



City of Lake Charles

326 Pujo Street
P.O. Box 900
Lake Charles, LA
70602-0900

Meeting Minutes Planning and Zoning Commission

Monday, April 14, 2025

5:00 PM

Council Chambers

OPEN MEETING

Vice Chairman Gus Schram called the meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission to order at approximately 5:00pm, and requested a roll call.

Prayer: David Berryhill

Pledge: Thomas Sanders

ROLL CALL

Present 5 - Alvin Joseph, David Berryhill, Gus Schram III, Thomas Sanders Jr., and Mitchell Gregory Pete

Absent 2 - Adam McBride, and Reginald Weeks

MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

Vice Chairman Gus Schram asked if everyone received a copy of the minutes from the previous meeting.

1st to accept: David Berryhill

2nd to accept: Thomas Sanders

All in favor.

SPECIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

Vice Chairman Gus Schram asked if there are any special announcements?

Mrs. Bynum states that any person aggrieved by the decision of this Commission for a Major Conditional Use permit, Variance, or Special Exception may file a written appeal with the Director of Planning within (15) days of the decision of the commission.

COMMISSION BUSINESS

ANX 25-03

CHAPTER 24 - LAKE CHARLES ZONING ORDINANCE

APPLICANT: JIN AN ZOU/CITY OF LAKE CHARLES

SUBJECT: The applicant is requesting annexation approval of 2.48-acres M/L, and generally described as the **Eastside 3500 Blk. Knight Lane (3521)**.

STAFF FINDINGS: The on-site and site plan reviews revealed that the proposed annexation is under review by the Registrar of Voters office and the Tax Assessor Office for Annexation Certification.

Vice Chairman Gus Schram asks for the applicant to state their name and address for the record.

Applicant not present.

Lauren Bynum states she has comments from engineering. There is no water along Knight Lane and there is no sewer along Knight Lane for this area and there appears to be a drainage lateral that traverses the property.

Vice Chairman Schram asks if any of those are prohibited.

Lauren Bynum states no, any development would have to go through the engineering review, when we annex, if there are not city services, we like to have it stated for the record.

Vice Chairman Schram asks if there is anyone who would like to speak.

Vice Chairman Schram calls for a vote.

Vice Chairman Schram calls for a vote. The motion carried by the following vote:

For: 5 - Alvin Joseph, David Berryhill, Gus Schram III, Thomas Sanders Jr. and Mitchell Gregory Pete

Against: 0

Absent: 2 - Adam McBride and Reginald Weeks

**ANXZON
25-03**

CHAPTER 24 - LAKE CHARLES ZONING ORDINANCE

APPLICANT: JIN AN ZOU/CITY OF LAKE CHARLES

SUBJECT: The applicant is requesting a zoning classification of Business Zoning District of 2.48-acres M/L, and generally described as the **Eastside 3500 Blk. Knight Lane (3521)**.

STAFF FINDINGS: The on-site and site plan reviews revealed that the proposed zoning classification of Business is consistent with the current zoning classification of the Parish of Calcasieu (C-2). Therefore, staff finds the request reasonable and acceptable for passage.

Vice Chairman Gus Schram asks for the applicant to state their name and address for the record.

Applicant not present.

Lauren Bynum states she has comments from engineering. There is no water along Knight Lane and there is no sewer along Knight Lane for this area and there appears to be a drainage lateral that traverses the property.

Vice Chairman Schram asks if any of those are prohibited.

Lauren Bynum states no, any development would have to go through the engineering review, when we annex, if there are not city services, we like to have it stated for the record.

Vice Chairman Schram asks if there is anyone who would like to speak.

Vice Chairman Schram calls for a vote.

Vice Chairman Schram calls for a vote. The motion carried by the following vote:

For: 5 - Alvin Joseph, David Berryhill, Gus Schram III, Thomas Sanders Jr. and Mitchell Gregory Pete

Against: 0

Absent: 2 - Adam McBride and Reginald Weeks

PREFNL-VA LAKE CHARLES SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS

R 25-05

APPLICANT: AZUCENA MADRIGAL (MADRIGAL SUBDIVISION)

SUBJECT: Applicant is requesting Preliminary and Final Subdivision approval (Sec. 2.3 & 2.4) in order to re-subdivide a .18-acre tract of land M/L into two (2) development lots including Variances in order to 1) reduce lot size requirement (4,000sq.ft. each vs. 5,000sq.ft.) and 2) create side setback property line encroachment, within a Mixed Use Zoning District. Location of the request is the **Southeast corner of N. Shattuck Street @ Commercial Street.**

STAFF FINDINGS: The on-site and site plan reviews revealed the applicant is requesting to subdivide a .18 acre tract of land into two development lots including Variances in order to 1) reduce the lot size requirement and 2) create a side setback property line encroachment, within a Mixed Use Zoning District. Both of the existing structures on the property have current Unsafe Structure cases open and the commercial building has an active demolition permit. Staff cannot forward a position of support due to the commercial redevelopment of these individual subdivided properties will make it challenging to adhere to the development standards. Sec 4-205(5)(a)(ii) of the Zoning Ordinance states Variances should not be granted which would permit the creation of a lot or parcel that cannot be developed in compliance with this ordinance and other regulations applicable thereto.

Withdrawn per applicant's request.

**PREFNL
25-09**

LAKE CHARLES SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS

APPLICANT: LINDSEY PRIOLA (PRIOLA'S POWELL PLACE SUBDIVISION)

SUBJECT: Applicant is requesting Preliminary and Final Subdivision approval (Sec. 2.3 & 2.4) in order to re-subdivide a 1.12-acre tract of land M/L into four (4) residential lots, within a Residential Zoning District. Location of the request is **5100 Powell Lane.**

STAFF FINDINGS: The on-site and site plan reviews revealed the applicant is requesting to re-subdivide a 1.12-acre tract of land M/L into four (4) residential lots, within a Residential Zoning District. The subdivision request meets the minimum lot size for development, therefore staff finds the request reasonable.

