

**Planning Commission
Public Hearing
June 26, 2018**

The meeting was called to order by Planning Chairwoman Rebecca Bush and the secretary called the roll.

Present: Michael Blache, Simmie Fairley, Ren Clark, Dennis Thomas and Rebecca Bush

Absent: Nixon Adams and Bill Sones

Also Present: Louissette Scott, Director, Planning Department; Paul Harrison, City Attorney; Catherine Casanova, Landscape Inspector; and Mayor Donald Villere

Ms. Bush moved to adopt the minutes of April 17 and May 8, 2018, seconded by Mr. Clark and was unanimously approved.

The first case discussed was S18-06-01 Crosby Development Co., LLC requests a tentative subdivision approval for Phase 5 of the Sanctuary Subdivision, zoned R-1

The applicant had requested to table the case until the July 24th meeting.

Mr. Clark moved to table the case until July 24th, seconded by Mr. Blache and was unanimously approved.

The next case discussed was P18-06-08 Adoption of the 2018-2019 Short Term Work Program in Resolution 18-01.

Ms. Scott requested any changes be emailed to her.

Mr. Blache moved to table the case until the July 10th meeting, seconded by Mr. Clark and was unanimously approved.

Mr. Blache moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Mr. Thomas and was unanimously approved.

Lori Spranley, Secretary

Rebecca Bush, Chairwoman
Planning Commission

**Zoning Commission
Public Hearing
June 26, 2018**

The meeting was called to order by Planning Chairwoman Rebecca Bush and the secretary called the roll.

Present: Michael Blache, Ren Clark, Simmie Fairley, Dennis Thomas, and Rebecca Bush

Absent: Nixon Adams and Bill Sones

Also Present: Louissette Scott, Director, Planning Department; Paul Harrison, City Attorney; Catherine Casanova, Landscape Inspector

Ms. Bush announced that written notice of decisions regarding zoning variances will be filed in the Board's office the following day of this meeting at which time applicable appeal time will begin to run.

The first case discussed was V18-03-04 Jeremy L. Sims requests a variance to Section 7.5.10.3, B-3 Site Development Regulations, Section 7.5.105, Special B-3 Old Mandeville Business District Criteria, and Section 9.2.5.2, Vegetation Protection Zone, lot 2, square 20, 1929 Monroe Street, zoned B-3

The applicant requested to table the case until the applicant requested it be placed on the agenda.

Mr. Clark moved to table the case until requested to be returned to the agenda, seconded by Mr. Fairley and was unanimously approved.

The next case discussed was V18-06-10 Joshua Brown requests a variance to Section 8.1.3, Supplemental Fence and Wall Regulations, lot 1, Hermitage on the Lake, Phase 1, 400 Chase Court W., zoned R-1

Ms. Scott presented that Joshua Brown recently completed construction on his new residence on Chase Court West backing up to Monroe Street. Mr. Brown was proposing install a 6' wood and metal fence along the property line about 3/4rds of the length of the property. The CLURO allowed for a 4' fence, but in this case there was a median and a wide right-of-way. Also, the house across the street had their fence in the same location as Mr. Brown was requesting. The fence would be tied into the Monroe Street fence. There was a row of Bradford pears planted within the right-of-way. It was discussed at the works session that the staff did not expect any root damage without a continuous chain wall for the fence.

Mr. Thomas asked about the permit for the other fence. Ms. Scott said the staff could not find the permit, but that did not mean it was not obtained within a previous permitting

program. The additional setbacks, the wide right-of-way, and the trees was not creating a walled off situation.

Mrs. Brown stated there would not be any footings for the fence. They wanted to create the same symmetry of the subdivision. Mr. Thomas asked if it would be a standard 6' fence or match the approved fence. Mrs. Brown said the fence would match the Monroe Street without the columns. Ms. Bush said this was in an effort to match a continuous look of the subdivision.

Mr. Thomas moved to approve the 6' standard wooden fence, seconded by Mr. Fairley and was unanimously approved.

The next case discussed was V18-06-11 Bryan and Phyllis Buechler request a variance to Section 9.2.5.6, Landscape Maintenance and Replacement Provisions, lots 15 and 16, square 3, West Beach Parkway Subdivision, 269 East Street, zoned R-1

Ms. Scott presented as discussed at the work session that there was a remnant of a 72' live oak tree and the applicant was requesting not to follow any of the replacement provisions other than the two tree planting with the City's Releaf program. The commission had requested there be some replacement. The applicant had submitted a planting plan of 6 Japanese magnolias as Class B to be planted within 8 months of the approval and two live oaks from the Street Tree Program for a total of 8 tree. The request would be for a 4 replacement tree relief instead of all 12 trees. It was discussed in depth of what happened to the tree to create the remnant and succors growing out of it. There were existing trees in the rear yard. The 8 month time period would be during the fall for the correct planting season.

Ms. Bush asked Ms. Casanova if that was an ideal situation. Ms. Casanova suggested planting the trees around December or January for the best planting time. Ms. Scott said many times the applicant was allowed up to one year to be planted within the proper planting season.

Mr. Thomas asked if a Japanese Magnolia was a similar trade because he considered it more of an ornamental tree. Ms. Casanova said Class B trees would be 20' and it would not a large shade tree but it would be a replacement. The live oak would be minimum 2" with the Street Tree Program. Mr. Thomas said he was familiar with the tree and he could testify to its age. Unfortunately, the previous owner kept cutting pieces off the tree. Mr. Clark said his Magnolia tree dropped many leaves so he asked to consider a different tree mix.

Phyllis Buechler, applicant, said she saw the tree on the list and recognized the species. She knew she would not fit six live oak trees on the property and she remembered the pretty flowers. Ms. Scott suggested a variety from the approved list. Ms. Buechler was agreeable to a mixture of Class A and B trees and plant them at the appropriate time.

Mr. Thomas moved to approve the planting of 8 mixed Class A and B trees at the approval of the City Arborist at the property planting season, seconded by Ms. Bush.

Rebecca Rohrbough, 2525 Lakeshore Drive, said she wanted to encourage the variance request. They had a neighbor with a dead live oak tree due to their house elevation. They did not remove the tree for years. After listening to their neighbors because of the stringent replacement requirement, it made sense for the lot because there was not enough room for that many live oak trees. She was concerned about the neighbor's live oak tree falling on their property. The applicant did not have an imminent danger and encouraged the landscaping of their yard. The regulations were designed for lots where there was no construction. When the rules were applied to a developed property, the replacement should be considered on a lot by lot basis. She requested the full allowance for mature trees. She suggested not allowing the planting of magnolia trees to be planted so close to the houses. She was concerned about the growth of two live oak trees on this property.

Nancy Clark, 420 Carroll Street, said as a citizen and member of the Parks and Parkways Commission there was a live oak tree protection ordinance. The volume of trees was to be more of a deterrent rather than suggested many trees on one lot. She noted it was a living tree, just not pretty. A few years ago there was a variance request on Lakeshore Drive for the removal of a live oak tree that was stated to be in the way and was not growing in a not good fashion. The request was denied. She said it was a slippery slope on the tree protection ordinance. The City should either have a live oak protection or not. She asked to recognize the number of tree replacement was more of a deterrent than a need to reforest your lot. She agreed that two live oak trees would have a hard time surviving with the number of existing trees. She suggested planting two live oak trees to be planted and to donate the planting of two live oak trees.

