

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

The secretary called the roll.

Commissioners Present: Karen Gautreaux Brian Rhinehart, Claire Durio, Simmie Fairley, Scott Quillin, and Mike Pierce

Absent: Nixon Adams

Also Present: Cara Bartholomew, Director Planning Department; Lauren Brinkman, Planner; David Parnell, City Attorney; Alex Weiner, Secretary; Keith LaGrange, Director Public Works; David LeBreton, City Consultant Engineer

Z22-10-02 – LSU Health Foundation requests the rezoning of a Planned Residential District to Planned Combined Use District and to establish site development criteria and allowable uses within the district, Parcel D Section 46, Mariners Village Subdivision, PRD Planned Residential District, Mariners Blvd

&

CU22-10-02 – LSU Health Foundation requests Conditional Use Approval to allow Administrative and Business Offices (6.4.1), Multi-Family Residential (6.2.7), Lodging (Transient) – Hotel/Motel (6.4.44), Restaurant-Sit Down with lounge (6.4.67), General Retail Sales (Conveniences) (6.4.38), Marine Services-Marina (6.4.53) and Marine Services – Retail (6.4.54) as defined in Article 6 - Land Use Classifications per the Table of Permitted Uses, CLURO Section 7.8, Parcel D Section 46, Mariners Village Subdivision, PCUD Planned Combined Use District, Mariners Blvd

Bill Hoffman, President of Woodward Interests: Said he was going to do a bit of a recap in case anyone was not present during the previous meeting. The property was donated to the LSU Health Foundation by the Copeland Family with two stipulations. The first being that the land was leased, and the second being that the land had an active adult community constructed on it. The marina will have 103 slips in it. The property was previously a lumber mill in the early 1900s. Around 1970 the land was acquired by the developer with the idea to develop the entire property. There were plans for a hotel, marina, and condominiums. The land was always considered a Planned District and being multi use.

Tree Mitigation

Mr. Hoffman said that there are eight live oaks on the site. Two are located by the marina, one is on the east side of the property, and five are located in a cluster and have grown tightly together. They do not have the characteristic majestic canopies and have been beaten down by the hurricanes. They could not build around the trees and moving them was not an option due to their lack of canopy, so a mitigation plan was decided on. They will plant thirty four (34) live oaks on the property with space to grow their canopies out and be present for the next generation to enjoy. One hundred and six (106) other tree species will be planted as well on the property. They have utilized Buck Abbey to assess the trees and make sure that everything was correct with their understanding of the status of the live oaks. They do not want the area to look like a shopping center with rows and rows of parking spaces. The plan to accomplish this is by locating the parking underneath the buildings and with extensive tree planting along the property.

Ms. Durio asked if there were any pictures of the oaks they were proposing to remove. Mr. Hoffman said they were at the office but he can share them with the City.

Mr. Pierce asked if Buck Abbey was present at the meeting. When Mr. Hoffman confirmed that he was, Mr. Pierce asked if Mr. Abbey thought his report was represented fairly.

Buck Abbey, 1129 Villere: Yes, his report was represented fairly. He has walked the site many times and the trees are a mixed bag. One has the shape of a field grown oak, but most are disfigured and not high quality. His recommendation is to replace them with healthy young trees, as the existing trees are not providing good service aesthetically or environmentally.

Mr. Rhinehart asked if Mr. Abbey had any input on the 34 oaks and 106 other species of trees. Mr. Abbey said he looked at the plant list, there are 2-3 species he probably would not use but most of them are good.

Ms. Durio asked if Mr. Abbey had an assessment of the other trees being removed. Mr. Abbey said that all trees of merit were surveyed by the developer, so anything over 5" dbh. Some nice trees will be removed but the most interesting one he found is outside the buildable area which is the largest American Elm he has ever seen.

Ms. Durio asked if everything would be proportionally replaced, Mr. Abbey said it would be. The planting plan is glorious and may be the best ever in the City.

Robert Fabacher, 10600 Baham Road: Mr. Hoffman said that the main entrance would be on Mariners Bl. If you were heading south, you would have to make a U-turn by the causeway to enter. He also wanted to know the dbh and age of the oak trees being removed. Mr. Rhinehart said that information was covered in the site survey.

Terri Lewis Stevens: Said that the plan could be mirrored with the large facility on the opposite side, which would miss the live oaks which might survive. The replacement oaks seem to be situated in the parking area, which is the worst place to plant trees. The other trees seem to be in the parking area and close to the buildings as well.