Lauren Bynum adds the engineering staff wanted to add the sewer would need to be extended across the whole length of the property by the property owner, water is available on Powell Lane.

Thomas Sanders states that he is going to abstain from any discussion or vote on this matter.

Vice Chairman Schram asks if the applicant is in attendance.

Applicant is not yet present, shows up a little later.

Vice Chairman Schram asks opponent to state name and address for the record..

*John Vickers, 4606 Powell Lane, Lake Charles- In Opposition
Purposed build doesn't fit in with neighborhood. Concerns about to much come and go with rental properties. Expressed concerns about density and traffic. The proposed*

property is three feet to low. Concerns about cheap houses on piers on the proposed site.

Vice Chairman Schram reminds Mr. Vickers of the three minute rule.

Vice Chairman Schram addresses Mr. Gale asking him if he had something he needed to say.

Mr. Gale states he is in attendance on behalf of the developer and apologizes for being late, he thought the meeting started at 5:30 p.m.

*Tom Gayle on behalf of Lindsey Priola, 1713 Kirby Lane, Lake Charles
Proposed site is on the edge of the city limits, it is a transition area. It has been engineered so that it doesn't have a negative impact or an adverse affect on drainage and the traffic. The idea, even though it is a higher density, it is in the city, a transitional area, and with the help of the city engineers will help improve the drainage in the area. Wanting to create a better transitional phase then what is there now. Gave examples of other developments that have helped with drainage. Country Club Rd will be widened eventually, the area is ripe for transitional growth.*

David Berryhill asks if these are going to be a little bit more than eleven thousand square foot lots.

Mr. Gayle confirms, stating they are not junk homes.

David Berryhill states the city minimum is five thousand square feet.

Lauren Bynum states the city minimum is six thousand for residential, so these are almost double of the minimum.

Mr. Gayle states the developer does not build junk homes, will build good quality houses. Sites other places the developer has done this same type of project in the city.

David Berryhill states there was a comment that piers will be used because of the low elevation.

Mr. Gayle confirms, and states that in floodways and in flood zones engineering has to accommodate for that.

Vice Chairman Schram asks about the drainage lateral and how it relates to this property.

Mr. Gayle states it is to the west of this property. Across the street.

Mr. Vickers speaks out from the back asking to say something, Vice Chairman Schram says no and that if he wishes to speak he would have to come back up and be recognized. Mr. Vickers continues to talk loudly. Mr. Sanders shuts him down stating what part of no did you not understand. Vice Chairman Schram states that a person does not get to speak out from the audience, it is not operated that way.

Vice Chairman Schram states that he is curious about what engineering had to say about the drainage as the lateral is on the property.

Lauren Bynum clarifies that statement was for a different property. For individual homes

on piers is better for the site. The flood zone is around the drainage lateral. Indicates on the GIS map.

Vice Chairman Schram asks the blue indicates what on the map.

Lauren Bynum states the flood zone.

Vice Chairman Schram asks which flood zone.

Lauren Bynum states flood zone AE is indicated by the blue.

Vice Chairman Schram clarifies that the property in question is not in the flood zone.

Lauren Bynum confirms. Flood zone Shaded X.

Vice Chairman Schram states Ms. Ruth Conner submitted a card.

*Ruth Conner, 5050 Powell Lane, Lake Charles -In Opposition
States she has a petition, everyone opposes the four shotgun homes being built. Asks if anyone has pictures of the homes.*

David Berryhill clarifies that this meeting is only about subdividing the lot, not about the houses themselves.

Ms. Conner asks if there will be another meeting about building on the lots.

Vice Chairman Schram states that if it is agreed to subdivide the lot they (the developer) can build what the city allows on the lots.

Ms. Conner states they are shot gun style houses, three bedrooms, long skinny houses at about twelve to thirteen hundred square feet. Expressed concerns about the coming and going of rentals, and depreciation of property values. Cheaply done houses will change the whole landscape. Expressed concerns about the traffic and the size of the street. Expressed concerns about drainage problems, the developer flipping houses. The size of the homes encourages short term rentals. The developer has a rental business. Has copies from the developers Facebook page as proof.

Vice Chairman Schram asks for the petition Ms. Conner referenced.

Ms. Conner continues to speak. Stating bringing the property into the city gives them more...

Vice Chairman Schram asks again for the petition.

Ms. Conner states they wouldn't mind two homes on the property. References the Facebook pages showing that the developer flips homes.

David Berryhill again clarifies what this item is for, the subdividing of the lot, not about the houses. Continues to clarify that when a lot is subdivided it is with the intention of selling the lots or building houses on the lots to sell or to be rented. Validates that he understands that Ms. Conner does not want this but states the developer could build to rights on the property now but would have to sell as a group rather than individually. The only alternative to keep this from happening is if Ms. Conner purchased the land in question herself. If you own the property then you can do what you want.

Ms. Conner states they want \$100,000 for the property.

David Berryhill states it is understandable when developers come in and they have made an application to buy a piece of property and they buy the property and it is all contingent on whether they can subdivide it. Yes, there is an intent to make money, it is development, it is investment, it is the same that any of us would do. Understands that Ms. Conner is presenting all this information to show what the developer has done in the past.

Ms. Conner states she was trying to show that the developer said one thing but is doing another.

David Berryhill states he is not trying to defend any thing that is right or wrong, but is just stating the facts.

Ms. Conner states she would like to speak on the drainage.

David Berryhill states there are things in place in the city that takes care of the drainage.

Ms. Conner states that it is a parish drain not a city drain.