Leonard Rohrbough, 2525 Lakeshore Drive, said everyone agreed that everyone wanted to grow trees and be the dominant structure. He thought the lakefront was the location of the donated trees was becoming saturated. As they grew there would not be any grass growing. A 12 tree replacement for tree that died 12 years ago was not appropriate. His neighbor's trees were already stressed and dying before Hurricane Katrina. The bottom large limb sheared off on his driveway. He said the owner should not be held at ransom for that many trees because a 300 old tree died. His tree replacement would be 24 trees on 1 ¼ acre and there was not enough room to plant that many trees. He had planted 12-15 trees in the last 20 years. The ordinance was flawed and he was in support to encourage the growth of trees, but it needed to be reasonable.

Ms. Scott said the staff was reviewing the provisions for possible amendments to allow for flexibility. Many requests were on a case by case basis. Mr. Blache empathized with Mr. Rohrbough's statements because his requirement was 42 trees on a B-3 district lot and it was a burden. Mr. Blache requested to review a larger sketch of the property. Ms. Scott said the staff determined the property could support what was proposed or the cost could be mitigated. Not all of the mitigated trees would be planted on the lakefront. Many people participated in the Street Tree Program. One of the points made was that the

verbiage was geared toward new construction. The staff was having difficulty in tree preservation, but with mature trees on a property there must be a balance.

Ms. Bush asked if Ms. Casanova reviewed the site for planting. Ms. Casanova suggested tall shade and understory stories would accommodate 8 trees but not the 12 tree requirement.

Mr. Thomas moved to approve the request for the planting with a mixture of 8 Class A and B trees at the City Arborist's direction. Mr. Clark suggested to review the overburdening of the planting of Japanese Magnolias. He noted that ugly was not a reason for removal in every case. Mr. Blache seconded the notion and was unanimously approved.

The next cases discussed were SUP18-06-04 123 Girod LLC, Ashley Geoghegan requests a Special Use Permit to Section 6.4.7, Animal Sales and Services, Ltd., a portion of square 2, 123 Girod Street, zoned B-3, and V18-06-13 123 Girod LLC, Ashley Geoghegan requests a variance to Section 7.5.10.5, Special B-3 Old Mandeville Business District, specifically (4) Reduction in Required Parking, (b) Parking Reduction by Exception, a portion of square 2, 123 Girod Street, zoned B-3

The driveways are proposed at a maximum of 12' in width and are in compliant with the B-3 zoning district as well as proposed limestone driveways and parking in rear, also compliant with the required aggregate/pervious material.

7.5.10.5 *Special B-3 - Old Mandeville Business District Criteria*

4. Reductions in Required Parking

a. By Right Parking Reductions.

(1) The minimum on-site parking requirement shall be two (2) spaces unless otherwise required by this section or Article 9 of this CLURO. No additional spaces shall be required for uses on any lot that generate the need for eight (8) or fewer spaces in the B-3 zoning district in accordance with the minimum parking space requirements of Article 9.

(2) When on-street parallel parking is available in areas where shoulders are adequate for parking or when public on-street parking bays are available, the required number of off-street parking spaces for non-residential uses may be reduced by up to a number equal to the number of on-street spaces, abutting the lot or on the opposite side of Lakeshore Drive for sites that face the lake. No fraction of a space shall be counted when using this provision.

(3) When only a portion of a building is being used for storage or business operations, the minimum required parking shall be based on areas to be used for business operations or storage, as documented by the on the site plan and subject to the applicant's agreement that additional parking will be provided prior to occupancy of the remaining space.

b. **Parking Reductions by Exception.** In the B-3 District, parking requirements for non-residential uses may be reduced or waived by the Zoning Commission in conjunction with a Special Use Permit application and based on the findings of the Zoning Commission that the reduction or waiver does not adversely affect surrounding commercial or residential uses and:

(1) Existing public parking within the area is sufficient to accommodate the proposed use; or

(2) The person receiving an exception to reduce the number of spaces agrees to contribute to the Optional Parking Mitigation Fund established for the purpose of providing public parking and pedestrian amenities in accordance with a Master Plan of the B-3 District in accordance with section

(3) The person receiving the exception has agreed to provide public improvements that mitigate the parking reduction within six hundred (600) feet of where the proposed use is located and the installation of sidewalks or pedestrian ways between the parking and the site, in accordance with the provisions of section **Error! Reference source not found.**

Landscaping: A Conceptual Landscape Plan prepared by Kyle Associates, LLC dated 5/25/2018 has been submitted with the Greenleaf proposal and is on Sheet No.: L1.0.

Greenbelt:

A 15' greenbelt is required on the site frontage on Girod Street. The landscape plan does not indicate a greenbelt, but the 10' building setback is indicated, with sidewalks accessing the stairs to go up into the building. It appears that the site is 5' deficient in required 15' greenbelt.

Buffer:

b. **Landscape Buffers Elsewhere in District.** A five (5) foot wide landscape buffer shall be required along the side and rear lot lines of all uses requiring conditional use or Special Use Permits, and:

(1) A fence and landscaping are required to shield headlights and abate noise, and

(2) Parking lot lighting shall not spill over onto adjacent properties.

No buffers are indicated on the landscape plan, however, a 6' high wood privacy fence is proposed, meeting the requirement for the construction of a fence to shield headlights and abate noise.

Site Interior Landscaping:

No data is provided on the landscape plan to determine compliance. Plan needs to be updated so evaluation by the city's landscape inspector can determine compliance.

7.5.10.5. Special B-3 - Old Mandeville Business District Criteria

f. Other Special Requirements.

- (1) Drive through facilities, goods or services shall not be allowed.
- (2) Dumpsters shall be screened on all sides facing residentially zoned property in accordance with Section 9.2.5.8.
- (3) In the B-3 district, such driveway access shall not be greater than twelve (12) feet in width except that this width may be increased by the Zoning Commission as an exception through the Special Use Permit process to allow driveway widths of twenty (20) feet for two-way access to a parking lot serving a development on two or more lots or parcels.

4.3.2.8. Findings for Special Use Permit Approvals

The Zoning Commission shall make the following findings before approving a Special Use Permit:

1. The proposed plan is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and the purposes of the applicable zoning district.
2. That the Special Use Permit application and site plan comply with the standards of these Comprehensive Land Use Regulations.
3. That any required modifications to the site plan are reasonable and are the minimum necessary to minimize potentially unfavorable impacts and protect the public health, safety and welfare as follows:
 - a. That the proposed use and site development, together with any modifications applicable thereto, will be compatible with existing conforming or permitted uses on adjacent sites or sites across from the proposed development site in terms of building height, bulk, scale, setbacks, open spaces, lighting, signage, landscaping, parking, access and circulation.
 - b. The site development provides for the safe and convenient circulation of pedestrians, motorists and bicyclists and adequately addresses the volume and traffic and other transportation impacts of the proposed development.
 - c. Proposed parking is designed to minimize negative impacts on surrounding property and provide safe and convenient access to the site.
 - d. The proposed design and use of the development adequately protects people and property from the negative impacts of erosion, flood or water damage, fire, odors, noise and glare anticipated to be generated by the proposed development.

Ms. Scott presented a Special Use Permit for a veterinary clinic use with indoor boarding and a variance for parking. As discussed at the work session, the plan did not comply with the buffer requirements for the B-3 zoning district. There was a 5' strip adjacent commissions authorized by exception to reduce parking. As discussed in the work session, the site plan did not comply with buffer requirement for B-3 zoning district with a 5' buffer. There was a 5' strip adjacent to the building to allow for flexibility for the parking under the building.

