

**Planning Commission
Work Session
August 10, 2021
Page 1 of 4**

The meeting was called to order at 6:30pm by Planning Chairwoman Karen Gautreaux.

The secretary called the roll.

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

Absent: None

Also Present: Cara Bartholomew, Director Planning Department; Lauren Brinkman, Planner; Elizabeth Sconzert, City Attorney; Whitney Stewart, City Attorney; Alex Weiner, Secretary

Minutes:

Mr. Rhinehart motioned to adopt the minutes from the July 13 and July 27 meetings and from the special meeting on July 20, Mr. Pierce seconded, and it was unanimously approved.

Res. 21-02 – A resolution of the Planning and Zoning Commission of the City of Mandeville outlining its review of the new Capital Improvement projects as set forth in the 2021/2022 annual budget for consistency with the comprehensive plan

Rebecca Rohrbough, 2525 Lakeshore: Asked if there was going to be a vote on the resolutions tonight, or would they be voted on at the next session, Mr. Adams said that the vote would be happening tonight. Ms. Rohrbough stated how there was no detail on the projects and suggested a joint meeting with the City Council and the Planning and Zoning Commission to go into detail. Mr. Adams replied that the details come from the budget discussion.

Elizabeth Sconzert, City Attorney: Explained the statute and the Planning and Zoning Commissions role in it.

Mr. Rhinehart asked that if a case came up pertaining to something in the resolution, would the city have to come before the Commission as the applicant. Ms. Bartholomew replied yes.

Mr. Rhinehart motioned to approve the resolution to be passed along to the City Council, Mr. Fairley seconded, and all were in favor.

Res. 21-03 – A resolution of the Planning and Zoning Commission of the City of Mandeville adopting the 2021/2022 short term work program

Ms. Gautreaux asked how the process was going for the budget for the resiliency plan and if it was a critical task, Ms. Bartholomew replied that they were working on the timeline and that it was the first task.

Mr. Rhinehart motioned to approve the resolution to be passed along to the City Council, Mr. Adams seconded, and all were in favor.

Ms. Gautreaux adjourned the Planning Commission Meeting.


Alex Weiner, Secretary


Karen Gautreaux, Chairwoman
Planning Commission

**Zoning Commission
Work Session
August 10, 2021
Page 2 of 4**

Nixon Adams, Zoning Commission Chairman, commenced the Zoning Commission Meeting.

Mr. Adams said 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.

New Business:

Mr. Fairley motioned to postpone cases V21-07-20 and V21-07-21 per the request of the applicants, Mr. Adams seconded, and all were in favor.

CU21-08-07 – Grapeful Ape is requesting a Conditional Use Permit per CLURO Section 7.5.10.2 B-3 Permitted uses Subsection 2-B, Sq. 11, Lot 4 5, B-3, Old Mandeville Business District, 2013 Jefferson St.

Accessory Outdoor Dining in Right-of-Way

Mr. Adams asked if the existing Special Use Permit would have to be modified (SUP19-09-05) and Ms. Bartholomew replied yes, for the parking Mr. Adams also stated that he liked the idea of sidewalk dining, but the use of the Right of Way falls under the purview of the City Council

Mr. Pierce asked if the original parking amount was nine, then reduced to three, and now at zero. Ms. Bartholomew replied yes. Mr. Pierce said that this was allowed by city parking, but it is located a block away, he likes the idea of sidewalk dining but thinks there is a parking issue.

Michelle and Doug Walker, 308 Girod: Stated that they have some issues, primarily safety concerns with people overflowing. They also had concerns with the noise from the people drinking and the food trucks.

Ann Downs, 2028 Jefferson: Brought up how Conditional Use Permits stay with the property, not with the person who filed for it, so that needs to be taken into consideration. She also said they need to decide if they are a bar or restaurant.

Leonard Rohrbough, 2525 Lakeshore: Opposed to the permit, thinks that it will be a hazard to people walking on the sidewalk who will have to move into the street. He says that Mandeville cannot afford to lose more parking.

Charles Guinchard, 635 Carroll: Likes the idea of dining outside, and hopes that more places do seating like this. The location is accessible by bikes, and he said that the Grapeful Ape is not the reason for parking issues. He also said that cars parking on the sidewalks block them, not tables. This is the type of small business that he wants to see, and that pop up food is good for business with COVID and wanted to mention that only the seating would be in the Right of Way, not any of the food.

Andrea Fulton, 3315 Avenue D: Voiced concern about this getting out of control with other businesses asking for similar things, the Commission needs to look at this carefully and avoid setting a precedent.