Vice Chairman Schram states he would like to make a comment about the drainage. It was mentioned by Mr. Vickers, as an objection, that the houses are being built on piers. The houses built on piers to compensate for the elevation is an appropriate way to deal with it and it will not effect the drainage that you are concerned about. Houses on piers don't displace water. Therefore no need to talk about the drainage.

Ms. Conner expressed concerns about traffic.

Vice Chairman Schram states it is the common view that they want the city to grow. Developers that target pieces of property are working in that direction for the city. Which is generally positive.

Ms. Conner states that Vice Chairman Schram is correct but that there is a big sewage problem.

Lauren Bynum states in reference to what the engineering department had said, the property owners will have to extend sewage themselves.

Ms. Conner states that the subdivision will create a hardship.

Vice Chairman Schram asks if they live in a subdivision that has restrictive covenants.

Ms. Conner states they are in an old subdivision so they are outdated.

Vice Chairman Schram states they are expired.

Ms. Conner confirms but states everyone takes care of their own stuff. Continues to express concerns about rental properties and the traffic.

Vice Chairman Schram asks her to stop stating that he had let her go way beyond the three minutes.

Mr. Vickers asks to say one sentence.

Vice Chairman Schram agrees.

John Vickers, 4606 Powell Lane, Lake Charles -In Opposition

The land is three foot to low. If you put the houses on piers it still wont come up to the street height. There are two canals that flow into this property and it floods every time it rains. People don't understand that the land is low. Used to work on the land with the previous landowners son.

Vice Chairman Schram states that is a long sentence.

Mr. Vickers continues to express concerns about the canals and drainage.

Vice Chairman Schram states that is enough, thank you.

Lauren Bynum states that the development standards that we now have in place is that a person has to build a foot above the road, the sewer manhole or the base flood elevation whichever is higher of the three. Even on piers it will have to be a foot above the road. If the house is on piers it will be less impactful from a drainage perspective, than the house that was previously on that property.

Mr. Vickers states that was what his comment was about having staff see the property.

Vice Chairman Schram states he has described it well.

Mr. Vickers states there is a problem if you put a house on piers on a property that low, it wont raise the house.

Vice Chairman Schram clarifies that piers can be built up as high as you want them to be.

Ms. Conner speaking out from the audience that they all object.

Vice Chairman Schram acknowledges stating that they all got the picture.

Vice Chairman Schram asks if there are any other comments or questions.

Vice Chairman Schram asks if Mr. Gayle would like to say anything. He declines.

Thomas Sanders states that he has abstained.

Vice Chairman Schram calls for a vote.

Vice Chairman Gus Schram called for a vote. The motion carried by the following vote:

For: 4 - Alvin Joseph, David Berryhill, Gus Schram III and Mitchell Gregory Pete

Against: 0

Absent: 2 - Adam McBride and Reginald Weeks

Abstain: 1 - Thomas Sanders Jr.

**PREFNL
25-10****LAKE CHARLES SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS****APPLICANT:** TANNER MILLER (BILBO ACRES)**SUBJECT:** Applicant is requesting Preliminary and Final Subdivision approval (Sec. 2.3 & 2.4) in order to re-subdivide a 0.272-acre tract of land M/L into two (2) residential lots, within a Mixed Use Zoning District. Location of the request is **1810 Bilbo Street thru to W. Bilbo Alley.****STAFF FINDINGS:** The on-site and site plan reviews revealed the applicant is requesting to re-subdivide a 0.272-acre tract of land M/L into two (2) residential lots, within a Mixed Use Zoning District. The subdivision request meets the minimum lot size for development, therefore staff finds the request reasonable.*Vice Chairman Schram asks the applicant to state their name and address for the record.**Cheryl Miller, 819 Gentry Dr, Sulphur, LA**The property was already split into two lots, but it was not equal. Wanting to move the center property line to make the two lots equal. They will eventually each be a single family home.**Vice Chairman Schram asks if there are any questions or cards.**Vice Chairman Schram calls for a vote.***Vice Chairman Schram calls for a vote. The motion carried by the following vote:****For:** 5 - Alvin Joseph, David Berryhill, Gus Schram III, Thomas Sanders Jr. and Mitchell Gregory Pete**Against:** 0**Absent:** 2 - Adam McBride and Reginald Weeks**SPC 25-02****CHAPTER 24 - LAKE CHARLES ZONING ORDINANCE****APPLICANT:** MARTIN TOVREA, MULTISTUDIO**SUBJECT:** Applicant is requesting a Special Exception (Sec. 24-4-206) in order to re-construct a non-conforming use (health clinic) and maintain existing non-conforming parking spaces, within a Mixed Use Zoning District. Location of the request is **2000 Opelousas Street.****STAFF FINDINGS:** The on-site and site plan reviews revealed the applicant is requesting to re-construct a non-conforming use (health clinic) and maintain existing non-conforming parking spaces, within a Mixed Use Zoning District. The applicant is requesting to maintain the existing non-conforming parking along both Opelousas Street and North Prater Street which does not meet the required 15' landscaped buffer from the property line to buffer the parking and a parking spot reduction of 200 spaces vs the required 284. The property is bordered to the North by residential properties and a church, to the East and West by residential properties and to the South by school property.*Vice Chairman Schram reads in the VAR 25-14 as well.**Vice Chairman Schram asks the applicant to state his name and address for the record.**Martin Tovrea, 1501 Religious St. Ste A, New Orleans, LA**Rebuild the facility that was destroyed by Hurricane Laura. The parking along Opelousas*

and North Prater Street is the original parking that has been there since the 90's when the building was built, requesting to leave it as is for the economics of the project and also if they were to remove the parking and try to install new parking lots along those two perimeters there would be a reduction by virtue of lack of land. The issue is that the parking is just beyond the current setback requirements.