She stated under Section 6.4.7, Animal Sales and Services (Limited), required a Special Use Permit (SUP). The Land Use was defined as:

Retail sales, veterinary services, outdoor kennels, grooming, and boarding when totally within a building, of dogs, cats, birds, fish, and similar small animals customarily

used as household pets. Typical uses include pet stores, small animal clinics, dog bathing and clipping salons, and pet grooming shops but excluding outdoor kennels and uses for livestock and large animals.

There could not be purely outdoor kennels and must have indoor kennels.

The plans submitted were prepared by Justin Greenleaf of Greenleaf Lawson Architects, all dated 5/25/2018: Site Plan, Site Survey, Floor Plans, Building Elevations, Barrier Fencing and K-9 Grass System. The fencing was part of the noise abatement. To further minimize disturbances, all exterior walls will have up to a sound rating of STC 56. The details for this wall assembly was shown in the drawings provided with this package. In addition, the 6' tall interior privacy fence has a sound rating of STC 26 (Sound Transmission Class). Another requirement was a 5' landscape strip which was shown to the rear, but was not included on the north and south sides. There was no perimeter fencing and it was located in the interior of the enclosure for the animals.

The lot area of this site consists of 16,944.18 square feet (84'x200'). All B-3 required yard setbacks were in compliance. The pervious/impervious calculation had not been received.

This land use required a ratio of 1:200 square feet of gross floor area. The building contained 2,600 square feet, requiring 13 parking spaces. The site plan submitted indicated there are 6 parking spaces proposed on the site, 3 in the rear and 3 underneath the structure, including 1 handicap parking space. Additionally, there was one parking space on-street adjacent to site. The applicant was requesting that the Zoning Commission grant a reduction in the required parking for the remaining required six (6) spaces, which was provided for in CLURO Section 7.5.10.5.4.b provided that the reduction or waiver does not adversely affect surrounding commercial or residential uses. There was an existing public parking lot located across the street from the site. There were two existing driveway cuts on Girod Street that were being utilized. The driveway went around the building with parking spaces to the rear.

Mr. Thomas said the plan indicated 20' from the back fence to almost half way into the parking spaces. He asked how to park in those three angled spaces protruding into the 20' setback that was also counted as a driveway.

Justin Greenleaf said there was a new survey and plan that pulled back the drive to have more than the 20' which allowed the 5' buffer. With the new survey, there was an additional 5' to the rear of the property which allowed the 5' buffer. From that point there was a 12' drive with angled parking. The plan was modified to provide a 5' buffer on the south side. The north side curb cuts and fence were located at 5'.

Ms. Scott verified that the north side would have a 5' buffer with a fence along the property line. The pervious calculation went from 26% to 35%. Mr. Clark and Mr. Blache asked what was the back up

Mr. Clark asked what approving. Ms. Scott said could be conceptual sketch. Mr. Clark said rear loaded off street parking. Ms. Scott detailed landscape plan, if approved use with conceptual plan and condition authorize parking and on site and off site must comply to make it functional. Mr. Clark said make it work and issue was the special use permit and variance for parking. That was spaces and not feasibility.. Ms. Scott said not functional would have to make it functional. Mr. Clark said design public safety issue but was there a fence along border of property. Justin two fence around property line and one around the yellow area for the animals. Property line would be 6' picket fence. Mr. Clark asked how did that work in hurricanes. Mr. Greenleaf said need privacy so could not do a wrought iron. Was it no fence or a different material? Ms. Scott clarified buffer was 5' plus a fence. Discussed perimeter fence and if not for 5' could be comfortable with that. Dgot 5' north and rear and wedge on south side and fence screened. No adjacent residential but could in the future especially on south side and would screen headlights. Mr. Clark said three space sin rear was not an issue. Ms. Scott said that was reason for review process. Mr. Clark said fences in storms were not a good solution. Ms. Scott said some alternating fence let water through. Mr. Greenleaf said it could have building close to Girod Street and yard could get smaller. The parking would be feasible.

Mr. Clark said vet and boarding and not a pet store. That was correct. It was hardly boarding with only three areas. Ms. Scott said back up width was 12.5'. Mr. Greenleaf said restricted to a 12' driveway.

Ms. Scott said would have to submit a detailed landscape plan, site plan was more refined. Still have a variance on south side buffer. Reduction in parking, special use permit. Mr. Clark said offsets had been solved. Ms. Scott said on the south side there was a wedge so a portion would still require a variance not more compliant than original plan.

Mr. Clark said use was in line with allowed in zoning district. Less intrusive use than a bar or restaurant. No adverse impact on adjacent properties. Coming resolution to develop comprehensive ... many project might need to review fencing. Willing to accommodate findings of stwp and water commission.

Leonard Rohrbough, 2525 lakeshore drive, said only caution was six onsite parking spaces and one on street. How many employees and multiple people bringing pets, where to park. Might be a possibility of looking at north side and instead of two driveways have one driveway shared by two properties and could get 2-3 more parking spaces. Girod Street was designed to have as much on street parking as possible but it should not be abused. This may not always be a vet clinic and with a bar or restaurant or doctor office. Ms. Scott said if could not meet parking come to the commission. Mr. Rohrbough said when building only other parking would be the dog yard area and suggested a parking buffer. His experience was many businesses may not be successful.

Mr. Blache said the shared driveway was an interesting prospect. Mr. Greenleaf said discussed in Design Review, now has three employees with only one more employee but no more than 3 at a time. Most was for back of house pet usage. Mr. Blache asked expected traffic daily. Mr. Greenleaf said her business was specializing with eastern medicine. Many

one on one time with patients. Ms. Bush said daycare area on plan. Mr. Greenleaf said business plan was not to board but only if patient needed to stay overnight. Ms. Scott said it was for rehabilitation. Mr. Greenleaf said acupuncture on the dogs. Only boarded if patient needed to stay. Mr. Blache understood the issues of the area with parking and suggested bank a section of dog yard. Ms. Scott said redesign area to show additional parking as a parking bank and commission could have it reviewed if there was a parking issue. Mr. Blache said he would feel more comfortable. Mr. Greenleaf said if use changed the play area could be for parking. to clarify outdoor areas was for rehabilitation. Mr. Blache said it allowed the commission to be able to re visit the site.

Mr. Thomas criteria. Ms. Scott said problems come through complaints. Mr. Blache said back to properties in b-3 knew there were problems and adjustments were made. Mr. Clark said was concern of dog treatment not having a place to park. Mr. Blache said yes or if waiting during surgery. Mr. Clark said parking in the area. Mr. Blache said functionally taking care of parking. Mr. Greenleaf said employees park off site for onsite customers. Hours of operation for beach house and McClain's was opposite from vet clinic. Mr. Clark asked if different use and now parking deficit. Mr. Blache said plan for the future. he wanted to see the parkign on site. Mr. Greenleaf estimated it could be six spaces. Mr. Blache asked to see it on the plans.

Mr. Blache moved to table. Mr. Greenleaf asked to preliminary approve to move forward. Mr. Clark moved to approve special use permit contingent upon delivery of parking bank proposal and approved administratively in location of play yard as banked. Did not address variances. Mr. Clark moving special use permit. Mr. Blache wanted amendment for parking bank. Seconded by Mr. Fairley unanimous.

Ms. Richardson said could be contingent upon administrative report at the next meeting and if adhere.

Mr. Blache moved to approve variance contingent upon parking bank approved administratively for six additional spaces, Second by r. Thomas unanimous.