Van Mayhall, 300 Mariners Isle: He loves the Mandeville area and the commission needs to protect the area. He has not decided on an opinion yet. He sits on his balcony and enjoys the trees in the evening. There are two bald eagles that roost in the cypress trees on the lakefront. There are also egrets and ospreys present. Are there any plans to continue that kind of benefit in the area?

Mr. Hoffman said that the whole site is designed to fit in the Mandeville neighborhood and have a soft tree line environment. The whole idea is to build a place where birds and everyone will come to enjoy and have foliage to attract them.

Mr. Rhinehart asked if, with the greenspace requirement, would there be any habitat left.

Kurt Culbertson, Design Workshop: There were multiple calculations done for the open space and they are meeting all the City requirements for number of trees in different areas, such as the parking and greenbelt requirements. They are exceeding the number of trees for pre and post development. They will be maintaining 36-40ft between the live oaks to give them adequate room. 100% of all plant species will also be native to the area which will have habitat value.

Mr. Rhinehart asked if they would be recreating the habitat. Mr. Culbertson replied not literally, but they are using native material which wildlife prefer.

Ms. Durio said there is a large number of trees on the site and based on a rendering shown at the last meeting the view from coming off the causeway seemed bare, is there any thought to increasing the number of plantings in front of the hotel. Mr. Culbertson replied that the renders were to show the design of the building and did not include a tree layer.

Mr. Quillin asked if the planting plan of the new live oaks could be provided, as he was also color blind.

Jeff Lyons, 515 Lamarque: Just wanted to make sure the public knew how valuable Buck Abbey is, and that his expertise is appreciated.

Site Open Space

Mr. Hoffman said they would meet the open space requirements. There were some comments about the lighting at the last meeting, all lighting will be compliant with the City regulations and would use the best practices. It will be low intensity lighting for safety, not harshness. The hotel and event space are 108,000 sq ft, the max amount is 100,000 so they would be asking for a variance.

Mr. Quillin asked if an orientation maker could be added to the future plans to assist people with orienteering themselves when looking at the plans.

Height

Mr. Hoffman said that they looked at the economics to get the size for the hotel, marina, active adult community, and restaurant and matched it with parking. They want to comply with the surrounding area in height, and that the hotel will be in scale with the existing condominiums on the other side of the marina.

Mr. Quillin asked what the dimensions of the hotel were, Mr. Hoffman replied that the height was just a tad over 35'. He was not sure about the height and width and would defer to Ashley King for those measurements.

Mr. Rhinehart asked if the 35' was from the street level, Mr. Hoffman confirmed that it was.

Ashley King, Trapolin Peer Architects: The surrounding vegetation was a big inspiration, with the cypress trees as a focal point. The indoor/outdoor connections are also important. The scale is kind of "C" shaped to prevent massing, with the third floor being more tucked into the roof level. The reason for the 108,000 sq ft is that all the porches, balconies, and exterior walkways were being counted. If those are removed the square footage drops down to 99,800.

Mr. Rhinehart asked if all of those were under the roof, Ms. King said that some are, and some are not. What is not under the roof is about 2,000 sq ft.

Mr. Quillin asked what the elevation was for the parking entrance. Ms. King replied that it was at 9' for the parking level, which was protected with a retaining wall. Level one of the hotel was at 19'.

Mr. Quillin said he liked hiding the parking under the building, but fill becomes a concern. Ms. King said that this was mitigated by recessing the building and letting the natural landscape embrace in the southern side of the hotel.

Mr. Quillin asked if there was terracing done, Ms. King said there was some natural terracing.

Mr. Quillin asked if there was a rendering for the south side, Ms. King replied it was in the presentation at the last meeting.

Mr. Hoffman said the active adult community was around 200 units. It was built around the oak trees. The height was about 60 $\frac{3}{4}$ feet and was chosen for this spot on the property. The other buildings are about 40' in height and will be in scale with the existing Tops L buildings.

Marc Tolson, Arrive Architecture Group: They felt that the coastal vibe of Mandeville worked perfectly for the site. The roof will be flat for the A/C equipment. The building is designed in sections and will be as low as possible while still being compliant with base flood elevation.

Ms. Gautreaux asked if the buildings had to be as high as they were designed, as the peak could be seen over the trees. Mr. Tolson replied that if they wanted it to be lowered it could

probably be done. He felt it was architecturally balanced as is, but they do not want it to be seen as a huge apartment complex.

Mr. Quillin asked what the first-floor elevation would be. Mr. Hoffman said they had done storm surge studies for the next 50 years and based on that information it would be at 9' so the same as the hotel. If anything flooded it would only be the parking garage.

Mr. Quillin asked if the average area of greenspace and roads were available, Mr. Hoffman replied he was not sure he had the average number. Mr. Quillin said the renders looked a little flat, Mr. Hoffman said that they are designed to show the buildings and not the landscaping. There is a significant step down from the buildings to the land, as it was where the marina spoils were deposited.