Vice Chairman Schram asks what is the existing setback.

Mr. Tovrea states he believes it is 20 feet.

Lauren Bynum asks if they are referring to the buffer. The buffer on North Prater appears to be just less than 10 feet, which is the required buffer on Prater. The requirement on Opelousas is fifteen feet because it is a collector. The landscape buffer is right under on both frontages.

Vice Chairman Schram asks what is the encroachment on the buffer yard.

Lauren Bynum states on North Prater it is about 18 inches and on Opelousas it is pretty minimal.

Vice Chairman Schram asks if the landscaping is still feasible.

Lauren Bynum states it is still feasible and would be a requirement.

Thomas Sanders asks what is the requirement for landscaping.

Lauren Bynum states it is one Class A tree every 40 feet, or two Class B trees every 40 feet, and 3 foot shrubs to buffer the parking.

Thomas Sanders asks Mr. Tovrea if that is acceptable, as it is required.

Mr. Tovrea states through landscaping or a berm they will meet the landscaping requirement.

Mr. Sanders asks if a berm would fit into the landscape requirements for the city.

Lauren Bynum states not for the trees. Once the landscape plan is submitted staff will review it and work with the developer. It will need to meet the landscape requirements or come back before this board.

Mr. Tovrea states they don't have the landscaping plan yet because they were waiting for this meeting first.

Mr. Sanders states it does not make sense to tear out the parking lot for a nine or ten inch variance. It sounds like they are willing to comply with the landscaping requirements. Mr. Tovrea confirms.

Mr. Tovrea states the second part is the reduction of parking for the new. The building on the west side is a footprint of the new building which is replacing the one that is pretty much torn down at this point. The goal is to minimize the footprint of the building, to accommodate parking as needed, and to maintain a better solution for drainage. The drainage along Opelousas in the street the pipes are under sized. They are requesting fewer parking by calculation to accommodate the predicted patient flow of the facility and to accommodate the staff that are there all day long. The reduction of the 84 spaces

offers the south end of the site to have a large area for water collection. There will be subsurface piping, and a location to collect all of the water that will then slowly percolate out and can be tapped into North Prater for bleed out into that storm system if needed. It will not be underground it will be a basin. It will be landscaped and we will make it look nice.

Mr. Sanders asks all of the parking that is shown on the south side of the structure is that all new. Mr. Tovrea confirms.

Mr. Tovrea states that the collection of the North parking that is existing, the west parking that is existing and the south parking which is new, will be right at 200 parking spaces.

Vice Chairman Schram comments that he likes the way they are addressing the drainage situation.

Mr. Sanders states what was there previously was a two story building and now it is going to be a three.

Mr. Tovrea states it was previously a one story. The predicted patient flow and the growth of the facility over the last 4 1/2 almost 5 years everything has been condensed into the building on the east, a lot of the spaces are inadequate for current health care uses not only by code but for functional reasons, accessibility, lighting, and day lighting. In order to accommodate for the predicted flow of patients over the next couple of years they would like two floors of clinical space and an upper floor entirely for administration that will consolidate the administration from a couple of locations into one location. The facility will have two full floors and a third floor that is only half of the footprint. The height limits currently are 35 feet to the roof and they are requesting 45 feet.

Vice Chairman Schram comments that might be a fire department issue.

Mr. Tovrea states they have done the calculations based on the hydrant flow, on the two corners and based on that they are going to install a fire pump which will have water flow all the way to the third floor, there will be stand pipes in the stairs, egress and fire department access. Accommodating all of the fire lanes. They are hopeful that this project will act as a catalyst to encourage more development in the area.

Vice Chairman Schram asks if anyone in the audience needed to speak.

Vice Chairman Schram calls for a vote on the first item, SPC 25-02

Vice Chairman Schram calls for a vote on the second item, VAR 25-14

Vice Chairman Schram called for a vote. The motion carried by the following vote:

For: 5 - Alvin Joseph, David Berryhill, Gus Schram III, Thomas Sanders Jr. and Mitchell Gregory Pete

Against: 0

Absent: 2 - Adam McBride and Reginald Weeks

VAR 24-42(2) CHAPTER 24 - LAKE CHARLES ZONING ORDINANCE

APPLICANT: SIGN WORLD

SUBJECT: Applicant is requesting a Variance (Sec. 4-205) in order construct a 40ft. in

height sign vs. the required monument style sign and maximum height of 10ft., within a Business Zoning District. Location of the request is **3030 Legion Street**.

STAFF FINDINGS: The on-site and site plan reviews revealed the applicant is requesting to maintain an installed sign that does not meet the monument sign requirements according to the new design standards for signage. Previously approved for a height variance of 40' vs the required 15', the sign will be 40' wide and 40' tall with a 24' monument base.

Vice Chairman Schram asks the applicant to state his name and address for the record.

Kemp Dousay, 1175 Hwy 12, Dequincy, LA

Provided a drawing to illustrate the size of the base. The point of contention is the size of the base.

Lauren Bynum states yes, it does not meet the definition of a monument sign. We were under the assumption that it would be a 40 foot tall sign by ten foot wide, not what is up there which is a ten foot tall sign that is 40 feet wide. The 24 foot base does not meet the 40 foot wide sign so it does not meet the monument definition which is why we wanted to bring it back in front of the commission so we are all on the same page.

Mr. Dousay indicating the illustration, states it shows the size of the base in relationship to the sign. The 24 foot base would be the 60%.

David Berryhill asks if the 60% is what Sign World is asking for.

Mr. Dousay states that what he originally asked for.

David Berryhill clarifies it hasn't been completed.

Mr. Dousay confirms and states if doesn't satisfy then we need to decide what they are going to do. The ordinance doesn't specifically say and we do a lot of different signs in a lot of different jurisdictions, some ask for 75% width some ask for 100% width. Asks for clarification on what the requirement will be.

