

**Planning Commission
Work Session
February 8, 2022
Page 1 of 3**

The meeting was called to order at 6:00pm by Zoning Chairman Brian Rhinehart

The secretary called the roll.

Commissioners Present: Karen Gautreaux, Nixon Adams, Scott Quillin, Mike Pierce, Brian Rhinehart, and Claire Durio

Absent: Simmie Fairley

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

Resolution 22-02 – A resolution of the Planning Commission of the City of Mandeville certifying that the Commission has met the continued education requirements

Mr. Adams motioned to adopt the resolution, Ms. Gautreaux seconded, and all were in favor.

Ms. Gautreaux said that the minutes would be moved to the end of the meeting and adjourned the Planning Commission Meeting.

Ms. Gautreaux commenced the Planning Commission meeting to adopt the minutes


Mr. Quillin motioned to adopt the minutes from the January 11 and January 25 meetings, Mr. Rhinehart seconded, and all were in favor.

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

The meeting was adjourned at 6:38pm.



Alex Weiner, Secretary



Karen Gautreaux, Chairwoman
Planning Commission

**Zoning Commission
Work Session
February 8, 2022
Page 2 of 3**

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.

Mr. Adams asked why both cases were presented as variances. Ms. Bartholomew said that all cases are processed as a variance, and then the Commission decides if it is a variance or exception.

V22-02-03 – Stephen Roy requests a variance to CLURO Section 7.5.9.3 B-2 Site Development Regulations, B-2 Highway Business District, 3910 Florida St

Mr. Rhinehart asked to clarify that the new construction is compliant with the pervious/impervious coverage, and just the entire project is short 1% with the incorporation of the existing site. Ms. Bartholomew replied that was correct. Mr. Rhinehart asked if there were any issues with the greenbelt, Ms. Bartholomew said there were none as they were compliant.

Mr. Adams mentioned that this is the third time this project has come before the Commission for a variance, asked if there was anything special that needed to be done since they were incorporating the old property into the project. Ms. Bartholomew said the old property is already permitted so nothing needs to be done. Mr. Adams asked if this was an expansion of the existing use, Ms. Bartholomew said that was correct.

Mr. Adams brought up that the view from East Causeway Approach should be considered as well as the view from Florida Extension when thinking about the tree removal. Ms. Bartholomew replied that when they came for permitting a landscape plan would have to be submitted and be compliant.

Ms. Durio said that the proposed drive would go through existing plantings and asked if the plantings would continue in the servitude. Ms. Bartholomew said that the servitude was owned by CLECO and would need to get their permission to plant in it. If permission was not granted, then they would have to plant in the seven feet on the backside. Ms. Durio asked if they were obligated to plant there if they got permission, Ms. Bartholomew replied that they were not obligated, it would just give them more room and the ability to screen that drive a bit better. They would have to be compliant no matter what.

Mr. Pierce asked if the existing 10% pervious coverage was compliant or did it receive a variance. Ms. Bartholomew said that it is a legal non-conforming site, and it is unclear if the regulations were even in place when it was constructed.

Vaughan Sollberger, 235 Girod: Architect on the project, they designed the new stuff to be compliant with the regulations and admitted to overlooking the old stuff that was to be incorporated. He did agree with Mr. Adams that the site would open up with the removal of the trees and said that they want to keep as much greenbelt and buffer as possible to have some screening in place.

Ms. Durio said that this design submitted is an improvement to the previous one and likes the effort to keep the delivery trucks off the street.

**Zoning Commission
Work Session
February 8, 2022
Page 3 of 3**

Mr. Quillin asked if the east side drive is shared with the surgery center. Ms. Bartholomew replied that it is. Mr. Sollberger also mentioned that was planned and advertised when the property was marketed.

No additional information was requested.

V22-02-04 – Justin Cadis requests a variance to CLURO Section 7.5.1.3 R-1 Site Development Regulations, R-1 Single Family Residential, 816 Magnolia St

Mr. Rhinehart asked how far they would be encroaching into the setbacks, Ms. Bartholomew replied six feet.

Ms. Durio brought up that there was plenty of space on the side and asked why the applicant could not reconfigure the plans to not encroach.

Ronaldo Olivas, 816 Magnolia: Owner of the property, said the addition includes an enclosed garage and so the plans could not be reconfigured.

Mr. Quillin asked for a letter or something in writing from the neighbor to the north saying they had no objection.

Mr. Rhinehart adjourned the Zoning Commission to return to the Planning Commission to adopt the minutes.



Alex Weiner, Secretary



Brian Rhinehart, Chairman
Zoning Commission