Terri Lewis Stevens: A height variance is being requested, aside from economics why not have three stories instead of four. Mr. Hoffman replied that placing the buildings at least 9ft in height will protect them from any storm surge, with any potential flooding occurring only in the parking garage. Hotels shut down when hurricanes arrive so there would not be any cars in the garage. There is a profit motive in the project as it needs operating income to run the site. A certain level of cash flow is needed, and they would have to take up more space if they lowered it to three levels. They balanced the height with the green space.

Ernest Burguieres, 241 Wilkinson St: Is there a photo showing the proposed trees for removal as they are today. Mr. Hoffman replied that there is not a picture of the trees being removed but the buffer line will be in place. Mr. Burguieres said that the replacement trees would be shorter, Mr. Hoffman agreed they would be shorter at first. Mr. Burguieres said that the existing mature trees hide the building, while younger trees would show more of the building. Mr. Hoffman replied that there would be a growth period, but they are planning for 20 years down the road.

Ms. Durio asked if it was possible to maintain a few of the existing trees, as there seems like the fewest trees are on the south side. Mr. Hoffman said they will maintain as many trees as they can. The plantings are still being reviewed as the trees need to survive the wind and water.

Ms. Bartholomew added that they are required to keep anything in the greenbelt area.

Robert Fabacher, 10600 Baham Road: Do the 22 acres include the marina or just the land, Mr. Hoffman replied that was the entire site including the marina. Mr. Fabacher asked how much of that was the land, Mr. Hoffman answered the land was 17 acres.

Mr. Fabacher asked how much fill they would be allowed to bring in, as they could create a levee if allowed too much. Mr. Hoffman said the site drains to a creek on the east side, and the marina on the west side. Frank Zemmer, Richard C Lambert Consultants, said they want to minimize the amount of water running through the ditch. Currently about 11 ½ acres flows through it, and they want to reduce that to about 1 ½ acres. They want to divert the water to drain into the marina and lake and keep it out of the ditch. Currently any offsite runoff goes around the site, not through it. Mr. Hoffman added that the property is not flooding people's property now, and it will not when they are done.

Parking

Mr. Hoffman said that there is no active adult community in the CLURO for parking requirements. There is residential, which requires two spaces per unit, and congregate living which requires 1.5 spaces per unit. The congregate living is the use most appropriate for the active adult community. Other active adult communities have a parking ratio of less than 1 space per unit. They are proposing a total of 505 parking spaces to adequately park everyone for the operation of the site. They did an hour-by-hour study of the site. For the hotel, Sunday – Thursday are not very active, with Friday and Saturday being the most active. The study also does not factor in cross use. People will not park in the neighborhood and walk in as the

distance is not feasible. They have balanced the demands for parking with the operations on site.

Mr. Quillin asked how many parking spaces were under the building compared to the open space. Mr. Hoffman replied that there would be 237 spaces under the active adult living building, which is assumed to be filled at all times. The hotel has 54 under the garage, the rest are open space.

Ms. Durio said she does not know many 55 – 75-year-old people with one car. There are 200 units with 237 spaces, is there any supporting information for the 1 space per unit that was referenced. Mr. Hoffman replied that he can send over prior projects.

Ms. Durio noted that there are 29 spaces for the marina/retail services. Mr. Hoffman said that the retail is just the shop for the marina. The numbers are based on the stats of comparable sites. There is not a boat launch on site, you would park and use your own boat. He estimates that 30% of the slips will be used by people in the active adult community.

Mr. Quillin said that the building pictured on the top right seems to have no parking with the three stories of living area. Mr. Hoffman said that there is a garage on the backside for parking due to the sloping of the land.

Ms. Gautreaux asked what the capacity for the wedding pavilion was. Mr. Hoffman replied that it was designed for 200 – 250 people. It is based on other hotel data. People will stay at the hotel for weddings, or families will arrive in one car.

Ms. Duiro said that it was a creative idea to have the parking under the buildings. She is concerned with adequate parking, but it is a sound design.

Mr. Pierce said that the CLURO asks for certain spots for indoor entertainment and those were omitted from the calculations. Ms. Bartholomew said that calculation is accounted for in the hotel parking calculation as hotels take into account event space with their square footage. Mr. Pierce clarified that it was included in the hotel square footage, Ms. Bartholomew replied that was correct.

Mr. Pierce brought up that some people who attend weddings may be locals who will not stay at the hotel and suggested adding some parking to accommodate them. Mr. Hoffman said those spots are included in the hotel calculations.