SUP18-06-05 Henry Randolph Hart LLC/Monroe Street Animal Hospital requests a Special Use Permit to Section 6.4.7, Animal Sales and Service, parcel in square 34, 2130 Monroe Street, zoned B-3 and V18-06-12 Henry Randolph Hart LLC/Monroe Street Animal Hospital requests a variance to Section 7.5.10.5, Special B-3 Old Mandeville Business District and Article 9, Parking and Landscaping, a parcel in square 34, 2130 Monroe Street, zoned B-3

The applicant has a Purchase Agreement for the property at 2130 Monroe Street, zoned B-3 Old Mandeville Business District. this property is improved with an existing building, previously used as a preschool and daycare. The applicant desires to open a veterinary clinic, which requires a SUP approval in the B-3 Old Mandeville Business District.

Special Use Permit:

The CLURO, under Section 6.4.7, Animal Sales and Services (Limited), requires a Special Use Permit (SUP) approval in the B-3 zoning district. This Land Use is defined as follows:

Retail sales, veterinary services, outdoor kennels, grooming, and boarding when totally within a building, of dogs, cats, birds, fish, and similar small animals customarily used as household pets. Typical uses include pet stores, small animal clinics, dog bathing and clipping salons, and pet grooming shops but excluding outdoor kennels and uses for livestock and large animals

A site plan submitted with the application indicates the following:

Site Development:

- The lot area of this site consists of 26,046.637 sf (86.2'x266.10'x99.14'x266.45'), in accordance with the submitted Survey by Randall W. Brown & Associates, Inc. dated June 17, 1993.
- All B-3 required yard setbacks exceed the minimum requirements per the Survey and Site Plan: 17.8' front, 130' rear, 17.4' east side and 25' west side.
- B-3 Zoning requires a minimum pervious coverage requirement of 25% (6,511.66 sf). The rear fenced yard is 80'x100' (8,000sf) with additional landscaping surrounding the building. The Pervious/Impervious calculations are met and exceed the minimum requirement referenced above.

Parking:

The CLURO, under Section 6.4.7, Animal Sales and Services (Limited) requires a ratio of 1:200 sf of gross floor area. The building contains a total of 2,500 sf, the Animal Hospital requires 13 parking spaces ($2,500/200=12.5$) with all spaces proposed on-site.

As discussed at the work session, a professionally drawn Site Plan was requested, the applicant has submitted a revised plan on Jun 21, 2018. The site plan provides for 14 parking spaces and continues to utilize the circular drive with the two driveways, providing circulation to the rear formerly used for drop off/pick up for daycare. Parking spaces are in compliance with CLURO **9.1.2 TABLE - MINIMUM PARKING FACILITY DESIGN STANDARDS** represented, as follows:

- 6 parallel parking spaces shown on the east side of the driveway,
- 3 angled parking (75 degrees) spaces shown at the rear east side of the driveway,
- 2 parallel parking spaces shown along the rear chain link fence, and
- 2 angled parking (60 degrees) spaces shown at the front.

However, it must be noted that the previous site plan indicating the parking spaces, and the driveways, are 5' from the property line – it appears that the existing conditions are compliant – but the revised site plan shows drives and parking spaces on the property line. Plan should be revised to reflect a minimum of 5' – both to meet CLURO 5.2.3.2 and the minimum buffer requirement.

The existing driveways are noted with a dimension of 12' and are gravel meeting the requirements for the B-3 special district criteria and art. 9 parking requirements for gravel.

LANDSCAPE COMPLIANCE:

The City's Landscape Inspector/Arborist has provided detailed tables that identify Requirements for Greenbelt (9.2.5.5.1), Site Interior (9.2.5.5.3), both Side Buffers and Rear Buffer (9.2.5.5.4) and Supplemental Planting and Plan Preparation Requirements (9.2.5.9). The columns include the following headers: Required, Preserved, Proposed, Needed and Conforms/Conformance with CLURO.

A landscape plan detailing the individual items that are in compliance with landscape requirements has not been submitted. Compliance will be reviewed once submitted. The proposed veterinary clinic is a change in use, and a further evaluation and review of existing/proposed landscaping will be required to determine compliance.

Site Interior Landscaping:

Compliant – detailed landscape plan to be submitted at time of permitting and before CO is issued.

7.5.10.5. Special B-3 - Old Mandeville Business District Criteria

b. Landscape Buffers Elsewhere in District. A five (5) foot wide landscape buffer shall be required along the side and rear lot lines of all uses requiring conditional use or Special Use Permits

- (1) A fence and landscaping are required to shield headlights and abate noise, and
- (2) Parking lot lighting shall not spill over onto adjacent properties.

f. Other Special Requirements.

- (1) Drive through facilities, goods or services shall not be allowed.
- (2) Dumpsters shall be screened on all sides facing residentially zoned property in accordance with Section 9.2.5.8.
- (3) In the B-3 district, such driveway access shall not be greater than twelve (12) feet in width

The P&Z Commission requested details to be submitted on how the areas boarding dogs will be addressed in regard to noise abatement. The applicant stated that their contractor will attend meeting to address this issue.

4.3.2.8. Findings for Special Use Permit Approvals

The Zoning Commission shall make the following findings before approving a Special Use Permit:

1. The proposed plan is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and the purposes of the applicable zoning district.
2. That the Special Use Permit application and site plan comply with the standards of these Comprehensive Land Use Regulations.
3. That any required modifications to the site plan are reasonable and are the minimum necessary to minimize potentially unfavorable impacts and protect the public health, safety and welfare as follows:
 - a. That the proposed use and site development, together with any modifications applicable thereto, will be compatible with existing conforming or permitted uses on adjacent sites or sites across from the proposed development site in terms of building height, bulk, scale, setbacks, open spaces, lighting, signage, landscaping, parking, access and circulation.
 - b. The site development provides for the safe and convenient circulation of pedestrians, motorists and bicyclists and adequately addresses the volume and traffic and other transportation impacts of the proposed development.
 - c. Proposed parking is designed to minimize negative impacts on surrounding property and provide safe and convenient access to the site.
 - d. The proposed design and use of the development adequately protects people and property from the negative impacts of erosion, flood or water damage, fire, odors, noise and glare anticipated to be generated by the proposed development.

The stated purpose of the B-3 Zoning District as outlined under Section 7.5.10.1 is:

The purpose of the B-3 Old Mandeville Business District shall be to provide a district that acknowledges the historic character of the area and the pedestrian orientation of the neighborhood by continuing to combine a mix of small scale residential, civic, commercial, service and office establishments that are relatively compatible with residential uses within and abutting the district. Lot sizes, setbacks, parking and landscaping requirements shall be more flexible to address the unique characteristics of an area substantially developed as a commercial district with smaller lots and greater development densities than newer areas of the City. Tree preservation and appropriate plantings in public and private spaces are key objectives within the B-3 district.

7.5.10.6 Special B-3 - Old Mandeville Business District Criteria

5. Reductions in Required Parking

b. By Right Parking Reductions.

- (1) The minimum on-site parking requirement shall be two (2) spaces unless otherwise required by this section or Article 9 of this CLURO. No additional spaces shall be required for uses on any lot that generate the need for eight (8) or fewer spaces in the B-3 zoning district in accordance with the minimum parking space requirements of Article 9.
- (2) When on-street parallel parking is available in areas where shoulders are adequate for parking or when public on-street parking bays are available, the required number of off-street parking spaces for non-residential uses may be reduced by up to a number equal to the number of on-street spaces,

abutting the lot or on the opposite side of Lakeshore Drive for sites that face the lake. No fraction of a space shall be counted when using this provision.