Lauren Bynum states a monument sign is monolith within some variation for design detail. So a forty foot sign with a twenty four foot base is not a monolith sign that meets our definition of a monument sign.

Thomas Sanders asks Mr. Dousay this is your business, what does a monument sign mean to you.

Mr. Dousay states it varies in jurisdictions, most of them tell us exactly what we have to do, the monument base.

Mr. Sanders states a forty foot by ten foot billboard on a pylon never meets the definition of a monument sign.

Mr. Dousay states if you do the base it does, if you construct the base. We have already been approved for the height and the size, now we have to figure out what kind of base.

Mr. Sanders states that they were approved to put in a forty foot monument sign but that is not what was built.

Mr. Dousay states if he knows the definition of the monument sign then he will build it.

Mr. Sanders states that it will be way more clear from this point and hereafter.

Mr. Dousay agrees and states that everyone should be on the same page.

Vice Chairman Schram states his understanding of the new sign ordinance is that a monument sign is allowed to be ten feet wide and fifteen feet tall. We all understood we were approving a ten foot wide sign that was forty feet tall. Which is way beyond the ten by ten or ten by fifteen. Asks Lauren Bynum to clarify what the rule is.

Lauren Bynum states that the ordinance states the height for the interstate is fifteen feet. Ten feet in height when not on the interstate. The size of the sign is dictated by the original ordinance which includes the frontage and the size of the building, but the height is restricted to the ten and fifteen feet.

Vice Chairman Schram states that the width of the sign varies depending on the property. Lauren Bynum confirms.

Vice Chairman Schram asks in the case of this property what is the permitted width of the sign.

Lauren Bynum states it is a really large property. What they have out there does meet the requirements for the size of the sign. It doesn't dictate the width or the height, which now that we are getting into the concerns of the monument style sign we might have to look into that, ours just gives the total square footage and it has been left up to the company designing the sign to what those dimensions are, but with the monument requirement it still stands that it has to be a monolith.

Vice Chairman Schram breaks it down into two parts. Asks does the sign that has already been built, meet the size requirement that you have indicated.

Lauren Bynum states yes.

Vice Chairman Schram states now then we need to talk about what the monument requirement would be.

Mr. Dousay states his application was for the height.

Vice Chairman Schram acknowledges Mr. Dousay's statement and states we are now talking about the monument base width size.

David Berryhill asks if what is there now is adequate for wind load.

Mr. Dousay confirms.

David Berryhill states that personally he thinks a forty foot wide base is going to look huge and will be very unsightly. Asks if there will be decoration or something unique at the base.

Mr. Dousay states that the building has ACM, an aluminum composite, it is used a lot in car dealerships, it is a nice smooth material, it lays down flat and it doesn't ripple. The building is constructed with black and silver ACM and he (the owner) would like the base to match the building.

David Berryhill asks if the base would be more black than silver or more silver than black.

Mr. Dousay states more black with silver trim.

David Berryhill states it would kind of hide it and it wouldn't stand out as much.

Thomas Sanders addresses Mr. Dousay stating that he is the sign builder so what does he think would look good esthetically.

Mr. Dousay states he recommended a 24 foot base which is a little over half the width. I think going forward we will have that a little clearer in the ordinance.

Thomas Sanders suspects that is true. Considering where the sign is located it will take up some existing parking area.

Mr. Dousay agrees that the owner will lose a couple of parking spots.

Thomas Sanders states these are electronic signs. Mr. Dousay confirms. Mr. Sanders states the messages on the signs can be changed. Mr. Dousay confirms. Mr. Sanders asks what is the owners intent with respect to advertising on the signs, will there be anything other than his own business.

Mr. Dousay states that the owner can't (advertise for any other business). That would be off premise advertising and he cannot.

Thomas Sanders states he wanted to confirm they were on the same page.

Gregory Pate asks if what they are voting on tonight is the 60% base.

David Berryhill confirms that is what is being asked for.

Vice Chairman Schram asks when the base is built will it be built triangular and meet the sign. Mr. Dousay confirms.

David Berryhill asks if there could be a stipulation that no lettering or signage can go on the base.

Mr. Dousay agrees stating it would look bad if they did.

Gregory Pate asks for a motion that they go with the 60% and no additional signage on the base. Thomas Sanders adds to the motion that no other advertising other than for the business.

Alvin Joseph seconds the motion.

Thomas Sanders asks if it is a requirement of the city as to what material has to be utilized for the base.

Lauren Bynum states there is no requirement as far as metal for the base. However, there is no issued permit for this project, it has not been submitted and this has been done without an issued permit. What has not been approved is the base itself so before anything else is done, based on the approval, that the information gets to us because the base needs to be looked at by the building department and we can go through the proper

measures to make sure all of the other things are met. The permit is not issued and there was also never any information in the permit about a base.

David Berryhill asks if there was a foundation inspection. Lauren Bynum states no.

David Berryhill addresses Mr. Dousay and asks if it was poured without a foundation inspection.

Mr. Dousay states he thought there was, thought they had the permits.

David Berryhill states someone would have inspected the open hole.

Mr. Dousay states they had left it there, they had a twenty foot hole, five foot in diameter, we left it cased.

Thomas Sanders states that the sign has power. Asks how the sign got power.

Lauren Bynum states power was requested and it was missed because the power was requested under a separate permit with a separate address. The two were very separate. As previously stated, it needs buttoned up, something that is twenty four feet by thirty feet tall needs to be evaluated by the building department.

Gregory Pete states he had gotten his electrical from the other dealership.

Lauren Bynum states when they had looked into it, it was under a different address. If it was under the same address it would have been caught.

Thomas Sanders asks if this sign is affiliated with the Mitsubishi dealership.