Mr. Rhinehart said he is not sold on some of the parking reductions. People they have consulted have one set of figures while the CLURO has another. Mr. Hoffman said that the active adult community is relatively new and not a lot of facilities like it, and there are none in the area. They have spoken with operators with other communities in spots across the country. There is no reason to build something and not provide parking.

Mr. Rhinehart said he is still concerned about the 100-spot reduction, he is still active with two cars. Mr. Hoffman replied that he is not the audience for this.

Ms. Durio said that the 55-65 age group was a significant portion of the pie chart at the last meeting. She understands that they are not building something that would not be successful. Other communities are more golfcart oriented, but this location is an island, as stated earlier.

Mr. Tolson said that he has built many active adult communities. They usually have 300 spaced in the residential area. They have a parking ratio of 1.5 – 1.3 spots per unit at peak times. The average age is 72-76 with some as young has 55. The national average is one car per unit.

Ms. Durio asked if there were more walking amenities in the other communities, Mr. Tolson replied that this had more than most with the café and hotel.

Ms. Durio asked where the data for being 40% single came from, Mr. Tolson said that he could provide that information, and added that they are comfortable with the 1.5 cars per unit based on experience.

Ernest Burguieres, 241 Wilkinson St: Said that the CLURO is the minimum standard. He asked if the slips in the marina were available to non-residents as well as residents. Mr. Hoffman said they were. There are 103 slips, but you would not park next to them, there is one parking space for every four slips. Mr. Burguieres asked if there was any plan for a fuel dock, Mr. Hoffman replied that they had not gotten that far yet. The marina design is behind as it came later in the process. The PowerPoint being shown tonight has the current design for the slips. Any fuel depot would be on the west side where the old one was.

Kevin Vogeltanz, 160 Cindy Lou: The applicant has said nothing relevant to the discussion topics. He brought up CLURO Section 1.2.4 which states the character of community and read an excerpt which stated that "... Mandeville has been a place to live and work in retreat from the stress, congestion and pollution of the metropolitan city...". He also mentioned that the property has already been rezoned by ordinance 98-40. The applicant has not shown that what they are proposing will be better for the neighborhood they are building in. No one has said how the changes will benefit the community. Mr. Rhinehart brought up that these meetings were still workshop meetings, and while those points have not been brought up yet they may in the future.

Mr. Hoffman said the intent of site was to be developed as mixed use until the Copeland family acquired it, it was historically a mixed use planned district. They are proposing a low impact mixed use residential development with three assets to the community, there are definite benefits to the city.

Mr. Rhinehart said they should get as much information as possible and then get into the strategic goal. Ms. Bartholomew added that she can put together some information about the comprehensive plan as well.

Ren Clark 420 Carroll: The commission needs to differentiate between mitigation and compensation. The runoff is designed to go into the lake. They need to look at how the development compensates the town.

Lawrence Grundmann, 301 Mariners Island: The developers said they fit in everything they could. If they are wrong the consequences will fall onto the surrounding neighborhood. He does not see how you could design something with one entrance and exit and 500 cars. They need to resize and downsize to have enough space to be self-contained. No study of existing utility systems has been presented, that should be on the list of topics. He does not want to see this development destroy the existing neighborhood.

Mr. Hoffman said that there is a road designed for emergency vehicles only, the site is designed to allow them access. Life safety has been taken into account.

Robert Fabacher, 10600 Baham Road: Parking for the retirement center is short 100 spaces, where will they go? They will park on the road designated for only firetrucks. If the development flops it will turn into an apartment complex with more than 1.5 spaces per unit. There is not enough space for parking, and he asked if restrictive deeds can be placed on the property. Will we use city resources to help them? Why are they decreasing space now and not looking at the future.

Terri Hamilton, 1111 Villere & Bridget Jarvis, 1212 Monroe: Ms. Jarvis has been here for about 30 years and would love to move into a place like this, but she has three cars. More parking is needed. Why are they adding an event center and putting other event centers out of business. Why is it needed.

Ernest Burguieres, 241 Wilkinson: At the prior meeting it was said that the hotel would have 55% – 60% occupancy rate. More hotels close than open, why not reduce the hotel size. Mr. Hoffman said that hotels have their highest use on weekends, and they need the extra rooms available. There is a balancing act to have the profit to sustain the development for years to come. They have 20 years of experience building projects that last, this will have the ability to be self-sustaining.

Lawrence Grundmann, 301 Mariners Island: There has been no mention of parking on the beach.

Mr. Rhinehart asked if the beach would be open to the public. Mr. Hoffman said that the beach would be open to the public, but it is a private beach. They are not allowing parties on the beach as they do not want that kind of environment. The beach is not as big as you think as well.