- (3) When only a portion of a building is being used for storage or business operations, the minimum required parking shall be based on areas to be used for business operations or storage, as documented by the on the site plan and subject to the applicant's agreement that additional parking will be provided prior to occupancy of the remaining space.

c. **Parking Reductions by Exception.** In the B-3 District, parking requirements for non-residential uses may be reduced or waived by the Zoning Commission in conjunction with a Special Use Permit application and based on the findings of the Zoning Commission that the reduction or waiver does not adversely affect surrounding commercial or residential uses and:

- (1) Existing public parking within the area is sufficient to accommodate the proposed use; or
- (2) The person receiving an exception to reduce the number of spaces agrees to contribute to the Optional Parking Mitigation Fund established for the purpose of providing public parking and pedestrian amenities in accordance with a Master Plan of the B-3 District in accordance with section **Error! Reference source not found.** of this Code; or
- (3) The person receiving the exception has agreed to provide public improvements that mitigate the parking reduction within six hundred (600) feet of where the proposed use is located and the installation of sidewalks or pedestrian ways between the parking and the site, in accordance with the provisions of section **Error! Reference source not found.**

Ms. Scott presented discussed at work session existing structure currently a preschool. Applicant was proposing to purchase property and open a veterinary clinic. Small building with existing circular driveway, large area to rear which was play area. requested to amend site plan to reflect existing conditions. The parking requirement would be met. Revised site plan. One of the issues was showing parking on property line and should be back 5'. Previous site plan showed the 5' which was existing. Revise plan to show the 5' buffer bamboo and a screen for the site.

Discussed at work session because existing building, asked provide floor plan and noise abatement for retrofitting. Supplied a flood plan showing two kennels for isolation, cat room in center with six cages, icu with 16 cages. No noise abatement but contractor was available for discussion.

Mr. Blache lack of green space in front. Ms. Scott on revised site plan show area as green. Ddbuldign 16' on one corner and 17' on other corner, take out gravel and reestablish right of way and replant. Portion of parking space in greenbelt which would be eliminated. Need detailed landscape and could be at permitting. Did not determine interior landscape compliance but need clean and planting. Remain green in play area. Reestablish planting alongside yard pushing back gravel. Mr. Clark asked what adjacent. Adjacent was Visiting Angels which was an office.

Jed Dufy, CJC Construction, check walls because it was used as a daycare so might be something there. It has bene in use. Find sdc value, if needed would add close cell foam or rock with soundproofing. In a property most would be icu most sound and two kennels and cats in middle of building. Building wide with buffer on sides. 5' was existing defined with grass and could be replanted and refined area.

Mr. Thomas said see 24 cages, where animal waste going. Applicants said it would be in trash and where dumpster going on site. Mr. Duffy rear parking area. no more than 4-5 employees on site at any one time. Daycare had more traffic than vet clinic.

Alica Whitney said previously hospital boarding 60 animals and use d8 trash cans which same amount as daycare. Two cages for isolation was one large and one small. Not daily use. Not many people boarding cats. All 16 cages might not be used but allowed day care and pick up. Mr. Clark said not operating boarding facility. If ill animals and going out of town would take them. Not camp pow qoq. Dr. Whitney said no.

Mr. Blache asked site plan address outside dog trot. Dr. Whitney said existing yard space. Mr. Thomas said 6-8 cans; Mr. Duffy said small dumpster could be placed. Mr. Thomas concerned since garbage was only once per week. Dr. Whitney said might be an upgrade from daycare.

Jamie Maxwell, 2124 Monroe Street, asked about description. Ms. Scott said not sales but bvet clinic. Ms. Maxwell said provide elderly services in their home and hiring and classes in rear room adjacent to dog yard. Group meetings in room and hard with kids playing. People are not afraid of kids for dogs. Put a sound machine. Kids don't poop in the yard. Concerned about how long dogs would be in the yard. She did not have soundproofing.

Mr. Blache asked where ramp. Ms. Maxwell said ramp was next to the yard and bamboo was 4'. Area cleaned daily. Her building set to the front of the property. must clean between dogs of solid waste. Not boarding so not having dogs in and out all day. Assuming dogs 8-6 took 4-5 15 minute breaks. Not many dogs out at one time because of staffing and safety issue. Want OT work with the neighbors and would be willing to accommodate any neighbor afraid of the dogs.

Ms. Bush said Dr. Ledet had depressed concern at the last meeting of same use. Could not take that into account.

Ms. Scott said regarding the noise abatement in the building, staff did not know ratings and building official could determine what was sufficient. Subject to review and approval of building official or other expert for proper sound abatement.

Mr. Thomas asked limited for garbage cans allowed. Mayor Villere said commercial applicants contract with waste company. Ms. Scott said did not want 8 garbage cans in front of building and could condition it, or place appropriately on site. Could require dumpster with screening and be on the site plan.

Mr. Clark said for noise being in vet clinics did not hold a candle to a preschool.

Ms. Maxwell pictured 15 dogs and right kids louder. She said they leave garbage cans out front. Mr. Clark asked with can or dumpster. If cans brought in it would not matter. Ms. Scott said identify space for location and screening. Update site plan.

Mr. Clark moved to approve sup for vet clinic subject to review discussed sound mitigation city approval, approved vet clinic and no competition, seconded by Mr. Fairley. Mr. Blache friendly amendment includes specific location of cans or dumpsters and screened and not in front acceptable to staff. Accepted amendment. unanimous

Lori Spranley, Secretary

Rebecca Bush, Chairwoman
Planning Commission

**Planning Commission
Work Session
June 26, 2018**

The meeting was called to order by Planning Chairwoman Rebecca Bush and the secretary called the roll.

Present: Michael Blache, Ren Clark, Simmie Fairley, Dennis Thomas, and Rebecca Bush

Absent: Nixon Adams and Bill Sones

Also Present: Louissette Scott, Director, Planning Department; Paul Harrison, City Attorney; Catherine Casanova, Landscape Inspector

P18-07-06 Recommendation to the City Council regarding Ordinance 18-20 to effect the annexation of certain immovable properties situated in Section 54, Township 7 South, Range 11 East, the Parish of St. Tammany, State Of Louisiana, containing approximately 12.98 Acres into the corporate limits of the City of Mandeville; designating and assigning the properties for purposes of zoning as B-2, Highway Business District and O/R, Office/Residential District and for other matters in connection therewith

Recommendation to the City Council on Ordinance 18-20 Z18-07-04 Recommendation to the City Council regarding Ordinance 18-20 to effect the annexation of certain immovable properties situated in Section 54, Township 7 South, Range 11 East, the Parish of St. Tammany, State Of Louisiana, containing approximately 12.98 Acres into the corporate limits of the City of Mandeville; designating and assigning the properties for purposes of zoning as B-2, Highway Business District and O/R, Office/Residential District and for other matters in connection therewith

CASE DESCRIPTION:

The City Council introduced Ordinance 18-20 at their meeting held on June 14, 2018 to annex approximately 12.98 acres of property surrounded by the City of Mandeville. A letter was mailed to Councilwoman Maureen O'Brien in District 10 on March 23, 2018, advising her that the City of Mandeville intended to effect an annexation under La. R.S. 33:172, Subsections C and F.

A letter was received from the Registrar of Voters dated April 18, 2018 certifying that the property depicted on the map has no registered voters within the property.

