside of the setbacks on the trace side, Ms. Bartholomew said that she can get in touch with the surveyor for the exact measurements.

Mr. Rhinehart stated that the existing structure is a single-family residence and asked if the new lot would be single family as well, Ms. Bartholomew replied that the lot is zoned as R-2 (Two Family Residential District) but it does not meet the area requirements for a multi family residence to be built. Mr. Rhinehart clarified that there was no chance that for a multi-family structure to be built, Ms. Bartholomew replied that was correct.

Mr. Quillin asked what the current front of the property was, Ms. Bartholomew said it was Rapatel St. Mr. Quillin asked if changing the front would change the setbacks, Ms. Bartholomew replied that the structure is inside the setbacks.

Chris Rayer, Gateway Properties, Applicant: Clarified that the setbacks are shown as if property had been subdivided, as the plan is to have the existing house face Montgomery St.

Mr. Quillin asked if a variance would be required for the existing house to meet the setbacks and wondered if they needed to include that if the variance was granted. Ms. Bartholomew said that the Planning Department can administratively flex the setbacks by 30% and the plans are inside that flexed area.

Mr. Adams said that the shortest dimension is on Rapatel, Ms. Bartholomew replied it would switch to the street frontage.

Mr. Rhinehart clarified that the street address is on Montgomery, but the front of the building faces Rapatel. Ms. Bartholomew replied that is correct.


Mr. Adams asked what the frontage of the other lots in the area were, Ms. Bartholomew replied they were between 50' and 75'.

Mr. Rayer said that the resubdivision would be consistent with the south side of Montgomery St.

Ms. Bartholomew said that she could get the dimensions of the surrounding lots for the next meeting.

Ms. Gautreaux adjourned the Planning Meeting

  
Alex Weiner, Secretary

  
Karen Gautreaux, Chairwoman  
Planning Commission

Brian Rhinehart, Zoning Commission Chairman, commenced the Zoning Commission Meeting.

Mr. Rhinehart read the announcement that any additional information determined to be needed by the Commission in order to make a decision regarding a case shall be required to be submitted to the Planning Department by the end of business on the Friday following the meeting at which the additional information was requested, or the case will automatically be tabled at the next meeting.

**V22-04-09** – Frank Stuart requests a variance to CLURO Section 9.2.5.7 Live Oak Protection Requirements, B-3 Old Mandeville Business District, 2047 Lakeshore

Mr. Rhinehart asked if a site plan for the replacement trees had been submitted, Ms. Bartholomew replied that none had been submitted yet.

Mr. Pierce asked if the City Arborist had looked at the site yet, Ms. Bartholomew replied not yet, but that she would visit before the next meeting. Mr. Pierce wanted to know if she agreed on the health of the tree, if the construction had impacted it in any way, and what her assessment was.

Mr. Quillin brought up that the area of a 10" live oak is not equal to three 3" trees and would like the replacements to be larger. Mr. Rhinehart brought up that there would be a better canopy with three trees.

Frank Thibodeaux, Arborist with Bob's Tree Service: They are willing to replace in kind, could do two 4" trees and one 2" tree, Mr. Quillin replied that it was an area question not a diameter question.

Mr. Adams said that only container grown trees should be used as a replacement and was in favor of increasing the canopy.

Ms. Bartholomew said that the CLURO states that the replacement of a live oak is measured by the caliper which is probably what they based their replacement on, and the minimum requirement is a 2" tree

**V22-04-11** – August Chappetta requests a variance to CLURO Section 7.5.2.3 R-1X Site Development Regulations, Sq. C, Lot 26A, R-1X Single Family Residential Existing Small Lots District, 751 Magnolia Ridge Drive East

Mr. Quillin asked if the existing structure is a legal non-conforming structure, Ms. Bartholomew replied that it is.

Mr. Adams asked if it was legal when it was built, Ms. Bartholomew replied that it was.

Mr. Quillin asked if there were any comments from the adjacent homes, Ms. Bartholomew said that there were none.

Mr. Adams asked if there was any existing mechanical equipment, Ms. Bartholomew said that there was existing mechanical equipment in the side yard setback so any additional equipment would be permitted by right to be placed there.

**V22-04-12** – Luci and Josh Brandner request a variance to CLURO Section 9.2.5.7 Live Oak Protection Requirements, R-1 Single Family Residential, 149 Coffee

Mr. Adams said that he thinks the process for cases like this is backwards, the character of the structure should be looked at before the Planning and Zoning Commission says if it can encroach into the dripline. Ms. Bartholomew said that the footprint could change dramatically depending on if they are allowed to encroach into the dripline or not.

Luci and Josh Brandner, Applicant, 149 Coffee: Would like to not delay this any longer and would like to start rebuilding their home. Mrs. Brandner spoke with the City Arborist and she said that she would walk the site with Mr. Guidry, the City consulting arborist. Everything that is currently under the dripline is already existing, and they are actually removing the deck which would expose more of the roots. She said that the City Arborist asked if they could build something above their garage, but they cannot build up and have to go to the side for the addition.