Mr. Rhinehart asked what topics would be going forward. Ms. Bartholomew said the traffic study being prepared would be done by the end of November, the Comprehensive Plan could also be a topic.

Mr. Rhinehart asked if they could do traffic and the marina at one meeting, Mr. Hoffman said there is not much to discuss about the marina. Ms. Bartholomew said there could be a general follow up meeting.


Ms. Gautreaux asked if there would be a meeting to discuss infrastructure, Ms. Bartholomew said that could be done at the traffic meeting.

Ms. Bartholomew said that the next meeting would most likely take place in December, and once a date was chosen plenty of advance notice would be given.

Ms. Gautreaux motioned to adjourn the meeting, Mr. Quillin seconded, and all were in favor. The meeting was adjourned at 8:12pm



Alex Weiner, Secretary



Karen Gautreaux, Chairwoman
Planning Commission



Brian Rhinehart, Chairman
Zoning Commission

Public Comments

Alex Weiner

From: Terri Hamilton [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, October 5, 2022 3:02 PM
To: Alex Weiner
Subject: Please forward to all Zoning Commission members immediately

Dear Zoning Commission Members,

Sucette Development, Mariners Village, is going to go in approximately 1/2 mile from Port Marigny. Port Marigny has been approved for 350 homesites and I believe a hotel and restaurants. The Port Marigny development will be built! Sucette is a similar development with 203 apartments, an 80 room hotel and restaurants along with office space, an event center and a marina as proposed.

Two very similar developments along the Monroe St corridor is likely too much for our current water, sewerage and roadway infrastructure. Does the Zoning Commission have to approve any of the Sucette development? Can the Zoning Commission leave the area zoned as it is currently?

What exactly is the mission statement and what are the rules regarding the Zoning Commission's duty to the City of Mandeville and it's citizens? Can the Zoning Commission arbitrarily decide to change a residential district to a mixed use district without input from the citizens of Mandeville?

I ask these questions of you as you are the gatekeepers for the City. What does the city gain from having two very similar developments within 1/2 mile of each other on a 2 lane road? What is Mandeville? What will Mandeville look like in 5 years if this development is approved? These are serious questions that you, the Zoning Commission must ask yourselves.

Terri Hamilton
1111 Villere St.

Alex Weiner

From: Missie And Jim Noel [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, September 21, 2022 10:28 AM
To: Alex Weiner
Subject: Sucette proposal

My name is Missie Noel and I live in New Golden Shores, 149 Dona Drive.
I am in complete opposition to this proposal.

Although I'm not completely opposed to the design that they have in mind, I just know that the entrance and exit for this is never going to be OK. There's no way they're gonna come out of Mariners Village onto causeway Boulevard and if they try to come onto Monroe Street, we can't handle that traffic! They are either going to cut through my neighborhood on Barbara, Cambronne or Cheron or they're going to have Monroe Street backed all the way up to Girod.

I don't have a problem with it being developed, but nothing that involves more than 200 cars daily is going to be a good idea right there simply because there's no good way in and out.

I know your in a bit of a 'tough spot', because they have the right to come up with a development, but the bottom line is this area can't handle the traffic. You can't widen Monroe to accommodate, you can't put a red light at the end of the Causeway, and the only other option is a cut through on Cambronne, which is a residential neighborhood.

Vote no.

Missie Noel
[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPhone

Alex Weiner

From: Melissa Rumsey [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, September 21, 2022 9:51 AM
To: Alex Weiner
Subject: Suzette harbor

For the record, I am very much in favor of the Susette Harbor! What a fantastic project and perfect for old mandeville.