Ms. Scott presented a map showing the 15 parcels under separate ownership to be annexed. Identified as infill area. case summary. No registered voters. Discussed for years. been included in stwp. First group of properties between highway 22 moore road and west causeway. All but parcel 14 would be b-2 and parcel 14 would be o/r. There was a pending applicant for multi-family for parcel 14 which was allowed in o/r.

Chuck miramon 4402 highway 22, state farm agency. Was for annexation but would there be a charge for property owners for annexation. Ms. Scott said once annexed subject to city property charges. Additionally did not have anything in ordinance for time frame to tie into city utilities and grandfather. Should need to get off individual plant would cost to hook. Impact fees for water and sewer and would discuss with Mr. Miramon since he wanted to hook up. Ms. Richardson said would work with property owners for utility costs and not included in ordinance. Ms. Scott said when moved forward would work with property owners. Mr. Miramon said sounded reasonable and would want to do it. Just concerned about feasibility of cost. Impact fee cost sounded reasonable.

P18-07-07 Recommendation to the City Council regarding Ordinance 18-19, an ordinance amending the CLURO Section 7.7, Table of Permitted Uses by Zoning District and providing for other matters in connection therewith

Ms. Scott presented cluro change for bed and breakfast residences. Case summary. Researched existing number of bed and breakfast. There were five currently in r-1 district; all but one was in Old Mandeville in Historic District. There were 5 in the B-3 district. It was not discussed with council members before introduction and did not know if total elimination or room for amendment for broader interpretation. Another idea was biggest push back in subdivisions. Option limit to historic district boundaries as a special use permit.

Mr. Blache felt this was reactionary. Ms. Scott said residence permitted use since cluro adoption in 1993. No issues or complaints during that time. Mr. Blache said bed and breakfast were in residential areas and mostly historic areas. Mr. Clark asked how many air bnb. Ms. Scott if operating b and b required sup in residential area. if not in violation. Mr. Clark said New Orleans cut them off from information. Ms. Scott said can't see where they are without booking for air bnb. That was a different issue to be addressed as short term stays. Mr. Blache said that was more of a problem than regulated bed and breakfasts. There were mixed opinions.

Ms. Scott asked what research would be liked to make a recommendation. Mr. Thomas said Jeffers on did not allow, Covington allowed with 14,000 s/f lot and commercial liability insurance, certificate holders, get research of other areas. New Orleans did not allow in single family residential. Felt r-1 was single family paying premium in neighborhood. Mr. Clark asked about other commercial enterprises. Mr. Thomas said cpa had client information and was during business hours. Know who is coming to the house. Mr. Clark asked about other activities, contractor.

Ms. Scott said would look at home occupation licenses report. Mr. Blache said long term boarders. Ms. Scott said accessory dwelling allowed even in r-1. Mr. Blache said in historic area people like to stay in old houses. Mr. Thomas said that was why b -3 was identified. Mr. Blache said mostly in r-1 settings. Biggest fears were potential for crime. Generally were unfounded fears. Spoke to local b and b owner, said 90% of guests no problems. Had that 1%, owner/operator shut down the party in the yard. Rule of onsite to monitor safeguards problems and issues. Mr. Thomas said it only takes that one time. Mr. Blache said crazy cousin Kenny could come over. Mr. Thomas said cousin Kenny you knew and he was not a stranger. Mr. Blache said leasing on a monthly basis the information may or may not save you.

Ms. Scott will address language in historic district.

Barry Brupbacher, 1925 Livingston Street, had a bed and breakfast. Experience with people booking. One lot past b-3 district in r-1. People tournaments at pelican park, relatives wedding. Particularly in older business end of Mandeville. Put a lot money in the

unit. It was downstairs and not in his residence. Spent \$5,000 for an additional suite. Walk to old rail, supporting old Mandeville businesses. More than showing up in your room. Trying to manage and operate a business welcoming people into Mandeville. Mixture of subdivision invaded by bed and breakfast was not evidenced by records. No indication created a problem in Mandeville. Would be spending \$50,000 on his house. Be sensitive to people committing to these units and bringing people into Mandeville.

Mr. Thomas asked how book. Website, air bnb and no problems with bookers, weekend \$139 night, mostly weekends. Welcome people let them know where to do things. Spend time with them. Mr. Thomas said first time seeing people when showing up at doors. No background checks but had commercial liability insurance that he should be protected. People ride the trace. Mr., Thomas asks where go. Stay in Mandeville almost always. Mr. Clark asked what did Mandeville get. Pay tax for hotel/motel, value of his property. Mr. Clark financial benefit being paid. Mr. Brupbacher said focused economic benefit was to the community businesses. In town for a reason in Mandeville but not to drive back and forth to New Orleans. Still a residence at the assessor, he lived there. No different than a lawyer in the house. Mr. Clark asked when started given list of rules. Parking, met requirement sin article 8 of cluro. built the parking to accommodate use. Mr. Clark asked if support a more detailed set of requirements. He chose to do it right. Mr. Brupbacher did not see a problem doing that. Mr. Clark said what if no insurance. He was protecting himself to avoid liability. Mr. Thomas lot, 90 x 140. No lot size requirement but packaging requirement. Ms. Scott said other communities have lot size. Mr. Brupbacher mostly weekends and not his primary income. It was beneficial as a business model.

Jim Noel, 149 Dona Drive, spoke at the prior application case. There was a subdivision all residential. Mr. Brupbacher's new home was close proximity to activities in the lakefront. He was 2-3 miles away from close amenities. That was a reason why subdivision viewed it as an encroachment and violation of their covenants. Dealing with that through litigation in the district court. Other neighborhoods contacted council members to introduce this ordinance. He felt this would unravel the fabric of his neighborhood. It was not like having a walkable restaurant and walk to the lakefront and drink at a bar. Concerned do one use that was a violation and not enforce it may create other problems. Mr. Blache asked when describing areas of local businesses realize ordinance eliminate those areas as well. Mr. Wolfe recently approved on lakefront would not be allowed. House had an amazing history. People were not realizing these issues. Understood about subdivision perspective. But throwing it all out may not be the answer. Mr. Noel enjoyed historic as well but the were just run of the mill houses. Thought it would erode fabric of neighborhood and could be detrimental to value of houses. Last time in chamber this was a reaction asked to be thoughtful. It was an issue.

Ray Baas, homeowner president worked with coalition of other associations. 617 Marilyn Drive. Suggested growth of Mandeville last 25 years fueled by single family neighborhoods. Concerned citizen and permission of several homeowner associations to state they agreed it was necessary legislation. Golden shores 165 magnolia 65 beau ravage 240 hermite 20 sanctuary 200 total 720 home sites represented by 5 civic associations to encourage adoption of legislation to regulate crass commercialism. Did not want outside of Old

Mandeville. Historic part of town was not a dedicated subdivision created, designed and filled within for single mail residential. Saw this encroachment of b anb and other commercial activities as an affront and deterioration of single family neighborhoods. This is a response to the approval of the case in new golden shores. Encourage to promote the restriction. Suggested subdivisions representing 25% of population of Mandeville. He had not had time to talk to the other civic associations. When others hear about it they will also be opposed. Reminded commission exchange of goods and services for money was a purely commercial activity.