Michelle Walker, 308 Girod: Spoke again saying that they are not opposed to the idea, but their issue is with the number of people in a public space.

**Zoning Commission
Work Session
August 10, 2021
Page 3 of 4**

Mr. Adams asked what calculations were used to figure out the parking, Ms. Bartholomew replied that they used what was in the Special Use Permit, that there were no additional requirements for outdoor space. Mr. Pierce said it was by sq ft not by patrons.

V21-08-22 – Danny Gaspard requests a variance to CLURO Section 7.5.1.3 R-1 Site Development Regulations, Sq. 84, Lot 4G, R-1, Single-Family Residential District, 639 Albert St.

Bradley Gaspard, Applicant: Said that the main issue was with the live oak, he only mentioned the side yard setbacks matching the surrounding houses to say that he would not stand out from the surrounding properties by having the layout this way.

V21-08-23 – Neil Jarrett requests a variance to CLURO Section 5.2.3.2 Drainage Overlay District and Fill Sub-Area A, Sq. 5, Lot 3-5, R-1, Single-Family Residential District, 225 West St.

Mr. Rhinehart said that the two other exceptions were brought up to 4.5msl, and asked if this was currently at 5.6msl, Ms. Bartholomew replied that the elevation certificate was shot with an old raised structure that has since been demolished.

-Mr. Adams asked if the new information would be available before the next meeting, the applicant said yes.

Neil and Aubree Jarrett, Applicants, 225 West: Clarified that the structure was an old, enclosed shed used for tool storage, and that their slab was not removed just covered in dirt from their piling replacements. They said that their home was at 2.5-3msl but they would get the correct and updated information to Ms. Bartholomew.

V21-08-24 – Duplantis Design Group requests a variance to CLURO Section 7.5.9 B-2 Highway Business District, Section 9.2.5.5 Landscape Requirements in Districts Other than Low-Density Residential, and Section 10.5 Regulations of On-Premises Signs and Murals, Sq. N1-SQ, B-2, Highway Business District, 3450 US-190.

Mr. Adams asked what the total signage was for the building vs what was allowed. Ms. Bartholomew replied that the total sign age was 149.3 sq ft and the allowed signage was 120 sq ft.

Mr. Rhinehart asked if they were asking for an additional sign, Ms. Bartholomew replied yes they were asking to put a sign on the side with no entrance. Mr. Adams asked if it was allowed how much sq ft could they have, Ms. Bartholomew said they were allowed 120 sq ft.

Mr. Pierce brought up how the additional parking eliminated some greenspace, was that something that they wanted, or were they doing it to be compliant.

Thomas Buckel, DDG and Townsend Underhill Stirling Properties Applicant: Said that they were required to add more parking spaces in order to be compliant. They also stated that the shared buffer is on their side so they can modify it without an agreement from the neighboring property. They said that the material used for the fire lane is going to be pervious, but the use in the CLURO classifies it as impervious regardless. They wanted to point out that the side sign is going to be used for wayfinding, and they want to make the parking work.

Mr. Adams said he is not in favor of tampering with the landscape buffers. He asked Ms. Bartholomew if the ordinance required adjacent shopping centers to connect, she said yes. Mr. Adams asked if there was any chance of connection between the shopping center to the west of them, the applicants said they would look into it as they are in support of connectivity.

**Zoning Commission
Work Session
August 10, 2021
Page 4 of 4**

Mr. Buckel and Mr. Underhill said that the easy thing to do would be to ask for a parking variance, but they are trying to do the better option, not just the easier one.

Mr. Pierce asked if they got a variance for the parking would they be interested in keeping the buffer. They replied that it was not their decision to make but would try to sell it to the tenant.


Leonard Rohrbough, 2525 Lakeshore: Asked for the applicant to restate their interest in connectivity as he could not hear them in the audience.

Rebecca Rohrbough, 2525 Lakeshore: Stated concerns about the buffer, she would rather lose parking than the buffer. She also said she is dubious about the live oaks being planted as a replacement for decreasing the buffer, thinks a better option would be to donate some live oaks to be planted elsewhere in the city, and to plant something like a crepe myrtle that is more suited to the area.

Ms. Bartholomew made an announcement that the meetings would be held on zoom going forward at 6:00pm instead of 6:30pm

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

The meeting was adjourned at 8:27pm.



Alex Weiner, Secretary

Nixon Adams, Chairman
Zoning Commission