Thank you,

Melissa Rumsey
1203 Magnolia Alley
Mandeville, LA 70471
985-778-1450

Sent from my iPhone

DISCUSSION POINTS FOR ZONING COMMITTEE MEETING 2022.09.21

- The Foundation should be required to apply for what it is building for its own use and any subsequent developers then apply for their specific purposes and designs so any conditions can be attached and flow with the land/permits. Control is lost when multifaceted, broad-based plans, without identifying responsible developers/operators for the various “sub-entities” are submitted as the basis for a decision as drastic as this zoning change. When this caution is ignored, the result is seldom in the public’s interest.
- The project is broadly scoped and is applying for a drastic zoning change from residential to something where it could build almost anything on it, including a casino, should St. Tammany Parish approve gambling. If the Foundation is to remain the owner of the property, will property taxes be paid or payments in lieu made due to the fact that this is essentially a private commercial development. If not, this puts the burden on all the other taxpayers.
- The information available does not provide any indication of who will actually build, maintain and operate the various elements of the project and who will be ultimately responsible. This is very important because this is a commercial development in the midst of a residential area, and maintenance and operations standards and limitations are required to protect the surrounding residential owners. For example, an entertainment venue of some sort is proposed. Will the operating hours be unfettered such that loud noise and music will flow from the venue at all hours of the night? Who will maintain all of the properties to the standards expected in an upscale residential area?
- We need clarity on when and whether the marina will be built. Originally, it was to be built prior to the rest of the project, and now, the materials indicate it will not be built until the full project is completed. What guarantee do we have that the marina will ever be built?
- How will area residents be buffered from the noise, sights, sounds, smells of this multi-use commercial project, both during construction and thereafter? Of particular concern will be light and sound “pollution” from the site in general and the event center in particular and what constraints will be put on the event center operator to control the site within those limits? The area is currently conducive to night sky viewing; will site lighting schemes be designed to preserve this asset? Will all the trees surrounding the Copeland property be cut down? What will be done with the at least two bald eagles that inhabit this area?
- The plans for parking at the retirement apartments are totally inadequate as most people aged 55 still have two automobiles. These may be national statistics, but Louisiana is a commuting state.
- There is an issue concerning the maintenance of the west side channel bulkhead and shoreline and rip-rap on the southwest area of the channel exit from the marina. With a new marina and many boats coming in and out and changes to the channel, who will be

responsible if these things cause erosion and destruction to the west side bulkhead and southwest shore in front of the existing Mariner's Island buildings?

- The Foundation has failed to adequately maintain its property in this area to neighborhood standards, allowing the grass to grow to knee-high before being bushhogged back, damaging communications installations and allowing the marina to go completely to seed, with the banks having fallen in and their bulkheads deteriorated to the point where adjoining land has been lost. What guarantees will we have that this project will be maintained to top residential neighborhood standards?
- If this project is permitted to go forward with the new proposed zoning, conditions should be imposed such that only this project can be built or the zoning reverts back to the prior zoning. Also, some "controlling person" should be designated as responsible for the operations, maintenance and welfare of the project in the public interest to protect the surrounding residents. There should be clear maintenance standards and operational standards, and some sort of guarantee that these will be maintained for some period of time. Should there be a board of directors or some sort of controlling entity surrounding residential development should have membership or observation rights.
- The mission of the Foundation is to inspire donors to invest in the LSU Health Sciences Center – New Orleans and its future. It is unclear how this project serves that mission. Prior communications indicated that a geriatric hospital or clinic would be built and this project was needed to serve that purpose. The geriatric facility should be built before this land is rezoned, and then the elements should be considered individually for rezoning as necessary to service a legitimate LSU Health facility.
- Many questions remain to be asked and answered. Only one charette was held for Mariner's Island residents which is one of the two residential developments most directly affected by this project. Normally, there would be a series of charettes so that these questions can be asked and answered. The sole charette was held last week, which appears to be an afterthought before the zoning meeting. This project rezoning should be delayed for at least six months to allow a series of these meetings to ask and answer all of these questions and to be fully transparent with what is happening. It has been indicated that the whole property will be leased to some developer or developers. Does that lease exist? Who will be these developers?
- In summary, there are many questions to be asked and answered, rendering this project as completely premature in terms of any rezoning decision.

Alex Weiner

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, October 11, 2022 5:27 PM
To: Alex Weiner
Subject: :LSU Mariners Village Property Plans Mandeville Louisiana Additional comments (#3) from Lawrence Grundmann to be added to the record and responded to

Dear Alex;

I am prepared to read these at the October 12, 2022 meeting, but I am hoping that since these are a prior written submission they will be read into the record at the meeting by PC personnel per its direction.

I have been looking further into the subject application on-line since the presentation plans were posted on the Planning Commission website and feel the need to submit the following additional comments for the record:

- 1) It appears that the developers crammed as much as they could in the way of facilities, saw how much room was left, determined it was enough to squeeze in 499 parking spaces, rounded to 500 and then made assumptions to justify same, some of which would not be supported by data or reasonableness.
- 2) There appears to be only one vehicular roadway for both in and out-the roadway does not make a complete loop. This should not be an acceptable configuration for the density contemplated even if adjusted downward.
- 3) Because the site is literally filled, there is no place to park on-site overflow if the assumptions of 500 spaces are indeed short, forcing the consequences on the existing neighborhoods
- 4) The desire to put so many facilities on the site results in narrow roadways, tight turns, questionable room for emergency vehicle and fire truck passage as well as major traffic congestion in case of emergency evacuation. This begs that in addition to the offsite traffic studies already identified as needed for the proposal, additional studies reflecting the concerns about internal parking and traffic, both under normal and under emergency conditions must be undertaken.
- 5) In summary, the proposed density of housing, hotel, event-center, marina, restaurant, shopping facilities, beach and resulting parking needs are too much for the 22-acre, limited access, site size and some combination of fewer facilities and smaller facilities are dictated. Eliminating the hotel or at least halving the hotel size and eliminating the event center may be a good place to start.