Mr. Blache asked how to limit to historic and how did they feel about it. Mr. Baas said no objection in historic part of town. Mr. Blache said eliminate whether historic or not. Mr. Baas said devil was in the details. Mr. Baas would like input on any verbiage changes sent to the City Council. Suggested beginning of deterioration and integrity of singe family subdivisions unless approve restrictive wording. Mr. Blache said his position was understanding suburb subdivision and relies on covenants. It has not been a problem needing to be addressed. Did not want to overreact to throw everything out. Welcome wagon for Mandeville and a need for it. Supports commerce, allowed play for people to stay rather than go to Covington. Mr. Baas said not saying not useful but not in subdivisions. Mr. Blache was in agreement. Mr. Clark said it was a blanket get rid of it. Mr. Baas said council members told him they expected a recommendation on verbiage.

Ms. Scott said consider allowing in historic district. Mr. Baas asked if wording from planning commission. Ms. Scott said drafted and introduced without input from stff or commission. Will work with the commission on input and recommendation. Mr. Baas assumed that was what would happen, care about residential only subdivisions. Mr. Thomas said change to subdivision. Ms. Scott said old Mandeville was full of subdivisions. Mr. Baas said representing 720 home sites in subdivisions. Ms. Scott said she would approach in historic district. Ms. Richardson said would research surrounding areas and put together language for historic district.

Lori Spranley, Secretary

Rebecca Bush, Chairwoman
Planning Commission

**Zoning Commission
Work Session
June 26, 2018**

The meeting was called to order by Planning Chairwoman Rebecca Bush and the secretary called the roll.

Present: Michael Blache, Ren Clark, Simmie Fairley, Dennis Thomas, and Rebecca Bush

Absent: Nixon Adams and Bill Sones

Also Present: Louissette Scott, Director, Planning Department; Paul Harrison, City Attorney; Catherine Casanova, Landscape Inspector

Z18-07-04 Recommendation to the City Council regarding Ordinance 18-20 to effect the annexation of certain immovable properties situated in Section 54, Township 7 South, Range 11 East, the Parish of St. Tammany, State Of Louisiana, containing approximately 12.98 Acres into the corporate limits of the City of Mandeville; designating and assigning the properties for purposes of zoning as B-2, Highway Business District and O/R, Office/Residential District and for other matters in connection therewith

V18-07-14 St. Tammany Parish School Board requests a variance to Section 7.5.6.3, Institutional District Site Development Regulations, more specifically (4), maximum height of structures, and Article 9, Parking and Landscaping, more specifically 9.1.4, Minimum Off-Street Parking Requirements by Use, Section 6.3.20, Public and Private Secondary or other Educational Facilities, 1 Skipper Drive, zoned I.

Ms. Scott presented case summary

St. Tammany Parish School Board has allocated funding for the construction of a new classroom building at Mandeville High School, which is identified as Area 4 on the MHS Classroom Building drawing by Holly & Smith Architects dated 06.06.18. The intent is to construct a three (3) story classroom containing 49,841 square feet, a two (2) story addition to the locker room of 5,990 square feet and renovate the existing lock rooms containing 2,135 square feet.

Most recent variance approvals for Mandeville High School include the following:
V15-12-18 variance to Section 8.1.4, Supplemental Regulations for Temporary Buildings to allow the installation of 15 modular classroom buildings, and Article 9, Parking and Landscaping.

V14-05-06 variance for no greenbelt along Purple Martin Dr., now Spc Robert L. duSang Drive.

This was approved in order for the modular buildings to fit within the property line and the required setback per the fire code.

This new three (3) story classroom building is located in the center of the school site and would have no impact on the adjacent residential properties. The building is adjacent to the existing auditorium, gymnasium and commons. The plan was reviewed and approved by the Design Review Consultants on May 24, 2018 as contextually appropriate for the location in the center of the campus. Two feet (2') of the main eave is imperceptible. The stair towers have sloped roofs, which break the horizontal line. The architectural element turns the corner and caps the building. The scale and proportion to the street is appropriate.

During construction the following temporary positioning of buildings is proposed: two (2) existing modular buildings containing two (2) classrooms will be relocated, ten (10) temporary modular containing eighteen (18) classrooms, and one (1) RR building will be located on the Mandeville High School site.

INSTITUTIONAL ZONING BUILDING HEIGHT

CLURO 7.5.6. Institutional District

7.5.6.3. Site Development Regulations

Each development site in the Institutional District shall be subject to the following site development regulations in addition to any other applicable regulations under the provisions of this Land Use Regulations Ordinance or any other laws of the City, state or federal government.

4. Maximum Height of Structures 35'

CLURO Article 8.1.1.6. Maximum Height Established

Subject to the provisions of this section, buildings and structures shall not exceed the maximum heights established in the applicable zoning district regulations. The height of a building is the vertical distance measured from the highest point of the street in front of the building or structure to:

1. **For Pitched Roofs:** The midpoint between the highest ridge and the lowest eave in the same roof plane as the highest ridge. For purposes of this provision, if one or more stories are located between the highest ridge and the lowest eave, height shall be measured at midpoint between the top plate of the highest finished floor, or ceiling if there is no top plate, and the highest ridge.

The following is in accordance with the "Building Height Variance Package" by Holly & Smith Architects dated June 6, 2018:

The main building height measures 37'-2". The proposed three (3) story building contains two (2) stair towers with the average height from average grade being 43'-2-1/2".

- Average grade at the building site 10.40'
- Highest ridge from average grade 45'-0"
- Lowest ridge from average grade 41'-5"
- Average height from average grade 43'-2-1/2"

VARIANCE REQUESTED:

- Average height from average grade 43'-2-1/2"
 - Maximum height of structure allowed 35'-0"
- TOTAL HEIGHT VARIANCE REQUESTED 8'-2-1/2"**

In summary, this is an additional 3'-6" to the majority of the new three (3) story classroom building, in order to reduce the building footprint area.

Building Height Notes:

Average building height- although the average maximum building height established per the criteria in Sections 7.5.3 and 8.1.1.6 of the CLURO is 43', which is 2-1/2" above the average grade at the site. The majority of the building roof is 38'-6" above average grade at the site. The only areas exceeding this height are the sloped roofs at the stair towers.

Adjacent building height –

1. High masonry wall (parapet) matches the adjacent auditorium height of 40' 9" above f.f.
2. Low masonry wall matches the adjacent gymnasium height of 28' 0" above f.f.

USE CLASSIFICATION PARKING

CLURO 9.1.4. Minimum Off-Street Parking Requirements by Use

6.3.20 Public and Private Secondary or other

<p>Educational Facilities instructional Senior High administrative required Parking spaces for any or gymnasium or stadium facility on the whichever is greater</p>	<p>8 spaces per classroom, lab, including facility plus 1 per faculty and staff member or the auditorium, site,</p>
---	---

The following is depicted in the "PARKING PLAN SUMMARY" prepared by Holly & Smith Architects, Sheet P-100 dated 06.07.18, which is part of the "Mandeville High School Classroom Building STPSB Project No. P1805" submittal documentation.