Mr. Dousay confirms the owner owns both of them.

Thomas Sanders states he understands that and Mitsubishi probably pulled the power from Kia so he didn't have to go under or over the canal. Lauren Bynum confirms.

David Berryhill asks if they would be able to advertise for Kia.

Lauren Bynum states they could as it is the same property and same owner.

Vice Chairman Schram asks if everyone has the understanding about the permits.

Lauren Bynum states that outside of this we have to have a permit.

Vice Chairman Schram asks if there any other questions.

Vice Chairman Schram calls for a vote on the amendment.

Vice Chairman Schram calls for a vote as amended.

Vice Chairman Schram called for a vote. The motion carried by the following vote:

For: 5 - Alvin Joseph, David Berryhill, Gus Schram III, Thomas Sanders Jr. and Mitchell Gregory Pete

Against: 0

Absent: 2 - Adam McBride and Reginald Weeks

VAR 25-14 CHAPTER 24- LAKE CHARLES ZONING ORDINANCE

APPLICANT: MARTIN TOVREA, MULTISTUDIO

SUBJECT: Applicant is requesting a Variance (Sec. 24-4-205) in order to re-construct a non-conforming use (health clinic) with a height of 45ft. vs. required maximum 35ft., within a Mixed Use Zoning District. Location of the request is **2000 Opelousas Street**.

STAFF FINDINGS: The on-site and site plan reviews revealed the applicant is requesting to increase the building height limitation to 45' from the required 35' to accommodate the proposed three-story building.

Vice Chairman Schram asks the applicant to state his name and address for the record.

*Martin Tovrea, 1501 Religious St. Ste A, New Orleans, LA
Rebuild the facility that was destroyed by Hurricane Laura. The parking along Opelousas and North Prater Street is the original parking that has been there since the 90's when the building was built, requesting to leave it as is for the economics of the project and also if they were to remove the parking and try to install new parking lots along those two perimeters there would be a reduction by virtue of lack of land. The issue is that the parking is just beyond the current setback requirements.*

Vice Chairman Schram asks what is the existing setback.

Mr. Tovrea states he believes it is 20 feet.

Lauren Bynum asks if they are referring to the buffer. The buffer on North Prater appears to be just less than 10 feet, which is the required buffer on Prater. The requirement on Opelousas is fifteen feet because it is a collector. The landscape buffer is right under on both frontages.

Vice Chairman Schram asks what is the encroachment on the buffer yard.

Lauren Bynum states on North Prater it is about 18 inches and on Opelousas it is pretty minimal.

Vice Chairman Schram asks if the landscaping is still feasible.

Lauren Bynum states it is still feasible and would be a requirement.

Thomas Sanders asks what is the requirement for landscaping.

Lauren Bynum states it is one Class A tree every 40 feet, or two Class B trees every 40 feet, and 3 foot shrubs to buffer the parking.

Thomas Sanders asks Mr. Tovrea if that is acceptable, as it is required.

Mr. Tovrea states through landscaping or a berm they will meet the landscaping requirement.

Mr. Sanders asks if a berm would fit into the landscape requirements for the city.

Lauren Bynum states not for the trees. Once the landscape plan is submitted staff will

review it and work with the developer. It will need to meet the landscape requirements or come back before this board.

Mr. Tovrea states they don't have the landscaping plan yet because they were waiting for this meeting first.

Mr. Sanders states it does not make sense to tear out the parking lot for a nine or ten inch variance. It sounds like they are willing to comply with the landscaping requirements. Mr. Tovrea confirms.

Mr. Tovrea states the second part is the reduction of parking for the new. The building on the west side is a footprint of the new building which is replacing the one that is pretty much torn down at this point. The goal is to minimize the footprint of the building, to accommodate parking as needed, and to maintain a better solution for drainage. The drainage along Opelousas in the street the pipes are under sized. They are requesting fewer parking by calculation to accommodate the predicted patient flow of the facility and to accommodate the staff that are there all day long. The reduction of the 84 spaces offers the south end of the site to have a large area for water collection. there will be subsurface piping, and a location to collect all of the water that will then slowly percolate out and can be tapped into North Prater for bleed out into that storm system if needed. It will not be underground it will be a basin. It will be landscaped and we will make it look nice.

Mr. Sanders asks all of the parking that is shown on the south side of the structure is that all new. Mr. Tovrea confirms.

Mr. Tovrea states that the collection of the North parking that is existing, the west parking that is existing and the south parking which is new, will be right at 200 parking spaces.

Vice Chairman Schram comments that he likes the way they are addressing the drainage situation.

Mr. Sanders states what was there previously was a two story building and now it is going to be a three.

Mr. Tovrea states it was previously a one story. The predicted patient flow and the growth of the facility over the last 4 1/2 almost 5 years everything has been condensed into the building on the east, a lot of the spaces are inadequate for current health care uses not only by code but for functional reasons, accessibility, lighting, and day lighting. In order to accommodate for the predicted flow of patients over the next couple of years they would like two floors of clinical space and an upper floor entirely for administration that will consolidate the administration from a couple of locations into one location. The facility will have two full floors and a third floor that is only half of the footprint. The height limits currently are 35 feet to the roof and they are requesting 45 feet.

Vice Chairman Schram comments that might be a fire department issue.

Mr. Tovrea states they have done the calculations based on the hydrant flow, on the two corners and based on that they are going to install a fire pump which will have water flow all the way to the third floor, there will be stand pipes in the stairs, egress and fire department access. Accommodating all of the fire lanes. They are hopeful that this project will act as a catalyst to encourage more development in the area.

Vice Chairman Schram asks if anyone in the audience needed to speak.

