

**Zoning Commission
Work Session
August 11, 2020**

The meeting was called to order by Planning Chairman Bill Sones and the secretary called the roll.

Present: Nixon Adams, Ren Clark, Simmie Fairley, Brian Rhinehart, Jeff Lahasky, and Bill Sones

Absent: None

Also Present: Cara Bartholomew, Planner; and Council Members Skelly Kreller and Jason Zuckerman

Ms. Spranley announced that the meeting was being held under the Zoom platform via teleconference under Governor John Bell Edwards Executive Proclamation.

Mr. Adams announced 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.

The first case discussed was V20-08-24 James Leonard and Lori Garner Martin request an exception to Section 7.5.10.3, B-3 Site Development Regulations, Section 8.1.1.4, Setback Encroachments, Mechanical Equipment and Section 8.1.5, Supplemental Regulations of Accessory Buildings and Structures, lot 1-C, square 25-A, 2112 Claiborne Street, zoned B-3

Ms. Bartholomew presented that the applicants owned the property in Square 25-A, Lot 1-C, located on the south side of Claiborne St, and to the west of Lafitte St being 2112 Claiborne St. The property was zoned B-3, Old Mandeville Business District and was improved with a Single- Family dwelling. The applicant was requesting to install a whole house generator on an existing A/C platform, within the east side setback. The applicants were also requesting to place a carport within the west side setback.

The lot had a width of 68.53' and depth of 164.75'. The minimum required side setbacks were 12'. The residence was setback 10' from the east side setback and 13.5' from the west side setback. The A/C platform was located 4' from the property line and was elevated to meet FEMA requirements. The applicant was requesting a variance of 8' from the required 12', in order to place the generator with the A/C equipment. The applicant stated there was enough room to place the equipment without having to enlarge the platform.

CLURO Sec 7.5.10.3 required all mechanical equipment elevated more than 3 feet above grade be screened in accordance with Article 9. The applicants are placing the generator to the rear of the existing equipment.

The applicants were also requesting to construct a covered carport to park their RV. The carport would be located behind an existing wooden fence. The fence was approximately 119 ft feet from the front property line. The carport was proposed to be setback 3' from the west side property line and 6' from the rear property line. The carport was compliant with accessory building setbacks but exceeded the maximum height of 14' by formula. The sketch provided by the applicant showed the peak at 16 ft, with the lowest eave being 14', by formula $(16+14)/2=15$, the applicant was requesting a variance to allow the height of the accessory structure to be exceed the maximum of 14' by 1', by formula.

The applicant has submitted the following statement:

We wanted to add a generator to the house and the only spot is on the same side of the house that the three air condition units are on. There is enough room on the deck to fit the generator.

We have an RV and have found that this area of the property is the only place we can park/store it is on this side of the house in the back.

The carport would be open air and compliant to the side yard setback. The RV was currently parked on the side of the house and would be placed behind a fence.

Mr. Sones said there had been several requests for generator locations that had been approved. He asked about the height of the RV.

Luke Locero, contractor, said the 14' was the minimum height to park the RV. There were air condition units on the top of the unit for the added height.

Mr. Fairley asked what the surface will be for the carport. It was answered that it would be a slab. Mr. Fairley was concerned about the tree. Ms. Bartholomew said the carport would be pushed back and the tree will be unaffected.

James Leonard, applicant, said they researched building and it needed a minimum clearance of 12'6" scraping the plastic covering. Most people were construction 14' x 14' carports to cover the RV. Serving the air condition unit will be difficult but manageable.

Mr. Rhinehart said the generator was a familiar topic. Ms. Bartholomew said she had worked on the language for an ordinance this day. In most cases, the gas line was already run adjacent to the air condition unit. Mr. Rhinehart and Mr. Lahasky had no comments.

The next case discussed was V20-08-25 Thomas Parks, Jr. requests an exception to Section 8.1.3, Supplemental Fence and Wall Regulations, a parcel situated in the east half of square 56, 1705 Montgomery Street, zoned R-1

The applicants owned the property in Square 56, located on the north west of Foy and Montgomery Streets being 1705 Montgomery Street. The property was zoned R-1, Single Family Residential and was improved with a Single- Family dwelling. The lot had a width of 130' on Montgomery Street and 120' on Foy Street. The applicant was requesting to construct a 6' privacy fence along of the back (north) property line, and along the Foy Street side (east) property line. The request was to construct the 6' privacy fence that will run from the North east corner property line 30' south along Foy Street. After the 30' stretch the fence would taper down for 5', to 4' fence that will run another 35' to the south, along Foy Street. The fence would run a total of 70' from the northeast corner south.

The 6' fence along Foy Street would run along the rear yard in order to give privacy to the back yard. The 30' span of 6' fence required a variance from the fence regulation. The regulation stated that on any corner lot, fences were required to be a maximum of 4' in height or must be setback 15' from the street side property line. The applicant was requesting a variance from the fence regulations of 2' (from 4' to 6') for the length of 30' along Foy Street.

The applicant has submitted the following statement:

We will be making a pool addition to our home in the near future and are requesting a variance. Due to the pool being placed near the rear of our home we would like to have a fence placed on the property line with an elevation of 6'. This is from north east corner of the property moving toward the south. Once line sight is clear of the pool from Foy Street, the fence will drop to an elevation of 4' to accommodate city ordinances. Maximum length of a 6' fence will be 30' then dropping elevation to 4' for the remainder 40' for a total of 70'. Our

family would like city officials to accommodate the privacy and safety of our children. We would like to offer continued investment toward quality of life in this great town.

Thanks.

Thomas and Fernanda Parks

Mr. Adams stated that Foy Street was the lesser frontage which would be considered the front yard. Ms. Bartholomew said the property owners had purchased an additional lot so the original frontage had been Montgomery Street. The additional variance would be advertised for 6' technically in the side yard setback.

Mr. Rhinehart asked if a variance would be required if it was a wrought iron fence. Ms. Bartholomew said the exception was for the 6' height in the requested location. The 6' fence would screen the pool in the rear yard.

Mr. Adams asked what property was to the north of this property. Ms. Bartholomew said it was a residence with a chain-link fence.

Mr. Sones stated this was his last meeting since he was selling his Mandeville home and moving out of state. He had enjoyed serving on the commission. The commissioners thanked him for his service.

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



Lori Spranley, Secretary

William Sones, Chairman
Planning Commission