Mr. Pierce asked why the City Arborist asked that question. Mrs. Brandner said that they had an existing garage and the Arborist asked why not use the space above it but the tree limb gets too close to build anything.

Mr. Quillin said that other than the stairs, there is not much impact, Mrs. Brandner said that the stairs are located on an existing walkway.

Mr. Adams asked if there were any issues with pervious/impervious coverage, Ms. Bartholomew replied there were none.

Mr. Quillin asked if there were any issues with the stairs for the front yard setback and wondered if they should include something for them in the variance. Ms. Bartholomew said that the applicant had not yet gone through design review.

Mr. Pierce asked if an arborist could look and see if going up would have any impact on the tree. Mrs. Brandner said that an arborist already came by, and they got a permit to prune some of the limbs so they would have space for the elevation they are doing to the house.

Mr. Rhinehart asked if the Arborist report would be ready before the next meeting, Ms. Bartholomew replied that it would be.

Mr. Adams requested that someone from Design Review be at the next meeting to comment on the structure.

**V22-04-13** – Stacie Landry requests a variance to CLURO Section 10.5.3.4 Attached Signs, B-2 Highway Business District, 3414 Hwy 190 Ste 2

Mr. Quillin asked if there was already a variance in place for this signage, Ms. Bartholomew replied that the sign code might have been changed after this sign was put up as she could not find any variance or the design package that was submitted to see what was approved.

Mr. Quillin asked if the lettering would stay the same size, Ms. Bartholomew said it would be.

Ms. Gautreaux mentioned that the tan areas to the side looked like they were getting painted a lighter color as well.

Mr. Pierce asked why they were going with a bigger sign, Ms. Bartholomew said it was part of a national brand change.

Stacie Landry, Deep South Signs, Applicant: Not going bigger on the signage, they are just removing the letters to paint the area blue and then adding them back on. This is part of a national rollout called "Dipped in Blue"

Mr. Adams wondered if it was any more blighty than it was now.

Ms. Bartholomew said they could get the existing square footage and the difference for the next meeting. Ms. Landry said her company did not do the initial survey but will look for it.

Mr. Adams asked if this was part of the gateway corridor and if anyone would look at it, Ms. Bartholomew said that Design Review would look at it.

Mr. Rhinehart asked if the tan area that they were painting was part of the building, Ms. Bartholomew said that was correct, it is only signage with the blue since it is part of their corporate colors. Mr. Rhinehart felt that was a matter of semantics.

**V22-04-15** – Kent and Heidi Sharp request a variance to CLURO Section 7.5.1.3 R-1 Site Development Regulations, R-1 Single Family Residential District, 1321 Livingston

Ms. Bartholomew said that it is addressed and faces Livingston, but the shortest side is on Atalin, so it is technically not compliant with the rear setbacks, but compliant if on Livingston.

Mr. Adams asked what was next to the structure on the Livingston side, Ms. Bartholomew replied it was an empty lot.

Mr. Rhinehart asked if the applicants owned the lot, Ms. Bartholomew said she did not believe so.

**Public Comment**

Ms. Bartholomew reminded everyone that there would be a Short Term Work meeting in June with the City Council, held before the regular meeting. She also announced that there would be a resiliency committee meeting soon

Ms. Gautreaux motioned to adjourn the meeting, Mr. Adams seconded, and all were in favor.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:01pm.



---

Alex Weiner, Secretary



---

Brian Rhinehart, Chairman  
Zoning Commission

# Public Comments

**City of Mandeville  
Planning and Zoning Commission**

KAREN GAUTREUX, CHAIRWOMAN  
PLANNING COMMISSION

BRIAN RHINEHART, CHAIRMAN  
ZONING COMMISSION

CARA BARTHOLOMEW, AICP  
DIRECTOR, DEPT. OF PLANNING &  
DEVELOPMENT



MEMBERS

SCOTT QUILLIN  
SIMMIE FAIRLEY  
NIXON ADAMS  
CLAIRE DURIO  
MIKE PIERCE

***NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING***

**TO:** *ALL INTERESTED PROPERTY OWNERS*

**FROM:** *ALEX WEINER, SECRETARY*

**RE:** John Crane requests a variance to CLURO Section 7.5.1.3 R-1 Site Development Regulations and to resubdivide into lots 6 and 7, Sq. 13, R-1 Single Family Residential District, 320 & 324 Lamarque

*There will be a work session held at the Mandeville City Hall Council Chambers, 3101 E. Causeway Approach, Mandeville, LA 70448 on Tuesday, April 12, 2022 at 6:00 p.m. to discuss the above referenced subject.*

*There will be a public hearing at the same location on Tuesday, April 26, 2022 at 6:00 p.m. to discuss and vote on the above referenced subject.*

*You are encouraged to attend the work session and public hearing, or to write me at City Hall, to voice your opinion on this matter.*

*Should you need any additional information, you may contact me at 985-624-3103.*

*I strongly support Mr. Crane's  
plans for improving the  
neighborhood.*

*Seal Kuebler  
1775 Jefferson St.*