Vice Chairman Schram calls for a vote on the first item, SPC 25-02

Vice Chairman Schram calls for a vote on the second item, VAR 25-14

Vice Chairman Schram called for a vote. The motion carried by the following vote:

For: 5 - Alvin Joseph, David Berryhill, Gus Schram III, Thomas Sanders Jr. and Mitchell Gregory Pete

Against: 0

Absent: 2 - Adam McBride and Reginald Weeks

VAR 25-15 CHAPTER 24- LAKE CHARLES ZONING ORDINANCE

APPLICANT: WADE WILSON

SUBJECT: Applicant is requesting Variances (Sec. 24-4-205) in order to 1) reduce required front landscape bufferyard from 15ft. to 7.23ft.; and 2) allow reduction of required landscape islands within parking area, within a Business Zoning District. Location of the request is **5100 Common Street**.

STAFF FINDINGS: The on-site and site plan reviews revealed the applicant is requesting to construct a new shopping center with variances in order to 1) reduce required front landscape bufferyard from 15ft. to 7.23ft.; and 2) allow reduction of required landscape islands within parking area, within a Business Zoning District.

Vice Chairman Schram asks the applicant to state his name and address for the record.

Wade Wilson, 1791 Deerfield Dr., Moss Bluff, LA

Wanting to move his businesses into their own building. Then came to find out the city along with DOTD wants forty feet at the front of his property before he can build anything on it. Would like to reduce landscape bufferyard from fifteen feet to 7.23 ft. Sites other properties on the same street that do not meet these regulations. Asking for the reduction of parking lot landscaped islands to be reduced from two to one. Again sites other properties on the street that do not meet these regulations.

Lauren Bynum states there are development standards that everyone has to follow.

Thomas Sanders states that standards change over time.

Mr. Wilson states that the square footage that a tree could be planted in was his point.

Vice Chairman Schram states the standards are not designed to minimize things, they are an attempt by the city to create an atheistic value over the whole city. It is asking every property owner to do their part, and they do make exceptions to it. From his point of view it is not based on what you can squeeze in, it is about trying to accommodate the property. Many times there are unique aspects to a property and sometimes they have to come up with a solution for that. In this case it is understood what is being said about the twenty four foot grid space but that is out of the property and in the right of way.

Mr. Wilson confirms the twenty four feet is the right of way and states the city wants an

additional fifteen feet from the property line so that is the twenty four plus the fifteen.

Vice Chairman Schram states the fifteen feet is the part they are talking about shrinking to seven feet.

Thomas Sanders states that if there wasn't a twenty five foot right of way there we would be looking at making you adhere to the standard more tightly but there is a lot of green space there already. Nothing can be put in the green space but it is there.

Thomas Sanders asks where is the drive thru.

Mr. Wilson states it is on the south side.

Mr. Sanders asks if there was any thought given to pushing the whole building back due to the twenty four foot area in the back.

Mr. Wilson states that it is parking and he has a twenty two foot swell ditch going to be put in for drainage.

Mr. Sanders asks about the twenty four foot area that is shaded in on the site plan.

Mr. Wilson states that it is limestone and they are putting a boil shack there and because of the parking we don't have a lot of places for the employees to park. Refers to open culverts that drain to his property.

Lauren Bynum asks Mr. Wilson if he has been to DOTD.

Mr. Wilson states the city had sent him a letter about a DOTD drainage review. When he called the city to ask about the culverts no one called him back.

Lauren Bynum states that DOTD will dictate the drainage on that property.

Mr. Wilson asks if DOTD put the culverts in that drain to his property.

Lauren Bynum states that DOTD could have required those property owners to do the drainage. The drainage is going to be dictated by DOTD because you are on a state route. DOTD has different drainage standards than the city does where ours are a little more conservative than DOTD's. The city will go with whatever DOTD says because it is on a state route. If you haven't been to DOTD that could change a lot.

Mr. Wilson states he understands what Lauren Bynum is stating but what he is asking about is the culverts.

Lauren Bynum states DOTD will tell you whatever you have to do and where it needs to go.

Mr. Wilson states that he can't do anything until the variance meeting is over with.

Lauren Bynum states DOTD will tell you what you have to do, our office is not going to tell you in regards to the drainage where to go and how much. That could change the project itself. It is a requirement to talk to DOTD, they could say more or less.

Mr. Wilson states that during a meeting with the city he was told he would have to apply for another variance to talk about the area in the back.

Lauren Bynum confirms also stating that Mr. Wilson needs to go talk to DOTD as far as the drainage goes. What was discussed for the landscaping in the back if you choose not to do the landscaping as far as the trees for the bufferyard requirements because it abuts residential.

Mr. Wilson states there is a fence and asks if there has to be a fence and trees. Lauren Bynum confirms.

Mr. Wilson states that he cannot finalize his DOTD plan until this meeting is over and it is decided what he can do with the front. His engineer stated that he can't send the report again until it is figured out how it changes the drainage.

Lauren Bynum states that typically the way that it works is that we see the applicant go to DOTD first because if they change things it will change things for us.

Mr. Wilson states that he did and states that the city said because of the ordinance he has to give the fifteen foot.

Lauren Bynum asks Mr. Wilson if he did go to DOTD.

Mr. Wilson states that he has already been and when he submitted the plans there was a variance needed due to the fifteen feet needed up front.

Lauren Bynum states yes, but she is talking about the drainage part. Asks Mr. Wilson if he went to DOTD for the drainage.

Mr. Wilson states yes, he paid \$5,000 for the report. That was before and the architect had it figured out they had stated where the retention pond had to be and where all the swell ditches came in, then he learned that the city wanted 15 foot. The 15 foot is going to push it back and change a lot of the drainage. That is what we are waiting on now because we have to figure out where it is going to fall. Mr. Wilson states they did not submit a drainage plan to the city yet. The architect has it and it will be all submitted as a package until the variance came up we stopped until we get this part done first then we can submit the last few pieces to the city.