Thank you for your kind attention to this request for its incorporation into the record.

Lawrence Grundmann
301 Mariners Island
Mandeville, LA 70448
[REDACTED]

Alex Weiner

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, September 21, 2022 10:30 PM
To: Alex Weiner
Subject: RE: LSU Mariners Village Property Plans Mandeville Louisiana Additional comments from Lawrence Grundmann to be added to the record and responded to.

Dera Alex

First I am concerned that the Commission did not follow its own process described in the Agenda Notice to the effect that if a commentor took the trouble to prefile written questions or comments with staff (you), those comments would be read into the record by the commission at the meeting. Those were the instructions with which I timely complied in submitting comments by email to you with the expectation they would be so read.

On another tack, the meeting discussions prompted two other questions/comments for the record as follows:

1) given the doubts expressed by many, including some commissioners, about the inadequacy of parking to handle the documented installations of the project I found it strange that the Woodward presenter embarked on identifying an additional attraction that a beach, probably the most attractive beach on the Mandeville shoreline of Lake Pontchartrain, was going to be created at the property south end from dredge spoils and did not indicated any way (or intent) of controlling public access and in that light where would those additional visitors park on a site with questionable parking capacity already. I don't believe anyone will believe they will just walk in from Monroe St. and beyond. Related to Parking doubts: there is no reasonable space for overflow on site and the streets leading from Monroe or otherwise onto either Mariners Blvd. or either E or W Antibe can accommodate curb parking and vehicle passage.

2) There was no mention of studies undertaken to determine adequacy of utility supplies: electric power capacity and delivery, fresh water supply and capacity to deliver and sewerage outflow and processing capacity. When will these be undertaken to assure adequacy since the proposed additions of the project are beyond, maybe well beyond, contemplated development when area was originally zoned residential.

Finally, I am beginning to see that possibly just too much is trying to be "shoehorned" into this site. My nomination for reduction and more likely elimination would be the hotel.

Please add these to my earlier list for record incorporation and answers.

Thank you
Lawrence Grundmann

Alex Weiner

From: Cara Bartholomew
Sent: Tuesday, October 11, 2022 1:30 PM
To: Christian Baas
Cc: Alex Weiner
Subject: RE: Woodward Developers High Density Proposal

Thank you for your comments. Your email will be distributed to the Commission and placed into the record.

Best,

Cara Bartholomew, AICP

Director, Dept. of Planning & Development
City of Mandeville
3101 East Causeway Approach
Mandeville, LA 70448
985.624.3103



From: Christian Baas <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, October 11, 2022 11:52 AM
To: Cara Bartholomew <cbartholomew@cityofmandeville.com>
Subject: Woodward Developers High Density Proposal

Ms. Bartholomew,

I strongly oppose the Woodward Developers high density project at the Mandeville Lakefront. I am a new homeowner in the Mariners Village subdivision and a recent transplant from Jefferson Parish. I relocated to the northshore in an attempt to remove myself from the overcrowding and overdevelopment that plagued my former home. The traffic, the commercial atmosphere and aesthetic, and the general overcrowding in Metairie affected my quality of life. I could not easily enter or exit my neighborhood. I could not see Lake Pontchartrain unless I was on the shoreline because of the highrise buildings. I could not run simple errands without spending excessive time in traffic. I moved to Mandeville to get away from those aspects of life in Jefferson Parish.

The development proposal by Woodward Developers would be a major step toward turning beautiful and pleasant Mandeville into the congested and off-putting area that the eastbank of Jefferson Parish has become. Monroe Street would become a virtual parking lot that would resemble Metairie Road every afternoon. The area proposed to be developed would begin to look like the north-end of Williams Boulevard in Kenner. Running errands from Mariners Village would be like running errands along Veterans Boulevard - an all-day affair.

Please do not allow this to happen to Mandeville!! Please do not allow Mandeville to become Metairie!! Please do not approve this development!

A concerned Mandevillian,

Chrisitan Baas



162 Sandra del Mar Drive
Mandeville, LA 70448

Alex Weiner

From: Cathy Lorio [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, September 21, 2022 12:59 PM
To: Alex Weiner
Subject: opposition and questions regarding sucette harbor

I am opposed to this development for many reasons. While I do not live in the city limits, my daughter just bought a house in Mandeville and this is why I am concerned.