PARKING DATA EXISTING

There is a parking deficiency of 236 spaces from the 1,054 parking spaces required, as shown in the "Parking Data Existing" Table. Parking calculations are based upon the following:

108 classrooms X 8	= 864	Areas 1-10
190 Faculty X 1	= <u>190</u>	

Total Required	1054	Total Provided	818
		Total Parking Deficiency (-236)	

PARKING DATA DURING CONSTRUCTION

There will be a temporary displacement and parking deficiency of 242 spaces from the 1,054 parking spaces required, as shown in the “Parking Data During Construction” Table. Parking calculations are based upon the following:

108 classrooms X 8	= 864	Areas 1-2	= 238 (-132 Displaced)
190 Faculty X 1	= <u>190</u>	Areas 3-4	= 81 (-83 Displaced)
		Areas 5-10	= <u>372</u> (+209 Added)
Total Required	1054	Total Provided	812
		Total Parking Deficiency (-242)	

PARKING DATA AFTER CONSTRUCTION

There is a proposed parking deficiency of 33 spaces from the increased 1,094 parking spaces required, as shown in the “Parking Data After Construction” Table. Parking calculations are based upon the following:

113 classrooms X 8	= 904 (+40)	Area 1	= 56 (+12)
190 Faculty X 1	= <u>190</u>	Areas 2-4	= 452 (-38)
		Areas 5-7	= 167 (+60)
		Areas 8-10	= <u>386</u>
Total Required	1094	Total Provided	1061
		Total Parking Deficiency (-33)	

TOTAL PARKING SPACES VARIANCE REQUESTED AFTER CONSTRUCTION 33

With the completed buildout of this project, including the new classroom building, reconfigured parking lot, added landscape beds, concrete curbs and new entry drive the parking deficiency will be reduced from 236 to 33. This is an improvement of 14% toward compliance with CLURO 6.3.20 Public and Private Secondary or other Educational Facilities required parking.

Area 10 Parking Note:

This parking lot area has 163 existing parking spaces, which are adjacent to the recently expanded Practice Field. This project proposes to increase this parking lot to accommodate a total of 372 spaces, which is an increase of 209 additional parking spaces.

An existing wetland line is drawn around the north, east and south sides of the proposed expansion of Area 10 parking lot. In addition, there is an existing ditch that is also drawn diagonally through the proposed expansion area. This ditch is drawn as “Drainage Canal” on the “Mandeville High School Practice Field & Parking Lot” Site Clearing Plan by Kyle Associates, LLC dated 1/23/2017 and a part of Permit #17-3813 issued 04/05/2017. City

officials have researched this canal and concluded that it is manmade and not a natural feature of the land. The School Board will work with the City to relocate this canal, if necessary.

The CLURO states the following concerning a variance request:

4.3.4.5. Variance Procedures

1. **Authority.** The Zoning Commission may authorize a variance upon appeal of a decision of an official administering the provisions of this Ordinance when a property owner can show that a strict application of the terms of this Ordinance relating to the use, construction, or alteration of buildings or structures, or the use of land will impose upon him unusual and practical difficulties or particular hardship; but only when the Commission is satisfied that granting such variance will not merely serve as a convenience to the applicant, but will alleviate some demonstrable and unusual hardship or difficulty so great as to warrant a deviation from provisions established by this Ordinance and at the same time the surrounding property will be properly protected.

School board presenting three story classroom building, renovated locker rooms and temporary portables during construction. New classroom would take place of existing portables. Realign parking with development of new building. Landscaping had been planted and was growing – oleander. Adjacent to auditorium. 38 classrooms, replace 28 modulars and 4 [portables]. In order to reduce building footprint 3 story classroom proposed. Additional 3.5' to majority of building and 8' for stair towers. Rather than spread it out just over the height. Existing auditorium would be in line with height of new building. Location fronting Purple Martin but not adjacent to any residential housing.

Existing parking 184 classrooms 1054 spas, 818 provided 23y6 deficiency. After development with variance of 33 spaces. Filling in the gap. Bought space where practice soccer field. Ms. Bush asked if parking was adjacent to proposed construction on Juniper. Ms. Scott would look at that. Ms. Bush asked if extension of existing gravel lot off Purple Martin. Ms. Scott said parking also picked up in other areas. City culverting area along baseball field on skipper drive for additional parking not counted in numbers because it was City property.

Mr. Thomas said at heend would there be temporary buildings with this proposal. Ms. Bush asked about portables by purple Martin because air conditioners were loud. They were staying.

Jeff Schoen, Jones Fussell, representing the school Board, Pete Jabbia, Cameron Tipton and architect Jeffrey smith and Pierre the riot. Only issues was need for height and parking. their view was height was small, looking in scale to auditorium it was in keeping. Thi would not dwarf an existing neighborhood. If out of scale and character and impair

people's view but carefully selected the site. Need it badly. Parking at end of day was net/net gain. As a result 209 spaces added, other areas not in count but should be considered, 23 on north end of footfall field, skipper drive. Students driving between last year 587 and 190 staff less than 800+ spas available. Principal reported needed spaces was not a problem. Difficult to balance idea of growth because to construct must demolish and create temporary parking to accommodate new construction and another phase to remove more modular. Remove oldest modular, state of the art building, move vertically rather than horizontally, reduce footprint, better appearance, quality of education better.

Ms. Bush said new building in Pontchartrain soon completed and would expect it to be as nice. \$13M project tells you well thought out and would be compatible with pes/tms.

Mr. Fairley said St Tammany parish second to none in Louisiana. Taken pride in our schools have been schools designed for students and administration to be able to present programs benefited from and compete throughout the country. This school know was compact and only place was up. Important to accommodate the school system. They take pride in designing and presenting program for community benefit.

V18-07-15 Jason Alberts requests a variance to Section 9.2.5.6, Landscape Maintenance and Replacement Provisions and Section 9.2.5.4, Landscape Requirements in Low Density Residential Districts, lot 24, square B, Golden Glen Subdivision, 193 Devon Drive, zoned R-1

Ms. Scott presented case summary

Additionally minimum planting requirement sin each setback. if someone di dot meet those requirements kicks in. in addition to 4 trees for replacement for removal also comply total 12 years with 3 in each setback. tree survey performed, has 9 trees, two to be removed for 7 on site. Majority were in front yard setback. 6 required 3. Case summary

Mr. Blache asked trees in buildable area. Ms. Casanova said one pine tree.

Did not now previous restrictions and changes. Mr. Blache said requirements for setbacks but if in some buildable areas allow that to be included. Mr. Alberts said there was a tree with fence around the tree. not much space and most trees require more space. It would be on the fence line. House was set further back. There was already too much in the front yard.

Mr. Clark asked if he was aware of the tree stuff would he have bought the property. Mr. Alberts liked the area and schools but might have reconsidered. Bought with assumptions and did not know the restrictions. Mr. Clark always thought about it. Mr. Alberts said assume it was your property and could have the use of it. Ms. Scott said the regulation came after the house purchase. Mr. Clark said citizens were always surprised and wondered where was the responsibility of notice.

Ms. Richardson said covenants were filed and responsibility of title company to let you know those restriction copies. Ms. Scott asked about planting smaller class b trees in the

front yard and Mr. Alberts said wanted play area. It could be mitigated. Mr. Blache asked price. Ms. Casanova said \$150 tree which was cost of purchase. Mr. Clark said did not know represented a short coming of the community. Mr. Thomas said how would the city know when he purchased. Mr. Blache said changed since he purchase the property. Mr. Thomas said if another hurricane would lose trees. Mr. Clark said if nature cut it down would there be a responsibility.

Mr. Blache said purchased property previous to the change. Have allowed grandfathering and there must be a middle ground. With no additional requirements there would be four tree replacement requirement.

Mr. Blache would not like more trees on site. Mr. Thomas said made no sense on the site and mitigate into fund or plant smaller one tree. Mr. Clark said tree was reaction to weed whacking with wooded lots. There were existing trees and some expectation of mitigation. Compromise makes sense. No indication of law change. In this particular case would not want to through baby out with the bath. Ms. Casanova said could plant any kind of tree and not necessarily large shade trees. Ms. Bush said need a planting plan.

Lori Spranley, Secretary

Rebecca Bush, Chairwoman
Planning Commission