Vice Chairman Schram clarifies that we are here to discuss the variances, the reduction of islands and of the 15 feet to the 7.23 feet.

Lauren Bynum clarifies her point was the DOTD requirements is part of the permitting process, DOTD evaluates as far as drainage and they say what is required, the capacity and the outfalls, then from there we know we have a better lay of the land. That is why the questions about drainage and it is correct that a drainage plan is not on file and if he wants to do underground drainage they would have to approve that.

Mr. Wilson states he understands but also states his question was whose drainage is draining on to his property right now. It is coming from the city roads, and while he has to have these requirements, no one can tell him who is draining onto the property.

Lauren Bynum clarifies the roads are DOTD roads not the city.

Vice Chairman Schram asks Mr. Wilson the culverts that have been pointed out, are they flowing water into his property.

Mr. Wilson states they are wide open and you can see the wash outs, there are two of them wide open on his property.

Thomas Sanders states he doesn't understand. Asks if there is a grate there and water can flow into it.

Mr. Wilson states there is no grate, it is a culvert wide open. Doesn't want to fix what things have been ignored by everyone else and then abide by every rule that everyone has come up with.

Mr. Sanders states he would like to get back to the shaded area at the back of the property. Knows he has a proposed swell, what is the shaded area on the back of the property and why couldn't this whole project be pushed back another ten feet.

Mr. Wilson states he wouldn't have any parking for his employees. They are in a building right now on McNeese St. where we have less parking than what is out in front of this property. They have a barber shop and on Saturdays and Sundays it is full. We will be hard pressed to accommodate customers with the bar and grill and the other two businesses they are going to have. They have been trying to figure out the parking.

Vice Chairman Schram states the shaded in area in the back will be for employee parking and a boil shack.

Mr. Wilson states he needs that area because they would be hard pressed to have employees park in spaces that were planned for customers. There is a drive thru so they have to have enough room in the back to have an 18 wheeler be able to drive through there, for deliveries, the trash truck and so on.

Thomas Sanders states as a patron of businesses turning off of Common St. and figuring out which way to go and how to turn, where to park and going around the building to pick up you are going to have people exiting and coming one way they are going to be meeting them head on.

Mr. Wilson states that the architect has not updated the drawing of the diagonal parking because it is supposed to look like a feather. Indicating the current drawing states that it is confusing. They were supposed to change it (the architect) and they have not.

Thomas Sanders asks if Mr. Wilson can verbally tell him what they have changed.

Mr. Wilson indicates what was originally submitted then after the meeting what was submitted after to show the seven or eight foot rather than the fifteen.

Thomas Sanders states everything is running on a diagonal.

Mr. Wilson states that all of the parking spaces should be pointing south.

Thomas Sanders states for clarification that in all of the parking spaces you will be pulling in from the north to the south. Mr. Wilson confirms for the diagonal parking in the middle.

Gregory Pete asks how. There has to be space for two cars, can't see the traffic flow if you feather that because you are pulling in the same direction, how would you get out to the street.

Mr. Wilson states that he has the plan that show the traffic flow of the parking lot but did not bring it with him. If you come in the concrete drive up to the handicap spaces those to the right should be facing back to the south. Agrees that the flow is crazy now that he looks at it.

Thomas Sanders states that by looking at it he can't figure out the traffic flow.

Mr. Wilson says he has the updated drawing but he didn't bring it.

Lauren Bynum states they have not been able to review any thing but the indicated drawing.

Mr. Wilson states the amount of parking will stay the same.

Vice Chairman states that if the variances are approved it will have to be built as indicated on the drawing.

Mr. Wilson asks if that means he can't change the direction of the parking spaces because of the footage we are asking for out front.

Vice Chairman Schram states they are looking at approving the concepts of what is wanting to be done with the landscapes in relation to the parking. If the layout needs to be changed perhaps that can be done administratively as long as it meets the same concepts. If the layout of the parking spaces is changed then it will shift the landscape island.

Mr. Wilson states if it goes in a V they could still accomplish the same amount of square footage. Asks if the amount needed is 180 square feet. Lauren Bynum confirms.

Mr. Sanders states if they used the feather they may have space at the tip of the feather as well as the base of the feather for landscaping area.

Mr. Wilson asks if it is 180 square foot per island. Lauren Bynum confirms.

Vice Chairman Schram states they could take the approach of one 180 square foot landscaping island. Mr. Sanders adds they could state 180 square feet total of landscaping area in the island.

Vice Chairman Schram asks staff to read out the rules.

Kelly Miseles states landscape area within parking lots should generally be ten by eighteen feet, 180 square feet.

Thomas Sanders asks if that is determined by the size of the parking lot.

David Berryhill states it is because there is parking in the middle.

Lauren Bynum states depending on the size of the parking area that determines how many landscaping islands are required.

Thomas Sanders clarifies that based on the size of this parking area, two landscaping islands would be required and with the variance Mr. Wilson is asking for one. Lauren Bynum confirms.

David Berryhill states the hardship is because four businesses would be operating out of this building and one of them is a restaurant.

Lauren Bynum states it meets the parking requirements.

Vice Chairman Schram calls for a vote.

Vice Chairman Schram called for a vote. The motion carried by the following vote:

For: 5 - Alvin Joseph, David Berryhill, Gus Schram III, Thomas Sanders Jr. and Mitchell Gregory Pete

Against: 0

Absent: 2 - Adam McBride and Reginald Weeks

OTHER BUSINESS

ADJOURN

MEETING ADJOURNED.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES:

*Gus Schram, Vice Chairman
Lake Charles Planning and Zoning Commission*

*Lauren Bynum, Asst. Director
Office of Zoning & Land Use*