1. Since the property is owned by LSU Health foundation I feel this is being **misrepresented** as a health project. When LSU first announced this project it would include **health care services** nowhere in current plans do they talk about health care.
2. LSU Health foundation is a **non profit organization**. Leasing the land to Woodward for 99 years.

19. Subsequent Events

In July 2021, a ground lease was executed with a developer for undeveloped property in Mandeville, Louisiana. The term of the lease is ninety-nine years commencing on the earlier of the date of construction or the first day of the calendar month after the design and financing period. Ground lease payments will begin at the start of the construction period and increase for each phase of the development. When all phases are executed, total annual payments will be \$600,000 with Consumer Price Index adjustments over the term of the lease.

It is using the land as a **revenue stream** to fund it's cancer research.

Per the St Tammany Assessor website, **LSU does not pay any taxes on the 3 parcels** it acquired from the Copelands (141-131-6885, 141-126-8171, 141-126-8090).

Prior to the donation in 2019 property taxes were **over \$50,000**.

The property taxes included many items the developer/residents will use such as **police and fire but will not pay** for.

3. Are there **any sweetheart deals** with this property giving **Copeland companies** or investments interest in the hotel, event center, restaurants and apartments.
4. Will this always be for people **55+**? Can they change it at a later date? I don't know many people who retire at 55 and who want to live in an apartment?
5. I believe this project will add many cars/trucks to the roads that are overcrowded causing additional traffic.
6. While I do believe we do need a hotel in Mandeville. I **do not believe** this project **reflects what this community deserves** as a development. It is cookie cutter buildings with no character to reflect the character of Mandeville. Where is the Louisiana Character as stated in the development narrative?
7. How many parcels are being developed in the current plan? Is it just one of 15 acres? What are plans for other parcels? One drawing had **storage** on site, what is this?
8. While the site includes a marina, where is the boat launch for these 160+ boats?
9. What kind of surfaces will be used for parking, shouldn't it be made with materials to absorb water and not just plain concrete or asphalt?
10. I believe the traffic numbers are underestimated! 200 apartments will have at least 300-400 cars. Most renters will have 2 cars. 80 room hotel will have well over 100 cars with staff and guests. This does not even take into account other

buildings so add at least another 200. Looks like at least 600+ cars potentially moving daily along with commercial trucks. Oh just imagine when all these people evacuate for a storm!

11. Removal of Oak trees and leaving only 10 trees. Planting new seedlings nowhere compares to a mature oak tree. We deserve better and should demand it!

12. Height- The Developers should made to comply. If they are cutting down the trees, buildings will be visible to the public with lack of tree canopy.

13. Why not build to the current specifications of CLURO?

Sincerely,

Cathy D. Lorio

CITY OF MANDEVILLE PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
SPEAKER CARD

CASE NUMBER: _____ DATE: 10/12/2022
CASE NAME: LSU Foundation
SPEAKER NAME: Lawrence Grundman
MAILING ADDRESS: 301 MARINERS ISLAND 70448
PHYSICAL ADDRESS (if different): KIGRUND@SBCCGLOBAL.NET
CITY: Mandeville STATE: LA
ZIP CODE: 70448 PHONE: [REDACTED]
COMMENTS: _____

I AM: () FOR () AGAINST (X) OTHER
(X) I WISH TO SPEAK () I DO NOT WISH TO SPEAK *[Signature]*

CITY OF MANDEVILLE PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
SPEAKER CARD

CASE NUMBER: _____ DATE: 10-12-22
CASE NAME: LSU
SPEAKER NAME: ERNEST BURGUIERES
MAILING ADDRESS: 241 WILKINSON ST. MANDEVILLE LA
PHYSICAL ADDRESS (if different): _____
CITY: _____ STATE: _____
ZIP CODE: _____ PHONE: [REDACTED]
COMMENTS: _____

I AM: () FOR (X) AGAINST () OTHER
() I WISH TO SPEAK () I DO NOT WISH TO SPEAK *[Signature]*

CITY OF MANDEVILLE PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
SPEAKER CARD

CASE NUMBER: _____ DATE: 10-12-22

CASE NAME: _____

SPEAKER NAME: Robert Feibacher

MAILING ADDRESS: 10600 Baham rd, Folsom, LA 70437

PHYSICAL ADDRESS (if different): _____

CITY: Folsom STATE: _____

ZIP CODE: 70437 PHONE: _____

COMMENTS: _____

I AM: FOR AGAINST OTHER
 I WISH TO SPEAK I DO NOT WISH TO SPEAK

RF